ISSN 1008-942X

JOURNAL OF ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

浙江大学学报
人文社会科学版

● 教育部"名刊工程"入选期刊 ● 全国中文核心期刊 ● CSSCI、CSA、IC 等来源期刊

1/2012
Vol.42, No.1 Jan. 2012
Zhejiang Daxue Xuebao(Renwen Shehui Kexueban)

第42卷第1期
2012年1月

浙江大学学报(人文社会科学版)
Journal of Zhejiang University(Humanities and Social Sciences)

Vol.42, No.1
Jan. 2012

主题栏目:国际休闲学研究前沿

DOI:10.3785/j.issn.1008-942X.2011.11.281

城市休闲制约与健康研究

——以韩国首尔为例

董二为[1] 冯革群[2] 叶 丹[2]

(1.南阿拉巴马大学 健康、体育与休闲研究系,阿拉巴马 莫尔比 36688;
2.宁波大学 建筑工程与环境学院,浙江 宁波 315211)

[摘 要]从公共健康和人口健康的视角研究休闲对健康的潜在贡献日益受到重视。北美的休闲制约研究已有四十年的历史,但关于休闲制约与健康关系的研究仍然空白。初步尝试休闲制约与健康研究并探究休闲制约如何影响个体健康的研究结果表明,社会与自我制约(如学习压力、配偶的休闲偏好不同、照顾孩子等)影响个体的身体状况(包括医疗、身体病痛等);而心理制约(如缺少活力和主动性等)则影响有意义的生活方式(如生活质量、对外表的接受度等)和身体健康。这为研究东亚大城市(首尔、东京、北京、上海和杭州等)的休闲制约对健康的影响提供了新的见解。

[关键词]城市;休闲制约;韩国;健康

Leisure Constraints and Health in Urban Korea: A Preliminary Study in Seoul

Dong Erwei[1] Feng Gequn[2] Ye Dan[2]

(1. *Department of Health, Physical Education and Leisure Studies, University of South Alabama, Mobile* 36688, *USA*; 2. *Faculty of Architectural Civil Engineering College, Ningbo University, Ningbo* 315211, *China*)

Abstract: The potential contributions of leisure to health have received increasing attention from a public and population health perspective. While leisure constraints have been studied for four decades in North America, there are no previous studies on exploring relationship between leisure constraints and health. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore how leisure constraints influence individual's health. The finding of this study indicates that social and self-imposed constraints (e.g., study pressure, spouse decision, taking care of children) affected individuals' physical condition (medical treatment and physical pain) and psychological constraints (e.g., lack of energy, lack of motivation) also influence meaningful lifestyle (e.g., quality of life, acceptance of bodily appearance)

[收稿日期]2011-11-28

[在线优先出版日期]2011-12-31

[基金项目]韩国基金留韩研究学金

[作者简介]1.董二为,男,美国南阿拉巴马大学健康、体育与休闲研究系助理教授,主要从事跨文化、休闲文化比较研究;2.冯革群,男,宁波大学建筑工程与环境学院副教授,主要从事跨文化城市发展和国际旅游研究;3.叶丹,女,宁波大学建筑工程与环境学院硕士研究生,主要从事城市文化、城市社会地理研究。

[本刊网址·在线杂志]http://www.journals.zju.edu.cn/soc

and physical health. The result of this study provides new perspectives for leisure constraints and health in East Asian big cities (e.g., Seoul, Tokyo, Beijing, Shanghai and Hangzhou).
Key words: urban; leisure constraints; Korea; health

一、引　言

北美的休闲制约研究已有四十年的历史,从 20 世纪 80 年代开始,休闲研究者们就用休闲制约理论研究性别、老龄化、青春期、多样性和文化。虽然东亚的休闲研究者们也对休闲制约进行过相关研究,但这些研究大多停留在描述阶段,很少涉及理论层面。近年来,休闲研究者们开始意识到从休闲研究的视角研究健康的重要性,这类研究主要关注作为城市重要的休闲娱乐的公共空间——公园的使用、体育活动和健康。尤其是许多休闲研究者认为公园的使用对人们的健康有积极的影响。笔者同意这样的观点,公园的使用与健康之间有正相关的关系。但当前的休闲与健康研究忽视了由城市化导致的城市空间缩小的事实,尤其是在东亚国家的大城市,如中国的北京、上海和杭州,韩国的首尔以及日本的东京和大阪等。当城市居民在休闲上面对诸多制约,比如上述由城市空间缩小而导致的缺乏娱乐和休闲公共空间的制约时,研究公园的使用和健康之间的关系不再是一个好的视角。因此,本文将研究视角转向休闲制约如何影响人们的健康。

二、文献回顾与研究背景

(一) 北美的休闲制约研究

休闲制约(leisure constraints)的概念来源于美国户外娱乐资源审查委员会(ORRRC)所进行的休闲障碍研究(leisure barrier studies)。在 ORRRC 的研究中,户外娱乐活动的参与度主要依据参与者或爱好者的社会经济特征来判定[1],虽然时间、健康、活动技能和娱乐设施方面的限制都被认定为对户外娱乐活动的参与有负面影响,但是“constraints” 和“barriers” 二词当时都还没有被概念化。1987 年,Crawford 和 Godbey 从社会心理学的角度把休闲障碍(leisure barriers)概念化,并将其归纳为以下三类:(1) 个人内部障碍;(2) 人际间的障碍;(3) 结构性障碍。其中,个人内部障碍指影响休闲偏好的个人内在心理状态,如压力、沮丧、焦虑。人际间的障碍是个体之间人际交往的结果,如缺乏同伴、夫妻的休闲偏好不同。结构性障碍指的是影响个体休闲偏好或休闲参与的外在因素,它是介于休闲偏好和休闲参与之间的中介制约因素,如时间、金钱、天气等[2]。1991 年,在《休闲制约的等级模型》一文中,“barriers”一词被“constraints”所替代,三类休闲障碍也相应地被修改为三类休闲制约——个人内部制约、人际间的制约和结构性制约[3]。此后,休闲研究者们便用休闲制约理论研究休闲,包括性别研究[4]、老龄化研究[5]、青春期研究[6]、多样性研究[7]等。但休闲制约理论的社会心理学视角排除了文化因素。从传统的休闲制约理论上可以看出,休闲制约理论偏向于社会心理层面,不涉及文化层面。而正如 Dong 和 Chick 所认为的,文化作为一个制约因素,在休闲制约的研究中应该被涉及[8-10]。而且就文化人类学的视角而言,休闲制约研究也应该涉及文化因素,因为文化赋予人类行为的能力,同时文化又对人类行为加以制约,使他们在自己的社会群体中行为得当。

(二) 北美以外的休闲制约研究

虽然关于休闲制约的研究主要集中于北美,但仍有一些学者将休闲制约理论运用于北美以外

的休闲研究中。例如,Soojin Lee 和她的同事在日本所作的日本人关于名人粉丝制约的心理协商研究[11];Walker 和他的同事所作的加拿大和中国大陆在校大学生休闲制约研究[12];Alexandris 和 Carroll 在希腊某一城市区块中调查参与娱乐活动的制约感知方面的人口学差异[13]。

在韩国,1990 年以前,休闲研究者们关于休闲制约的研究很少,但到 1990 年末这一情况有了较大的转变。在过去的十余年中,他们确实在休闲制约方面作了一些研究。例如,1997 年,Kang 调查了韩国首都首尔 660 名成年居民在休闲制约感知上表现出的人口学差异与社会经济地位差异。该研究既没有采用 Crawford 和 Godbey 的分类法,也没有采用休闲制约等级模型,而是用五个指标项目对研究对象的休闲制约因素进行调查,包括缺少休闲设施、缺少休闲资源(时间和金钱)、缺少休闲教育、忙于赚钱及其他制约因素。该研究发现,性别、年龄、宗教、职业、收入水平的差异会导致休闲制约感知的不同。大部分研究对象表示缺少休闲设施是最大的制约因素,缺少时间和金钱为第二大制约因素。同时,处于不同家庭生命周期也会导致休闲制约感知的不同,那些要担负孩子教育支出和家庭支出的受访者认为缺少金钱和时间是最大的休闲制约因素。基于这些分析结果,Kang 最后得出为了提高首尔居民的休闲参与度,必须增加休闲设施的结论[14]。2001 年,Pyo 和 Kim 对 657 名年龄在 20 岁到 69 岁之间的城市(包括首尔)家庭妇女进行调查研究,分析家庭生命周期如何影响对休闲制约的感知。该研究采用了 Crawford 和 Godbey 的分类法,即将休闲制约分为个人内部制约、人际间的制约和结构性制约三类。他们发现研究对象中的新婚者认为个人内部制约是最重要的制约因素,因为他们在特定休闲活动上的技能的自我觉察,或对特定休闲活动的休闲满意度的自我觉察有时会成为休闲制约因素;而那些为孩子准备婚礼的研究对象认为结构性制约是最重要的制约因素;其余的研究对象则表示人际间制约是最重要的制约因素[15]。2004 年,Song 和 Yeo 对 570 名城市(包括首尔地区)工人在休闲制约感知上表现出的人口学差异和社会经济地位差异进行了研究。该研究采用了休闲制约等级模型,在该项研究中,个人内部制约因素为缺少时间、缺少技能、工作压力、不适感;人际间的制约包含五个因素,分别是家庭成员的支持、家庭责任、好朋友的赞同、缺少休闲同伴,以及对自身社会声誉的考虑;而结构性制约因素则是缺少金钱、缺少信息、令人不适的交通、朋友的经济困难。他们发现,研究对象中三四十岁的已婚男性比二十多岁的单身女性表现出更严重的人际间的制约,而二十多岁的研究对象则比其他年龄段的研究对象表现出更严重的个人内部制约和结构性制约,在校大学生比高中毕业生更多地感到人际间的制约[16]。

