

OF UNIT IDEAS IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF LEISURE

Jiri Zuzanek*

Abstract

It has been said that the concepts of leisure and labor have sociological meaning only *vis-a-vis* each other. Robert Nisbet's notion of "unit ideas," referring to common historical concerns, is used in this article to examine changing assessments of the role assigned to leisure and labor throughout history. What role has been attributed to leisure and labor in the past and is attributed to them today in forming human identity, stimulating social change, enforcing social integration, raising social equality, and contributing to well-being? Two other controversial issues examined in the article are associated with the alienating effects of the division of labor on leisure and the conflicting views with regard to the coming of the "society of leisure." The article attempts to demonstrate that the relationships between labor and leisure are not "uni-linear" and the well-being borderline runs not *between* labor and leisure, but *within* them.

Key words: Leisure; Labor; Social integration; Well-being; Society of leisure.

DA UNIDADE DE IDEIAS NA SOCIOLOGIA DO LAZER**Resumo**

Já foi dito que os conceitos de lazer e trabalho têm significado sociológico apenas *vis-à-vis* uns aos outros. A noção de "idéias unitárias", de Robert Nisbet, referindo-se a preocupações históricas comuns, é usada neste artigo para examinar as mudanças nas avaliações do papel atribuído ao lazer e ao trabalho ao longo da história. Que papel foi atribuído ao lazer e ao trabalho no passado e é atribuído a eles hoje na formação da identidade humana, estimulando a mudança social, reforçando a integração social, elevando a igualdade social e contribuindo para o bem-estar? Duas outras questões controversas examinadas no artigo estão associadas aos efeitos alienantes da divisão do trabalho sobre o lazer e as visões conflitantes em relação à chegada da "sociedade do lazer". O artigo tenta demonstrar que as relações entre trabalho e lazer não são "uni-lineares" e o limite de bem-estar não é *entre* trabalho e lazer, mas *dentro* deles.

Palavras Chave: Lazer; Trabalho; Integração Social; Bem-estar; Sociedade do Lazer.

DES IDÉES UNITAIRES DANS LA SOCIOLOGIE DES LOISIRS**Resumé**

Il a déjà été dit que les notions de loisir et de travail ont une signification sociologique seulement *vis-à-vis* de l'autre. La notion «d'idées unitaires» de Robert Nisbet, qui fait référence à des préoccupations historiques communes, est utilisée dans cet article pour examiner l'évolution des évaluations du rôle assigné aux loisirs et au travail tout au long de l'histoire. Quel rôle a été attribué aux loisirs et au travail dans le passé et qui leur est attribué aujourd'hui en formant l'identité humaine, en stimulant le changement social, en appliquant l'intégration sociale, en augmentant l'égalité sociale et en contribuant au bien-être? Deux autres questions controversées examinées dans l'article sont associées aux effets aliénants de la Division du Travail sur les loisirs et les points de vue contradictoires en ce qui concerne l'avenir de la «société de loisirs». L'article tente de démontrer que les relations entre le travail et les loisirs ne sont pas "unilinéaires" et le bien-être limite ne fonctionne pas *entre* le travail et les loisirs, mais en *leur* sein.

Mots clés: Loisirs; Travail; Intégration sociale; Bien-être; Société des loisirs.



Licenciada por Creative Commons
Atribuição Não Comercial / Sem
Derivações/ 4.0 / Internacional

* PhD in Sociology (1970), Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic. Distinguished Professor Emeritus at the University of Waterloo, Canada. Formerly held appointments in the University of Lund, Sweden, Queens College in New York, and the University of Western Ontario, Canada. Was Research Director of the UNESCO European Centre for Leisure and Education, Prague. Subjects of interest: areas: leisure, labor, human identity, social change, social integration, stratification, division of labor, well-being, society of leisure. Address: University of Waterloo, 200 University Ave W, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canadá [zuzanek@uwaterloo.ca]

1 INTRODUCTION

Robert Nisbet, in *The Sociological Tradition* (1966:5), used the concept of *unit-ideas* in analyzing European sociological thought in its great formative period, 1830-1900. Unit-ideas refer to common social concerns which form the core of sociology "amid all the manifest differences among its authors." As examples of unit-ideas in the 19th century sociology, Nisbet listed alienation, the role of the community, relationship between the sacred and the secular. Several criteria need to be met, according to Nisbet, to qualify as unit-ideas. These ideas must have generality, be relevant to the present and the past, and be discernible in the works of the towering minds of an age. As well, unit-ideas must be specific for the given area of study and combine insight with observation. The notion of unit-ideas seems to be well suited for the analysis of everlasting social problems such as the relationship between work and leisure.

In this article, an attempt will be made to apply the notion of unit-ideas to the historical study of leisure and labor, the two concepts that, in Bennett Berger's words, "have sociological meaning only vis-à-vis each other" (1963: 28). Analysis of issues dominating the study of leisure and labor shows that discussion involving these phenomena revolved historically around several key and controversial issues such as: (1) the role of leisure and labor in forming human identity; (2) leisure and labor as stimuli of social change; (3) leisure's and play's role as sources of social stability; (4) leisure's and labor's impact on the deepening or toning down of social inequalities; (5) division of labor and its alienating effects on leisure (spillover or compensation?); (6) future trends in the allocation of leisure time (will we live in a 'society of leisure' or of the 'harried leisure class'?), and (7) leisure's and labor's contribution to subjective well-being (*swb*). While most of these issues fall predominantly into the domain of sociological inquiry, the interest in the relationship between leisure and *swb* is shared by sociology and social psychology.

The first three *unit-ideas* (leisure as a source of human identity, social stability, and a stimulus of change) have been examined in the literature mostly from historical and anthropological perspectives. The conflicting views about the alienating effects of labor, the stratification implications of leisure, the direction of leisure trends, and the well-being correlates of leisure have been subject of conceptual discourse as well as empirical examination.

My motivation for examining work-leisure relationships from the *unit-ideas* perspective is two-

fold. I intend to show that these relationships are multifaceted and change with historical circumstances.

I will refrain from the role of an arbiter, while discussing controversies surrounding the *unit-ideas* of leisure and will leave their overall assessment to the concluding part of the article, suggesting there that these ideas reflect the "*l'esprit du temps*" (*Zeitgeist*), as well as ideological positioning of individual authors within it. In the concluding part, I will also address my second concern - the 'partisan' or 'lobbying' position with regard to leisure often taken by leisure researchers. Leisure, to me, is a formidable challenge, but not necessarily a universal cure. The dividing line of the *pros* and the *cons* does not run *between* leisure and labor but *within* them. This is what this article will try to demonstrate.

2 LEISURE OR WORK AS PILLARS OF HUMANITY? *VITA ACTIVA VERSUS VITA CONTEMPLATIVA*

The question whether the essence of human life lies with work or leisure was on the mind of philosophers and social thinkers since the time of Antiquity. Sebastian de Grazia, in his seminal publication *Of Time, Work, and Leisure* (1962), pointed out that in Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome, leisure was not viewed as a derivative of work but, on the contrary, work was defined as non-leisure (*a-scholia* in Greek; *neg-otium* in Latin). According to Huizinga (1938), for Aristotle, leisure rather than work was the foundation of humanity.

To Aristotle, husbandmen, craftsmen and laborers were indispensable for the normal functioning of the state, but their contribution to it was not attributed social recognition or respect. It was looked down upon. It is impossible, according to Aristotle, to practice excellence for a man "who is living the life of a mechanic or labourer" (2009:69).

A similar position with regard to work was taken by Plato, who insisted that good men (guardians) should not imitate smiths, oarsmen, boatswains and the like. Labour was not part of guardians' social identity. It was positioned outside of the borders of respectable life, delegated to the slaves or the group of citizens, whose manual work and social position is today somewhat awkwardly translated as 'mechanics'.

Yet, Ancient Greece knew other attitudes towards labor as well. Philosophers, and possibly the public at large, were not unanimous. Hesiod's *Works and Days*, written around 700 BC, was an apology of work. To Hesiod (1988:46), idle men resembled drones in a hive. "Work, so that famine may hate

you and Demeter (goddess of agriculture and nourishment –JZ) love you. Gods and men dislike the non-worker... Work is no disgrace; idleness is a disgrace." Hesiod's position reflected value orientations of the 'archaic' period of Greek history, but strong 'pro-work' attitudes can be found in Plato's time as well. Xenophon described a meeting between Socrates and Aristarchus, which took place during the Peloponnesian war.

Aristarchus, who fled the besieged Piraeus, tells Socrates that he lost his land, his house and does not know how to support his family. On hearing this, Socrates asks Aristarchus whether he is aware that Ceramon was able to provide himself and his relatives with provisions, and Cyrebus, by making bread, maintained his whole household and lived luxuriously, and most of the Megarians sustained themselves by manufacturing vests. Certainly, they did, Aristarchus replied: for they purchased barbarian slaves and forced them to do what they pleased "but I have free-born persons and relatives on my hands." To this, Socrates replied: "Then, do you think, because they are free and your relatives, they should do nothing other than eat and sleep?" (Xenophon, 1994: 63) This vision of work, clearly, differs from Aristotle's or Plato's.¹

Conflicting opinions about the historical role of labor and leisure were carried into the Middle Ages. Examining relationship between *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa*, Thomas Aquinas suggested in *Summa Theologiae* (1265-1274) that active life precedes contemplative life in time, but the contemplative life supersedes it in merit (see II-II, Q. 182, Art. 2).

