issue revolves around the extent to which the terms "leisure" and "work" are meaningful to individuals; also whether people dichotomize all activities in this way or whether they use other definitional categories. Another concern is with the question of what constitutes "leisure", and what activities and situations are defined as leisure.

Apart from the question of leisure and non-leisure, however, in order to understand the meaning of leisure, it is also necessary to understand why particular situations come to be defined as leisure situations. In other words, it is important to explore the various factors present in any situation in order to determine which factors are most salient or significant in determining how the situation is defined.

In this study, therefore, the meaning of leisure is examined through analysis of the impact of these situational factors with regard to leisure and non-leisure designations. An assumption of the study is that the meaning of leisure can vary from one society to another, and from one social group to another, since meanings are defined through interactions with others. This means that there may not be only one meaningful definition of leisure among the population under consideration. The universality of meaning is not assumed, then, and the possibility exists for the emergence of several different definitions of leisure.

1

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

National Library
of CanadaBibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Division

Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

59939

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Susan Mary Shaw

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

11. 3. 46

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

England

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

6176 Pepperell Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3H 2N9

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

The Sexual Division of Leisure:
Meanings, Perceptions and the
Distribution of Time

University — Université

Carleton

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Ph.D.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1983

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

Dr. B. McFarlane

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF
CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of
the filmThe author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permissionL'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈ-
QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de
prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du filmL'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication, ni la thèse
ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou
autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur

Date

16 December, 1982

Signature

Susan M. Shaw

THE SEXUAL DIVISION OF LEISURE:
MEANINGS, PERCEPTIONS AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF TIME

by

© Susan M. Shaw, B.P.E., M.Sc.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
December 15, 1982

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of the thesis:

"The Sexual Division of Leisure:
Meanings, Perceptions and the Distribution of Time"

submitted by Susan M. Shaw, B.P.E., M.Sc.,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Thesis Committee: (Chairperson)

Chairperson, Department
of Sociology

Carleton University

December 15, 1982

ABSTRACT

Despite the recent growth of interest in the area of leisure research, little is known about the meaning of leisure within the context of everyday life experiences. This study used a time-diary technique combined with interviews with a sample of married couples to explore perceptions of leisure situations and the distribution of leisure time.

Leisure was shown to be an important and valued part of the daily lives of both men and women. Employing the interactionist concept of the definition of the situation, considerable consensus was found with regard to the perceptual factors associated with leisure situations. The factors shown to best differentiate leisure from non-leisure were enjoyment, freedom of choice, relaxation, intrinsic motivation and the lack of evaluation. None of these factors alone can be equated with the concept of leisure, but the combination of three or more factors leads to accurate predictions of the definition of situations as leisure or as non-leisure.

The consensual sharing of the meaning of leisure is not widely recognized by people. This is, in part, because leisure definitions are not consistently associated with particular types of activity. This means, also, that the validity and meaningfulness of activity definitions of leisure for research purposes is questionable.

Individual definitions of daily events as recorded in the time-diaries were used to calculate leisure time. Multiple classification analysis showed males to have significantly more leisure time than females, although differences in total leisure time between employed and non-employed females (housewives) were small. In addition, spouse's work time affected leisure time, especially for women, and family size was also related to the availability of leisure for housewives.

The reduced leisure time of females compared to males was explained in terms of the lower status of women in society. Moreover, the notion of the unequal distribution of leisure was considered to be important in terms of the quality of life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to all the people who willingly, and often with great enthusiasm, participated in this investigation. In addition, I am very grateful to the assistance provided by the interviewers, Carol Pooley, Arend Bonen, Sharon Horn and Jean Desmond. Their interest and involvement in the research project was both stimulating and helpful.

I would also like to thank my research advisor, Bruce McFarlane, and my committee members, Flo Andrews and Stephen Richer for their useful comments and advice, and for their continued support.