总之,基于过去有限的休闲制约研究,在 20 世纪 90 年代韩国人认为缺少休闲设施是最严重的休闲制约,但从 21 世纪开始当地方政府致力于增加休闲设施时,他们才开始意识到人际间制约是比缺少休闲设施更为严重的制约。

(三)休闲与健康研究

从公共健康和人口健康的视角研究休闲对健康的潜在贡献已经日益受到重视,休闲被认为是生活方式的一部分,对人们的健康起到十分重要的作用[17]。相关研究表明,积极的休闲活动(运动或体育活动)能够增强心血管的健康,从而降低患心脏病的几率[18]。作为社区因素之一,休闲活动近来也被美国国立卫生研究所认为能缩小社区居民的健康差异,而被作为居民身体外部的介入机制加以推荐。此外,积极的休闲活动还有助于增强自尊和提高生活质量[19]。对此,加拿大学者 Mannell 基于以下五点阐述了休闲与心理健康之间的关联:(1)双手空闲、头脑忙碌;(2)愉快、放松、开心;(3)自我成长;(4)自我认识、自我肯定;(5)应对压力的能力。但 Mannell 同时还指出,非运动性的休闲即消极休闲还未被充分证实对生理健康或心理健康有正面作用[17]。

可见,休闲研究者们已经意识到研究休闲与健康之间关系的重要性。虽然可以从诸多角度对

两者进行研究，但当前的研究尤其是在北美地区主要集中于公园的使用与健康之间关系的研究[20-22]。据我们所知，从跨文化的角度探究休闲制约与健康还属于空白阶段。因此，本文旨在从跨文化的视角研究韩国首尔的居民有哪些休闲制约，以及休闲制约如何影响个体健康。基于此，本文围绕以下三个研究问题展开：首尔居民有哪些休闲制约？北美的休闲制约分类（个人内部制约、人际间的制约、结构性制约）是否适用于非北美文化的城市环境，如韩国首尔？首尔居民健康和休闲制约之间的关系如何？

三、研究方法

（一）自由列举法

在跨文化的环境中研究人类现象或休闲常常要回答的一个问题是应该采用哪种概念和分类，东方的还是西方的？对于西方的休闲理论是否适用于东方，休闲研究者们也同样意见不一。例如，如果我们想要在韩国进行休闲研究，通常要问一个问题，西方的或北美的，甚至是一些更小的区域团体提出的休闲概念是否适用于韩国文化，或者说这样的概念及分类能否被采用？在这里，有效性是所有研究者关心的问题。又比如，对在 A 文化中所产生的现象的描述确实能适用于 B 文化中产生的相应现象吗？但是，民族志学能够解决这些问题，它通过判定人如何看待自己所生活的世界而得到答案。

通常而言，人类学家会花费少则一年多则几年的时间研究其他国家的文化，目的是了解这些国家的人如何看待他们自己的世界。在这个过程中，人类学家通常用参与式观察法和非结构式访谈收集数据，而这两种方法也常常被民族志学者所借鉴。除此之外，涉及的其他一些人类学研究方法同样适用于民族志学的研究，如自由列举法。民族志学者通常对假定已经定义好的和已经被了解的文化领域感兴趣，目的是明确研究对象的定义和范围。某一个文化领域就是一系列拥有同样规则的术语，这些术语通常又可以被命名成一个新的术语或新的表达，或至少可以被包含在其中。美国人类学家 Weller 和 Romney 对此解释到："任何研究的第一步就是对所研究对象的定义和范围有一个清晰的了解。一个固有的假定就是假设研究者对研究对象所想的'某些事情'感兴趣，为了方便起见，我们称'某些事情'为语义的或文化的领域，即指语义或文化领域内能够引起兴趣的部分及其一系列相关联的术语。对该领域的已有研究包括颜色、血缘关系、疾病、植物、动物、飞机操作失误、疼痛类型和喂食婴儿的方法特征等。领域的概念是一个综合性概念，几乎涵盖了包含在内的所有事物。"[23]9

因此，通过民族志学来解决跨文化的研究，首先要对研究对象的文化领域进行定义和范围界定，而自由列举法则能够帮助达到这样的目的。自由列举法是近年来经常被认知人类学家所使用的一种方法，它是对某个文化领域下定义的第一步，确定文化领域的界限，同时也是确保研究所涉及的概念与研究区域的文化相关的一种有用的综合性方法。

"自由列举法中个人列表的数据的频率和等级属性为认知数据提供了丰富的资源。研究对象在放松和自然的状态中完成调查。自由列举法能够帮助研究者避免使用不恰当的术语。"[23]16

自由列举法类似于开放式的问卷调查[24]，研究者们往往要求研究对象罗列出所有他们能够想到的特定领域的术语。例如，研究对象可能被要求写出所有他们能够想到的动物的名称，或者列出所有他们在闲暇时间进行的活动。然后研究者根据自由列表中的条目，分析哪些条目更为显著，也就是说那些被提到的次数更多以及被早早列出的条目比其他条目更为显著。其中，频率和显著性能够通过 ANTHROPAC 4[25] 自动生成，而且生成的频率数据列表和 Smith 显著指数可用于进一

步的数据分析。出于数据饱和度的要求,自由列举法的研究对象的人数通常要控制在相对较小的范围,为20人前后。此外,自由列举法的结果还能运用于其他研究方法中,如问卷调查。

由于是在跨文化的环境中进行的,因此本研究用自由列举法收集韩国首尔休闲制约的数据,对韩国的休闲制约这一文化领域进行定义和范围界定,而非采用在非韩国文化研究中得到的休闲制约分类或休闲制约等级模型。自由列举数据收集自18名居住于首尔的居民(表1),然后根据这些自由列举数据设计了一份制约因素问卷,进行第二轮数据收集。这一收集问卷数据的方法在作者之前的研究中已经使用过[10]。

表1 研究对象的社会人口统计信息

研究对象	年龄	性别	职业	婚姻状况
1	16	男	高中生	未婚
2	16	女	高中生	未婚
3	29	男	研究生	未婚
4	25	女	公司雇员	未婚
5	25	女	公司雇员	未婚
6	29	男	公司雇员	未婚
7	38	女	家庭主妇	已婚
8	39	男	个体经营者	已婚
9	36	男	个体经营者	已婚
10	37	女	家庭主妇	已婚
11	41	男	研究人员	已婚
12	43	女	研究人员	未婚
13	40	男	公司雇员	已婚
14	43	女	个体经营者	已婚
15	54	女	个体经营者	已婚
16	54	女	家庭主妇	已婚
17	59	男	个体经营者	已婚
18	58	男	政府官员	已婚

表2显示了研究对象罗列的12个制约因素。其中,有10个研究对象提到缺少金钱和时间,而家庭责任、健康状况、配偶的休闲偏好不同、学习压力和缺少休闲信息只有一个研究对象提到。

表2 研究对象列举的休闲制约因素(自由列举)

频率	休闲制约因素
10	缺少金钱
10	缺少时间
3	照顾孩子(子女、孙子女)

续表 2

频率	休闲制约因素
3	疲劳
3	缺少积极性
3	缺少同伴
3	缺少活力
1	家庭责任
1	健康状况
1	配偶的休闲偏好不同
1	学习压力
1	缺少休闲信息

（二）问卷数据收集

问卷要求研究对象依据李克特（Likert）量表的 1—5 分评分标准对每项制约因素的重要程度进行评价。例如，如果“缺少金钱”在某一研究地点被列入制约因素问卷中的话，那么该地点的研究对象就被要求对“缺少金钱”这一制约因素以 1—5 分进行评分（1 是最不重要，5 是最重要）。

个体健康通过世界卫生组织研制的生存质量测定表进行测量，即 WHQOQL。WHQOQL 是一套国际性的跨文化的生存质量评估工具，在许多国家被广泛使用，用于评估个体在其文化体系和价值体系内的个体感知，以及他们对健康的关注。WHOQOL 也是采用李克特量表的 1—5 分评分法进行测量。其中，本研究采用的是 WHOQOL 的简化版，即 WHOQOL-BREF（世界卫生组织生存质量测定简表），该表由 26 项指标组成，包括生理健康、心理健康、社会关系和环境等[26]。此外，本研究还对体重、身高和血压三个变量进行了测量。美国疾病控制与防御中心表示，用个体的体重和身高能够计算身体质量指数（BMI）[27]，该指数是判断肥胖与否的重要指示器，而过度肥胖则会导致健康问题。血压数据包括心脏收缩压和心脏舒张压，也是判断身体健康与否的重要指标，如果血压上升或长时间停留在较高值，会对身体的诸多部位造成损伤，如心脏、血管、肾等。而健康的生活方式则能够帮助人们延迟或防止高血压（HBP）[28]。