Attitudes toward labor and leisure continued to be part of intellectual discourse and ideological confrontation during Renaissance, Reformation and Enlightenment. Two great persons of the Italian Renaissance, Lorenzo the Magnificent and Leon Battista Alberti, in a fictitious dialogue, discussed comparative merits of active and contemplative life and agreed that they complement each other, with the latter guiding the former (see de Grazia, 1962).

Weber, in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905), showed that Protestantism contributed to a profound change in the attitudes toward work. Most religions of the past put the end values of life outside of this world. Contemplation and religious quietism were the ultimate sources of salvation. The life in this world was a transient step in the 'valley of tears.' Abstention from trade and

business was accompanied by an aristocratic contempt of work. Such attitudes could not provide a basis on which a new industrial civilization could be built. It was necessary to attribute positive value to work and productive activities, to legitimize them in the people's mind. This is what Protestantism did. It made work and productive effort honorable rather than shameful. It created a climate favorable for the Industrial revolution and brought capitalism to life.

For Immanuel Kant, Denis Diderot, Adam Smith and other representatives of Enlightenment, work and effort were integral parts of progress and reason. True knowledge could not be gained without effort. The road to moral judgment and well-being was laborious.

The 19th century was swarmed by diatribes of labor, such as Thomas Carlyle's *Doubt, of whatever kind, can be ended by Action alone* or *One monster there is in the world: the idle man* (1843: 198-203). Friedrich Engels was no less enthusiastic about labor. In the *Dialectics of Nature* (1883:85-87), he wrote:

"Labour is the source of all wealth, ... but it is also infinitely more than this. It is the primary basic condition of all human existence, to such an extent that we have to say that labour created man himself...Hundreds of thousands of years elapsed before human society arose out of a band of tree-climbing monkeys. Yet this eventually happened. And what do we find as the characteristic difference between the band of monkeys and human society? Labour!" (2010:456).

The apotheosis of labor found its critics as well. Engels's closest friend, Karl Marx, in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, in the *Grundrisse* (1857), and his magnum opus *Das Kapital* (1863-83) praises leisure as the ultimate realm of freedom. The frequently quoted passage from Volume III of *Das Kapital* reads: "The realm of freedom begins only where labour, which is determined by necessity and mundane considerations, ceases; thus, in the very nature of things, freedom lies beyond the sphere of actual material production" (2010: 593).

Even under socialism, when labor will be freely chosen, it will be nevertheless guided by necessity. Marx's praise of time 'free of necessity' was brought to an 'absurd-logical' conclusion by his son in law, Paul Lafargue, in the provocative pamphlet *The Right to be Lazy* (1883).

The end of the 19th century witnessed growing signs of discontent with the ethic of work. Friedrich Nietzsche in *The Gay Science* (1882) wrote:

"The breathless haste with which [Americans] work ... is already beginning to infect old Europe

¹ It is interesting that one of the arguments raised during the trial against Socrates was his approval of the Hesiod's praise of work; even of work which was unjust or shameful (see Xenophon, 2014).

with its ferocity and is spreading a lack of spirituality like a blanket. Now one is ashamed of resting. [...] One thinks with a watch in one's hand. ... More and more, work enlists all good conscience on its side; the desire for joy is beginning to be ashamed of itself. ... Soon we may well reach the point where people can no longer give in to the desire for a *vita contemplativa* without self-contempt and a bad conscience" (2008: 183).

Reassessment of base value orientations at the doorsteps of the newly emerging 'mass society' has affected not only valuations of work but of leisure as well. Ortega y Gasset's *The Revolt of the Masses* (1930) was a scathing critique of mass culture and lifestyles of the masses who refused to help or serve others and were preoccupied only with their whims, garments, and pleasures.

Pitirim Sorokin, in *The Social and Cultural Dynamics* (1937-1941), criticized sensate mentality dominating modern leisure and culture, where mass media stimulate an insatiate thirst for sensual pleasures and no boundary lines distinguish true from untrue, or 'right' from the 'wrong.'

The importance of contemplation, in a world obsessed with work, was most forcefully articulated in the 1950s by Joseph Pieper in the pamphlet *Leisure. The Basis of Culture* (1952). Pieper sought inspiration in the writings of Thomas Aquinas. Leisure, to him, was, essentially, an "inner absence of preoccupation, calm, and an ability to let things go, to be quiet" (1952: 24). Pieper recognized the necessity of work and rest, but posed the question: "Can the world of man be exhausted by being just the world of work? Can a human being be satisfied with being just a functionary? Can human existence be fulfilled in being exclusively a work-a-day existence?" (1952:42).

The critique of the Protestant ethic of work and the praise of intrinsically motivated leisure became a common theme in the second half of the 20th century in most leisure textbooks (Kraus, 1971; Neulinger, 1974; Iso-Ahola, 1980; Murphy, 1980). Aristotle's statement that "*We work in order to be at leisure,*" became the banner of leisure researchers and was repeatedly quoted. At the survey level, the role of leisure and labor became part of empirical studies of work-leisure relationships and their well-being implications - an issue that will be discussed in greater detail in the final section of this article.

3 LEISURE AND PLAY AS STIMULI OF SOCIAL CHANGE

For many years the conviction has grown upon me, Huizinga wrote, that civilization arises and

unfolds *in* and as play ... A happier age than ours called our species by the name *Homo Sapiens*. In the course of time we realised that we are not as reasonable as the philosophers of the Eighteenth century thought; hence it became fashionable to designate our species as *Homo Faber*: Man, the Maker [...] There is a third function, however... just as important as reasoning and making, namely, playing. It seems to me that next to *Homo Faber*, and perhaps on the same level as *Homo Sapiens*, *Homo Ludens* - *Man the Player*, deserves a place in our nomenclature." (1955: i)

Homo Ludens is a book about play as well as leisure. At its beginning, Huizinga (1955: 8) wrote: "Play can be deferred or suspended at any time. It is never imposed by physical necessity or moral duty. It is never a task. It is done at leisure, during 'free time'."

A question often addressed in the literature about play is its anteriority in the evolution of mankind. What, historically, came first - play or labour? Plato was among the first to draw attention to this issue. In his last dialogue, the *Laws*, he wrote that if a boy is to be a good farmer or a good builder, he should play by building toy houses or farming. "One should see games as a means of directing children's tastes and inclinations to the role they will fulfill as adults." (*Laws*, Book 1).

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) and Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920) argued that utilitarian functions preceded the play. Wundt in the *Ethics* (1886) stated that there is "not a single type of play that would not mimic in one way or another some serious endeavour, which precedes it in time." (Wundt, 1886: 145).

A different position has been articulated by Karl Bücher (1847-1930) in his book *Die Entstehung der Volkswirtschaft* (*The Genesis of the Economy*):

"The development of manufacturing industry begins with the ornamentation of the body, tattooing, piercing or deforming various parts of the body... Technical skills are acquired in the course of play and are put to practical use gradually. The hitherto accepted succession of the stages of play and labour must be turned around: play is older than work, and art is older than the production of useful things" (1893:75).

A similar position has been taken by Karl Groos (1861-1946) in *Die Spiele der Tiere* (*The Play of Animals*, 1896). According to Groos, play prepares young animals and children for their future life and hence precedes it. "Not play is the child of labor, but on the contrary, labor is the child of play" (1896:125).

The debate about "which comes first" - labor or play - has been joined at the end of the 19th century by Georgy Plekhanov (1856-1918), a leading Marxist theoretician and the founder of Russia's social

democratic party. Plekhanov's *Unaddressed Letters* (1899), a study of the social role of the arts is, in essence, a polemic with Karl Bücher and Karl Groos. Plekhanov agreed that, at the individual level, play may precede practical activities, but from the societal perspective, utilitarian activities pave the way to play. Military conflict creates the need for skilled warriors; play comes only thereafter - to serve this need. "Labour is older than play as parents are older than their children and as the society is older than its individual members" (1958: 62).

Huizinga, seemingly, sided with the authors who advocated the primordial role of play. *Homo Ludens* starts with the words: "Play is older than culture, for culture always presupposes human society, and animals have not waited for man to teach them their playing" (1955:1). It is a shameful misconception, Huizinga adds, to insist, as Marxists do, "that economic forces and material interests determine the course of the world" (1955: 192). The issue of the 'primogeniture' of work or play was, however, not at the centre of Huizinga's interests. After all, the question whether labor precedes the play or the opposite is true, is insolvable as the question about who comes first: the chicken or the egg?

Unlike Plekhanov, to whom history always found the right person to do what needed to be done, Huizinga thought that man can incite change. To him – in spite of repeated insistence that play is neither good nor ethical or true – play signified a positive factor in human evolution. Play, and indirectly leisure, were, for Huizinga, stimuli without which human needs could never materialize.

The spirit of playful competition was, according to Huizinga, a social impulse that pervades all life as its 'ferment.' Play-factor lies at the root of most fundamental forms of social life. Law, commerce and profit, craft and art, poetry, wisdom and science, are all, according to Huizinga (1955:5), rooted "in the primeval soil of play."