Particular appreciation goes to Arend Bonen for his help and support throughout the whole research process, and to my children, Ben and Amanda, for their understanding and cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANALYSIS OF THE MEANING OF LEISURE	18
(a) Objective Approaches to the Definition of Leisure	19
(b) The Attitudinal Approach to the Definition of Leisure	26
(c) The Interactionist Perspective	35
(d) The Exploration of Meaning	41
CHAPTER 3. FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANALYSIS OF LEISURE TIME	51
(a) Sex Differences in Leisure Time	52
(b) The Development of a Theoretical Model	63
CHAPTER 4. THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS	75
(a) The Sample	76
(b) The Interview Process	93
CHAPTER 5. THE ANALYSIS OF DIARY EVENTS THE DEFINITION OF ACTIVITIES	109
(a) The Relationship between Activity Type and Situational Definition	114
(b) The Effect of Objective Situational Factors on the Definition of Leisure and Work Events	128
(c) Individual Differences in the Definition of Diary Events	134
(d) Specific Situational Differences in the Definition of Diary Events	143

CHAPTER 6. THE MEANING OF LEISURE: DEFINING LEISURE SITUATIONS	147
(a) Type of Individual Definitions of Leisure	148
(b) Attitudinal Factors Associated with Leisure Definitions	153
(c) The Relationship between Perceptual Factors and Definitions for Selected Diary Events	158
(d) The Discriminating Power of Each Perceptual Dimension	165
(e) The Combined Effects of Perceptual Dimensions	177
(f) The Question of Consensus of Meaning	186
(g) The Question of Reliability and Validity	189
CHAPTER 7. THE DISTRIBUTION OF LEISURE TIME	193
(a) The Division of Daily Time	196
(b) The Relationship between Leisure, Sex and Employment Status	200
(c) Other Factors Affecting Leisure Time	204
(d) The Combined Effects of Employment and Family Variables on Leisure Time	215
CHAPTER 8. CONCLUSION	230
(a) Leisure Values	231
(b) Leisure Activities	233
(c) Leisure Meanings	237
(d) Leisure Inequalities	244
(e) Limitations of the Study	250
(f) Implications for Leisure Research	252

REFERENCES	254
APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY LETTER	279
APPENDIX B: TIME DIARY	280
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	288
APPENDIX D: SEX ROLE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE	293
APPENDIX E: ACTIVITY CODE SHEET	296
APPENDIX F: COMPARISON OF SAMPLE DATA WITH CENSUS TRACT DATA	300

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1:	Model of the Sexual Division of Leisure Time	71
Table 1:	Comparison of Family Size and Number of Pre-School Children between Cowie Hill and Clayton Park Families	83
Table 2:	Comparison of Family and Personal Income Levels between Cowie Hill and Clayton Park Residents	85
Table 3:	Comparison of Occupational Groups between Cowie Hill and Clayton Park Males and Females	86
Table 4:	Comparison of Educational Level between Cowie Hill and Clayton Park Males and Females	87
Table 5:	Employment Status of Wives by Age, Presence of Children and Family Size	90
Table 6:	Comparison between Full-time and Part-time Employed Women with regard to Suburban Area, Occupation, Husband's Occupation and Husband's Income	92
Table 7:	Distribution of Diary Days with regard to Day of Week and Month	95
Table 8:	The Distribution of Individual Definitions of Events by Sex	111
Table 9:	Comparison of the Distribution of Number of Events and the Distribution of Time According to Individual Definitions of Events	113
Table 10:	Comparison of the Distribution of Definitions of Events According to Category of Activity	115
Table 11:	Definitions of all Diary Events According to Type of Activity	117

Table 12:	Definitions of Recreational Activities by Participants	126
Table 13:	The Definition of Events According to the Day of the Week and the Time of Day	129
Table 14:	The Definition of Events According to Location	130
Table 15:	The Definition of Events According to the Presence of Other People	132
Table 16:	Percentage of Leisure Definitions for each Activity by Sex	136
Table 17:	Percentage of Leisure Definitions for each Activity by Employment Status for Women	137
Table 18:	Percentage of Leisure Definitions for each Activity by Family Type	138
Table 19:	Percentage of Leisure Definitions for each Activity by Age	139
Table 20:	The Incidence of Different Definitions of the same Activity by the same Individual	144
Table 21:	The Distribution of Definitions of Selected Diary Events by Sex	159
Table 22:	Correlational Analysis between Perceptual Dimensions and the Definition of Selected Diary Events	160
Table 23:	The Discriminating Power of each Perceptual Dimension with regard to Leisure and Non-Leisure Situations for the Total Sample	167
Table 24:	The Discriminating Power of each Perceptual Dimension by Sex	170
Table 25:	The Discriminating Power of each Perceptual Dimension for Females by Employment Status	174

