Contents

Part 4: Leisure Forms and Settings

Part 5: Indexical Themes

1
Introduction: Process and Context

Chris Rojek, Susan M. Shaw and A. J. Veal

This Handbook is designed to provide a cadastral survey of the various and diverse ways in which leisure forms and practice are situated and develop and the contribution of Leisure Studies in elucidating these processes. In the last 20 years, Leisure Studies has matured. Throughout the world, student numbers in higher education institutions have expanded. The 1991 *International Directory of Academic Institutions in Leisure, Recreation and Related Fields* (D'Amours, 1991) listed some 1,400 institutions in 60 countries offering tertiary education in the field. Institutionally, in the universities, the subject has been subjected to the buffetings of higher education reform. Departments of Parks and Recreation in North America and leisure and recreation elsewhere, have been combined with a variety of other disciplines or fields, including tourism, hospitality, marketing and sport (Mommaas, 1997). Despite its changing form and location in universities, the subject, formerly recognized as marginal, even in some eyes, *eccentric*, is now acknowledged to be a key part of the social science and Management Studies canon.

Nor is it just a matter of growing academic numbers throughout the West, Southeast Asia and South America. Simultaneously, the significance of leisure and the professional, vocational, market and state resources assigned to leisure forms and practice, is more accentuated in everyday culture. There is a sharper appreciation of the role of leisure in a range of quality of life issues. For example, the causal links between popular leisure activities such as smoking tobacco, alcohol consumption, eating food with high cholesterol content and low fibre, and illness and mortality are now widely understood. Similarly, the role of play in stress release and tension management and the role of physical exercise in promoting health, are broadly acknowledged. Likewise, the expansion of consumer culture together with the development of the casualization of work, the expansion of part-time work, fixed term and flexitime work contracts and the growing numbers of the retired, combine to magnify the centrality of leisure in contemporary Western lifestyle.

Contra the Victorian precedent, the American 'New Deal' and the British welfare state philosophy of William Beveridge, paid labour is now commonly viewed

as the means to finance leisure choice and practice rather than the proverbial 'central life interest'.[1] These developments have posed important new dilemmas for students of leisure. For example, while casualization is prominent, it may also represent a loss of power for workers and trade unions who want full-time work. Similarly, the shift to part-time work is not evenly distributed between the sexes. Women are over-represented, a fact which reflects continuing structural inequality in the labour market and concerns about balancing work and family. Nonetheless, most commentators would agree that the cultural prominence of leisure has risen dramatically over the last quarter of a century.

In view of these considerations, it is perhaps surprising to note that this is the first Handbook of Leisure Studies to be published. Pioneering collaborative studies, such as *Mass Leisure* (Larrabee and Meyersohn, 1958) and *Leisure and Society in Britain* (Smith et al., 1973) offered valuable accounts of the field. But both are now rather long in the tooth and each was descriptive rather than producing a coherent field of study. More recently, Jackson and Burton's (1999) *Leisure Studies: Prospects for the Twenty First Century*, provided a stimulating and instructive collection, which built upon their interesting earlier collaboration (Jackson and Burton, 1989) to clarify several matters concerning methodology, individual experience, delivery and key debates in Leisure Studies. These books represent a survey of research accomplishments, but they neglected to develop a deep conceptual or theoretical basis for understanding leisure. In particular, their contribution to clarifying the place of power, identity, representation and change in leisure is disappointing. In addition, 26 of the 32 chapters were written by contributors based in North America. This is perhaps a fair reflection of the academic division of labour and power in the field. Conversely, the bias towards North American perspectives raises concerns about the balance and breadth of the volume.

While the majority of contributors to this Handbook are based in the US, Canada and the UK, we made it a matter of policy to commission chapters from elsewhere. Accordingly, the Handbook includes chapters from scholars living and working in Japan, India, the Netherlands, Greece, Hong Kong and Australia. We can hardly be said to have eliminated the problem of Western bias. But we have made an effort to recognize that there are serious problems in placing Western perspectives at the centre of analysis. This is a direct response to what was already emerging as a signal theme in academic and everyday life when the Jackson and Burton (1999) collection appeared, and has since been more pronounced, namely globalization. Indeed, although globalization is a key theme in this volume, it is part of a fivefold category of key themes that are presented as offering a firm focus for the discipline of Leisure Studies:

1. *Globalization*, the growing economic, cultural and political inter-connectedness and interdependence of human relations.
2. *Interdisciplinarity*, the hybrid, yet self sustaining character of the discipline, which draws on the theories and methods of the established Social Sciences, especially Sociology, Geography, Psychology, Economics and Political Science, but which has reached a level of disciplinary maturity.

3. *Power*, the positioning of leisure forms and practice in relations of power.
4. *Process*, the recognition that leisure activity is sensuous, variable and multidimensional and mobile rather than simply the expression of economic, cultural and social reproduction.
5. *Context*, the location of leisure forms and practice in the central questions of individualistic citizenship, especially issues of moral tolerance, social inclusion and distributive justice.

The rest of the Introduction elaborates on this fivefold category, expanding upon the significance of each, and relating each directly to leisure forms and practice. The relation of the chapters in each of the five parts of the Handbook to the elucidation of the key themes that structure the volume is addressed at the end of each section below.

Globalization

Prima facie, to nominate globalization as a prominent theme in contemporary Leisure Studies is innocuous. Everybody is aware that we live in an interconnected world in which events in one place may have rapid repercussions elsewhere. Arguably, because leisure is so powerfully rendered in cultural terms as a positive social status and lifestyle value, there is a tendency for leisure professionals and students to tilt towards upbeat evaluations of globalization. For example, the Sao Paulo Declaration, issued by the World Leisure and Recreation Association in 1998, while recognizing the 'increasing threats and opportunities' presented by globalization, nonetheless included Articles among its provisions that state:

> All governments and institutions should preserve and create barrier free environments, e.g. cultural, technological, natural and built, where people have time, space, facilities and opportunity to express, celebrate and share leisure.
>
> All private and public sectors consider the threats to diversity and quality of leisure experiences caused by local, national and international consequences of globalization. (World Leisure, 1998)

Scarcely anyone would oppose the sentiment behind these demands, for it seeks to promote the widening of access to leisure resources and increasing participation. However, both beg many thorny questions. Roughly speaking, these can be divided into issues relating to the mechanics of international strategy and the dangers of conflating globalization with a new version of Westernization.[2]