The affinity between play and law is, according to Huizinga, obvious, once we realize how much the practice of law resembles playful contest. Up to the 17th century, dealings in life-insurance were called 'betting'. Theatres and social clubs served as testing grounds for the emergence of parliamentary parties. Many breakthroughs of science were born out of playful activities.²

Play's and leisure's contribution to sciences and technological progress was acknowledged by

Hannah Arendt. "It is a matter of historical record," she wrote in *The Human Condition* (1958: 298), "that modern technology has its origins not in the evolution of those tools man had always devised for the twofold purpose of easing his labours and erecting the human artifice, but exclusively in an altogether non-practical search of useless knowledge [...] If we had to rely on men's so-called practical instincts, there would never have been a technology to speak of."

Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning, in the *Quest for Excitement. Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process* (1993), highlighted the positive role of sports and play, as part of the civilization process, in England. However, the problematic role of play and sports has also been called in question. Serious sport, George Orwell (1968: 42) wrote, "has nothing to do with fair play. It is bound up with hatred, jealousy, boastfulness, disregard of all rules and sadistic pleasure in witnessing violence."

Huizinga, notwithstanding his praise of play, acknowledged that it can be easily corrupted and serve interests of obscure prejudice rather than social progress and freedom. Huizinga's own fate – he was arrested during the Nazi occupation of the Netherlands in World War II – confirms his fear that play may be turned into its brutal caricature – the goose-stepping marches of indoctrinated youth, torch carrying processions, and military parades.

4 LEISURE, LABOR, AND SOCIAL STABILITY

One of the most controversial aspects of the relationship between leisure and labor is their role as sources of social order and social stability. At the beginning of human history, social order and solidarity were usually sustained by play and ritual. Collective festivities and rituals served as powerful instruments of social cohesion (Durkheim, 1912; Malinowski, 1922). Radcliffe-Brown (1922: 252) pointed out that

in the dance, the individual submits to the action upon him of the community; he is constrained by the immediate effect of rhythm as well as by custom and is required to conform in his own actions and movements to the needs of the common activity.

According to Hunnicutt (2006: 65), leisure and play, rather than work or war, served as "the glue that held societies together in the ancient world." Leisure, as a 'culture-generating expression of freedom,' provided the Greeks "with an arena in which cultures were played out, where humans were able to engage each other in public, creating fine

² Pascal's and Fermat's correspondence about dice gave birth to the theory of probability (see Apostol, 1969). Plato's close friend, the inventor and philosopher Archytas of Tarentum, constructed, according to the legend, a toy pigeon powered by steam that actually flew (see D'Angour, 2013).

arts, playing sports, making music, doing politics, having conversations, and performing free activities that constituted the very bone and sinew of their cultures.” (Hunnicut, 2006: 59).

Yet, contrary to this statement, as we will try to show, leisure often served in Greek history as a socially destabilizing force. Athens’ affluence, according to Aristotle, made it possible to subsidize citizens, relieve them from the toil of labour and provide them with time to partake in civic affairs. This participation, however, often turned into rebellious strife. One of the statements from Aristotle’s *Politics* that seemed to get little attention reads: “enjoyment of good fortune and the leisure, which comes with peace, tend to make men insolent” (2009: 189).

Labor, which was not held by Aristotle in high esteem, helped, according to him, to stabilise the life in the early Greek *poleis*. Of the different types of democracy, Aristotle (2009:156-157) wrote,

the best is the oldest; for the best material of democracy is an agricultural population; there is no difficulty in forming a democracy where people live by agriculture or by tending of cattle. Being poor, they have no leisure, and therefore do not often attend the assembly, and not having the necessaries of life they are always at work, and do not covet the property of others. Indeed, they find their employment pleasanter than the cares of government or office.

The complex relationship between labor, leisure and social stability in Ancient Greece is reflected in the historical conflict of Greece’s two most powerful *poleis* – Athens and Sparta. This conflict was, among others, a conflict between two concepts of leisure.

According to Plutarch’s account of the life of Lycurgus (*Plutarch’s Lives*, 1914), Spartiates³ were immersed in choral dances, festivals, feasts, hunting expeditions, physical exercise, and conversation, but these activities were not freely chosen. The role of athletics in Sparta extended, according to Christensen (2012: 239), well beyond socialization and included a disciplined adherence to social norms. “Spartiates were subjected from an early age to continuous and powerful coercion, both overt and covert.”

The contentious relationship between leisure, labor, and social order is reflected in Plato’s vision of the future. In the utopian city of Magnesia, described in his last dialogue, the *Laws*, citizens, who were prohibited from industrial and commercial activities, enjoyed universal access to leisure. No other

activities were allowed to interfere with their leisure (see Samaras, 2012: 3).

How does, then, a city, abundant with leisure, maintain social order? This is where Plato turns to play. Play, to him, serves the interests of social order and stability if children, from their earliest age, imitate virtuous activities,⁴ but these activities should be rigidly regulated. Children were expected to play the same games, with the same rules, with the same toys. Their games were not to be changed, nor new ones invented. Only thus could the society remain stable. To promote novelties, to use different shapes, colors, or whatever, would, according to Plato, bring a potential disaster. In other words, play served interests of social cohesion only when it turned into its direct opposite and became ‘unfree’⁵.

A somewhat similar picture of leisure emerges from another famous vision of future – Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516). More is usually presented as a forerunner of things to come - an early visionary of a society that will reduce workloads and open its doors to leisure (Parker, 1971; Rademakers, 2003). In *Utopia*, citizens worked six hours a day and had generous access to free time but, similar to the situation in Plato’s *Magnesia*, their leisure was highly regimented.

The emphasis on ‘proper’ use of leisure resulted in a puritanical uniformity of Utopians’ lifestyles and leisure pursuits. In each of *Utopia*’s streets, there were great halls that lied at an equal distance from each other. The Utopians wore same colour clothes. Every two years they changed their residences and moved from the villages to the cities or vice versa. A trumpet called them for dinner and supper, where they met and ate together.

Through most of the Middle Ages, the function of social integration lay mostly in the hands of religion and political power. The historical transition from the feudal system to the new capitalist order transferred the function of social bondage from religion to labor. Reformation, Weber argued in *The Protestant Ethic and Spirit of Capitalism* (1958: 36), did not eliminate Church’s control over everyday life, but substituted previous forms of control with new ones. It repudiated control which was very lax... in favor of regulations which penetrated “all departments of public and private life and were earnestly enforced.” The

⁴ Play in Magnesia was not limited to childhood only. Its citizens were expected to sing and dance in choruses through most of their lives (*Laws*).

⁵ Plato’s rigorous attitude towards play was extended to the arts. He was willing to ban from children even his beloved author Homer. “We must remain firm in our conviction that hymns to the gods and praises of famous men are the only poetry which ought to be admitted into our State” (2008: 423).

³ Spartiates were Spartan ‘men of equal status’ exempt from manual labor and trained for battle.

leisureliness of the past was suddenly destroyed. "The idyllic state collapsed under the pressure of a bitter competitive struggle...The old leisurely and comfortable attitude toward life gave way to a hard frugality" (Weber, 1958: 68). Perhaps, contrary to the original intentions of its founders, Protestant ethic of work turned from a voluntarily accepted vocation to an enforced social order.

Interest in leisure, as a potential source of social integration, was revived in the 20th century. When work lost its power to command moral identifications and loyalties of men, Bennett Berger (1963) wrote, society lost an important source of normative integration. The withdrawal of motivation from work strained "the network of bonds which relate the world of work to the world of non-work, and the individual to both" (1963:36). In such a situation one can expect, according to Bennett, transfer of functions formerly performed by the institutions of work to the "leisure institutions" (1963:36).

In an interesting paper "*Work and leisure: The implications of technological change*", Peter Kelvin (1981) suggested that the anticipated 'decline of work' has led to a discussion of what might take its place. "And since we tend to think in dichotomies, there has been a marked tendency to look at leisure - the opposite of work - as its alternative." Kelvin had, however, "grave doubts" about this scenario. The potential decline of work, he wrote, will create difficult problems at the level of the 'universal' human need to perceive life as reasonably stable.

"Work provides structure because it specifies the time, place and nature, not only of what one does and when, but also with whom... People become interdependent in and through their work, even if they do not particularly like each other. Leisure, in its essential nature, lacks precisely this bond, based on a sense of necessity" (Kelvin, 1981: 12-13).

Thelma McCormack (1971) expressed a similar concern but, unlike Kelvin, attached to it a positive valuation. To her, modern leisure, as a political concept, needs to be distinguished from recreation. Recreation is a system of social control. As all systems of social control, it is to some extent manipulative, coercive and indoctrinating. Leisure, on the contrary, should remain the domain of non-conformity, privacy and dissent.

The question about the role of leisure as social bondage seems to remain as open-ended today as it was in the distant past. Like the Roman god Janus, who presided over the unity and the discord, the war and the peace – leisure's role with regard to social order is double-faced.

5 WORK, LEISURE AND SOCIAL EQUALITY

The question whether access to leisure deepens or lessens social inequalities produced, similar to other leisure related *unity-ideas*, conflicting responses. Facile access to leisure among Athens' privileged youth, sharpened, according to Plato, social divisions, while in Sparta, which in the opinion of Athenians did not have true leisure, there was no distinction between the rich and the poor. According to Aristotle, "They all have the same food at their public tables, and the rich wear only such clothing as any poor man can afford" (Aristotle, 2009: 105).