问卷在韩国首尔汉江市民公园发放并收集。调查问卷共采集了 182 个研究对象，他们都居住在首尔。表 3 所示的是研究样本的社会人口统计信息：

表 3　研究样本的社会人口统计信息

类别		数量	比例（%）
性别	男	84	47.2
	女	94	52.8
年龄	≤ 40	95	52.5
	＞ 40	86	47.5
收入	≤$ 36 000	86	49.4
	＞$ 36 000	88	50.6

续表3

类别		数量	比例(%)
教育程度	两年大学教育及其以下	80	46.2
	大学及其以上	93	53.8
家庭成员	≤3	85	46.7
	>3	97	53.3
婚姻状况	未婚	73	40.3
	已婚	108	59.7

(三)数据分析

本研究采用统计学工具SPSS 17.0对所得问卷数据进行分析。为了减少休闲制约因素的数量(一共有12个休闲制约因素和19个健康变量)和提炼数据中的潜在因素,以及为将来的数据分析创造出一系列新的变量,本研究进行了主成分因子分析(用方差旋转和大于等于1的特征值作因子筛选)。为了判定休闲制约因子如何与健康变量相关联,本研究用Pearson相关系数来测定各个变量之间的相关性。

(四)研究地点的选择

研究对象主要在首尔市汉江市民公园选取。汉江市民公园是首尔最受欢迎的娱乐场地之一,仅2006年一年,汉江市民公园的游客量就超过5 100万人次,这个数据意味着每个首尔市民在该年内平均去汉江市民公园五次。汉江市民公园由12个靠近汉江的小公园组成,我们在其中一个叫汝矣岛公园的小公园内收集数据。选取汝矣岛公园是因为我们本着样本容易获取的原则,而它是12个小公园中游客量最大的。

我们将调查点设在汝矣岛公园的入口处,要求五名研究助理尽可能依据游客的年龄、性别、家庭团队方式或非家庭团队方式游玩等,选择不同类型的游客作为研究对象。研究助理向游客们解释研究目的,询问他们是否有兴趣参加,那些同意参与的游客被邀请进调查点并填写调查问卷,在填写的过程中,针对他们不理解的问题,进行相应的解释。问卷填写结束后,我们发给每位研究对象一瓶水和一支圆珠笔表示感谢。

四、研究结果

表4显示的是研究对象依重要性对12项休闲制约因素进行评分的分值平均值和标准差:

表4 休闲制约因素的平均值和标准差

序号	制约因素	平均值	标准差
1	缺少金钱	3.32	1.15
2	缺少时间	3.25	1.17
3	疲劳	3.13	1.13
4	缺少活力	2.72	1.16

续表 4

序号	制约因素	平均值	标准差
5	缺少积极性	2.69	1.13
6	家庭责任	2.52	1.14
7	缺少休闲信息	2.37	1.08
8	缺少同伴	2.29	1.14
9	照顾孩子(子女、孙子女)	2.25	1.39
10	配偶的休闲偏好不同	2.11	1.13
11	健康状况	2.09	1.12
12	学习压力	2.02	1.12

在最重要的五个制约因素中，首尔居民将“缺少金钱”列为最重要的制约因素，然后依次是“缺少时间”、“疲劳”、“缺少活力”和“缺少积极性”。最不重要的五个制约因素依次是“学习压力”、“健康状况”、“配偶的休闲偏好不同”、“照顾孩子”、“缺少同伴”。从表 2 可知，问卷中共有 12 项休闲制约因素之多，为了减少休闲制约因素的数量和提炼数据中的潜在因素，以及为将来的数据分析创造出一系列新的变量，笔者进行了主成分因子分析，得出占总方差 52.05% 的三个主要因子，如表 5 所示：

表 5　休闲制约因素的重要性主成分因子分析结果

因子	方差百分比 (%)	因子名称	部分休闲制约因素
1	28.89	社会与自我制约	学习压力、配偶的休闲偏好不同、照顾孩子等
2	12.59	心理制约	缺少活力、缺少积极性、疲劳
3	10.56	结构性制约	缺少时间、缺少金钱

主成分因子分析之后，得到了一组新的变量，包括社会与自我制约、心理制约和结构性制约。

由于问卷中有多达 19 项健康变量，因此我们同样用主成分因子分析法来减少数据。如表 6 所示，主成分因子分析后得到占总方差 56.62% 的三个主要因子，分别是“有意义的生活方式”、“生活满意度”和“身体状况”。

表 6　健康变量的重要性主成分因子分析结果

因子	方差百分比(%)	因子名称	部分健康变量
1	34.42	有意义的生活方式	评价你的生活质量、接受你的外形、享受生活等
2	12.59	生活满意度	满意你的健康状况、满意你的睡眠质量、满意你的工作等
3	9.61	身体状况	医疗、身体疼痛

为了确定三个休闲制约因子与三个健康变量之间的关系，本研究用 Pearson 相关系数对休闲制约因子和健康变量作相关分析，相关结果如表 7 所示。

表 7 显示部分因子之间的相关性显著。社会与自我制约和身体状况呈正相关，但相关性不是很强(r=0.23)，两者的正相关关系可以解释为那些有更多社会与自我制约的人觉得身体状况也更糟糕，因为他们需要更多的医疗，并且感到更多的身体病痛。有意义的生活方式、身体状况两者都与心理制约表现出相关性，r 分别为 −0.18 和 0.23。其中，有意义的生活方式与心理制约的负相

关关系,表明那些受心理制约因素所制约的人缺乏有意义的生活方式。虽然结构性制约和有意义的生活方式、生活满意度以及身体状况都不显著相关,但结构性制约与生活满意度、身体状况接近相关,p 值分别为0.08和0.06,十分接近0.05。

表7 休闲制约因子与健康变量因子的相关性(N=182)

制约因子	相关性	有意义的生活方式	生活满意度	身体状况
社会与自我制约	r	−0.02	−0.11	0.23
	p	0.75	0.15	0.00
心理制约	r	−0.18	−0.05	0.23
	p	0.02	0.52	0.00
结构性制约	r	0.08	−0.13	−0.14
	p	0.28	0.08	0.06

注:r 表示 Pearson 相关,p 表示显著性水平。

五、结 论

虽然只是对休闲制约与健康研究的一次初步探索,但本研究为休闲研究者和工作者们在跨文化的城市环境中研究休闲制约与健康提供了初始数据,原因如下:

首先,正如文章开头所述,以往的休闲和健康的研究主要关注体育活动、公园的使用和健康之间的关系[20-22],而休闲制约从未被作为能够影响个体健康的因子而加以研究。本研究的结果表明休闲制约和健康之间确实存在关联,社会与自我制约(如学习压力、配偶的休闲偏好不同、照顾孩子)影响个体健康状况(医疗和身体病痛),而心理制约(如缺少活力、缺少积极性)则影响首尔居民有意义的生活方式(如生活质量、对外表的接受度)和身体健康。

其次,虽然大部分休闲研究者们都采用休闲制约理论研究休闲制约,但他们将研究对象的回答归类到现成的分类之中(三类休闲制约:个人内部制约、人际间的制约和结构性制约)。我们认为,基于研究对象的回答来对休闲制约因素进行分类[2],对休闲研究者和休闲服务来说都是更为合适的方法。因此,对韩国政府官员和休闲服务工作者而言,本研究所得出的休闲制约比不考虑跨文化环境的抽象的三分法更可行、更有用。比如,如果得出心理制约是影响健康的主要因子,那么首尔市政府和休闲服务部门就要寻找能够减少这类制约的方法。同样,如果社会与自我制约对身体状况造成负面的影响,那么首尔市政府和休闲服务部门也要寻找能够减少这类制约的方法。

再次,在确定首尔居民的休闲制约因素上,人类学的研究方法作出了很大的贡献,尤其是它的自由列举法,作为被认知人类学家普遍使用的特定方法,在本研究中可以被认为是确定文化领域(如休闲活动、休闲制约)的第一步。虽然 Garry Chick 作为文化人类学家,从1981年就开始研究娱乐和休闲,在80年代中期发表的诸多相关文章中都引入了人类学的视角[29-32],但并没有引起其他休闲研究者的重视和效仿。因此,未来的休闲学研究应该引入人类学的研究方法以提高研究的有效性和可靠性。

最后,本研究结果为研究东亚大城市(首尔、东京、北京、上海和杭州等)的休闲制约对健康的影响提供了新的见解,尤其是人类学视角对我国的休闲研究有借鉴意义。与不考虑跨文化环境的抽象的三分法相比,本研究基于研究对象的回答而得出的制约因素分类(社会与自我制约、心理制约、