Table 26:	The Discriminating Power of each Perceptual Dimensions for Males by Occupational Group	175
Table 27:	Correlational Matrix between all Perceptual Dimensions	178
Table 28:	Discriminant Analysis, Discriminating between Leisure and Non-Leisure Situations for the Total Sample and for Males and Females separately	180
Table 29:	The Classification of Events for Leisure and Non-Leisure Situations for each Perceptual Dimension Variable using Discriminant Analysis	183
Table 30:	The Classification Accuracy of Discriminant Functions using Employment, Freedom of Choice and Self Evaluation for Family Type, Age, Employment Status and Occupational Groups	185
Table 31:	Comparison of Original Definitions of Selected Diary Events with Later Definitions for those Events that were Redefined	191
Table 32:	The Division of Time on Weekdays for the Total Sample and for Males and Females	197
Table 33:	The Division of Time on Weekends for the Total Sample and for Males and Females	198
Table 34:	The Effect of Sex and Employment Status on Weekday and Weekend Leisure Time	201
Table 35:	Multiple Classification Analysis of Weekday Leisure Time for various Occupation-related and Attitudinal Variables, adjusted for Sex	208
Table 36:	Multiple Classification Analysis of Weekend Leisure Time for various Occupation-related and Attitudinal Variables, adjusted for Sex	213

Table 37:	Multiple Classification Analysis of Weekday Leisure Time for Males by Occupation, Work Time, Spouse's Work Time, Family Workload and Sex Role Attitude	216
Table 38:	Multiple Classification Analysis of Weekend Leisure Time for Males by Occupation, Work Time, Spouse's Work Time, Family Workload and Sex Role Attitude	217
Table 39:	Multiple Classification Analysis of Weekday Leisure Time for Employed Females by Occupation, Work Time, Spouse's Work Time, Family Workload and Sex Role Attitude	221
Table 40:	Multiple Classification Analysis of Weekend Leisure Time for Employed Females by Occupation, Work Time, Spouse's Work Time, Family Workload and Sex Role Attitude	222
Table 41:	Multiple Classification Analysis of Weekday Leisure Time for Housewives by Spouse's Work Time, Family Workload and Sex Role Attitude	224
Table 42:	Multiple Classification Analysis of Weekend Leisure Time for Housewives by Spouse's Work Time, Family Workload and Sex Role Attitude	225

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

To the early Greeks, leisure was a valued life style representing freedom to fill one's life with education, music, art, philosophy and contemplation (de Grazia, 1964). To the early Calvinists, leisure meant inactivity and idleness, and was seen as a sin against God and against "mankind" (Rodgers, 1974). To the Dogons of Sudan, where the traditional integrated form of life has survived, the concept of leisure has no meaning. For them, leisure cannot be distinguished from other forms of activity such as work, cultivating the fields, religious activities, dancing and ceremonies (Thomas, 1964).

There is, then, no one unchanging concept of leisure. Instead it is clear that the form and content of leisure, the value placed on leisure, and thus the meaning of leisure, varies from society to society and from one historical period to another.

Leisure is often conceptualized in terms of its opposition to work. However, as the meaning of leisure changes according to socio-historical conditions, so too does the meaning of work, and the relationship between the two concepts is not necessarily a simple dichotomization of activities.

The writings of Aristotle, for example, describe a

complex relationship between work, leisure and other forms of activity or conditions of life. in early Greek society.¹ The Greek word for leisure was scholé and this denoted a positive and highly valued condition. Work or occupation, on the other hand, was defined negatively through the word ascholia meaning, literally, the absence of leisure. A different term, ponos (meaning sorrow) was used to indicate toil or painful manual effort and labour. Other Greek terms included paidia, meaning amusement and anapausis, meaning recreation, both of which were thought to be inferior to the condition of leisure and necessary only because work was necessary. It is also clear from the writings of both Aristotle and Plato that leisure and work were not so much seen as activities, but as "conditions of life". The life of leisure was highly valued, but was only possible as a life-style for Greek men of high social standing. Indeed, it was only possible at all because slaves, women and economically and socially disadvantaged free men were obliged to work.