Relationship between leisure and social inequality re-entered intellectual discourse with the advent of industrialism and transfer of power to constitutional governments. Aristocracy lost some of its leisure privileges. This, however, did not eliminate class divisions with regard to leisure - at least not in Europe. In *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), Adam Smith distinguished between the leisure habits of the common or 'low condition' people and the upper classes.

People of the *low condition* had little time to spare. As soon as they were fit, they had to work "to earn their subsistence"; their trades were usually simple and uniform, leaving "little leisure and less inclination to think of anything else" (Smith, 2007:605). The situation of the rank and fortune class was different. The members of this class were seldom "harassed from morning to night." Their employments were neither as simple nor as uniform as those of the common people. They

"exercised their heads rather than their hands" and, generally, had "a good deal of leisure, during which they could perfect themselves in every branch, either of useful or ornamental knowledge, for which they may have acquired some taste in the earlier part of life" (2007: 604).

The situation in the United States was different. Interesting observations about the relationship between class, wealth, life-styles and leisure in the New World were made by Alexis de Tocqueville in the *Democracy in America* (1835 and 1840).

Inequality in America evolved, according to Tocqueville, along different lines than in Europe. "As the United States were colonized by men holding equal rank amongst themselves, there is as yet no natural or permanent source of dissention between the interests of its different inhabitants" (1972:300). Representatives of different social groups and occupations "communicate and intermingle every day, imitate and emulate one another" (1945: 40).

In aristocratic societies, social inequality was accompanied by demonstrable differences in honor and taste. In the democratic societies, economic distinctions, according to Tocqueville, did not necessarily carry pronounced taste and intellectual attributes. The most opulent members of the American society did not display tastes that were substantively different from the rest of the population.

Although life-style differences subsided, under the surface of this affinity, there nevertheless remained ample room for social tensions. "When everything is nearly on the same level, the slightest privileges become important and the slightest inequalities hurt" (Tocqueville, 1945:147). According to Tocqueville, social changes in North America smoothed the veneer of inequality but did not alter its substance. Divides of prestige and honor were reduced, but the inequalities of wealth widened. American society became 'life-styles alike' but 'riches apart.'

Tocqueville's position was put to question at the end of the 19th century by Thorstein Veblen in the *Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899). From the days of Greek philosophers, Veblen wrote, to the present day, the degree of leisure and exemption from labour have been recognized as a prerequisite to a worthy, beautiful, and blameless human life. "Manual labour was the exclusive occupation of the inferior classes. The upper classes were, on the contrary, exempt from industrial employment" (1953: 21).

Veblen was nostalgic about the early stages of American history, when status was associated with work rather than leisure, and leisure was subordinated to the needs of community life. This situation did not last long. Work and leisure have eventually split. The new bourgeoisie developed similar attitudes toward work as its aristocratic predecessors. According to Veblen, Puritans attempted to escape from the "parasitical aristocratic idleness," but by promoting the 'natural right' of private property, they paradoxically created a new "leisure class." Speculation, absentee ownership, conspicuous consumption, and wasteful leisure betrayed early American values. Leisure became, according to Veblen, self-serving, senseless and despicably unfair.

Veblen's harsh assessment of America's class divide has not been shared by most commentators. "Veblen's theory of the leisure class," Wippler wrote, "is no longer valid for modern Western societies, because leisure time has ceased to be the privilege of the upper class but is now also at the disposal of the lower class and the middle mass" (1970: 64).

Leisure was heralded as the 'great equalizer'. Sociologists spoke off "typical leisure time occupations of people of all classes" (Dahrendorf, 1959:69). All classes, Nels Anderson wrote, "attend the same

ballgames, the same prize fights, the same night clubs, even the same opera. All listen to the radio and view the same television programs" (1961: 34). Kenneth Roberts (1970: 32) summarized this position: "The variations that are found between the leisure interests of different occupational groups shade into insignificance when set against the extensive similarities in the leisure activities of people in all sections of society."

The old barriers of estate, class, and status will disappear, it was believed, in the melting pot of mass consumption, mass recreation, and entertainment. Inexpensive travel, mass media, and common affluence, it was argued, have brought various forms of leisure within the psychological and economic reach of everyone. Instead of class, one's lifestyle, presumably uninfluenced by family background, will become the key factor in forming leisure interests and modes. "It appears," H. Schelsky wrote, as if "the position of the consumer, instead of class status," becomes the central determinant of everyday life (quoted in G. Lüschen, 1963: 259).

David Riesman in *The Lonely Crowd* (1950: 145) suggested that beneath the old rubrics an amorphous structure is emerging, in which "the brow hierarchies compete for recognition with the traditional hierarchies based on wealth and occupational position." In a somewhat different way, analogous concerns were voiced by Daniel Bell (1973), who argued that social divisions in technologically advanced societies cannot be fruitfully explored along the traditional class lines of hierarchy and dominance. To Pierre Bourdieu (1984), class distinctions, as part of the cultural *habitus*, became primarily a matter of taste.

Not everybody agreed. According to Dumazedier (1967), social divisions within leisure and cultural consumption remained relatively deep, especially at both poles of the social spectrum. He wrote about the cultural underdevelopment ('atony') of large segments of French population (survey in Annecy). Concerns about continuing presence of social and class inequalities in the uses and access to leisure have been voiced by Scott (1982), Clark and Critcher (1985), and Reid (1998).

In the 1960s, a number of researchers called attention to the 'turn around' of traditional leisure inequalities. Fourastié (1960), Wilensky (1963) and Andrae (1970) argued that, under the conditions of welfare economics and post-industrial development, social inequality took a different form from the past. To Harold Wilensky, there was no leisure class in modern industrial societies in the sense that Veblen wrote - a privileged class demonstrating its status through different forms of conspicuous consumption and leisure.

"For centuries, the majority worked hard to provide the necessary means of existence, comfort and luxury for the leisured minority. Now the situation is being reversed. A small minority will be able, due to technological and scientific progress (automation), to provide all the necessary means of existence for the masses. There will be a growing demand for and pressure on the most educated, efficient, productive and functionally indispensable individuals, whose talents and skills are unique and cannot be delegated. Groups with high status have lost most of their previous leisure privileges. They work long hours...Lifetime leisure seems to be heavily weighted toward the lower strata" (1963:111).

According to Fourastié, in the 1950s, French ministers worked 3 to 3.5 thousand hours per year, while their office messengers' workload amounted to only 2.5 thousand hours. This reversed situation typical of the 19th century (1960: 173). William Grossin observed that in 1966, when punch clocks were installed in French ministries: "Contrary to our expectations, the top executives were found to work as long as their subordinates, often longer, and rarely less" (1969: 53).

An argument can be made that longer hours of work do not necessarily imply deepening of social inequalities. Wilensky (1963: 113) admits that, "although lifetime leisure decreases with increased status, the picture is one of bunched, predictable leisure for elites, and intermittent, unpredictable leisure for the masses." Leisure of the top professionals carries substantial advantages in terms of structure and quality. Longer vacations and sabbaticals enable a more rational use of leisure.

Linder, in *The Harried Leisure Class* (1970), suggested that the shortage of leisure is usually accompanied by its more intensive and expensive use. When we have a lot of free time, we are often loafing, watching television, talking for hours on the telephone. Leisure activities, which take the greatest amounts of free time, are the cheapest in terms of per time-unit cost, while those which take little time are more expensive. The cost of one man-hour of attending a symphony concert or an opera performance in Canada is inordinately higher than the cost of a man-hour of watching TV. One is left speculating on how much one 'man-hour' of yachting costs.

Lundberg, Komarovsky, and McInerney (1934), analyzing differences in the leisure behavior of various social groups at the beginning of the 1930s, made an important observation, suggesting that variations in the leisure habits of different social groups lie not in

the amounts of leisure, but in the "qualitative variations and choice of the activities" (1960:195).

8 HOW DOES DIVISION OF LABOR AFFECT LEISURE?

Interest in the well-being effects of the division of labour, as with so many other issues, goes back to the times of antiquity. Plato, in the *Republic*, suggested that the well-being of the state rests with the common effort of husbandmen, builders, weavers, shoemakers, and other purveyors of bodily wants, who bring the results of their labor into the common stock.

The role of the division of labor as a motor of economic and social progress was on the minds of leading personalities of the Enlightenment – David Hume, Denis Diderot, Immanuel Kant, and Adam Smith.

For Diderot, participation in specialized working routines was a precondition of labor's efficiency and mastery of one's use of time (see Sennett, 1998). Kant, in the *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785), wrote that all trades, arts, and handicrafts have gained by the division of labour. When, instead of one man doing everything, each one confines himself to a certain kind of work, distinct from others, he can perform his task with greater facility and greatest perfection. "Where each is a jack-of-all-trades, there the trades still remain in the greatest barbarism" (2002:4).

Adam Smith's vision of the causes of economic success and wealth included a clearly articulated notion of the division of labour. A pin-maker, working 'with the utmost industry,' could make only a few pins a day, but when his work was divided between the metal cutter, pin drawer, roller, finisher, and others specializing in their skills, each of them ended up producing 4,800 pins daily. The division of labor resulted, according to Smith, in "the greatest improvement in the productive powers of labour" (2007:8).

Yet in Smith's writings we find also the first signs of a critical attitude towards social implications of the division of labor. The *Wealth of Nations*, which begins with a praise of the division of labor, contains Smith's observation that a man, whose whole life is spent in performing a few simple operations has no occasion to exert his understanding or to exercise his invention. "He naturally loses the habit of such exertion and becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become" (2007:603).