To take the subject of the mechanics of international strategy first, structured bilateralism and multilateralism can be positive forces in international relations. For example, bilateral and multilateral agreements exist to try to control illegal leisure activities supplied by global drug cartels and prostitution rings. They can scarcely be judged to be an unqualified success. Still, at least they constitute a basis for principled international policing. However, the power of foreign governments

to interfere in the affairs of sovereign states is heavily conditioned. Bilateral and multilateral agreements usually rely upon economic and moral force. They seldom involve physical force. Rogue states have a relatively wide berth to ignore collective agreements. In addition, states, of course, have the option of unilaterally revoking agreements. In these incidents the moral and economic authority of bilateralism and multilateralism is frequently seriously compromised. For example, the 2001 decision by President George W. Bush not to participate in the Kyoto (1997) treaty on global warming presented a challenge to international efforts to prevent the attrition of the environment. The US is estimated to account for approximately 25 per cent of greenhouse gas emissions (Alterman and Green, 2004: 200). This is of direct concern to leisure professionals since a major cause of pollution is vehicle exhaust fumes, and driving for pleasure has been celebrated as a long-standing right of the American consumer (Gartman, 1994). In this regard, international resolve has found it very difficult to oppose American exceptionalism. The result is that the threat to the global environment has intensified. Similarly, the failure of China to enforce multilateral intellectual property agreements is said to adversely affect Western music and film industries.

A different range of problems is raised by the conflation of globalization with Westernization. The economic and military preponderance of Western interests in global affairs means that most international issues in leisure forms and practice are stamped with a Western seal of approval. Indeed, in much of the post-war era, the Western model of leisure was assumed to constitute the destination for all societies bent upon progress. This followed theories of modernity which held that the Western example was of revolutionary significance in approaches to social and economic development. Different theories placed greater or lesser emphasis upon what constitutes the core components in the Western model. But all pointed to the significance of individualism, secularism, nationalism, rationalization, urbanization, science, technology, pluralism, the market and the development of a public sphere of debate which Karl Popper (1950) labelled, somewhat tendentiously, 'the open society'.[3]

The model of leisure attached to this theory of modernity was quite specific. It presupposed that work is the central life interest, that rational individualism had replaced traditional society, that pluralism had succeeded tribal, courtly and colonial political structures, large-scale Fordist forms of industry had supplanted small, local businesses and that the nation-state was the primary unit of analysis in relation to social, economic, cultural and political processes. In the last 20 years all of these assumptions have been destabilized. The single evolutionary view of modernity has been supplanted by a perspective which recognizes that a variety of mixtures between traditional and modern elements is compatible with the notion of progress. The emphasis is now upon 'different modernities' (Gaonkar, 2001; Pieterse, 2003).

Part and parcel of this is the recognition that the Western version of modernization possesses limitations which prevent it from being simply exported to the rest of the world. While some continue to emulate the Western commodification of sexuality and youth culture, the preference for secular over religious celebration

in leisure practice, the liberal tolerance shown to alcohol use, the privatization and compartmentalization of leisure from community life, the standardization and regulation of consumer culture, have been vigorously resisted and condemned in many countries as examples of Western decadence rather than progress. In the 1970s and 1980s, the deplored example of the West was a profound stimulant to the revival of Islamic fundamentalism.

Part 1 of the Handbook aims to demonstrate the dangers in conflating Westernization with globalization.

Rojek explores the role of culture in resisting the juggernaut of Westernization. His discussion uses the concepts of *kultur* and *zivilization* to sketch how the poliltics of resistance and opposition operates in leisure practice. The resistance of local traditions to sweeping global processes is highlighted and a case is made that the focus for Leisure Studies should not be either culture or civilization, but the interplay between the two. Chick despatches the important, and frequently ignored, task of examining the anthropology and pre-history of leisure. Arguably, a bias in historical work in Leisure Studies is to present leisure as a product of industrialization (Cunningham, 1980; Cross, 1993; Kammen, 1999). Perhaps this reflects the wider, traditional subservience to evolutionary theories of modernity that, until recently, prevailed in Leisure Studies. Be that as it may, Chick's chapter goes some way towards redressing the balance by producing a compelling case for the significance of pre-industrial play forms and practices.

Hunnicutt then disentangles the historical roots of the Western case and elucidates the seminal processes behind Western leisure forms and practices. Bhattacharya further exposes the ethnocentricity of Western modernity and correlative models of leisure, by considering non-Western traditions. Using India as a case study, her chapter contributes to a more acute understanding of globalization by addressing the textured, multilayered character of leisure forms and practice throughout the world.

Interdisciplinarity

The antecedents of Leisure Studies are mixed in convoluted ways, which have always complicated the task of defining the subject. We can safely say that the question of the meaning and purpose of free time has interested philosophers and educators since ancient times. It is also a constant in all of the major world religions, since many leisure practices were, and are, seen to have moral dimensions, as did 'non-work' in the West after ascetic Protestantism introduced the notions of religious 'calling' and the work ethic (Weber, 1936; DeLisle, 2003). However, while the question of free time is obviously present in these traditions, it tends to be addressed narrowly in terms of private subjective or specific community interests. As such, much of it is conventionally the subject of control and prohibition while 'permitted' areas of activity, such as the arts and sport, are presented in either positive or aspirational terms relating to the individual, with 'freedom' the preponderant mooted quality of leisure forms and practice or in religious, collectivist terms in which leisure is the expression of social order and cultural reproduction.

At the present juncture, our concern is to maintain that the question of leisure in Western urban-industrial society commenced as an adjunct of a much larger agenda in moral philosophy and political economy relating to the nature of private duties, public responsibilities, distributive justice and the shifting, restless topic of improving personal and social life. Historically speaking, with respect to the design of public life, these issues were articulated in leisure forms and practice developed first and foremost through vocational-professional means rather than the Academy. With the exception of Veblen (1899) and some pioneering but isolated American work in the 1920s and 1930s (Lundberg et al., 1934; Neumeyer and Neumeyer, 1936) and speculative British essays (Russell and Russell, 1923; Keynes, 1931), there was scant academic interest in leisure until the late 1950s. From the outset, in the urban-industrial age, the question of leisure was interrelated with professional and practical concerns having to do with the control and regulation of populations. The subject of the uses of free time was initially addressed in relation to six problem areas in urban-industrial life: housing, city planning, child development, physical and mental health, family and community life and crime. The professional and vocational grid of power that emerged to manage these issues was located among specialists in architecture, town planning, education, medical practice, social work and policing. This professional grid played the principal role in defining the nature of 'respectable' leisure forms and practices, and assigning resources through the privileged monitoring and advisory partnership it possessed with the legislative state apparatus. It was also central in defining the ways in which leisure and recreation were officially applied to improve the human condition.