结构性制约)在我国的大城市也是可行的。因为对于政府和休闲服务部门来讲,从文化人类学角度基于研究对象的回答所得出的分类要比照搬从社会心理学角度得出的现成的分类更切实际。

当然,本研究也存在不足。第一,汝矣岛小公园是汉江市民公园 12 个小公园中空间最大的小公园,因此人们可以在此举办活动,如社交聚会,人流量很大。第二,汝矣岛公园比其他小公园拥有更为便捷的交通系统(地铁),所以它的可达性很强,出地铁站走 3—5 分钟就可以到达。第三,汝矣岛小公园离住宅区和商务区很近,因此无论是周末还是平时,人们都会去那里走走。因此,本研究的样本或许会因为其研究地点地理位置的特殊性而招致非议。

为什么我们不通过邮寄问卷的方式来获取数据从而避免这种不足呢? 因为韩国的城市文化使邮寄问卷的方式不可行。韩国城市居民倾向于认为邮寄的问卷资料是一种市场营销手段,从而会很慎重地考虑是否要参与填写,因为之后他们有可能会被铺天盖地的广告传单搞得筋疲力尽。因此,韩国社会科学研究者们发现邮寄问卷的回收率很低,于是倾向于优先选择现场问卷,然后是电话问卷、网上问卷,最后才是邮寄问卷的方式。此外,韩国人尊重大学研究,所以当我们现场面对面询问公园内的游览者们是否愿意参与填写问卷时,那些潜在的研究对象相信本研究不是市场营销问卷,都表示愿意参与。因此,由于韩国这一特殊的文化现象,我们最终决定采用现场问卷的方式以提高回收率。

[参　考　文　献]

[1] A.Ferris, *National Recreation Survey: Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report* 19, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

[2] D.Crawford & G.Godbey, "Reconceptualizing Barriers to Family Leisure," *Leisure Sciences*, Vol.9, No.2 (1987), pp.119-127.

[3] D.Crawford, E.L.Jackson & G.Godbey, "A Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constraints," *Leisure Sciences*, Vol.13, No.4 (1991), pp.309-320.

[4] K.Henderson & B.Ainswoth, "Enablers and Constraints to Walking for African and American Indian Women," *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, Vol.71, No.4 (2000), pp.313-321.

[5] F.McGuire & W.Norman, "The Role of Constraints in Successful Aging: Inhibiting or Enabling," in E.L.Jackson (ed.), *Constraints to Leisure*, State College, PA: Venture Publishing, 2005, pp.89-101.

[6] L.Caldwell & C.Baldwin, "A Developmental Approach to Understanding Constraints to Adolescent Leisure," in E.L.Jackson (ed.), *Constraints to Leisure*, State College, PA: Venture Publishing, 2005, pp.75-88.

[7] M.Stodolska & E.L.Jackson, "Discrimination in Leisure and Work Experienced by a White Ethnic Minority Group," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol.30, No.1 (1998), pp.23-46.

[8] E.Dong & G.Chick, "Possibility of Refining the Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constraints by Different Populations," in J.Murdy (ed.), *Proceedings of the* 2003 *Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium*, New York: Bolton Landing, 2003, pp.338-344.

[9] G.Chick & E.Dong, "Culture Constraints on Leisure," in E.L.Jackson (ed.), *Constraints to Leisure*, State College, PA: Venture Publishing, 2005, pp.169-183.

[10] [美]盖瑞·奇克、董二为:《中国六城市休闲制约因素研究》,《浙江大学学报(人文社会科学版)》2009 年第 1 期,第 31-42 页。[G.Chick, & E.Dong, "An Ethnographic Analyses of Leisure Constraints in Six Chinese Cities," *Journal of Zhejiang University* (*Humanities and Social Sciences*), No.1 (2009), pp.31-42.]

[11] D.Scott & S.Lee, "The Process of Celebrity Fan's Constraint Negotiation," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol.41, No.2 (2009), pp.137-155.

[12] G.Walker, E.Jackson & J.Deng, "Culture and Leisure Constraints: A Comparison of Canadian and Mainland Chinese University Students," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol.39, No.4 (2007), pp.567-590.

[13] K.Alexandris & B.Carroll,"Demographic Differences in the Perception of Constraints on Recreational Sport Participation: Results from a Study in Greece," *Leisure Studies*, Vol.16, No.2(1997), pp.107-125.

[14] B.Kang,"A Study of Factors Associated with Limitations on Leisure Activities of Koreans in Seoul," *Journal of Korean Society of Leisure and Recreation*, Vol.14(1997), pp.75-86.

[15] Y.Pyo & Y.Kim," The Relationship between Family Life Cycle and Leisure Activity and Leisure Constraints," *Journal of Korean Sociology of Sport*, Vol.14, No.2(2001), pp.457-467.

[16] W.Song & I.Yeo,"The Influence of Leisure Constraints on Leisure Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction of Urban Workers," *The Korean Journal of Physical Education*, Vol.43, No.4(2004), pp.685-697.

[17] R.Mannell,"Leisure, Health and Well-being," *World Leisure Journal*, Vol.49(2007), pp.114-128.

[18] I.Lee & R.Paffenbarger,"Associations of Light, Moderate, and Vigorous Intensity Physical Activity with Longevity: The Harvard Alumni Health Study," *American Journal of Epidemiology*, Vol.151, No.3(2000), pp.293-299.

[19] S.Elavsky, E.McAuley & R.W.Motl, et al,"Physical Activity Enhances Long-term Quality of Life in Older Adults: Efficacy, Esteem, and Affective Influences," *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, Vol.30, No.2(2005), pp.138-145.

[20] E. Orsega-Smith, A. Mowen & L. Payne, et al," The Interaction of Stress and Park Use on Psycho-physiological Health in Older Adults," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (2004), pp. 232-256.

[21] K.Shores & S.West,"Physical Activity Outcomes Associated with African American Park Visitation in Four Community Parks," *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, Vol.26, No.3(2006), pp.75-92.

[22] M.Floyd, J.Spengler & J.Madddock, et al," Environmental and Social Correlates of Physical Activity in Neighborhood Parks: An Observational Study in Tampa and Chicago," *Leisure Sciences*, Vol.30, No.4(2008), pp.360-375.

[23] S.C.Weller & A.K.Romney, *Systematic Data Collection*(*Qualitative Research Methods Series* 10), Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.

[24] M.Quinlan,"Considerations for Collecting Freelists in the Field: Examples from Ethobotany," *Field Methods*, Vol.17, No.3(2005), pp.219-234.

[25] S.Borgatti, *ANTHROPAC* 4.0 *Methods Guide*, Natick, MA: Analytic Technologies, 1996.

[26] Anonymity,"WHO Quality of Life-BREF (WHOQOL-BREF)," 2011-12-08, http://www.who.int/substance_abuse/research_tools/whoqolbref/en/, 2011-12-08.

[27] Anonymity,"About BMI for Adults," 2011-09-13, http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/adult_BMI/about_adult_BMI.htm, 2011-12-08.

[28] Anonymity,"What is High Blood Pressure,"2011-04-01, http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/dci/Diseases/Hbp/HBP_WhoIsAtRisk.html, 2011-12-08.

[29] G.Chick,"Leisure and the Development of Culture," *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.11(1984), pp.623-626.

[30] G.Chick,"Anthropology and Leisure," in S.Parker(ed.), *International Handbook of Leisure Studies and Research*, London: Leisure Studies Association, 1985, pp.118-119.

[31] G.Chick,"The Cross-Cultural Analysis of Leisure Behavior," *Leisure Information Quarterly*, Vol.12(1985), pp.8-9.

[32] G.Chick," Leisure, Labor, and the Complexity of Culture: An Anthropological Perspective," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol.18(1986), pp.154-168.

DOI: 10.3785/j.issn.1008-942X.2011.11.281

Leisure Constraints and Health in Urban Korea: A Preliminary Study in Seoul

Dong Erwei[1] Feng Gequn[2] Ye Dan[2]

(1. *Department of Health, Physical Education and Leisure Studies, University of South Alabama, Mobile* 36688, *USA*; 2. *Faculty of Architectural Civil Engineering College, Ningbo University, Ningbo* 315211, *China*)

Ⅰ. Introduction

Leisure constraints have been studied for four decades in North America. Since then, many leisure researchers have used the leisure constraints theory to study gender, aging, adolescence, diversity and culture. Although leisure constraints have been also studied by Eastern Asian leisure scholars, most studies are largely descriptive and atheoretical. Recently, leisure researchers have realized studying health is critical from leisure studies perspectives. Studying leisure and health has been heavily focused on park use and physical activity. In particular, many researchers believe that park use positively influences people's health. While we agree with positive relationship between park use or physical activity and health, we think current leisure and health studies neglect decrease of urban space due to urbanization especially in East Asian countries such as China, Korea and Japan. We think studying relationship between park use and health may not be a good approach when urban residents face many constraints on leisure such as lack of public spaces for recreation and leisure. Therefore, we are particularly interested in studying how leisure constraints influence people's health in this paper.