The Hebrews and the early Christians also viewed work as painful toil, but in other ways their views of work and leisure were substantially different from those of the

1. For a discussion of Aristotle's writings on leisure as well as of other Greek philosophers, see de Grazia (1964).

Greeks. Leisure was not conceptualized in the same positive way in terms of it representing the ideal way of life. In addition, in traditional Judaism and Christianity work was not simply drudgery, but it was also seen as punishment from God and as atonement for original sin (Tilger, 1962). Work, therefore, was not to be shunned, but was both necessary and obligatory.

The early Christian and Jewish view of work as a necessary aspect of life gradually led to the development of a positive value being placed on work because of its association with spiritual dignity. Despite this development, however, overall it was the negative view of work and the corresponding positive view of leisure which survived into the Middle Ages. This "neo-Platonic" view of work and leisure was disseminated throughout Western Europe during the Renaissance and came to be the dominant attitude of the European aristocracy (Rodgers, 1974). The feudal lords saw no value in "dirtying their hands" with work. Work was for those people of lower social status who were not deemed to be worthy of the aristocratic life of leisure. Veblen's (1925) scathing criticism of the leisure class was aimed at people who espoused these elitist attitudes as well as at the display of social superiority through "conspicuous consumption".

It was with industrialization and the rise of

capitalism that the terms work and leisure took on new meanings and new values. In fact, the origins of present-day attitudes towards leisure and the form and content of leisure in modern society can be traced back to the Industrial Revolution. Industrialization led to the separation of home and work and to set hours of labour market activity. The Protestant Reformation, in conjunction with industrialization, also brought about the rapid development of the "Work Ethic".² Protestantism preached the spiritual dignity of work and "man's" obligation to work for the glory of God. Work came to be highly valued while leisure was de-valued and came to be defined negatively as non-work time, inactivity, idleness and sinfulness. This new set of work and leisure values was espoused not only by the Protestant Reformers, but also by the industrial capitalists who greatly benefitted from the Work Ethic ideology.