The move towards the interventionist state in the West after the 1880s provided a fillip to the influence of this grid because it posed new questions of national heritage (including the criteria of preservation for places of outstanding natural beauty and wildlife reserves) and the provision of public leisure resources.[4] These distributive considerations overlaid the connotations of freedom and constraint from the Puritan period. Questions of leisure were now debated in relation to scientific and technological productivity and the issues of moral and social progress attached to them. Throughout, the old Puritan anxiety about the dangers of unregulated leisure for health and social order remained. But it was eclipsed by the enormous productivity of the industrial age that expanded access to leisure resources through the provision of paid holiday time and the growth in levels of real disposable income.

The key academic disciplines that forged Leisure Studies were themselves influenced by the central questions of regulation and improvement produced by the urban-industrial age. Sociology, Psychology, Social Psychology, Geography, Economics and Political Science drew upon an analysis of state and market solutions to questions of urban-industrial resource allocation, especially issues relating to maintaining order and managing change. However, the question of leisure did not emerge as a topic of concern within these disciplines as they emerged in the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. Leisure Studies did not appear on the map until after the Second World War. It emerged partly as a by-product of policy concerns – for example, the substantial research work of the US Outdoor

Recreation Resources Review Commission (1962) arose from concerns about how the outdoor environment was to be managed to cater for the massive growth in demand generated by expansion of 'Parks and Recreation' in American Universities. Other academics relatively detached from the managerial and administrative theatre began to explore a series of important hermeneutic questions about the meaning of leisure, leisure values, social inclusion, social exclusion, affluence, deprivation and distributive justice.

Part 2 of the Handbook investigates these interdisciplinary roots. Van der Poel considers the contribution of Sociology and Cultural Studies to the study of leisure. The opposition to common-sense views of leisure as mere voluntarism by a variety of sociological arguments concerning the structural influences on leisure choice and action, is cogently expressed. Mannell, Kleiber and Staempfli provide an account of the influences of Psychology and Social Psychology to the development of the discipline. This provides a useful counterpoint to that form of sociological reasoning which erases individual autonomy and choice by a version, or more often an *implication*, of structural determinism. The contribution of Psychology and Social Psychology provides a vital function in reminding us that the choices and actions of individuals occupy the fulcrum of the discipline. Leisure Studies has done much to elucidate the ways in which choice and action are positioned. But Mannell, Kleiber and Staempfli remind us that the psychological dilemma of individual choice and action is a constant in personal and group trajectories of leisure. Crouch investigates the influence of Geography. Spatial culture and the distribution of human resources are fundamental in the organization of leisure forms and practices. Crouch shows how geography clarifies the location principles behind leisure choices and actions. Veal's chapter on Economics considers the relation of choice and action in leisure in relation to the distribution and access to the fruits of production. Play may be a universal in human society. But leisure forms and practices were dependent upon the production of an economic surplus. This produced a surplus of time and a culture of luxury which was initially monopolized by ruling strata, but which later spread throughout society. Veal's chapter analyses the contribution of Economics in the planning and prediction of resource distribution and the widening of access to leisure assets. Coalter's chapter investigates the contribution of Political Science and Public Policy. Leisure is sometimes understood as involving a continuous balance between freedom and constraint. The management and reconciliation of these polarities is a political process. Coalter provides a guide to central political questions in the allocation of leisure resources. He clarifies the processes by which the competing themes of individualism and collectivism are reconciled and also the pressure points that elicit change in the relationship between them.

The subtext behind all of the chapters in Part 2 of the Handbook is that Leisure Studies has matured to assimilate elements from the social sciences to create viable disciplinary boundaries which demarcate the field as distinctive. It is no longer satisfactory to consider it as some kind of Johnny-come-lately appendix to older, established traditions of theory and research. In the last 20 years Leisure Studies has come of age. This doesn't mean ejecting the social sciences from the premises. After all, the discipline is organically related to the social sciences. However, just as

an organism changes and grows in novel and challenging ways, the discipline of Leisure Studies is innovating new methodologies, concepts and theories in relation to traditional questions of the work–leisure balance, access to and the distribution of leisure resources and the relation of leisure to lifestyle and power. This section of the Handbook is designed to show the academic origins of the field, but also to maintain that interdisciplinarity has created a vigorous generative discipline which is moving beyond the established social sciences in elucidating questions of leisure.

Power

All societies depend upon the production of surplus to maintain order, govern change and secure growth. Leisure Studies is distinctively focused upon issues relating to the distribution of surplus and access to leisure resources. The term 'leisure resources' refers not merely to economic assets, but also to the honorific properties associated with access and restraint. Veblen's (1899) study of the leisure class, arguably the first genuine modern classic work in the study of leisure, potently demonstrates how the representation of leisure functioned to convey status and power in industrial society in ways that gradually became independent of economic power. One of the central arguments of the study is that conspicuous consumption is destined to popularize the values of excess and waste to a degree that threatens the viability of the economy.

Leisure is continuously and has ever been, positioned within power relations. Society has devised a variety of formal institutions and informal mechanisms to regulate access to leisure resources. In some cases, these have produced prohibitions on the uses of free-time behaviour. For example, over many years, the Church, the state and the law combined to regulate or prohibit a range of activities including drinking, gambling, theatre and Sunday leisure.[5] Gradually, a mantle of stigmas and taboos settled upon these activities and significant political mobilization was required to achieve liberalization. More prosaically, institutions like work, class, gender, race, the state, the corporation and the various branches of mass communications operate to distribute leisure resources and regulate access.

We call this set of formal and informal institutions the *axial constructs* around which leisure forms and practices emerge and develop. They are *axial* in the sense of being fundamental to the leisure actions and choices that individuals make and the leisure trajectories which they follow. They are *constructs* in two senses. First, they provide what the late French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 1984) called *habitus*. Habitus refers to the generative principles and structures through which distinctive traditions of behaviour and social values are embodied. Through our ways of speaking, accents, fashion choices, work and leisure activities, we reveal how we are positioned in relation to luxury and privation, inclusion and exclusion, power and subordination. Axial constructs are central to *habitus* because they regulate distribution and access to leisure resources.