Smith's critique of the social implications of the division of labor is repeated by Jean-Baptiste Say and Auguste Comte. It is a sad commentary, according to Say, that most of the time we make nothing more than the eighteenth part of a pin. A similar concern about workmen who manufacture all their life knife-handles or

pin-heads was voiced by Comte (quoted in Durkheim's *Division of Labor in Society*, 1964: 43 and 371).

To Alexis de Tocqueville (1945: 168-169), economic necessity, that is more powerful than manners and laws, binds the man "to a craft and frequently to a spot, which he cannot leave; it assigns to him a certain place in society, beyond which he cannot go; in the midst of universal movement it renders him stationary. In proportion as the principle of the division of labor is extended, the workman becomes weaker, more narrow-minded, and more dependent." While the society may have gained, the individuals have lost.

A similar position with regard to the social implications of the division of labor has been formulated by Marx. The division of labor has increased society's production and its "powers and pleasures," but it has also curtailed the ability of every person to act as an individual. In short, the division of labor is, to Marx, nothing else but an "estranged, alienated posting of human activity" (2009/ 1844: 55).

An elaborate effort to revisit the problem of the division of labor and its implications has been undertaken by Emile Durkheim in *The Division of Labor in Society* (1893). Unlike his predecessors, Durkheim argued that the division of labor had beneficial social effects. It allowed societies to replace *mechanical solidarity*, based on authority, by *organic solidarity*, based on common interests and mutual cooperation. "Far from being trammelled by the progress of specialization, individual personality develops with the division of labor" (1964:403).

The discourse about social implications of the division of labor focused in the 20th century on the effects of assembly-line work upon after-work life. Since work represents, for most people, the single most important life activity, it affects decisively the quality of one's self-concept, life style and leisure. Leisure, Greenberg (1958: 38) wrote, "is at the bottom a function of work, and changes as the nature of work changes." This 'spillover' concept of work-leisure relationship became popular in the writings of the critics of modern industrial societies (Marcuse, 1964; Ellul, 1964).

A different position has been taken by Georges Friedmann (1961). According to Friedmann, who examined everyday behaviour of French blue-collar workers, leisure compensated workers for their dissatisfaction with monotonous work. The worker sought to regain in his leisure the initiative, the responsibility and the sense of achievement denied to him in his work. Leisure, to Friedmann, appeared as more appropriate for humanizing life than the technologically and economically constrained work. In the last ten years, Friedman (1961: 105) wrote,

"there has been a 'fantastic mushrooming' of hobbies, of arts and crafts and of all sorts of free time activities, such as photography, pottery, electronics, radio, etc.," which unlike the 'press-button' services of automatic machines provided workers with psychological relief."

But while leisure's compensating capacity was a positive good, it has been achieved, according to Daniel Bell, at the high cost of "the loss of satisfaction in work" (1960: 251).

Friedmann's position was reformulated by his follower, Joffre Dumazedier, who argued that leisure can serve not only as a compensation for the drudgery of industrial work, but could form a sovereign challenge to work's dominance over everyday life. In the book *Toward the Society of Leisure* Dumazedier (1967: 76) suggested: "We have seen that leisure, backed by growing prestige, provides models for behaviour and can even stamp a style on everyday life. Its effect is felt at the moment of choosing a job...Many young people are looking for the leisure possibilities in the jobs they are choosing." For Dumazedier, leisure was not only free time but a newly emerging societal value orientation.

In the 1960s and 1970s, automation and progress of scientific and technological revolution raised hopes that radical transformation of the work environment will profoundly affect the character of work and of the after-work life. Assembly line working conditions were expected to give room to more challenging supervisory and controlling functions that could break the monotony of standardized industrial work (see R. Richta, *Civilization at the Crossroads*, 1969).

According to Marshall McLuhan (1964: 381), automation, paradoxically, makes liberal education mandatory. The electric age of servomechanisms suddenly releases men from the mechanical and specialist servitude of the preceding machine age.

"As the machine and the motorcar released the horse and projected it onto the plane of entertainment, so does automation with men. We are suddenly threatened with a liberation that taxes our inner resources of self-employment and imaginative participation in society. This would seem to be a fate that calls men to the role of artist in society."

Most sociological analyses were, however, less optimistic than Friedmann's, Dumazedier's or McLuhan's. One of the most interesting studies of work-leisure relationship addressing the question whether leisure activities provide opportunities for social interaction and discretion, which are missing at work, or carry over the patterns of work to leisure, was

conducted in the 1960s in British Columbia (Canada) by Martin Meissner. His conclusion, reported in the article *The Long Arm of the Job: A Study of Work and Leisure* (1971), was that, in most cases, the carry-over pattern prevailed. A similar conclusion, based on a survey conducted in the Netherlands, has been reported by R. Wippler (1968).

9 TOWARD A SOCIETY OF LEISURE OR OF A HARRIED LEISURE CLASS?

Beginnings of modern interest in the coming of the 'society of leisure' can be traced back to the 1930s. John Maynard Keynes, in the essay *Economic Possibilities for our Grandchildren* (1930), wrote about forthcoming time use trends:

"For the first time since his creation, man will be faced with his real, his permanent problem - how to use his freedom from pressing economic cares, how to occupy the leisure, which science and compound interest will have won for him, to live wisely and agreeably and well" (1963: 365).

Similar expectations can be found in George Lundberg's publication *Leisure: A Suburban Study* (1934:4): "The amount of leisure time has been constantly increasing and seems destined to an even more rapid increase in the near future."

The peak of the hopes with regard to leisure and its growth falls on the 1950s and 1960s. According to Kenneth Galbraith (1967: 370), by mid-1960s, the notion of a "new era of greatly expanded leisure" has become a "conventional conversation piece." Fourastié (1965) predicted that in 1985 French men and women will work only one-third of their life, the length of the workweek will not exceed 30 hours, and 12 weeks of vacation will be guaranteed. French edition of the Dumazedier's influential book *Vers une civilisation du loisir?* (1962) was translated into English and published - without the question mark - as *Toward a Society of Leisure* (1967).

Optimistic expectations of the continuing growth of leisure began fading in the 1970s and 1980s. Linder's polemical essay *The Harried Leisure Class* (1970) questioned the belief that people in post-industrial societies lead increasingly leisurely lives. The tenor of the discussions shifted from the 'promise of leisure' to 'time scarcity.'

Academic and popular publications wrote of rushed life-styles and time pressure (Rifkin, 1987; Burns, 1993). Schor in *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure* (1991: 1) claimed that, if the present trends were to continue, Americans could spend at the end of the millennium "as much time at their jobs as they did back in the nineteen twenties."

Not everybody agreed with these pessimistic scenarios. John Robinson (1989:6) argued that, at the end of the 1980s, Americans enjoyed more free time "than 20 years ago". Gershuny doubted that time scarcity trends will continue and suggested that there may still be some hope for the 'leisure society' (see Gershuny & Fisher, 1999)⁶.

In the article *What happened to the society of leisure? Of the gap between the 'haves' and 'have nots'* (2015), I suggested that the question whether people in advanced industrial societies lost or gained leisure may be the wrong question to ask and should be replaced by the question, *which population groups have gained or lost free time?* I attempted to show that, if time-use trends diverge for different population groups, averaging time use for the entire population may obscure widening 'real-life' time use gaps.

Table 1 shows that if time use trends of respondents, interviewed in Canadian General Social Surveys⁷, were examined for the entire population aged 15 and over, the combined workload of paid and domestic work amounted in 1981 to 29% of respondents' daily time. In 2010, the corresponding figure was 30%. The proportionate share of free time did not change during the observed period at all; it amounted to 25% of the daily total, or approximately 6 hours, in both 1981 and 2010. The situation changes, however, if time use trends are examined for the employed parents aged 20 to 64, with at least one child aged 12 or under.

⁶ For a detailed analysis of leisure trends and the "society of leisure" controversy see A. J. Veal's (2018) *Whatever Happened to the Leisure Society?*

⁷ Tables 1 to 4 are based on data from Canadian General Social Surveys (GSS) and the 1975 U.S. time diary survey. Tables 5 and 6 use data from the 2003 Experience Sampling Survey (ESM), conducted by Zuzanek (principal investigator) and Mannell at the University of Waterloo, Canada. Time use in GSS was calculated as a summary duration (in minutes) of activity episodes reported on a diary day, grouped into larger activity categories. Respondents were also asked to identify the most enjoyed activity performed during the survey day and assess how happy (1-4) and satisfied with life (1-10) they felt. Information about GSS can be found at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/89f0115x/89f0115x2013001-eng.htm>. The 2003 Experience Sampling Survey of teenage high school students and their parents was supported by a strategic SSHRC grant. Respondents carried for a period of one week a pager that was randomly activated eight times a day (between 8 am and 23 pm). At the time of the beep, respondents reported what they were doing, where and with whom they were, as well as a number of experiential states, such as feeling happy or sad, pressed for time, bored, lonely, being in control of the situation, etc. Time use in the ESM surveys was calculated as per cent of self-reports allocated to various daily activities during the survey week. More detailed information about ESM can be found in Zuzanek, J. & Zuzanek, T. (2015) *Of Happiness and of Despair, Is There a Measure? Time Use and Subjective Wellbeing*, published in the *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16: 839-856.