Although societal views of work and of leisure have undergone a number of changes since the industrial revolution, the Work Ethic has survived in one form or another, and has continued to affect the meaning of leisure

~~~~~  
2. According to Weber (1952), the "taproot" of the Work Ethic lies in the Protestant Reformation. It is clear, also, that industrial capitalists supported this new work-oriented ideology for both religious and pragmatic reasons.

in industrial and post-industrial societies. During the nineteenth century the Work Ethic was largely secularized. The idea that one worked in the first instance for the glory of God began to decline and was replaced by a growing adherence to the importance of usefulness or utilitarianism (Rodgers, 1974). This was not so much a new idea, but the popularization of a doctrine which had been espoused earlier, for example by Adam Smith in The Wealth of Nations (1776). The utilitarian ideology continued to stress the importance of hard work and the avoidance of "indulgence" in pleasure, but the rationale for such a life style was somewhat different.

The early part of the twentieth century saw a rapid decline in the work week both in Europe and in North America (de Grazia, 1964; Hunnicutt, 1980). This represented the first time a significant amount of free time (or leisure time) had been available for the mass of workers since the Industrial Revolution. This decline in the workweek was seen positively by some segments of society, including industrialists concerned with productive efficiency (Hunnicutt, 1980). Free time, or "re-creation", was thought to be needed by workers so that they could renew their energies and build up their strength ready for the next bout of work. At the same time, the increasing leisure or free time led to concerns about the potential dangers of such a



situation, especially the dangers of political and social instability (e.g. Huxley, 1925; Cutten, 1926).

There is little evidence that leisure was taken seriously as an important and valuable part of life at this time by any segment of society. This relates to continuation of the use of a negative or residual definition of leisure as non-work time or time away from work. However, it should be remembered that our knowledge of leisure attitudes and leisure definitions in other historical periods is essentially a knowledge of the attitudes of the educated and literary classes of the time. Little is known with any certainty about the meaning of leisure in the daily lives of the mass of population in earlier cultures.

During the Depression increased "free time" or "non-work time" manifested itself more in the form of unemployment than in a reduced work week (Hunnicut, 1980). Thus, the problem was not seen by political and intellectual leaders as a leisure problem, but rather it was seen as an economic and industrial problem.

After the Second World War, and during the economic expansion of the 50s and 60s, the length of the work week continued to decline, though the rate of decline was considerably less than in the early part of the century. The 50s and 60s saw some renewed concern about the "problem"

of leisure and the potential "misuse" of leisure time (e.g. Anderson, 1960; Charlesworth, 1964). There were also some predictions of a coming "Age of Leisure" (e.g. Larrabee and Meyersohn, 1958; Dumazedier, 1967; and Fourastié, 1965), not only in terms of more leisure time, but also in terms of a changing value system (e.g. Riesman et al., 1950; Dubin, 1963; Reich, 1970). However, evidence for any radical changes in the meaning of leisure or work at that time was scarce.

At the present time, there remains a scarcity of information with regard to attitudes and values associated with work and leisure. It is not clear to what extent the Work Ethic continues to dominate modern post-industrial society, or whether there is any new, emerging "leisure orientation". This is, in part, due to the fact that we do not know what the concepts of "leisure" and "work" mean to people within the context of their daily life activities. Thus, there is little understanding of the meaning of leisure in modern society.

The current recession and concern over job loss and unemployment may serve to reinforce the Work Ethic despite the fact that it means more non-work time. Alternatively, it may lead to more serious consideration of free time and leisure issues and concerns, including consideration of the role of leisure in people's lives. Jenkins and Sherman

(1981) contend that modern society does not treat leisure seriously, but they also contend that the impact of microtechnology on work time and unemployment means that attitudes should be re-evaluated and leisure should be accorded much greater attention.

Societal attitudes towards work and leisure obviously have influenced the sociological study of leisure. Since leisure has not been highly valued in industrial societies, and has not been treated very seriously, it is not surprising that leisure studies has traditionally been treated as a "fringe area" within sociology (Parker and Smith, 1976), rather than as a serious area of academic study. For many sociologists it appears that leisure is viewed, at best, as a byproduct or residual concern of more "weighty" matters such as the economy, work and social class (Smith et al., 1973).

Despite this negative orientation towards the study of leisure, though, some academic interest in the phenomenon of leisure can be traced back into the last century. Veblen's Theory of the Leisure Class, written in 1899, is generally considered to be the first sociological study of leisure. This book, though, was in fact a criticism of the leisure orientation among certain members of the aristocracy who were not contributing to society through work. Veblen's book represents in many ways an isolated piece of work, and

his approach was not duplicated, perhaps because of the decline of any identifiable "leisure class" as industrialization progressed.

In the 1920s and 30s interest in the study of leisure appears to have been related to the identification of leisure as a "social problem". Research at this time (e.g. Lynd and Lynd, 1929 and 1937, Lundberg et al., 1934; and Sorokin and Berger, 1939) was concerned primarily with determining what people were doing with their new "leisure time", and whether this time was being used in socially beneficial ways.

There was little sociological study of leisure during and immediately after the Depression. However, academic interest in leisure re-emerged in the 1950s. Interestingly, the sentiments expressed at this time were very similar to those of the 1920s. Much of the research at this time was concerned with rates of participation in "leisure" activities. Part of the motivation for such studies was concern that people make "good use" of their leisure time. In addition, a new, but related, concern emerged at this time, which was a concern over recreational planning. This new concern manifested itself in terms of applied research studies dealing with the need for various recreational facilities and programmes.

The 1970s and early 80s has witnessed a rapid growth

of academic interest in leisure. This is clear from the increasing number of books and journals in the area, and from the growth in the number of leisure studies programmes and research institutes both in Europe and in North America.<sup>3</sup> Studies dealing with rates of participation in various leisure-time activities remain the single largest body of research in the sociological analysis of leisure today. This includes analysis of the effect of various socio-economic and demographic variables on participation rates (e.g. White, 1955; Havighurst, 1957; Hoar, 1961; Morris et al., 1972; and Noe, 1974). It also includes the more statistically sophisticated studies which have used factor or cluster analysis to determine what types of activities tend to "cluster" together, and whether people can be categorized according to different "leisure types" (e.g. Ritchie, 1975; London et al., 1977; Duncan, 1978; Yu, 1980; Pierce, 1980). Other more recent areas of academic interest have been concern with the relationship between work and leisure in modern industrial society (e.g. Smigel,

~~~~~

3. For example, some of the more recent journals in the area of leisure studies include the Journal of Leisure Research (a journal of the United States National Recreation and Parks Association, first issue 1968), Leisure Sciences (an interdisciplinary journal based in New York, first issue 1977), Loisir et Société (based in Quebec, first issue 1978, but previously published as Society and Leisure from 1969 to 1978), and Leisure Studies (the journal of the British Leisure Studies Association, first issue 1982).