Second, they are fundamental in representing the perspectives of justice, inequality, rights, responsibilities, social inclusion and exclusion in leisure forms

and practice. In this sense they *manufacture* our view of the world and facilitate orientation. While they cannot, except in highly unusual circumstances, *determine* our individual perspective they can encourage preferred options and readings of social and economic circumstances which incline our behaviour to follow certain trajectories.[6]

The third part of the Handbook explores the central axial constructs in Western leisure. Zuzanek's chapter investigates how individuals and groups are positioned in relation to the resource of time. The common-sense view of time is that everyone has the same access to it. But as soon as the question of economic and cultural inequality is addressed this common-sense view collapses. To Bill Gates, chairman of Microsoft and one of the world's richest people, and one of his shopfloor employees, the access to leisure resources in a minute or an hour are very different things. Zuzanek clarifies the various complexities involved in the relation between leisure choice, action and time. Schor, builds upon her (1991) influential approach to work and leisure to examine how orientations and experiences of work impact upon leisure trajectories. The focus here is not merely upon economic inequality, but also upon the motivations that individuals bring to work and leisure choices. Axiomatic to the analysis is the proposition that consumer culture positions individuals in distinctive ways in relation to the work–leisure balance. Henderson and Shaw consider the axial construct of gender. The feminist contribution to Leisure Studies has been enormously important in demonstrating how identity is constructed through relations of power and representation. This chapter provides a critical assessment of how gender operates to channel leisure resources and mould leisure identities. Harahousou fastens upon a subject that is emerging as a key challenge for affluent societies, namely ageing. While questions relating to the lifecycle have been a focal concern in the discipline, they have usually concentrated upon youth cultures and subcultures. As life expectancy in the West has grown, the subject of leisure and old age has become more pressing. Harahousou's chapter demonstrates how leisure choice and action is influenced by the lifecycle and elucidates the various challenges to the allocation of state resources, through extended provision of pension entitlement, posed by large cross-sections of the population living longer.

Another key institution in society that has been peculiarly neglected by most leisure researchers is race. Freysinger and Harris's chapter provides some restitution, by examining the place of race and racism in leisure. They show how race persists as a key factor in the unequal allocation of leisure resources and how connotations of race influence the entire culture of Western leisure. Critcher's chapter investigates the institution of class in relation to leisure forms and practice. The emphasis upon the significance of class is stronger in the European and Australian traditions of Leisure Studies than in its North American counterpart. However, the collapse of the communist alternative in Eastern Europe in the 1980s and the advocacy of 'Third Way' politics in the European Union has raised questions about the continuing relevance of class in the analysis of leisure. Critcher's chapter defends the importance of class in understanding leisure forms and practice. He demonstrates the salience of class inequality in the distribution of leisure resources and types of participant leisure practice. Jenks shows the complex ways in which identity is tied with subcultural

constructions of collectivity and difference. Cook's chapter tackles the crucial question of leisure and consumer culture. The historical trend in commodified culture is for voluntary, free leisure practices to be co-opted by the leisure industry and transformed into a source of revenue. In turn, this raises important questions of how free leisure practice really is in contemporary consumer culture. Cook provides a penetrating critical guide to these issues which demonstrates how far 'voluntary' choice in leisure has been colonized by the criteria of the leisure industry. Rowe's chapter reminds us of the vital importance of mass communication in contemporary leisure choice and practice. In mass society, leisure choices are not simply given through the individual's relationship with the community, they are coded and themed by the machinery of mass communications. The representation of leisure is an essential component in individual leisure choice. In traditional communities the key institutions of representation are the family and community. In modern societies, these institutions still play a significant role, as Stebbins's (1992) study of serious leisure practice verifies. But increasingly, the mass media equip us with data relating to leisure options and positive and stigmatized leisure forms. Rowe's chapter illuminates the central role of mass communications in contemporary leisure practice and cogently stresses the fundamental importance of the media in shaping leisure choice and identity.

Process

For most people, in most circumstances, leisure is desired; passionately so in the majority of cases. Leisure is usually presented as an unequivocal good. Yet this presupposes a variety of preconditions, among the most important of which are that we possess the health to enjoy leisure and that we have the financial means to access leisure resources. For someone in the advanced stages of multiple sclerosis or Parkinson's disease, limitless leisure may be a dreadful prospect. How are you to fill the minutes and hours pleasantly if your body has ceased to obey your will? Likewise, the man or woman who plays golf or tennis on Saturday and who is made redundant on Monday is apt to rapidly become an object of concern, if not pity. How will they manage? What will they do when the severance money runs out? Do they have any private assets to tide them over in the immediate or long term? Where will the money come from to look after the children? Leisure is generally desired, but its quality comes with many strings attached. To participate in it with pleasure presupposes that we occupy quite secure status positions that are prior to leisure choice and inform leisure practice. Health, ownership or use of sufficient capital and paid employment are pivotal. Once these are eliminated, once we become physically ill, homeless, or suffer a significant fall in income, leisure often ceases to be valued as a self-evident good. It may swiftly become our prison.

To allude to the status preconditions of leisure is to submit, in other words, that a political economy surrounds leisure forms and practice. Leisure practice is *positioned* in wider fields of influence and power. This *positioning* reflects the struggle of individuals and collectivities to gain access to leisure resources and the unintended consequences that result from the outcome of this struggle. For a variety

of historical reasons, our culture typically conflates leisure with voluntarism. Yet once we examine leisure agents and leisure practice the sinews that govern access and participation are quickly exposed. Individual choice is *situated* and freedom *conditioned* by social, cultural, political and economic variables. We may select leisure activities, but we do so in *patterned* ways that reflect, among other things, nationality, culture, tradition, sexuality, wealth, income, ethnicity, religion, health and age as well as individual taste and personality. In addition, the *representation* of leisure practice is also situated and patterned. That is, the portrayal and meaning of freedom, choice and self-determination is culturally coded and socially themed. Our prosaic sense of personal autonomy and freedom of choice in leisure practice is therefore deceptive. We act in conditions under which personal autonomy is supported and shaped by many social, cultural and economic factors. Similarly, our leisure choices are made in a context in which representations of preferred and stigmatized options are culturally textured.

