

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE LEISURESCOPE FOR GERIATRIC CLIENTELE FROM DIVERSE ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS

*Lisa Ostiguy, Concordia University
Flora Masella, St. Mary's Hospital, Montreal
Rich MacNeil, University of Iowa*

Purpose of the study

To determine the appropriateness of the Leisurescope as a leisure assessment tool for long term geriatric clients.

Significance of the study

Finding an appropriate tool to assess leisure needs and interests of clients is a most difficult task. In Canada, there is very little information on leisure assessments. Most of the existing assessment material comes from hospitals in the United States, with little or no research or appropriateness for a Canadian population. The assessment tools which do exist contain very little information on reliability and validity for long term care geriatric clients. Does the assessment produce reliable results? Is the assessment an accurate measure of client needs and interests? Are there factors such as age, gender, and ethnic background which influence the Leisurescope? Is the Leisurescope appropriate for the multiethnic clientele at a hospital in the Montreal area? Questions such as these form the framework for the study.

Research Questions

Specifically the investigation addressed the following research questions:

1. Is the Leisurescope a reliable leisure assessment for the geriatric clientele?
2. Is the Leisurescope a valid leisure assessment for the geriatric clientele?
3. Are there socioeconomic and demographic variables that influence the results of the Leisurescope?

Literature Review

During the past decade therapeutic recreation professionals have been faced with the challenge of increasingly stringent expectations for accountability. Largely this responsibility has been directed toward the assurance of the quality and appropriateness of services provided to clients. One of the major processes in demonstrating such accountability is client assessment (Dunn, 1989). Many leisure assessment tools have been developed by educators and practitioners. However, further growth is still needed in the understanding, location, evaluation and appropriate use of existing assessment procedures. A major difficulty with this practice is the low level of confidence which can be placed in the results of such procedures (Dunn, 1983).

The current state of assessment reveals a dominant emphasis on interest inventory checklist and profiles related to activity involvement. Additionally, current assessment efforts seem to be largely agency specific, focused on isolated developments in assessment procedures to address agency needs or services. There appears to be very few developments in assessment procedures that are designed to address the general concept of leisure competence or the client needs in relation to leisure functioning (Witt, Connolly, & Compton, 1980).

Loesh (1980) offers opinions related to the general status of leisure assessment instrumentation. He finds few worthwhile instruments and that the availability of instruments is limited. There is also a concern over the lack of quality in terms of validity, reliability, and the level of sophistication of assessment instrumentation. Many of the assessments are currently available, instruments are underdeveloped and lack a theoretical base. Many have not been subject to norming procedures and lack the use of large and representative samples. Often the information on the validity of the instruments is unavailable.

Information on the Leisurescope is limited, however, a review of literature generated the following information. Studies have been carried out for the reliability and consistency of the Leisurescope (Schenk, 1990). Reliability was determined through a test/retest design. The weakness of the study is that there were 91 adults in the sample but less than 10 percent of the population was over the age of 65. Stumbo (1987), in a comparison of leisure assessments, indicated that there was no reliability information available for the Leisurescope with geriatrics.

Galloway (1990) reports using the Leisurescope with inner-city youth because it accurately and effectively measures activity interest of individuals tested and allowed the provision of meaningful activities and programs. While Galloway used the Leisurescope with adolescents he reports that the instrument takes into account minority and cross-cultural interests of the clients and that the instrument can be used for people with different languages.

Taylor (1990) reports using the Leisurescope with psychiatric and chemically dependent adult patients up to the age of 83 and has found the Leisurescope to be effective as an assessment as well as for leisure education purposes. Taylor does not indicate the number of older adults in her report, nor does she indicate any evidence of reliability. While many report the benefits of the Leisurescope (Burlingame, Miller, Smith, Bauer & Wells) there is still little evidence of the validity or reliability of the instrument for a multi-ethnic geriatric population.

Methodology

Study Population

The population for this investigation included twenty randomly selected long-term care clients from a large hospital in the Montreal area. The criteria for selecting clients for the investigation included:

1. Willingness of the client to participate in the study
2. Client must be a long-term care unit of a specified Montreal hospital
3. Client must have a minimum score of 21 on the Folstein Standardized Mini-Mental State Examination.

Since the method of collecting data for this study involved a minimum cognitive level, the Folstein Mini-Mental State Examination was used to identify appropriate clients for the study. The Mini-Mental is a widely used instrument to measure cognitive impairment in the elderly. The Folstein Examination was selected because it does not take long to complete and the scores for each are recorded on the test form itself. Anecdotal reports supported the reliability and validity of the instrument.

Data Collection

Data was collected using two methods: client interviews and administration of the Leisurescope. Client interviews were conducted before and after the administration of the Leisurescope.

The purpose of the interviews was to identify elements of leisure experiences which were not included in the Leisurescope assessment and to determine the appropriateness of the information collected from the Leisurescope. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. The co-investigators used the qualitative computer program NUD*IST to assist with the analysis of qualitative data.