1963; de Grazia, 1964; Parker, 1972; and Haworth and Smith, 1975), and concern with the satisfactions that people gain from leisure participation (e.g. Hawes, 1978; Tinsley and Kass, 1978; Ragheb, 1980; Pierce, 1980; Beard and Ragheb, 1980).

It is not clear, though, whether the sociological study of leisure has become, or is becoming, academically respectable. One of the problems, it can be argued, which has limited the development of the sociological analysis of leisure, is that much of the research in this area has been "atheoretical" in that it has failed to specify underlying assumptions. This has greatly restricted the development of a "body of knowledge" and the non-cumulative nature of leisure research has been observed and commented on (e.g. Bull, 1973; Kelly, 1974; Crandall and Lewko, 1976). Part of the problem revolves around the difficulty of integrating leisure research into mainstream sociological theory as represented by Marx, Weber, Durkheim and others. Dumazedier (1967 and 1974) has argued that this problem arises because most sociological theory fails to take into account the importance of leisure in social life. Nevertheless, the last decade has produced some initial attempts at the development of sociological theories of leisure (e.g. Kelly, 1978a; Iso-Ahola, 1980a; Cheek and Burch, 1976; Roberts, 1978), although only Roberts' work represents a

participation is only as "good" or as useful as the operational definition that is used. Clearly, therefore, the validity of any data or findings is open to question.

Much of the empirical leisure research uses some type of residual definition of leisure, that is, that leisure is defined operationally in terms of the absence of work. However, it is not clear to what extent this type of definition is meaningful in modern industrial societies. This residual definitional approach is based not only on the assumption of the continuing dominance of the Work Ethic, but also on the assumption of a simple dichotomization of situations between work and leisure. Neither assumption may be correct. In addition, even if this type of definition is rejected, it is not clear what conceptualization of leisure should be used to replace it.

A number of leisure researchers have recognized the need to understand the meaning of leisure in modern society (e.g. Harper, 1981; Kelly, 1974 and 1978a; Iso-Ahola, 1980a; and Neulinger, 1981a and 1981b). However, although many different definitions of leisure have been presented and discussed in the theoretical and philosophical literature, there have been few attempts to empirically ground or test these definitional constructs. Harper (1981) has argued for a phenomenological approach to the understanding of leisure. Such an approach could provide a "grounding" or a conceptual

base for the whole area of leisure studies. Other researchers have criticized the traditional survey research approach to the analysis of leisure and have also supported the notion of the use of more qualitative methodology (e.g. Kelly, 1980, Smith, 1979 and Smith and Smale, 1979). Nevertheless, to date, there have been few research studies which have put these ideas into practice.

The present study represents an attempt to empirically examine and explore the question of the definition of leisure in modern society. It is based on a belief in the importance of meaning and the need to understand the meaning of leisure within the context of individuals' daily life experiences. It is also based on the belief that to understand the role of leisure in people's lives it is necessary to focus on and examine specific real life situations rather than hypothetical or generalized situations. For this reason, a time-budget technique was used in conjunction with individual interviews. The time-budget technique meant that a record was maintained of all daily activities, and these recorded activities were also used as a basis for interview questions concerning the meaning and definition of leisure.

One of the concerns within the study is the question of how people conceptually divide up and categorize their daily life activities and situations. That is, an initial

issue revolves around the extent to which the terms "leisure" and "work" are meaningful to individuals; also whether people dichotomize all activities in this way or whether they use other definitional categories. Another concern is with the question of what constitutes "leisure", and what activities and situations are defined as leisure.

Apart from the question of leisure and non-leisure, however, in order to understand the meaning of leisure, it is also necessary to understand why particular situations come to be defined as leisure situations. In other words, it is important to explore the various factors present in any situation in order to determine which factors are most salient or significant in determining how the situation is defined.

In this study, therefore, the meaning of leisure is examined through analysis of the impact of these situational factors with regard to leisure and non-leisure designations. An assumption of the study is that the meaning of leisure can vary from one society to another, and from one social group to another, since meanings are defined through interactions with others. This means that there may not be only one meaningful definition of leisure among the population under consideration. The universality of meaning is not assumed, then, and the possibility exists for the emergence of several different definitions of leisure.