There have been many attempts in Leisure Studies to expose the allocative mechanisms and structures of power which distribute, code and theme leisure practice. This is of course at the core of economic analysis (Gratton and Taylor, 2000). Some approaches, like the functionalist perspective associated with the work of Stanley Parker (1983) and the Systems approach propounded by Cheek and Burch (1976), produce powerful accounts of the order of leisure relations and patterns of practice. One may take issue with some of their theoretical assumptions and their failure to incorporate an adequate dimension of power into the analysis. Yet at least they are clear about the structure of certain aspects of leisure relations. When it comes to the issue of social change, they are much weaker. Functionalist and Systems approaches struggle to illuminate why catalysts and takeoff points emerge in leisure forms and practice that change the quality and experience of leisure. Even so, those perspectives that fasten upon the importance of division and change, like the Marxist approach, tend to get frozen in inflexible propositions. Clarke and Critcher (1985) noted the difficulties that cultural Marxists had in the 1970s in coming to terms with feminism. Their own study, while constituting perhaps the leading neo-Marxist contribution in the field, nonetheless exaggerated class as an explanatory variable and equates positive leisure experience with false consciousness.

This does not seem to get to grips with an obvious and taken-for-granted aspect of leisure experience, namely that it is a source of pleasure. That is why the majority desire leisure so ardently and why they assign so many resources to it. While it is correct to submit that leisure practice is a relation of power and that this conditions leisure experience, we should be cautious about proceeding on the basis that experience can be analytically *predetermined* by the position of individuals in relation to leisure resources. Theories of leisure are indispensable in helping us to map the terrain, but human behaviour is sensuous and innovative. Ethnography and qualitative research must be at the heart of Leisure Studies because they contribute to our knowledge of the diversity of leisure experience and the processes through which this experience develops. Leisure practice *is* process.

Accordingly, the fourth section of the Handbook focuses on questions of diversity and process in leisure experience. Birrell examines the significance of

sport in trajectories of leisure behaviour. The cultural prominence of sport has grown massively in the post-war period. It is now a major source of investment in personal leisure time and it has become a leading industry in contemporary capitalism. Birrell examines the relationship between sport and leisure and provides an assessment of the significance of sport in modern culture. Stevenson's chapter addresses the topic of the arts, entertainment and the mass media. These are the key mechanisms of mass representation in culture. They provide us with a continuous flow of data relating to the quality and range of leisure choices that are available to us. Stevenson investigates the relationship between these means of representation and the experience of leisure. Jenkins and Pigram's chapter considers the motivations and types of experience associated with the allocation of leisure resources to nature and outdoor recreation. They contrast the experience of outdoor recreation with the frustrations and limitations of urban existence. The chapter clarifies the yearning that many leisure seekers have in going back to nature as a source of escape. Franklin's chapter turns to the subject of tourism. Tourism is now the world's fourth biggest industry. More people are travelling for pleasure than ever before. But what do they hope to find on their travels? And how is their experience patterned? Franklin's chapter illuminates the contradictions in tourist experience and demonstrates why tourism has developed into a staple of modern leisure practice. Finkelstein and Lynch provide a penetrating guide to the social objectives and rituals involved in eating out. Restaurant dining is one of the most popular types of leisure practice. Finkelstein and Lynch show why eating out is an important form of display and positioning in leisure practice. Harrington's chapter probes into the subject of family leisure. She elucidates the division of labour in family leisure practice and considers the role of family leisure in developing identity and solidarity. Sivan's chapter explores the use of leisure experience in education and self-development. Play and recreation are pivotal mechanisms in acquiring meaning and belonging. Sivan clarifies the relationship between leisure, personal learning and social integration. Stebbins developed the influential distinction between serious and casual leisure. In this chapter he sets out his latest thinking on the subject, clarifying the experience involved in each leisure form and expanding on their respective social consequences.

Context

In the West, the philosophy of modern public leisure strategies and private civil leisure trajectories were born in the seventeenth century, with Locke's (1690) liberal philosophy of the duties of individualism in relation to religion and the state and Hobbes's (1601) contract theory as a pre-emptive strategy to avoid the 'war of all against all'. Both Locke and Hobbes heralded a version of individualistic citizenship that submitted that men and women are rational managers of their destinies. Both also outlined strategies to construct solidarity out of the universal human dilemma of natural scarcity. Individualistic citizenship implied new levels of personal responsibility, mutual respect and tolerance in the form and conduct of public life. In addition, it suggested a pretext for curbing or weeding out behaviour deemed to

produce negative consequences. The Puritans were hostile to free expression and mistrusted emotion and 'natural' feelings. Instead they opted for a programme of moral regulation that acknowledged the value of leisure practice but defined it characteristically, in terms of 'sober mirth' (Daniels, 1995). Leisure acquired connotations of respectability, self-control and constraint. The old association with freedom and licence was hardly erased by this development. Even today most of us strongly associate leisure with personal choice and responsible freedom. At the same time, notions of citizenship, especially the idea of 'respectable leisure', and moral regulation inhibit the practical expression of individual choice and freedom. The seventeenth-century philosophy of individualistic citizenship was instrumental in laying the foundations for the balance between freedom and constraint in leisure forms and practice that continues to this day.

The causes behind this development were various. The accumulation of fiscal powers in the hands of the state, initially, chiefly for the purposes of war, exploration and the maintenance of Empire, was important since it raised the question of the proper use of public resources. But so were the development of constitutionalism; the separation of the state from the Church; the growth of science, industry, business and technology in producing regular, dependable economic surplus; the philosophy of individualism; the expansion of public education and health services, and the transference of populations from the country to urban-industrial centres. Leisure became a central issue in public life when the rights and responsibilities of the individual to engage in programmes of self-determination became generalized.

By the late eighteenth century in Western Europe and the British colonies of the Eastern American seaboard this condition was clearly under way. The American (1776) and French (1789) revolutions were conducted in the name of the rejection of monarchical law and precedence and the advocacy of public rights and duties. This itself presupposes three huge structural shifts in the constitution of society. First, the decline in religious power which conventionally presented individual action as fate. Secularism and science are closely interrelated. By the late eighteenth century, the effect of both was to make individuals seek this-worldly solutions for their condition and the social, economic and political contexts in which they found themselves to be located.

Second, the transference of power from the monarch and court society to a body of representatives elected by the public and a correlative standing salaried staff complement of civil servants charged with the task of impersonally translating Parliamentary decisions into policy. The decentring of monarchical power was paralleled by loss of sovereignty of colonial powers over colonized territories. By democratizing accountability, these political developments increased the requirement for ordinary citizens to reflect upon their own aspirations for better forms of leisure and superior types of society.