Table 1 - Total workloads and free time: 1981 to 2010 (Canadian General Social Surveys).

Total workload (paid and unpaid work)	1981	2010	Change
	min per day	min per day	min per day
Total sample, aged 15+	410.9	426.1	+15.2
Employed parents, 20-65, child <=12	518.1	628.4	+110.3
Free time			
Total sample, aged 15+	363.7	362.0	-1.7
Employed parents, 20-65, child <=12	296.2	239.8	-56.4

Source: GSS 1981 and 2010.

For this lifecycle group, the combined workloads of paid and domestic work rose during the observed period from 36% to 44% of the daily total, while their free time shrunk from 21% to 17%.⁸ In real-time terms, the daily combined workload of employed parents was 110 minutes longer and their free time 56 minutes shorter in 2010 than in 1981 (see Table 1). The supposable growth of leisure was accounted for by demographic shifts, namely the growing proportionate share of the retired and school-age populations.

The polarization of time use is reflected in other findings as well. The proportion of respondents who felt in 1992 rushed every day or several times a week amounted to 63.6 percent. In 2015, it was 64.1 percent. Interestingly, not only the proportion of respondents, who felt rushed, remained high or increased slightly, but so did the proportion of respondents who reported that they "had more time on their hands than they knew what to do with." The share of this group grew during the observed period from 20.8 to 23.8 percent of the surveyed population (not in the tables).

The seriousness of the challenge posed by the widening of the time use gap between the 'time rich' and 'time-poor' population groups is underscored by demographic forecasts, according to which, the proportion of population aged 65 and older will increase in Canada from 14% in 2010 to over 18% in 2020. The later entry of younger adults into the labour force and the rapid aging of the population reduce the pool of employable labour resources. Under these circumstances, the problem of sustaining economic growth and ensuring balanced time use of different population groups becomes one of the most serious challenges facing modern societies.

10 LEISURE, WORK AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

Leisure rather than work has been traditionally associated with higher levels of emotional well-being. For Aristotle, Michel Montaigne, Henry David Thoreau,

to name only a few, leisure was a source of personal happiness.

In a recent study of the well-being implications of leisure, Newman, Tay and Diener (2014) summarized survey evidence reported in 363 articles. Most of the findings in the reviewed articles supported the popular notion that leisure enhances subjective well-being. This conclusion was based on solid evidence, but certain aspects of the relationship between leisure and subjective well-being may have been overlooked.

Georg Lundberg (1934:2) was among the first to warn that growing access to leisure will not, necessarily, be accompanied by rising levels of happiness. "Clearly, something more than a short and easy working day, even with economic security, is needed before we have any assurance that the lives of men will be happier and lighter. It all depends on what we do with the additional leisure and our attitude toward these activities."

Findings reported in Tables 2 to 6, based on data from the Canadian General Social Surveys (GSS) and Experience Sampling Surveys (ESM), conducted in Ontario, do not cover the relationship between leisure and subjective well-being in its entirety but illustrate some of its problematic aspects, which have been, so far, given relatively little attention.

Table 2 - Most enjoyed activity performed on the diary by Canadians (Per cent of respondents).

Itens	GSS 2005	
	%	Rank
Attending sports, pop arts, movies	51.5	1
Playing with children	45.6	2
Attending social events	38.9	3
Dining at restaurants	20.8	4
Watching T.V.	14.0	5
Non-grocery shopping	10.5	6
Paid work	8.4	7
Child care	7.8	8
Grocery shopping	4.2	9
Cooking	3.1	10
Commuting to / from work	2.1	11
Cleaning the house	1.9	12

Source: GSS (2005).

⁸ Wilensky (1981) was one of the first authors who drew attention to the life-cycle squeeze of employed parents.

Table 2 lists enjoyment ratings of daily activities performed during the time diary day and reported by the respondents of the 2005 Canadian GSS at the end of the interview. These ratings clearly favor free time activities. When asked to name the most enjoyed activity, 40 to 50 percent of respondents chose attending social events or sports and popular culture, compared to only 8%, who mentioned paid work and fewer than 2%, who listed house upkeep.

Findings reported in Table 3 show, however, a somewhat different picture. The surprising finding in it is that before 2005, in the U.S. and Canada, feelings of life satisfaction correlated with free time *negatively* rather than positively. John Robinson (1977:162) was one of the first authors, who drew attention to the fact that life satisfaction in U.S. time use surveys was associated “with less rather than more available free time”. In Canada, only after 2005, did correlations between the amounts of free time and life satisfaction become mildly positive.

The associations between time allocated to paid work and subjective well-being reveal a reverse pattern. In the early time use surveys, paid work was associated with positive emotional outcomes. This relationship turned to a negative one only after 2005. It is interesting that domestic work, which is traditionally assessed as burdensome, was accompanied during the entire observed period with neutral emotional outcomes.

Table 3 - Paid work, domestic work, free time and subjective well-being.

Frequency	Time use surveys				
	US	Canadian GSS			
Time diary	1975	1986	1998	2005	2010
Free time	-.07	-.04	-.02	.03	.04
Paid work	.05	.06	.02	-.05	-.05
Domestic work	-.02	ns	ns	ns	.02

Note: Standardized β controlled for gender, age, and education of the respondents.

Source: U.S. 1975 and Canadian GSS 1986 to 2010.

The relatively weak and multi-directional relationships of subjective well-being with free time, paid and domestic work temper overly optimistic assessments of the emotional effects of free time. The question that calls for an answer is, how can we explain the seemingly paradoxical difference between high enjoyment rating of free time activities and the relatively weak association of leisure time with subjective well-being?

Part of the answer lies in the fact that leisure is a “mixed bag” of activities. It includes attending sporting events and popular arts, which were rated as the most enjoyed activity by 52 per cent of respondents, but it also contains watching TV, which got the high rating

from only 14 per cent of the respondents. It should not surprise, therefore, that the “mixed bag” of leisure, containing on the diary day 125 minutes of TV viewing and only 14 minutes of spectatorship, did not generate a more positive emotional outcome. As commented by Lundberg (1934:195)

“Perhaps our most important practical conclusion is that the difference of greatest significance in the leisure of various groups lies not in their total amounts... The most meaningful difference lies in the qualitative variations between the activities which we have been *compelled to classify under the same captions*” (italics added).

The other factor that needs to be taken into consideration, when assessing well-being effects of leisure activities, is the dependency of this relationship on the extensity and the length of leisure participation. Excessive involvement, even in enjoyable activities, may be followed by a negative emotional outcome (the “hangover effect”).

Analyses of time diary data, collected as part of the 2003 in-school survey of Ontario teens, showed that having access to less than 6 hours or more than 10 hours of free time on Sundays, was associated with lower levels of subjective well-being (happiness) and greater likelihood of having emotional problems than having access to 6 to 10 hours of free time.

The level of perceived happiness was rising with the growing volume of free time but declined beyond a saturation point (not in the tables). This observation is supported by the 2005 GSS findings, reported in Table 4, which show that employed respondents on workdays felt happier when they had access to 3 to 6 hours of free time than when they had less or more of it.

Table 4 - Relationship between weekday access to free time and feeling happy. Two ends against the middle?

Free time on weekdays (time diary)	Feel happy (1-4)
Less than 3 hrs	3.36
3 to 6 hours	3.41
More than 6 hours	3.35

Source: GSS (2005).

Difference between instantaneous and cumulative effects of daily activities is reflected in ESM findings as well. Table 5 shows that when adult respondents were asked to assess emotional impact of leisure activities at the time of the beep, their assessments were positive. A frequent exposure to leisure activities, on the other hand, did not make the person happier. Correlation between the frequency of

participation in leisure activities and the weekly mean of affect was negative ($\beta = -.09$).

Table 5 - Well-being connotations of instantaneous and cumulative participation in daily activities.

Type	Affect (episode)	Affect (weekly total)
Parents		
Free time	.07	-.09
Paid work	-.06	-.07
Domestic work	.02	.24
Teens aged 12-18		
Free time	.07	-.03

Notes: ¹ Standardised β was controlled for the adult population for age, gender, and education and for the teens for gender and age. ² Composite of feeling happy, good and cheerful at the time of the beep (Alpha=.84). ³ Cumulative affect accompanying all activity episodes reported during the survey week. All relationships are statistically significant ($p \leq .005$)

Source: ESM (2003).

It is not easy to establish when “too much” of a good thing becomes counterproductive. When does pleasurable watching of TV reach a saturation point? Survey evidence tells us that this point is higher on Sundays than on weekdays and among the teens than among the adults. It is unfortunate that – with the possible exception of Gershuny’s (2013) analyses of the marginal utility of time use - the dependency of enjoyment ratings of leisure activities on their duration - is missing in the debate about the well-being effects of time use.

The final point in assessing the well-being merits of leisure, labor and other daily activities concerns the concept of subjective well-being. Examining the concept of well-being from a historical perspective, Hannah Arendt revived the Greeks’ notion of eudaimonia. Eudaimonia, she wrote, was the daimon, who accompanied every man throughout his life. “Unlike happiness, which is a passing mood and unlike good fortune, which one may have at certain periods of life and lack in others, eudaimonia, like life itself, is a lasting state of being” (Arendt, 1958: 193). From today’s perspective, “eudaimonic” well-being refers, essentially, to a balance of emotional, intellectual and substantive elements that make life interesting, enjoyable and meaningful. From this broader perspective, the contribution of different daily activities to well-being varies.