One of the purposes of developing an empirically-grounded definition (or definitions) of leisure is that this could then be used as a conceptual base for further sociological analysis. A considerable amount of previous research has been carried out into the question of leisure participation and leisure time. In addition, this question of the distribution of leisure remains a central issue in leisure research, especially given the association that is often made between leisure and the "quality of life" (e.g. Neulinger, 1982). However, the conclusions reached in previous studies of leisure time are questionable because of the operational definitions of leisure that are used and because the findings are highly dependent upon these definitions. Given this lack of confidence in previous research into the distribution of leisure, therefore, another major concern of this present study is to examine leisure distribution using what is considered to be a more meaningful definition of leisure. Leisure, therefore, is operationally defined according to each individual's own designation of leisure and non-leisure situations, and the distribution of leisure time is examined accordingly.

Throughout this study, emphasis is placed on differences between males and females with regard to leisure. This is, in part, because the daily life experiences of men and women are very different, at least in

terms of what they do and what activities they are involved with. In addition, it was thought that sexual inequality in other areas of life would be likely to affect equality with regard to leisure as well. Consequently, the meaning and role of leisure in the lives of men and women might also be thought to be different. Sex differences, therefore, (as well as other differences) are explored in terms of leisure activities and definitions of leisure situations, and in terms of leisure time.

The question of the meaning of leisure and the definition of leisure situations is conceptually separate from the question of leisure time and the distribution of leisure. The two types of question are functionally linked given the necessity to understand the meaning of leisure first, and to develop an empirically-grounded definition of leisure, before the question of the distribution of leisure can be looked at in a meaningful and realistic way. However, since the types of data and analyses used to examine these two related research questions are different, the framework for analysis for the two major portions of the study will be discussed separately in the following two chapters.

CHAPTER 2. FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANALYSIS
OF THE MEANING OF LEISURE

The question of how leisure should be defined has been widely debated in the literature. Many different definitions of the term leisure have been proposed and discussed and several attempts have been made to categorize different types of definition (e.g. Kraus, 1978; Murphy, 1975; Kaplan, 1975). Some of the more common categories that have been identified include the classical view of leisure as a "state of being", leisure as discretionary-time, leisure as a form of activity, the therapeutic view of leisure (that is leisure as a socially useful instrument or as a means of control), and the all-encompassing holistic model of leisure. However, some of these categories are difficult to conceptually distinguish from each other, and it is not always clear what criteria are being employed in the systems of categorization.

A simpler and more useful way of categorizing definitions of leisure is according to the type of factors used to differentiate leisure from other activities or other experiences. Essentially these factors fall into two main types. These are: 1. objective factors such as the type of activity or the time of day, and 2. subjective factors such

as attitudes, perceptions or feelings experienced by the individual. This leads to a distribution of methods of definition into objective approaches and subjective or attitudinal approaches.⁵

(a) Objective Approaches to the Definition of Leisure

The objective approach generally utilizes a residual-time definition of leisure in which leisure is seen as non-work or free time. In some cases a content or functional aspect is added to this definition of leisure as non-work, in that only some types of non-work activities are defined as leisure. The residual, non-work type of definition of leisure can be traced back to early industrialization and the Protestant Work Ethic (e.g. Brightbill, 1963; Lundberg, et al., 1934; Kaplan, 1960). It represents a dichotomous and segmentalist conceptualization of daily activities in which activities are divided into work or leisure. With a positive value placed on work activities, leisure is defined negatively in terms of the absence of work and tends to be viewed as relaxation or recreation (literally meaning re-creation for work).