Third, and underwriting each of the two developments mentioned above, the emergence of the 'public sphere' (Habermas, 1962) in which matters of private and public duty, virtue and aspiration are legitimately and exhaustively debated in the press, literature, science and the various branches of the media. The public sphere takes duty, virtue and aspiration as an object not only of reflection but also of

action. By the late eighteenth century, Jefferson, Franklin, Paine, Rousseau, Ferguson and Adam Smith were openly debating the rights of 'Man' as central parts of a programme of civil renewal and moral enrichment. Although it hardly proceeded at pell-mell pace, and was uneven and dilatory in incorporating women, ethnic minorities and unskilled workers, the next two centuries witnessed a clear trend in Western society to increase the democratization of the public sphere by enlarging popular participation in the debate around care for the self and care for the other. In the course of this, diverse issues of private and public leisure were articulated.

We make these points in order to hold that there is value in exploring what we call *indexical thematics* in leisure practice. By this we mean an approach that commences with analysing the immediate context of leisure practice, but tracks action back to the reference points of the institutional structure of power and discourses of citizenship and subjectivity.

This submission is important because we wish to combat the common-sense view that leisure forms and practice possess autonomy, flexibility and self-determination. We have already made the point that leisure forms and practice are *positioned*. It follows that a primary task of students of leisure is to explore the chain of causality and dynamics relevant to this positioning and try and produce objective knowledge about them. In introducing the concept of indexical thematics we mean to deepen what is meant by the concept of positioning to include rights and responsibilities that are either manifest or latent in the concept of individualistic citizenship.

The term 'indexical' is borrowed from Harold Garfinkel's (1967) ethnomethodology.[7] Garfinkel applied it to maintain that the immediacy and particularity of social accounts and practices militate against generalized sociological accounts. The critical emphasis here is aimed against the structural functionalism of Talcott Parsons that, in the discipline of Leisure Studies, is most fully realized in the work of Cheek and Burch (1976). Garfinkel wanted to insist on the uniqueness of exchange and the aridity of social theories which 'read off' action from predetermined propositions relating to socialization and the development of identity. We share the same preference. However, we also wish to maintain that individual actions and exchanges draw on generative rules and resources which are independent of personal will. Personal leisure choice draws on an index of options that are structurally conditioned. Marxist and feminist accounts in the study of leisure have done much to clarify the cultural and economic dimensions of this index. They elucidate how class and gender theme leisure conduct. We wish to produce a more inclusive, differentiated approach to indexical thematics by proposing that leisure practice raises three continuous sets of questions relating to, *distributive justice*, *social exclusion* and *moral tolerance*.

The final part of the Handbook is designed to elucidate some of the paradoxes that these present for the discipline. Rojek examines the topic of representation. Our orientation to questions of distributive justice, social inclusion and moral tolerance partly reflects our *habitus*, but also the many ways in which leisure forms are constructed in society. Representation is crucial for the practice of individualistic citizenship because it constitutes the foundation for rational judgement. In this chapter Rojek explores the mechanics of representation. He analyses the leisure practice of smoking to demonstrate the interplay between positive and negative

connotations of leisure practice. In a subsequent chapter, Rojek investigates how identity coagulates around types of representation, particularly the commodity form. Using the case studies of the automobile and the Apple Mac computer, he shows how leisure choice in commodity culture extends beyond the possession of a leisure commodity to enunciate a statement about lifestyle and inner worth. In sum, leisure choice is about constructing and strategically placing our identities in relation to others. While structural forces propel us in certain directions and compel us to make what might be called 'preferred choices and readings' in leisure action, Rojek insists on the reality of individual conscience and the capacity of leisure actors to make rational judgements about their actions. Indeed, the latter may be taken as a core identifying characteristic of individualistic citizenship. Barker's chapter focuses on the role of praxis in leisure forms and behaviour. Praxis relates individual choice to wider structural questions of resource allocation, morality and the balance between social inclusion and social exclusion. Barker helps students of leisure to appreciate the centrality of this concept in exploring questions of identity and trajectories of leisure practice. Harris's chapter moves on to address the important subject of how leisure practice articulates social and civil rules and resources. Articulation is a neo-Marxist concept, associated with the sociology of Antonio Gramsci, but elaborated, and to some extent codified, in contemporary culture by Stuart Hall and his colleagues in the Birmingham School approach to contemporary culture. Harris shows how beliefs and values penetrate leisure choice and practice and further how individual forms of behaviour reflect historically and socially constructed rules and resources. Pedlar and Haworth focus on leisure and the community. Most commentators on modern society argue that community life has been replaced by privatization and disembedding.[8] Pedlar and Haworth consider the continuing relevance of the concept of community for Leisure Studies. Their chapter raises key issues of autonomy and solidarity in leisure forms and practice. Shaw's chapter reminds us that leisure is not merely a basis for integration and harmony. It is also a mechanism of resistance and a source of conflict. A sign of the increasing maturity of the discipline is that students of leisure are now more willing to entertain the notion that the old critical slogan that 'the personal is political' also applies to leisure relations. Gender, class, race and status influence the grain of leisure patterns. Shaw demonstrates that the dimension of resistance is fundamental in the concept of leisure and the discipline must do more to illuminate its operation and history.

Leisure Studies: the agenda

This Handbook can be read and used as a survey of the discipline. The chapters also constitute topics in an agenda for future research. The backcloth to this is the central social and economic transformations that are occurring in everyday life. If leisure is to be seen as integral to these processes, then those engaged in Leisure Studies must engage with the central social, economic, cultural and political questions of the time. They will need to avoid the temptation of regarding leisure to be an enchanted glade wherein the logic of practice is independent of the gravity of social, economic,

cultural and political forces that inform everyday experience and orientation. Which of these questions are most pertinent to Leisure Studies today?

1. The revolution in science and technology associated with genetic engineering, cloning and replacement surgery constitutes a profound challenge, not merely to the concept of ageing as it has been traditionally understood, but also to orthodox thinking about the lifecycle. These developments offer exciting new opportunities for humankind. Extending life and reducing suffering have long been dreamt of, and modern science and technology is making huge strides in both fields. But they also present deep challenges to conventional thought on marriage, family life and the work ethic. The extension of the period of retirement implies new fiscal challenges for the state and occupational pension schemes. These in turn have consequences for economic growth and international competition. If more resources have to be set aside to cover old age, they can only come from greater borrowing, higher growth or reducing resource distribution at earlier stages in the lifecycle. Analogously, if each stage of the lifecycle is to be substantially prolonged, what are the consequences for our understanding of the breaks between adolescence, youth, adult and old age subcultures? The relation between parents and children? The gendered nature of the institution of marriage, the restrictive definition of marriage in many parts of the world and the lack of access to divorce in some societies? These questions have a direct bearing upon leisure choice and leisure form. Students of leisure will need to keep abreast of these developments in natural science and associated policies to produce meaningful accounts of leisure in the social sciences.
2. The emergence of the US as the world's only genuine superpower raises a series of questions about the Americanization of global society. American television, film, music, literature, social science, computer systems, sport, restaurant chains, systems of education, beer, clothing, sports equipment, automobiles and countless other commodities constitute a strong basis for technological convergence. Whether convergence at the cultural level will follow suit is one of the pressing topics of our time.