Ⅱ. Literature Review

1. Leisure Constraints Research in North America

Looking back in history, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission of (ORRRC) of U.S. conducted barrier studies which are the origin of the concept of leisure

Received date: 2011-11-28 **Website**: http://www.journals.zju.edu.cn/soc

Online first date: 2011-12-31

Foundation item: Fellowship for Field Research, Korea Foundation

Author profile: 1. Dong Erwei, Assistant Professor of Leisure Studies, Department of Health, Physical Education and Leisure Studies, University of South Alabama, USA; 2. Feng Gequn, Associate Professor of Cross-cultural Urban Development, Faculty of Architectural Civil Engineering College, Ningbo University, China; 3. Ye Dan, Master Degree Candidate of Faculty of Architectural Civil Engineering College, Ningbo University, China.

constraints. In the ORRRC studies, outdoor recreation activities were primarily examined in terms of socioeconomic characteristics of people who participated in or preferred the activities[1]. Although time, health, skill and facilities were indentified to negatively impact outdoor recreation participation, the term "constraints" or "barriers" were not conceptualized in the ORRRC studies. In 1987, Crawford and Godbey suggested barriers should be categorized as: (1) intrapersonal, (2) interpersonal, and (3) structural barriers. Intrapersonal barriers involved individual psychological states interacting with leisure preferences (e.g., stress, depression, anxiety). Intrapersonal barriers were outcome of interpersonal relations between individuals' characteristics (e.g., lack of partners, spousal decision), and structural barriers referred to constraints conceptualized as intervening factors between leisure participation and preference (e.g., time, money and weather)[2]. In "A Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constraints" written by Crawford, Jackson and Godbey in 1991, "barriers" were rephrased to "constraints", which were further categorized as intrapersonal constraints, interpersonal constraints and structural constraints[3]. Since then, many leisure researchers have used the leisure constraints theory to study leisure including (a) gender[4]; (b) aging[5]; (c) adolescence[6]; (d) diversity[7]. However, due to the social psychology-oriented leisure constraints theory, culture is not included in the theory. As Dong and Chick[8] and Chick and Dong[9-10] argued that culture, as a constraint factor, should be considered in leisure constraints studies. From anthropological perspective, culture is humanity's great enabler but it also imposes constraints on human behavior[9-10].

2. Leisure Constraints Research Outside North America

While research on leisure constraints has been heavily focused on North America[8], several international scholars have adopted leisure constraints theory to conduct leisure research outside North America. For example, celebrity fan's constraint negotiation study was conducted in Japan among Japanese people by Soojin Lee and her colleagues[11]. Walker and his colleagues conducted leisure constraints among university students in Canada and in Mainland China[12]. Alexanderis and Carroll investigated demographic differences in the perception of constraints on recreational sport participation in an urban area in Greece[13].

Although Korean leisure scholars have rarely studied leisure constraints until the late 1990, a few scholars did conduct the research on leisure constraints over the last decade. For example, Kang examined the demographic and social economic status differences in the perception of leisure constraints among 660 adult citizens of Seoul, the capital city of Korea. Kang's study did not use Crawford and Godbey's model or the hierarchical model of leisure constraints. Kang used five items to ask about leisure constraints including a lack of leisure facilities, a lack of leisure resources (time and money), a lack of leisure education, the pursuit of monetary gain, and other constraints. Kang found that there were age, gender, religious, occupational, and income-level differences in the perception of leisure constraints, and that most respondents considered a lack of leisure facilities as the most serious constraint, and a lack of time and money as the second most serious constraint. Kang's study, however, showed that there were family-life-stage differences in the perception of leisure constraints, and that the respondents who were to be responsible for children's education and marriage expense regarded the lack of time and money as the most

serious leisure constraint. Kang strongly suggested the development of leisure facilities so as to improve the level of Seoul citizens' leisure engagement[14]. A few years later, Pyo and Kim researched how family life cycle influences the perception of leisure constraints among 675 urban housewives including Seoul residents. The study participants aged between the 20s and 60s. They adopted intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints from Crawford and Godbey's model. Pyo and Kim's study found that the new-weds respondents felt the intrapersonal constraints were the most significant constraint because their self-awareness about the ability and skill for certain leisure activities and/or the level of leisure satisfaction with certain leisure activities sometimes played a role as leisure constraints. They also found that the respondents who prepared for their children's wedding thought of the structural constraint as the most serious one, and the other respondents considered the interpersonal constraint as the most severe one[15]. Song and Yeo investigated the demographic and socio-economic status differences in the perception of leisure constraints among 570 urban workers including ones in Seoul area. They employed the hierarchical model of leisure constraints. In their study, the interpersonal constraints included five items including agreement of family members, family obligation, the consent of close friend(s), a lack of leisure companion, and consideration of social reputation. The items related to the intrapersonal constraints were a lack of time, a lack of skill, pressure from job obligation, and uncomfortableness. The structural constraints included a lack of money, a lack of information, uncomfortable transportation, and friends' economic difficulties. Song and Yeo found that male, the 30s and 40s, and married respondents perceived more serious interpersonal constraints than female, the 20s, single respondents. This study also presented that the 20s felt more serious intrapersonal and structural constraints than other age groups. The study shows that college graduates respondents felt more intrapersonal constraints than high school graduates[16].

In sum, based on paucity of previous leisure constraints studies, urban Korean people perceived the lack of leisure facilities as the most severe constraints in the 1990s; however, urban Korean people have begun to perceive interpersonal constraints as more serious constraints than the lack of the number of leisure facilities since the 21st century when local government started to develop more leisure facilities than before.

3. Leisure and Health Research

The potential contributions of leisure to health have received increasing attention from a public and population health perspective. Increasingly, leisure is viewed as a domain of lifestyles that are important for people's health[17]. According to previous research, active leisure (exercise or physical activity) can reduce the risk of heart disease by enhancing cardiovascular health[18]. Leisure activities, as one of community factors, have been recently recommended by National Institute of Health (NIH) of the U.S. to serve as interventions that could reduce health disparities. Furthermore, active leisure has shown to be related to increased physical self esteem and quality of life[19]. Mannell summarized explanations of the link between leisure and psychological well being based on the following five themes: (1) keeping idle hands and minds busy, (2) pleasure, relaxation and fun, (3) personal growth, (4) identity formation and affirmation, and (5) resource for coping with stress. However, non-exercise forms of leisure (passive leisure) have not been well-documented to show a positive impact on either physical or psychological health[17].

Leisure researchers have realized that research on leisure and health is critical. While studying leisure and health could be conducted in many ways, recreation and leisure research has been heavily focused on park use and health[20-22]. However, to our best knowledge, there are no previous studies on exploring relationship between leisure constraints and health cross-culturally. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore how leisure constraints influence individual's health and what leisure constraints are faced by Korean people in Seoul, Korea. The research questions are as follows: What are leisure constraints faced by Seoul residents? Are leisure constraints classifications (intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural) created in North America applicable to a cross cultural urban setting (Seoul, Korea)? What are relationships between health and leisure constraints among Seoul residents?

Ⅲ. Research Methods

1. Free Listing Technique

Studying human phenomenon or leisure in cross-cultural settings often raises the question of whose concepts and categories to use. Leisure researchers may argue whether or not Western leisure theories could be applicable to the East. For example, if we want to conduct leisure research in Korea, we often raise the question that is, should the Western or North American or even some more limited group's concept of leisure be imposed on Korean culture or should the concepts or categories of the groups under study be used? The issue here is the validity issue concerned by all researchers. Are descriptions of phenomena developed in culture A really describing what they are supposed to when applied to culture B? However, ethnography can answer these questions that are to determine how others see their own worlds.

Traditionally, anthropologists spend at least a year, and often many years, in other cultures in order to understand how residents of those cultures see their worlds. In generally, anthropologists normally use participant-observation and unstructured interviews to facilitate data collection, but other methods can be used to conduct ethnographical studies as well. Ethnographers are often interested in presumably well defined and understood cultural domains to understand the definition and boundaries of what is being studied. A cultural domain is a set of items that are of the same order and often are named or, at least, can be referred to by an encompassing term or phrase. Weller and Romney explain:

> …the first step in any study is to obtain a clear understanding of the definition and boundaries of what is being studied. … there is an implicit assumption that the researcher is interested in what the respondents think about 'something'. For convenience we call the 'something' a semantic or cultural domain. The semantic or cultural domain is simply the subject matter of interest, a set of related items. Examples of domains that have been studies include color terms, kinship terms, diseases, plant terms, animal terms, airplane piloting errors, kinds of pain, and characteristics of infant feeding methods. The concept of a domain is a very general one and may include almost any coherently defined subject matter.[23]9

Recently often used by cognitive anthropologists, free listing is one technique that can serve as the first step in defining a cultural domain and as a useful general method to ensure that

concepts under study are culturally relevant. According to Weller and Romney:

> …it [free listing] provides a strong source of cognitive data in terms of frequencies and the order properties of the individual lists. Informants can usually do the task in an easy and natural way. Free listing helps prevent researchers from using inappropriate items. [23]16

Free listing is similar to open-ended survey questions[24]. In particular, researchers typically ask informants to list all of the items in a particular domain that they can think of. For example, informants might be asked to name all of the kinds of animals they can think of or list activities that people do during their free time. After a free list of items is constructed, researchers can analyze which items are more salient, that is, those that are listed more frequently and are listed/named early by informants are more salient than those that are listed less frequently and later. ANTHROPAC 4 can generate frequencies of listing and Smith's salience index, and can be used for further data analysis[25]. Usually, only a relatively small number of informants, approximately 20 required for data saturation. The results from free listing can be then used in other research methods such as surveys.