Table 6, based on 2003 ESM data, attempts to do justice to the complex relationship between leisure, labor and subjective well-being. Findings reported in this table show that participation in leisure activities is associated with a number of positive emotional outcomes. Engagement in leisure activities was

associated with higher levels of affect, lower levels of anxiety, and lower desire to engage in other activities than participation in working activities. When engaging in leisure activities, respondents felt less pressed for time than when they were at work.

Table 6 - Relationship between paid work, leisure and instantaneous measures of subjective well-being.

Type	Work episode	Free time episode
Affect ²	-.06	.07
Anxiety ³	.13	-.12
Wish doing something else	.19	-.22
How well were you concentrating	.26	-.06
Did you feel bored	-.02	.03
Did you feel lonely	-.05	.03
Did you feel passive	-.15	.19
Did you feel pressed for time	.26	-.27
Flow ⁴	.28	-.16
How important was what you were doing	.05	-.15
Were you in control of the situation	.03	-.04

Notes: ¹ Standardised β was controlled for gender, age, and education of the respondents. ² Composite of feeling happy, good and cheerful; Alpha= .84. ³ Composite of feeling worried, upset, and tense; Alpha= .84. ⁴ Flow is an equivalent ratio of perceived challenge and skill at the time of the episode.

Source: ESM (2003).

Some swb connotations of leisure were, however, not so positive. Leisure episodes were more often than working episodes associated with the feelings of boredom and loneliness. Leisure activities correlated with lower levels of flow (composite of skill and challenge). Respondents felt less in control of the situation during leisure episodes than when they were at work. Work was considered by respondents as more important than leisure and was accompanied by greater concentration. In sum, while emotionally more satisfying, leisure experiences appeared substantively and intellectually less challenging than work experiences.

What conclusions can be made based on the above findings? I tried to answer this question in the article *Of happiness and of despair is there a measure?* (2015). It seems that we all keep in our minds a preferential order of activities that we enjoy and would like to engage in. Involvement in sporting activities and socialising with friends are some of our favourites. The key for the understanding of the relationship between time use and subjective well-being is, however, not an exponential growth of the most enjoyed activities but a balanced use of time. Excessive involvement even in the most favoured activities may carry negative emotional implications.

We may have definite activity preferences in our mind, but the reality of everyday life forces us to engage in less enjoyable pursuits, which are an indispensable part of normal daily routines. Dramatic shifts of well-being valuations, as a result of recurring turnover of daily activities, would be psychologically uncomfortable. We harmonize our daily lives by controlling our preferences. Real life is not a dreamlike pursuit of favourable pastimes but an ongoing challenge and compromise between what we want, what we can, and what we do. As suggested by Aristotle (1996: 273): "It would be indeed strange that amusements should be our end – that we should toil and moil all our life long in order that we may amuse ourselves... To make amusements the object of our serious pursuits seems foolish and childish to excess."

9 CONCLUSIONS

Historical analyses show that the relationships between leisure, labor and well-being generated, times and again, conflicting assessments. Leisure has been interpreted as a source of human identity as well as social instability. It has been assigned the role of a stimulus of social change and social equality, as well as a catalyst for political dominance and deepened social divide. Leisure has been hailed as a root of happiness, but also faltered for escapism. As commented by Hunnicutt (2006: 56), "Over time, work and leisure have been valued in different ways, and that valuing often contrasted the one as more valuable with the other as less valuable." The question whether leisure is a 'blessing' or a 'curse' haunted the journalists of the 20th century as it did the philosophers of antiquity (see Zuzanek, 2007).

In the early stages of Greek civilization or at the beginning of the new industrial era, great hopes were put into labor and human effort. With the aging of civilizations and the living standards rising, the growing access to free time generated different responses. Some authors expected leisure to improve human conditions, others feared that social comfort and leisurely life would weaken moral bondage holding societies together and diminish their political resilience. Both of these visions sought and found support in historical evidence.

The same pattern, which was observed in individuals' leisure participation, a decline of subjective well-being beyond a saturation point, seems to apply to the societies at large. As observed by Orrin Klapp (1975: 252) in his analysis of the opening and closing of social systems, if "openness surpasses tolerance," periods of social opening are followed by periods of social closing. Today, we may be able to successfully

accommodate and enjoy greater amounts of leisure than our predecessors, but this does not put aside the question about potential loss of control over our spare time and the weakening of social bonds holding society together. Does Pitirim Sorokin's critique of the emotional chaos of the sensate culture express an unwarranted fear of a traditionalist or is this an accurate foresight of a deepening social crisis? There is no easy answer to this question.

In the introductory section of this article, I promised to refrain from the role of an arbiter in the ongoing discourse about the comparative merits of leisure and labor. It is not my intention, however, to end this article with a sophistry conclusion that both positive and negative assessments of the role played by leisure or labor are right. The conflicting assessments of their role reflect multi-faceted nature of these phenomena and different circumstances in which such assessments were formulated. Paradoxically– in different situations - conflicting positions can assume contextual validity, in spite of their seeming irreconcilability. As suggested by William James (1904), in real-life and in concrete situations, the truth is specific rather than abstract and only one alternative is usually right. It is the past that can often tell us what to expect in the future and how to react to the challenge.

It has been said that History yields her secrets only to those who begin with the present. It was, however, also written that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it" (Santayana, 1905: 284). This article was guided by an interest in the present and reverted to the past in a search of clues for the understanding of our present situation.

While in the early stages of leisure research, the phenomenon of leisure elicited genuine intellectual curiosity and excitement about its potential contribution to human development, much of today's leisure research, unfortunately, lacks conceptual relevance and is narrowly focused on the present situation rather than the analysis of social change.

Bennett Berger wrote in the early 1960s that theoretical relevance was missing from most of the contemporary work in the sociology of leisure. "The sociology of leisure today is little else than a reporting of survey data on what selected samples of individuals do with the time in which they are not working and the correlation of these data with conventional demographic variables" (1963:28). This observation remains valid today. Examining gender differences in accessing free time is an important issue, but it is part of the sociology of gender. An analysis of how changes in accessing leisure and its composition contributed to the widening or narrowing of the gender

gap turns attention to the phenomenon of leisure. A subtle difference conceptualizes leisure by making it the focus of inquiry.

One of the shortcomings of leisure research today is its rather 'territorial' and self-serving bias. Repose, pastimes, entertainment, amusements, diversion, as well as creative, autotelic and developmentally rich leisure activities have conflicting emotional and social implications. Leisure is, however, often presented in research studies as an indivisible good. As a free and intrinsically motivated behaviour it is contrasted with behaviourally constricted and extrinsically motivated labor. Yet, as proposed at the beginning of this article, the dividing line of subjective and social wellbeing does not run between leisure and labour but within them. Leisure is not a panacea but a challenge that requires a weighted analytical approach.

Another major problem faced by leisure studies today is that sociology of leisure has given up its position to psychology. Rolf Meyersohn (1972: 227) alerted to this situation, when he wrote that if the subject of leisure studies should shift to process and meaning, the unit of analysis should shift from the individual "to the various communities, which provide relevant context for leisure activities." Analysis of conflicting positions within the unit-ideas discourse in this article urges us to turn attention from the individual and his personality traits to the society, social change, social communities, and social policies. Paraphrasing Aristotle, this article can be concluded by a suggestion that not only is the man a political animal (*zoon politicon*), but so is his leisure.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, N. (1961) *Work and Leisure*, New York, Free Press of Glencoe.
- Andraee, C.A. (1970). *Okonomik der Freizeit*. Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Apostol, T.M. (1969) *Calculus*, Vol. II. John Wiley & Sons.
- Aquinas, T. (2006/1265-1274) *Summa Theologica*. Project Gutenberg. Part II-II.
- Arendt, H. (1958) *The Human Condition*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle, (1996) *Nicomachean Ethics*, (translated by Rackham), Wordsworth Classic.
- Aristotle, (2009) *The Politics and The Constitution of Athens*. Ed. by S. Everson, Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, D. (1960) *The End of Ideology*, Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press.
- Bell, Daniel (1973) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Berger, B. (1963) *The Sociology of Leisure: Some Suggestions*. In E.O. Smigel (ed.) *Work and Leisure: A Contemporary Social Problem*, New Haven, CT, College and University Press
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, London, Routledge & Kegan
- Bücher, K. (1893) *Die Entfaltung der Volkswirtschaft*. Tübingen.
- Bücher, K. (1899) *Arbeit und Rhythmus*. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner Verlag.
- Burns, L. (1993) *Busy bodies: Why our time-obsessed society keeps us running in place*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Carlyle, T. (1843) *Past and Present*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Christensen, P. (2012) Athletics and Social Order in Sparta in the Classical Period, *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 193-255
- Clark, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) *The Devil Makes Work*, Basingstoke, Macmillan
- Comte, A. (2007/1830) *Cours de philosophie positive*, IV, p. 430
- D'Angour, A. (2013) Plato and Play Taking Education Seriously in Ancient Greece, *American Journal of Play*, volume 5, number 3
- Dahrendorf, R. (1959) *Social Classes and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- De Grazia, S. (1962) *Of Time, Work and Leisure*. Garden City, NY Anchor Books.
- Dumazedier, J. (1967) *Toward the Society of Leisure*. New York: The Free Press. (Annecy).
- Durkheim, E. (1964/1893) *The Division of Labor in Society*, New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Durkheim, E. (2012/1912) *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. The Project Gutenberg.
- Elias, N. and E. Dunning (1993) *Quest for Excitement. Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process*. Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Ellul, J. (1964) *The Technological Society*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Engels, F. (2010/1883) *Dialectics of Nature*. In: Marx & Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, Lawrence & Wishart Electric Book
- Fourastié, J. (1960) *The Causes of Wealth*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.
- Fourastié, J. (1965). *Les 40,000 heures. Inventaire de l'avenir*. Paris: Laffont-Gonthier.
- Friedman, G. (1961). *The Anatomy of Work, Labour, Leisure, and the Implications of Automation*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Galbraith, J. K. (1967) *The New Industrial State*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin.
- Gershuny, J. (2012) National Utility: Measuring the Enjoyment of Activities *European Sociological Review* Vol. 29 No 5, 996–1009.
- Gershuny, J. and Fisher, K. (1999) *ISER working paper No 99-03*. Colchester, Essex: Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- Greenberg, C. (1958) *Work and Leisure Under Industrialism*, in Larabee, E. and R. Meyersohn, *Mass Leisure*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Groos, K. (1896) *Die Spiele der Tiere*. Jena (quoted in Plekhanov).
- Grossin, W. (1969) *Le Travail et le Temps. Horaires-durees-rythmes*. Editions Anthropos.