   Likewise, American ascendancy is regarded to be oppressive and threatening by large sections of the world's population. 9/11 showed the level of disenchantment and antagonism outside America for 'the American way', particularly in the Muslim world. The ascent of China and India as opposing economic and military powers to American hegemony and the counterveiling example of the European Union, where traditions of welfarism and intervention are more deeply entrenched, suggests a series of difficult counterpoints for the conduct of international relations. The old polarities of the Cold War have given way to a more complex picture of global cross currents and frictions which impact upon trajectories of leisure. Leisure has always been an expression of culture (Rojek, 2000). To date in human history cultural identity has been based first on tribe and subsequently on nation, with religion and Empire providing overlays for some of the time. To what extent will the emerging world order change this pattern?

3. Globalization underlines how far the leisure of the West relies upon output from the developing world. Many of the West's foremost leisure multinationals, such as Nike, Adidas, Starbucks and Armani, source their production from Third World labour in the Philippines, Taiwan, Indonesia, Thailand and Mexico. While Japan in the 1970s, and Malaysia and Singapore more recently, have managed to build booming economies with – eventually – rising wages on the back of low-wage, export-oriented economies, and China currently seems set to repeat the pattern, this has not been true of all developing countries. Western consumers enjoy unparalleled exposure to leisure commodities and services. But it comes on the back of an organized global system of low wages, the use of child labour, unacceptable levels of illiteracy and high rates of disease and mortality. While there is a considerable literature on these issues in other branches of the social sciences, and some attention has been given to the issues in Tourism Studies, Leisure Studies has generally failed to engage with the moral and practical issues presented by the development gap. The interrelationship between Western leisure forms and Third World oppression need to be illuminated. Only then will leisure professionals be in a position to combat the individualistic credo that individuals can do whatever they like in their free time provided they obey the limits of the law.
4. Within the social sciences there is a persistent tendency to postulate strategies of reform and improvement at either the level of the responsible citizen or the enlightened state. What this ignores is the obvious fact of multinational corporate power. The global reach of multinationals enable them to be highly effective in processes of flexible accumulation. Precisely because of this they have the potential to be equally effective in flexible distribution, especially in the area of leisure forms. Leisure professionals should pay more attention to the multinational sector as a third force in the globalization of leisure. The potential for alliances and partnerships with global charities is enormous and largely untapped. Of course, the citizen and the state remain crucial in effective strategy. But creative thought about the third force in leisure practice is an area of great fruitfulness in theory and research.
5. The degradation of the environment through the burning of fossil fuels poses enormous global risks. Leisure forms constructed around the automobile and jet travel are significant net contributors to the physical processes that enhance global warming. Perhaps it is time to shift Veblen's concept of conspicuous consumption from a focus on the commodity form to the global destruction of natural resources. Leisure professionals need to address the relationship between the pursuit of pleasure and environmental attrition. They must devise ways of curtailing abuse and excess before a global physical crisis forces people to change their behaviour. This is partly a question of research, but it also requires the development of suitable pedagogies at the levels of schools, universities and community education.
6. The freedom, choice and flexibility that leisure practice is held to deliver has been so strong that leisure is often read as one of the principal expressions of the ideology of Western superiority. The discipline has reached a stage of maturity

> in which a more scientific understanding of leisure forms and practice should be accomplished. Basic to this, is widening our understanding of how leisure contributes to various types of individual and group pathology. Leisure practice is not always personally and culturally enriching. It can be the transmission belt for gender, racial, homophobic and religious stereotypes that breed intolerance and insensitivity. For many people, leisure is experienced as disempowering and dehumanizing. Leisure professionals and students need to address the causal links between bullying, persecution, terrorism and leisure forms. Our aim must be to understand more objectively, how leisure is practiced. We cannot assume, on *a priori* grounds, improving, integrating effects for leisure.

The relevance of studying leisure behaviour has never been greater. The move towards mass systems of tertiary education and the revolution in mass communication produced by satellite broadcasting has exposed the limitations of representative, elected government. One sign of this is the resources that most contemporary democratic governments devote to demonstrating that they are 'in touch' with the people through focus groups, the development of special public missions and Quangos. In the 1960s and 70s social movements like feminism, gay and lesbian rights and anti-racism established and popularized the principle that 'the personal is political'. The influence of this transformation in civil society provides the context for the political, economic and cultural processes in which government and everyday life operate today. Settings of serious leisure were and remain catalysts in developing these movements. Individuals were energized and politicized in meetings in clubs, pubs, coffee bars and lecture halls. What emerged at this time was a powerful mass renewal of voluntarism which, in turn, extended cultural privatization and individualism.

However, by overemphasizing the decline of community, critics of modern civic life like David Putnam (2001) may have missed a recent shift in citizenship: the rise of the active citizen. Campaigning for the protection of the environment, stopping bullying in schools, educating people about the effects of diet, alcohol consumption and secondary smoking, promoting awareness of institutionalized racism and sexism, opposing the psychology of 'logo' brand-culture and a variety of other cultural and social concerns are arguably significantly more prominent than 50 years ago. Significantly, much active citizenship occurs informally, where people develop concepts of neighbourliness and social responsibility more routinely and collectively than critics like Putnam allow. The sense of solidarity that people develop is sometimes based around face-to-face meetings, but more often it takes the form of developing recognition and belonging through television, radio, newspapers and the internet. Harris (2004: 62–7, 251–6) provides an interesting analysis of how the internet has shifted educative and political functions of leisure to more decentred and non-hierarchical forms of practice. The use of mass communications in leisure is creating spaces for engagement and exchange in which the boundaries separating people by age, gender, race and physical distance have either frayed or collapsed. All of this is hard to analyse because much of it occurs in privatized settings and it is, moreover, somewhat fragmented.[9] Action may be issue specific. It

may be cultivated in the midst of relatively passive and even conformist attitudes to many aspects of life. But perhaps the ethic of involvement and making a difference is more ordinary and stronger in daily life than most realize. Leisure is, perhaps, the primary setting for the active citizen. One of the most valuable challenges facing students and professionals in Leisure Studies is to elucidate the connections between leisure forms and practice and the dynamics of personal transformation and civil action.