In this study, we used free listing to collect data on leisure constraints in Seoul, Korea, since this study was conducted in a cross-cultural setting. The free listing data were collected from 18 informants who resided in Seoul. We then used these data to construct a survey for a second round of data collection in Seoul. This approach has been used by previous research for survey data collection[10].

Table 1 Socio-demographic Information of Informants

Informants	Age	Gender	Occupation	Marital status
1	16	Male	High school student	Single
2	16	Female	High school student	Single
3	29	Male	Graduate student	Single
4	25	Female	Company employee	Single
5	25	Female	Company employee	Single
6	29	Male	Company employee	Single
7	38	Female	housewife	Married
8	39	Male	Self-own business	Married
9	36	Male	Self-own business	Married
10	37	Female	Housewife	Married
11	41	Male	Researcher	Married
12	43	Female	Researcher	Single
13	40	Male	Company employee	Married
14	43	Female	Self-own business	Married
15	54	Female	Self-own business	Married
16	54	Female	Housewife	Married
17	59	Male	Self-own business	Married
18	58	Male	Government officer	Married

Table 2 shows 12 constraints listed by the informants. Both money and time were listed by 10 informants whereas family obligation, health condition, spouse's decision, pressure of study and lack of leisure information were listed by one informant respectively.

Table 2 Constraints Listed by the Informants (Free Listing)

Frequencies	Constraints
10	Lack of money
10	Lack of time
3	Taking care of children (your children, grandchildren)
3	Tiredness (fatigue)
3	Lack of motivation
3	Lack of companions
3	Lack of energy
1	Family obligation
1	Health condition
1	My spouse's decision/reason
1	Pressure of study
1	Lack of leisure information

2 .Survey Data Collection

The surveys asked informants to rate each item on their final list in terms of importance on a 1-5 Likert-type scale. So, for example, if "lack of money" is on the list of constraints for a particular research site, the informants at that site would be asked to rate the importance of "lack of money" from 1 (extremely unimportant) to 5 (extremely important). Individual's health was measured by using the Quality of Life constructed by the World Health Organization (WHO) where weight, height and blood pressure were variables in the survey. The WHO developed an international cross-culturally comparable quality of life assessment instrument called The World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHOQOL). The WHOQOL evaluates the individual's perceptions in the context of their culture and value systems, and their health concerns. The WHOQOL instruments have been widely tested in many countries. WHOQOL is measured using a 1-5 Likert-type scale. WHOQOL-BREF is a shorter version of the original instrument comprised 26 items including physical health, psychological health, social relationships, and environment[26]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the U.S notes that Body Mass Index (BMI) can be calculated using a person's weight and height, which is a reliable indicator of body fatness for people. In addition, BMI is an inexpensive and easy-to-perform method of screening for overweight qualifiers that may lead to health problems[27]. Blood pressures were measured. If blood pressure rises and stays high over time, it can damage many organs of human body, such as heart, blood vessels, kidneys, and other

parts of the body. However, a healthy lifestyle helps some people delay or prevent high blood pressure (HBP)[28].

Questionnaires were distributed and collected in Hangang Park located in Seoul, Korea. Survey data were collected from a total of 182 informants who identified themselves as Seoul's residents. Socio-demographic information for the Seoul residents sampled from the survey data is shown in the table 3 below.

Table 3 Socio-demographic Information of Survey Samples

Category		Quantity	Proportion(%)
Gender	Male	84	47.2
	Female	94	52.8
Age	≤ 40	95	52.5
	> 40	86	47.5
Income	≤ $ 36 000	86	49.4
	> $ 36 000	88	50.6
Education	2 years college or less	80	46.2
	College or more	93	53.8
Family Members	≤ 3	85	46.7
	>3	97	53.3
Marital Status	Single	73	40.3
	Married	108	59.7

3. Data Analysis

A total of 12 constraints and 19 health variables were included in the survey. To determine the underlying factors and to create a new set of variables for further analyses, we conducted a principal components analysis (using varimax rotation and eigenvalues of ≥ 1 for factor extraction). Since we were interested in determining how components of leisure constraints are related to health variables, we correlated each with health variables using Pearson's correlation coefficient. SPSS 17.0 was used for the data analysis in this study.

4. Research Site

Survey respondents were primarily selected in Hangang Park in Seoul. In 2006, over 51 million people visited Hangang Park. This number means that every Seoul citizen visited the Park almost 5 times in 2006. As one of the most popular recreation places in Seoul, Hangang Park is composed of 12 small parks near the Han River. We collected the data from one of the 12 small parks, called Yeouido where is the most visited park among the 12 small parks. Convenient samples were chosen for this study.

In the Yeouido Park, we installed the survey booth near to the entrance. Five research assistants approached as many visitors as possible of various characteristics including age, gender, family or non family group. The assistants explained the research purpose to the visitors and asked them whether they were interested in participating in the study. Those who agreed entered the survey booth and filled out the survey form. For those who could not understand the questions well, we explained the questions to them. After the completion of filling out the survey form, we gave the respondents a bottle of water and a ballpoint pen.

Ⅳ. Result

Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations for the 12 leisure constraints rated most important by the informants.

Table 4 Means and Standard Deviations for Leisure Constraints

No.	Constraints	M	SD
1	Lack of money	3.32	1.15
2	Lack of time	3.25	1.17
3	Tiredness (fatigue)	3.13	1.13
4	Lack of energy	2.72	1.16
5	Lack of motivation	2.69	1.13
6	Family obligation	2.52	1.14
7	Lack of leisure information	2.37	1.08
8	Lack of companions	2.29	1.14
9	Taking care of children (your children, grandchildren)	2.25	1.39
10	My spouse's decision/reason	2.11	1.13
11	Health condition	2.09	1.12
12	Pressure of study	2.02	1.12

Among the top five most important constraints, "lake of money" was rated most important by Seoul residents, followed by "lack of time" "tiredness (fatigue)", "lake of energy" and "lake of motivation". The least five important constraints were, "pressure of study", "health condition", "spouse'sdecision", "taking care of children" and "lack of companions". Table 2 indicates a total of 12 constraints were included in the survey data, and data reduction of leisure constraints was conducted to determine if there are underlying factors existing in the constraints data, and to create factors (variables) for further analyses. Therefore, we conducted factor analysis, and, in particular, a principal components analysis (using varimax rotation and eigenvalues of $\geqslant 1$ for factor extraction) was chosen from factor analysis. This procedure resulted in three components that account for 52.05% of the total variance. Table 5 shows the principal components analysis results for leisure constraint importance.

Table 5 Principal Components Analysis Results for Leisure Constraint Importance

Factor	Percent of Variance (%)	Factor Name	Examples of Constraint Items
1	28.89	Social and self-imposed constraints	Study pressure, spouse decision, taking care of children etc.
2	12.59	Psychological constraints	Lack of energy, lack of motivation and Tiredness
3	10.56	Structural constraints	Time and money

A new set of variables including social and self-imposed constraints (28.89% of the total variance), psychological constraints (12.59% of the total variance) and structural constraints (10.56% of the total variance) were created after factor analysis was completed.

Since we have a total of 19 health variables in the survey data, we then conducted factor analysis to reduce the data by using the same statistics procedure of the leisure constraints data. Tables 6 shows three factors generated by a principal components analysis (using varimax rotation and eigenvalues of $\geqslant 1$ for factor extraction). "Meaningful life", "life satisfaction" and "physicalcondition" account for 34.42%, 12.59%, and 9.61% of the total variance, respectively.

Table 6 Principal Components Analysis Results for Health Variables

Factor	Percent of Variance (%)	Factor Name	Examples of health Items
1	34.42	Meaningful life	Rate your quality of life, Accept your bodily appearance, Enjoy your life, etc.
2	12.59	Life satisfaction	Satisfied with your health, Satisfied with your sleep, Satisfied with your work, etc.
3	9.61	Physical condition	Medical treatment, Physical pain

We were interested in determining how the three factors of leisure constraints related to the health variables, so we correlated them using Pearson's correlation coefficient. The correlations are shown in Table 7.

Some of the correlations shown in table 7 are significant. Social and self-imposed constraints and physical condition are positively related, although not strongly so ($r=0.23$). The positive relationship between social and self-imposed constraints and physical conditions is explained by the fact that those who faced more constraints also felt that their physical conditions were worse because they needed more medical treatment and felt more physical pain. Both meaningful lifestyle ($r=-0.18$) and physical conditions ($r=0.23$) appear to be related to psychological constraints. Its negative sign means that those are more constrained by psychological constraints have less meaningful lifestyle.