- Hesiod (1988) *Theogony and Works and Days*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huizinga, J. (1955/1938) *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hunnicut, B.K. (2006) *The History of Western Leisure*. In: A Handbook of Leisure Studies. Ed. by C. Rojek, S.M. Shaw and A.J. Veal, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Iso-Ahola, S. (1980) *The Social Psychology of Leisure and Recreation*. William C Brown.
- James, W. (1904) *What is Pragmatism*. In: Writings 1902-1910, Library of America
- Kant, I. (2018/1785) *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kelvin, P. (1981) *Work and leisure: The implications of technological change*. Manuscript from SIRLS.
- Keynes, J. M. (1930) *Economic Possibilities for our Grandchildren*. In *Essays in Persuasion*, New York: Norton & Co.
- Klapp, O. E. (1978) *Opening and Closing: Strategies of Information Adaptation in Society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Kraus, R. (1971) *Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society*. Appleton Century-Crofts.
- Lafargue, P. (2011/1883) *The Right to be Lazy: Essays by Paul Lafargue*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr
- Linder, S. (1970) *The Harried Leisure Class*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lundberg, G. A., M. Komarovskiy and M.A. McInerney (1960/1934) *Leisure: A Suburban Study*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lüschen, G. (1963) Soziale Schichtung und Soziale Mobilität bei Jungen Sportlern. In *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 15.
- Malinowski, B. (1922) *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An account of native enterprise and adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Marcuse, H. (1964) *One Dimensional Man*. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marx, K. (2010/1883) *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. III
www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works
- Marx, K. (1953/1857) *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie*, Berlin
- Marx, K. (2009/1844) *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*.
www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/manuscripts/preface.htm
- Marx, K. (2015/ 1883) *Capital*.
www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/p5.htm
- McCormack, T. (1971) Politics and leisure, *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, XII pp. 169-181
- McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited.
- Meissner, M. (1971) *The Long Arm of the Job: A Study of Work and Leisure*. *Industrial Relations* 10, 239-60
- Meyerson, R. (1972) Leisure. In: *The Human Meaning of Social Change*, Ed. by A. Campbell and P.E. Converse, New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- More, T. (2005/1516) *Utopia*. The Project Gutenberg
- Murphy, J. F. (1974) *Concepts of leisure: philosophical implications*. Prentice Hall
- Neulinger, J. (1974) *The Psychology of Leisure*. Charles C. Thomas, Springfield.
- Newman, D.B., Tay, L., and Diener, E. (2014) *Leisure Engagement and Subjective Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis*, *Psychological Bulletin* 141(2).
- Nietzsche, F. (2008/1882) *The Gay Science*. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. Cambridge University Press.
- Nisbet, R. (1966) *The Sociological Tradition*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. ([1929] 1930). *The Revolt of the Masses*. New York: Norton.
- Orwell, G. (1968/1945) *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell 1903-1950*. Vol. IV, London: Secker & Warburg
- Parker, S. (1971) *The Future of Work and Leisure*, London: Praeger.
- Pericles' funeral oration. [incomplete]
www.greatbooksojai.com/Pericles_Funeral_Oration_Crawley.pdf
- Pieper, J. (1963/1952) *Leisure. The Basis of Culture*. New York: Random House.
- Plato (2008a) Republic. The Project Gutenberg Ebook.
- Plato (2008) *Laws*. The Gutenberg Project Ebook.
- Plekhanov, G. (1958/1899) *Unaddressed Letters*. In: *Literatura i Estetika*. Moscow; Khudozhestvennaja Literatura
www.marxists.org/archive/plekhanov/1912/art/index.htm
- Plutarch's Lives* (1914) New York: The Macmillan Co.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1922) *The Andaman Islanders: A Study in Social Anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rademakers, L. (2003) *Filosofie van de vrije tijd*. The Netherlands: Damon Publishers.
- Reid, I. (1998) *Class in Britain*, Cambridge, Polity Press
- Richta, R. et al. (1969) *Civilization at the Crossroads*, Prague: International Arts and Sciences Press Inc.
- Riesman, D. (1950). *The Lonely Crowd*, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Rifkin, J. (1987) *The time wars*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Roberts, K. (1970). *Leisure*, London: Longman.
- Robinson, J. (1989) Time's up. *American Demographics*, 11(7), 6-7.
- Robinson, J. P. (1977) *How Americans Use Time*. A Socio-Psychological Analysis of Everyday Behaviour. New York: Praeger.
- Samaras, T. (2012) Leisured Aristocrats or Warrior-Farmers? Leisure in Plato's Laws, *Classical Philology*, Vol. 107, No. 1, pp. 1-20
- Say, J.-B. (1803) *Traite d'economie politique*, Book I, ch. viii (quoted in Durkheim's DLS)
- Scheuch, E. K. (1965). *Die Problematik der Freizeit in der Massengesellschaft*. in: *Universitätsstage*.
- Schor, J. (1991) *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*. New York: Basic Books.
- Scott, J. (1982) *The Upper Classes: Property and Privilege in Britain*, Basingstoke, Macmillan.

- Sennett, R. (1998) *The Corrosion of Character: the personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*, New York: Norton.
- Smith, A. (2007/1776) *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Amsterdam: MeroLibri.
- Sorokin, P. (1937-1941) *The Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Cincinnati: American Book Company.
- Thucydides (1996/423 BC) *Pericles' Funeral Oration*. University of Minnesota. Human Rights Library.
- Tocqueville, A. (1954/1835-1840) *Democracy in America*, Democracy in America, Vol. 1, New York: Schocken Books; Vol. 2 (1945/1840) New York: Vintage Books University Press.
- Veal, A.J. (2018) *Whatever Happened to the Leisure Society?* Hardback Routledge, Critical Leisure Studies.
- Veblen, T. (1953/1899) *Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Mentor Books.
- Veblen, T. (1953/1899) *Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Mentor Books.
- Weber, M. (1958/1904-1905), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons
- Wilensky, H. (1963) The uneven distribution of leisure: The impact of economic growth on free time. In *Work and Leisure*. Ed. by E. O. Smigel. New Haven, Connecticut: College and University Press: 107—145.
- Wilensky, H.L. (1981). *Family Life Cycle, Work and the Quality of Life: Reflections on the roots of happiness, despair, and indifference in modern society*, No. 442.
- Wippler, R. (1968) *Social Determinants of Leisure Behavior*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp.
- Wippler, R. (1970) Leisure Behaviour: A Multivariate Approach. *Sociologia Neerlandica* 6, pp. 51-67
- Wundt, W. (2006/1886) *Ethics: The Facts of Moral Life*. Cosimo Classics.
- Xenophon (1994) *Memorabilia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Xenophon (2014) *Apology of Socrates to the Jury*. eBooks@Adelaide.
- Zuzanek, J. (2007) Beginnings of Leisure Research in North America: A Forgotten Legacy? In: R. McCarville and K. Mackay (Eds.) *Leisure for Canadians*, State College, PA: Venture Publications, pp.17-26
- Zuzanek, J. and Zuzanek, T. (2015) Of Happiness and of Despair, Is There a Measure? Time Use and Subjective Wellbeing, *Journal of Happiness Studies* 16: 839-856.
- Zuzanek, J. *What happened to the society of leisure? Of the gap between the "haves" and "have nots" Social Indicators* DOI 10.1007/s11205-015-1133-0.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank A. J. Veal and two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions.

Processo Editorial / Editorial Process

Editor Chefe/Editor-in-chief: PhD Thiago D. Pimentel (UFJF).

Recebido em 18 de Setembro de 2018; aceito em 26 de Novembro de 2018; publicado online em 15 de Janeiro de 2019.

Received on September 18, 2018; accepted on November 26, 2018, published online on January 15, 2019.

Artigo original / Original article. Seção revisada por pares / Double blind review section.