The Leisurescope is a photographic leisure interest assessment produced by Leisure Dynamics. Results of the Leisurescope are obtained through 45 visual comparisons. Ten leisure categories on cards are compared with all others, resting in a graphic display on a score sheet. Every time a score is recorded, it becomes part of a bar graph representing a client's preference.

Results

Reliability for the Leisurescope was determined by a test/retest method. Clients were asked to complete the Leisurescope twice within a one month time period. The results indicate a high reliability ($r = .78$) for the study population. Although not statistically significant, it did appear that the higher the score on the Folstein Mini-Mental State Examination, the higher the reliability. Language and ethnic background did not influence the reliability of the instrument.

A Chronbach alpha was calculated ($\alpha = .69$) and verified that there was a relatively high internal consistency between items. The validity of the instrument was determined using a number of different methods. Construct validity was measured by having clients (not selected to be in the study) identify categories and groupings of photographs of leisure pursuits into each category. Overall this method determined that the validity of this instrument was high with the exception of the categories for collections and volunteering. Many clients placed collections with crafts, games, social affiliation, and arts and music. The category of volunteerism was identified often with social affiliation, sports and entertainment.

Another method used to determine validity of the adapted Leisurescope was to compare interests identified by the clients during the interview process to the interests identified by the Leisurescope. The interviews were recorded, transcribed and entered into NUD*IST to determine themes. The interviews confirmed high validity of the instrument.

The analysis of the qualitative interview data revealed that many specific leisure interests were not represented. Many of the clients from different ethnic backgrounds reported different activities not found in any of the photographs on the Leisurescope. The "crafts" category revealed the greatest diversity of activities not represented.

In all subjects, there was a confirmation of main interest categories identified by the Leisurescope. It did not appear that any of the sociodemographic factors influenced the selection of leisure interests by category.

References

- Anastasi, A. (1988). *Psychological testing*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dunn, J.K. (1989). Guidelines for using published assessment procedures. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 23(2), 59-69.
- Dunn, J.K. (1987). Establishing reliability and validity in evaluation instruments. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 5, 61-70.
- Gunn, S.L, Peterson, C.A. (1987). *Therapeutic Recreation program design: Principles and procedures*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Howe, C.Z. (1984). Leisure assessment instrumentation in therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation*

Journal, 18,14-24.

Loesh, L.G. (1980). *Leisure counseling*. Ann Arbor, MI.

Malloy, D.W., Alemayehu, E., Roberts, R. (1991). A Standardized Mini-Mental State Examination

(SMMSE): Its reliability compared to the traditional Mini-Mental State Examination.

American

Journal of Psychiatry, 148, 102-105.

Witt, P., Connolly, P., & Compton, D.M. (1980). Assessment: A plea for sophistication.

Therapeutic

Recreation Journal, 14, 5-8.

Contact Information: Lisa Ostiguy, Applied Human Sciences, Concordia University, 7141 Sherbrooke St., W., Montreal, QC, H4B 1R6. E-mail: ostiguy@vax2.concordia.ca Phone: (514) 848-3340 Fax: (514) 848-4200



Appropriate Use of Documents: Documents may be downloaded or printed (single copy only). Please note that this document is copyrighted and CREDIT MUST BE PROVIDED to the originator of the document when you quote from it. You must not sell the document or make a profit from reproducing it. You must not copy, extract, summarize or distribute downloaded documents outside of your own organization in a manner which competes with or substitutes for the distribution of the database by the Lifestyle Information Network (LIN). <http://www.lin.ca>

[Back to the table of contents](#)

ABSTRACTS
of Papers Presented at the
Ninth Canadian Congress on Leisure Research
May 12 - 15, 1999
Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia

Editor: Paul Heintzman

Assisted by: Karen Naugler and Sean Smith

Printed and bound by Acadia University Printing Services

Copyright © 1999 Canadian Association of Leisure Studies

Organizing Team for the Ninth Canadian Congress on Leisure Research:

Glyn Bissix
Tom Delamere
Paul Heintzman
Scott Hennigar
Susan Markham-Starr
Heidi McKinnon
Neil Munro
Karen Naugler
Brenda Robertson
Jerry Singleton

The Canadian Congress on Leisure Research
Is held under the auspices of the
Canadian Association for Leisure Studies

Le Congrès canadien de la recherche en loisir
se tient sous les auspices de
L'Association canadienne d'études en loisir

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS/CONSEIL D'ADMINISTRATION
1996-1999**

President/Presidente

Dr. Edgar L. Jackson
University of Alberta

Past President/President-sortant

Dr. Susan M. Shaw
University of Waterloo

**Vice-President & Treasurer
Vice-president et trésorier**

Robert Soubrier
Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières

Secretary/Secrétaire

Dr. Tom Hinch
University of Alberta

Directors/Directeurs

Dr. Linda Caldwell Pennsylvania State
University

Dr. Wendy Frisby
University of British Columbia

Dr. Susan Markham-Starr Acadia
University

Dr. Lisa Ostiguy Concordia
University

Dr. Paul F. Wilkinson York
University

Dr. Don Dawson Université
d'Ottawa

Dr. Colleen Hood Dalhousie
University

Dr. Gaetan Ouellet
Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières

Dr. Bryan Smale University of
Waterloo