Leisure will never be life's primary activity, because labour remains the source of all value. However, leisure is the means through which cultural, political, ethical and spiritual existence can be enhanced and refined for the betterment of life in general. We believe that the study of leisure should be guided by this ambition. It is the best reason one can give for doing Leisure Studies in the complex, challenging, difficult, but always exciting, 'local–global balance' of the world in which we live today.

Notes

1. The notion that work is the central life interest is the Victorian deformation of Puritan thought. The Puritans believed that work was dedicated to expanding God's glory. The urban-industrial age ushered in by the Victorians transformed this into the sober work ethic.
2. Practically speaking, the issue of Westernization today is dominated by the question of Americanization, since the US is the only genuine superpower. One of the main challenges of students and professionals in Leisure Studies in the twenty-first century is to develop a reflexive understanding of US power in the commodification and acculturation of leisure forms and practice.
3. It is tendentious because class, gender, race and status differences raise obvious difficulties with the notion of liberalism and social openness. Popper was perhaps too uncritical of the formal political equality achieved under the liberal democracies.
4. These questions were of course formulated and perpetuated in the context of major inequalities of power, in which differences of class, race, gender, religion and status were paramount.
5. These activities survived in what might be called the subterranean economy of leisure in which they were conflated with a culture in which illicit pleasure was a source of attraction.
6. The notion of 'preferred option' implies that we are positioned in relation to leisure resources and options so that some forms of conduct become 'natural' and 'obvious' while others are neutralized.
7. Ethnomethodology is an approach in sociology dedicated to uncovering the members' methods and forms of social competence used in constructing a sense of collective reality. Ethnomethodologists attack orthodox sociology for failing to acknowledge that social reality is constructed by the micro-actions of individuals and treating subjects as 'cultural dopes'.
8. Privatization simply means that tendency for social experience to be conducted in domestic settings or settings sequestered from public view. One aspect of this is the interiorization of experience, that is, the tendency to promote personal experience as the best guide to reality. Disembedding is a product of modernity and refers to the tendency for individuals to be plucked from their family of origins and places of birth by the labour process.
9. Of course, Harris also recognizes that the internet produces new opportunities for manipulation and exploitation. However, his discussion cogently demonstrates the structural shift in leisure practice and form that the new technology offers.

Bibliography

Alterman, E. and Green, M. (2004) *The Book on Bush*, New York, Penguin.
Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction*, London, Routledge
Cheek, N. and Burch, W. (1976) *The Social Organization of Leisure in Human Society*, New York, Harper & Row.
Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) *The Devil Makes Work*, London, Macmillan.
Cross, G. (1993) *Time and Money*, London, Routledge.
Cunningham, H. (1980) *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution*, Beckenham, Croom Helm.
D'Amours, M. (1991) *International Directory of Academic Institutions in Leisure, Recreation and Related Fields*, Trois Riviers, Quebec, World Leisure and Recreation Association/Presses de Université du Québec.
Daniels, B. C. (1995) *Puritans At Play*, New York, St Martin's Press.
DeLisle, L. (2003) 'Keys to the Kingdom or the Devil's Playground? The Impact of Institutionalized Religion on the Perception and Use of Leisure, *Annals of Leisure Research* 6(2): 83–102.
Gaonkar, D. (2001) *Alternative Modernities*, Durham, Duke University Press.
Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Engelwood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
Gartman, D. (1994) *Auto-Opium*, London, Routledge.
Gratton, C. and Taylor, P. (2000) *Economics of Sport and Recreation*, London, E & FN Spon.
Habermas, J. (1962) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
Harris, D. (2004) *Key Concepts in Leisure Studies*, London, Sage.
Hobbes, T. (1601) *Leviathan*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.
Jackson, E. and Burton, T. (eds) (1989) *Understanding Leisure and Recreation: Mapping the Past, Charting the Future*, State College, PA, Venture Publishing.
Jackson, E. and Burton, T. (eds) (1999) *Leisure Studies: Prospects for the Twenty First Century*, State College, PA, Venture Publishing.
Kammen, M. (1999) *American Culture, American Tastes*, New York, Basic Books.
Keynes, J. M. (1931) 'Economic Possibilities for Our Grandchildren', in *The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes, Vol. 9, Essays in Persuasion* (1972 edn), London, Macmillan, pp. 321–32.
Larrabee, E. and Meyersohn, R. (eds) (1958) *Mass Leisure*, Glencoe, Free Press.
Locke, J. (1690) *Two Treatises of Government*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Lundberg, G., Komarovsky, M. and McInery, M. A. (1934) *Leisure: A Suburban Study*, New York, Columbia University Press.
Mommaas, H. (1997) 'European Leisure Studies at the Crossroads? A History of Leisure Research in Europe', *Leisure Sciences* 19(4): 241–54.
Neumeyer, M. and Neumeyer, E. (1936) *Leisure and Recreation*, New York, A. S. Barnes & Co.
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (1962) *Outodoor Recreation for America*. Washington, DC, ORRRC.
Parker, S. (1983) *Leisure and Work*, London, Allen & Unwin.
Pieterse, J. (2003) *Globalization and Culture*, Boston, Rowman and Littlefield.
Popper, K. (1950) *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 2 Vols, London, Routledge.
Putnam, D. (2001) *Bowling Alone*, New York, Touchstone.
Rojek, C. (2000) *Leisure and Culture*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
Russell, B. and Russell, D. (1923) *In Praise of Idleness and Other Essays*, London, Allen & Unwin.
Schor, J. (1991) *The Over-Worked American*, New York, Basic Books.
Smith, M., Parker, S. and Smith, C. (eds) (1973) *Leisure and Society in Britain*, London, Allen Lane.
Stebbins, R. (1992) *Amateurs, Professionals and Serious Leisure*, Montreal, McGill University Press.
Veblen, T. (1899) *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, London, Allen & Unwin.

Weber, M. (1936) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit Of Capitalism*, London, Penguin.
World Leisure (1998) São Paulo Declaration, Cedar Falls, IA, World Leisure; available at <www.worldleisure.org/pdfs/saopaulo.pdf>.

Index