Although structural constraints are not related to meaningful lifestyle, life satisfaction and physical conditions, structural constraints almost have relationships with life satisfaction ($p=0.08$)and physical conditions ($p=0.06$).

Table 7 Correlations between Leisure Constraints Factors and Health Items Factors (N=182)

Constraints	Correlation	Meaningful Lifestyle	Life satisfaction	Physical conditions
Social and self-imposed Constraints	Pearson Correlation	−0.02	−0.11	0.23
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.75	0.15	0.00
Psychological Constraints	Pearson Correlation	−0.18	−0.05	0.23
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.02	0.52	0.00
Structural Constraints	Pearson Correlation	0.08	−0.13	−0.14
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.28	0.08	0.06

Ⅴ .Discussion

Although a little work has been done on leisure constraints and health, this study provides preliminary data on leisure constraints and health in a cross-cultural urban setting for both leisure researchers and practitioners.

First, as we have indicated in the beginning of this study, leisure and health have been focused on investigating relationship between physical activity and park use and health[20-22], and leisure constraints have not been considered as factors which could contribute to impact on individuals' health. The finding of this study indicates that social and self-imposed constraints (e.g.,study pressure, spouse decision, taking care of children) impacted individuals' physical condition (medical treatment and physical pain) and psychological constraints (e.g., lack of energy, lack of motivation) also influenced Seoul residents' meaningful lifestyle (e.g., quality of life, acceptance of bodily appearance) and physical health.

Second, while leisure constraints theory is used by most of leisure researchers to study leisure constraints, we think classifying leisure constraints[2] based on research participants' responses, rather than attempting to compel them into preconceived categories (intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural constraints), is a more appropriate strategy for both leisure researchers and leisure services. We believe that leisure constraints that we have found in this research is much more practicable and useful to both Korean government officials and leisure service practitioners than abstract classifications such as "intrapersonal" "interpersonal" or "structural" without considering cross cultural settings. For example, if psychological constraints are main factors that impact people's health, solutions for reducing such constraints should be sought by the government and leisure services in Seoul. Similarly, if social and self-imposed constraints are also contributors to worse physical conditions, solutions for reducing such constraints should also be sought by the government and leisure services.

Last, anthropological approach made a contribution to this study to identify leisure constraints in Seoul's residents. In particular, free listing, as one of specific methods commonly used by cognitive anthropologists, can be thought of as the first step to identify cultural domains (e.g., leisure activities, leisure constraints) in this study. Although Garry Chick, as a cultural anthropologist, who has worked in recreation and leisure studies since 1981, introduced

anthropological perspective on the study of recreation and leisure to the field in several published journal papers in the mid-1980s[29-32], leisure researchers still fail to adopt an anthropological approach to study of leisure. Therefore, anthropological approach should be used in recreation and leisure studies to increase validity and reliability of leisure research in the future.

The limitations of this study cannot be avoided. First, Yeouido Park is the largest park among the 12 parks, so people can hold an event, such as social gatherings. Second, Yeouido Park has more convenient transportation system (subway) than any other small parks, so it is very easy to access to the Yeouido park. As soon as you get out from the subway station, it takes only 3-5 minutes for them to get the park by walk. Third, the residential areas (apartment complexes) and companies are very close to the Yeouido of Hangang Park. So people can easily access to the park in any time. People visit Yeouido not only on weekends but also during the week. Not only can workers but also many old people and housewives visit the park. Therefore, samples of this study may be biased due to geographic location of research sites.

Last, limitation of this study can also stem from the convenient on-site sampling. The reason why we could not conduct a mail-in survey is due to Korean urban culture. Korean urban people tend to consider a mail-in survey material as a marketing kit, and tend not to consider it seriously because they are likely to be exhausted with a deluge of advertising materials. Thus, many of the Korean studies found that the response rate of mail-in survey is very low, and Korean social science scholars tend to conduct more interview-surveys, phone- surveys or on-line surveys than mail-in surveys. In addition, Korean people tend to respect a university research, so when we (university researchers) personally (face-to-face) asked the park visitors to participate in this study, the potential participants could believe this study was not a marketing survey and come to be willing to participate in the study. Because of this Korean culture, we decided to conduct on-site survey instead of mail-in survey to increase the response rate.

Bibliography

[1] A. Ferris, *National Recreation Survey: Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report* 19, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

[2] D. Crawford & G. Godbey, "Reconceptualizing Barriers to Family Leisure," *Leisure Sciences*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (1987), pp. 119 - 127.

[3] D. Crawford, E. L. Jackson & G. Godbey, "A Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constraints," *Leisure Sciences*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (1991), pp. 309 - 320.

[4] K. Henderson & B. Ainswoth, "Enablers and Constraints to Walking for African and American Indian Women," *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, Vol. 71, No. 4 (2000), pp. 313 - 321.

[5] F. McGuire & W. Norman, "The Role of Constraints in Successful Aging: Inhibiting or Enabling," in E. L. Jackson (ed.), *Constraints to Leisure*, State College, PA: Venture Publishing, 2005, pp. 89 - 101.

[6] L. Caldwell & C. Baldwin, "A Developmental Approach to Understanding Constraints to Adolescent Leisure," in E. L. Jackson (ed.), *Constraints to Leisure*, State College, PA: Venture Publishing, 2005, pp. 75 - 88.

[7] M. Stodolska & E. L. Jackson, "Discrimination in Leisure and Work Experienced by a White Ethnic Minority Group," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (1998), pp. 23 - 46.

[8] E.Dong & G.Chick,"Possibility of Refining the Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constraints by Different Populations," in J.Murdy (ed.), *Proceedings of the* 2003 *Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium*, New York: Bolton Landing, 2003, pp.338-344.

[9] G.Chick & E.Dong,"Culture Constraints on Leisure," in E.L.Jackson (ed.), *Constraints to Leisure*, State College, PA: Venture Publishing, 2005, pp.169-183.

[10] [美]盖瑞·奇克、董二为:《中国六城市休闲制约因素研究》,《浙江大学学报(人文社会科学版)》2009年第1期,第31-42页。[G.Chick, & E.Dong,"An Ethnographic Analyses of Leisure Constraints in Six Chinese Cities," *Journal of Zhejiang University* (*Humanities and Social Sciences*), No.1 (2009), pp.31-42.]

[11] D.Scott & S.Lee,"The Process of Celebrity Fan's Constraint Negotiation," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol.41, No.2 (2009), pp.137-155.

[12] G.Walker, E.Jackson & J.Deng,"Culture and Leisure Constraints: A Comparison of Canadian and Mainland Chinese University Students," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol.39, No.4 (2007), pp.567-590.

[13] K.Alexandris & B.Carroll,"Demographic Differences in the Perception of Constraints on Recreational Sport Participation: Results from a Study in Greece," *Leisure Studies*, Vol.16, No.2 (1997), pp.107-125.

[14] B.Kang,"A Study of Factors Associated with Limitations on Leisure Activities of Koreans in Seoul," *Journal of Korean Society of Leisure and Recreation*, Vol.14 (1997), pp.75-86.

[15] Y.Pyo & Y.Kim," The Relationship between Family Life Cycle and Leisure Activity and Leisure Constraints," *Journal of Korean Sociology of Sport*, Vol.14, No.2 (2001), pp.457-467.

[16] W.Song & I.Yeo,"The Influence of Leisure Constraints on Leisure Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction of Urban Workers," *The Korean Journal of Physical Education*, Vol.43, No.4 (2004), pp.685-697.

[17] R.Mannell,"Leisure, Health and Well-being," *World Leisure Journal*, Vol.49 (2007), pp.114-128.

[18] I.Lee & R.Paffenbarger," Associations of Light, Moderate, and Vigorous Intensity Physical Activity with Longevity: The Harvard Alumni Health Study," *American Journal of Epidemiology*, Vol.151, No.3 (2000), pp.293-299.

[19] S.Elavsky, E.McAuley & R.W.Motl, et al,"Physical Activity Enhances Long-term Quality of Life in Older Adults: Efficacy, Esteem, and Affective Influences," *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, Vol.30, No.2 (2005), pp.138-145.

[20] E.Orsega-Smith, A.Mowen & L.Payne, et al," The Interaction of Stress and Park Use on Psycho-physiological Health in Older Adults," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol.36, No.2 (2004), pp.232-256.

[21] K.Shores & S.West,"Physical Activity Outcomes Associated with African American Park Visitation in Four Community Parks," *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, Vol.26, No.3 (2006), pp.75-92.

[22] M.Floyd, J.Spengler & J.Madddock, et al," Environmental and Social Correlates of Physical Activity in Neighborhood Parks: An Observational Study in Tampa and Chicago," *Leisure Sciences*, Vol.30, No.4 (2008), pp.360-375.

[23] S.C.Weller & A.K.Romney, *Systematic Data Collection* (*Qualitative Research Methods Series* 10), Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.

[24] M.Quinlan,"Considerations for Collecting Freelists in the Field: Examples from Ethobotany," *Field Methods*, Vol.17, No.3 (2005), pp.219-234.

[25] S.Borgatti, ANTHROPAC 4.0 Methods Guide, Natick, MA: Analytic Technologies, 1996.

[26] Anonymity,"WHO Quality of Life-BREF (WHOQOL-BREF)," 2011-12-08, http://www.who.int/substance_abuse/research_tools/whoqolbref/en/, 2011-12-08.

[27] Anonymity,"About BMI for Adults," 2011-09-13, http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/adult_BMI/about_adult_BMI.htm, 2011-12-08.

[28] Anonymity,"What is High Blood Pressure ,"2011-04-01, http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/dci/Diseases/Hbp/HBP_WhoIsAtRisk.html, 2011-12-08.

[29] G.Chick,"Leisure and the Development of Culture," *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.11 (1984), pp.623-626.

[30] G.Chick,"Anthropology and Leisure," in S.Parker (ed.), *International Handbook of Leisure Studies and Research*, London: Leisure Studies Association, 1985, pp.118-119.
[31] G.Chick,"The Cross-Cultural Analysis of Leisure Behavior," *Leisure Information Quarterly*, Vol.12(1985), pp.8-9.
[32] G.Chick,"Leisure, Labor, and the Complexity of Culture: An Anthropological Perspective," *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol.18(1986), pp.154-168.

·浙江大学校史专栏·

西迁浙大的师资队伍分析

朱之平　金灿灿　蓝　蕾　张淑锵
(浙江大学 档案馆, 浙江 杭州 310028)

建立一支结构合理的师资队伍,是高等学校改革和发展的根本大计。师资队伍的职称结构、学历结构、年龄结构、学缘结构等是否合理,反映了师资队伍的总体面貌和整体实力,是衡量高校办学水平的重要指标。本文着重介绍西迁浙大的师资队伍结构情况,为完善高校师资队伍建设提供案例与参考。

在竺可桢校长的主持下,西迁时期的浙江大学,名师云集,精英汇聚。据 1947 年 1 月统计,国立浙江大学 1946 年度教员共计 332 名,具有硕博学历的有 63 名,具备国外留学背景、曾就读于世界一流大学的教员多达 101 名。如校长竺可桢为哈佛大学气象学博士,束星北同时是英国爱丁堡大学硕士、美国麻省理工学院硕士。除去 136 名毕业于本校,其他教员大多来自于国立清华大学、国立中央大学、国立复旦大学等多所国内著名高等学府。同时,师资队伍中本校毕业生与非本校毕业生之间的比例约为 2∶3,基本形成了合理的师资学缘结构(《国立浙江大学卅五年度教员名册》,浙江大学档案馆,档案编号:1900-ZL12-0144)。高学历结构、来源广泛的师资队伍结构,体现了西迁浙大教师的科研能力和整体素质,也推动了学校平稳、快速发展,西迁时期在浙大任教并在日后当选为中科院学部委员及院士的有王淦昌、卢鹤绂、贝时璋、谈家桢、罗宗洛等 27 位,创造了高等教育史上的一大奇迹。

西迁浙大根据本校的办学规模、类型、经费等情况,培养了一批重点学科带头人和教学科研骨干,促进了各个学科的综合发展,同时适度扩大正、副教授的比例,形成了符合其发展需要的职称结构。1937 年西迁之初,国立浙江大学共有专任教员 131 人,其中教授 56 人、副教授 4 人、讲师 28 人、助教 43 人,教师职称结构比例是 43∶3∶21∶33。高级职称 60 人,占教师总数的 46%。此后,高级职称在教师总数中的比例稳步上升。截至 1946 年西迁中最后一次统计教员,1945 年度国立浙江大学共有教员 269 人,其中教授 89 人、副教授 45 人、讲师 32 人、助教 103 人,教师职称结构比例是33∶17∶12∶38。高级职称 134 人,占教师总数的 50%(《浙江大学历年教职工人数统计表》,浙江大学档案馆,档案编号:ZD-1953-XZ-8)。

西迁浙大的老、中、青各年龄段教员人数达到均衡,年龄结构合理。据 1947 年 1 月统计,1946 年度 332 名教员中,50 岁及以上的 31 名,其中包括校长竺可桢,德高望重的教授如王琎、钱宝琮、郑晓沧、陈建功等。而 40—49 岁的 91 名和30—39 岁的 119 名教员占据了整个师资队伍中大部分的教授、副教授名额,包含了西迁浙大的不少教学、科研骨干,如吴耕民、董聿茂、王焕镛、夏承焘、张其昀、蔡邦华、苏步青、王淦昌、束星北、王季午、谭其骧等。30 岁以下(不包括 30 岁)的 91 名教员,则大多为品学兼优、充满活力的年轻助教,他们作为骨干教师的补充,构成了数量充足的师资储备资源。可见,西迁浙大的师资队伍以处于最佳年龄期(一般认为 30—50 岁之间)的中青年教师为主体,是一支经验丰富又充满活力、创新力,具有较大发展潜能的教学队伍。

从性别结构看,西迁浙大师资队伍中的女性虽少,但个个精英。据 1946 年 4 月统计,女性只占到 1945 年度教员总数的十分之一:其中教授 89 人,女性仅占 1 人;副教授 45 人,女性占 3 人;讲师 32 人,女性占 8 人;助教 103 人,女性占 14 人(《民国三十五年四月国立浙江大学黔校廿四学年教员统计表》,浙江大学档案馆,档案编号:L053-001-0016)。26 名女教员中唯一的女教授李今英曾总结多年讲授英语经验,撰写《英语教学法》。1942 年,李今英受国民政府国防部委托,担任军官外语补习班英语系主任,因工作成绩突出,授上校军衔,获"光华甲种奖章"。数学系副教授徐瑞云,是中国历史上第一位女数学博士。西迁期间,她加盟由著名数学家苏步青、陈建功主持的数学讨论班,在战火硝烟的大后方将这种教学相长、遴选英彦的科研形式进一步发扬光大。在她的培养下,当时受教的学生曹锡华、叶彦谦、金福临、赵民义、孙以丰、杨宗道等,后来都成了杰出的数学家和数学教育家。

师资队伍结构合理与否关系高校生存与发展。在竺可桢校长的带领下,西迁浙大形成了一支结构合理、卓有成绩的师资队伍,保证了浙江大学在战火纷飞的恶劣环境下攀登科学高峰的步伐。在全体教员的努力下,浙江大学规模不断壮大,大师云集,人才辈出,办学成绩硕果累累,崛起为一座著名的高等学府,并被誉为"东方剑桥"。

- 新闻出版总署“中国期刊方阵双效期刊”
- 教育部高校哲学社会科学“名刊工程”入选期刊
- 华东地区优秀期刊
- 浙江期刊方阵“精优型期刊”
- 中国人文社会科学各检索机构、各数据库历年核心期刊、来源期刊
- 美国《剑桥科学文摘》(CSA)来源期刊
  (包括“语言学与文学”文摘、“社会学文摘、”“世界政治科学”文摘三大数据库)
- 波兰《哥白尼索引》(IC)来源期刊
- 美国现代语言协会(MLA)国际参考书目来源期刊

浙江大学学报 (人文社会科学版)
Zhejiang Daxue Xuebao (Renwen Shehui Kexueban)
2012 年 第 42 卷 第 1 期
1955 年创刊 (双月刊)
2012 年 1 月 10 日出版

Journal of Zhejiang University
(Humanities and Social Sciences)
Vol.42, No.1 Jan. 2012
Started in 1955 (Bimonthly)
Publishing on Jan. 10, 2012

主管部门	中华人民共和国教育部	Dept in Charge	Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China
主办单位	浙江大学	Sponsored by	Zhejiang University
主编	罗卫东	Editor-in-Chief	Luo Weidong
编辑单位	浙江大学学报编辑部 (杭州市天目山路 148 号 邮编:310028)	Edited by	Editorial Board of Journal of Zhejiang University (148 Tianmushan Road, Hangzhou 310028, China)
网址	http://www.journals.zju.edu.cn/soc	Web Site	http://www.journals.zju.edu.cn/soc
电子信箱	zdxb_w@zju.edu.cn	Email	zdxb_w@zju.edu.cn
电话	0571-88273210 0571-88925616	Tel	86-571-88273210 86-571-88925616
出版单位	浙江大学出版社有限责任公司	Published by	Zhejiang University Press Co., Ltd.
印刷单位	杭州丰源印刷有限公司	Printed by	Hangzhou Fengyuan Printing Co., Ltd.
国内发行	浙江省报刊发行局	Distributed Abroad by	China International Book Trading Corporation (P.O.Box 399, Beijing 100044, China)
订阅处	全国各地邮政局(所)		
国外发行	中国国际图书贸易集团有限公司 (北京 399 信箱 邮编:100044)		
广告许可证号	330100400125	License Number of Advertising	330100400125

中国·杭州 HANGZHOU, CHINA (国内外公开发行)　　乌利希国际期刊分类代码(Dewey #): 300

刊号: ISSN 1008-942X / CN 33-1237/C　　邮发代号: 国内 32-35 / 国外 BM 372　　国内定价: 45.00 元/期 / 270.00 元/年

ISSN 1008-942X