Although the negative connotation of leisure as

~~~~~  
5. This two-fold categorization of leisure conceptualizations is similar to those proposed by Parker (1972) and Neulinger (1974).

non-work may be rejected by most leisure researchers today, the majority of empirical studies of leisure continue to use some kind of residual-time or activity definition of leisure. Time-budget studies, for example, generally use a "free time" approach where leisure becomes defined as time free from work and other obligations (that is, time free from work, housework and household obligations, child care, personal needs, and travel). They also make use of the concepts of "active" and "passive" leisure which are defined according to activity type (e.g. see Szalai, 1972).

Research studies concerned only with leisure rather than with all daily activities tend to use an activity definition in which certain activities are selected to represent "leisure". In many cases the activities selected are "cultural" activities (where culture means "high culture", thus introducing a class bias). This is true of the Secretary of State reports into the use of leisure time in Canada (Kirsh, et al., 1974; Schliewan, 1977), where the emphasis is on the media, on the theatre, on reading and on expressive-creative activities such as art, sculpture and music, etc.. Other activity definitions have a bias towards sports and physical activities: this is evident, for example in the Ontario Recreation Survey (Ontario Recreation Survey, Survey Documents, 1973; Yewer and Heit, 1975)..

The residual-time or activity approach to the

definition of leisure has the advantage of being easily operationalizable for research purposes. It provides an objective and relatively reliable operational definition of leisure, and clearly this is why it is used in most empirical research.

Much of the knowledge that has been generated with regard to "leisure" behaviour comes from use of this type of definition. This includes information about rates of participation in leisure activities, the distribution of leisure time, the relationship between work and leisure behaviour, leisure satisfaction and the relationship between leisure, life satisfaction and mental health.<sup>6</sup>

However, this type of operational definition requires the a priori categorization of activities into leisure and non-leisure, and this presents a major problem of exactly how, and according to what criteria, the process of categorization should proceed.

Apart from the question of bias in the selection of

~~~~~

6. For example, research into leisure participation rates includes: Kirsh et al. (1974); Schliewan (1977); Watson (1980); Wippler (1970). Research into leisure time includes: Szalai (1972); Wilensky (1961); Meissner et al. (1975); Clark and Harvey (1976); Heit and Malpass (1975); Robinson (1980). Research into work and leisure includes: Brown (1973); Mott (1973); Burdge (1969); Gerstl (1961); Parker (1975 and 1976). Research into leisure satisfactions includes: Spreitzer and Snyder (1974); Donald and Havighurst (1959); Tinsley and Kass (1978); Robinson (1977); Hawes (1978); Ragheb (1980); Beard and Ragheb (1980).

leisure activities, a more basic problem underlying the objective definitional approach concerns the possibility of being able to separate work and leisure activities in a meaningful way. The segmentation of life into work and non-work which may have characterized early industrial society is much less obvious in post-industrial society. The segmentalist orientation is based on the ideas of 1. work as manual labour, and 2. work as paid employment, but the percentage of work that involves manual labour in advanced industrial societies is small and continuing to decline. In addition, a growing number of anomalies concerning work and paid employment have arisen. Housework, for example, is generally regarded as work although it is unpaid, and sports are generally regarded as leisure activities although professional sportsmen and sportswomen and a growing number of "shamateurs" receive payment for their participation. Also, for most professional occupations the exact requirements of the job for which one is paid is unclear. Business lunches and entertaining clients or colleagues are examples of activities which are not clearly part of the professional's paid work activities.

Another type of activity which is difficult to categorize is the consumption of goods, including both the time taken to select and buy consumer products and the time taken up in usage of these products. Some consumer goods,

such as washing machines, food processors and other household products, are thought of as "time saving" devices, but ironically may increase the time spent in household work through changes in standards of cleanliness or food production and through the maintenance and cleaning of the purchased products. Even "recreational" products such as sail boats, skis or tennis racquets may require maintenance time, and may lead to feelings of guilt if such goods are not frequently "used".

The consumption of goods appears to take an increasing amount of time in modern society and it has been suggested that the new consumption ethic with its economic doctrine of Keynesianism has replaced the work ethic which was based on classical economics (Kando, 1975). Clearly, the relationship between productive work, consumerism and leisure is a complex one (Dubin, 1978), and although it is difficult to conceptualize consumption time as "work" it may not be meaningful to call it "leisure" either. Linder (1970), in fact, strongly argues that consumption time is not only not leisure, but that in modern society the emphasis on consumption means that leisure time is greatly reduced.

It would seem, then, that work and leisure are becoming increasingly indistinct on any observable level. Support for this argument also comes from Kaplan (1960), who

believes that the lines between work and play have faded, and from Reisman (1958) who says that in post-industrial society leisure has become as mechanized and as compulsive as work. If this trend towards the fusion of work and leisure has been accurately perceived, this means that the division of activities into leisure and non-leisure for research purposes becomes increasingly difficult and arbitrary.

There are also other problems related to the definition of leisure according to activity type. One problem is that this approach does not take the individual into account. Instead, it imposes a universalistic definition: that is, if an activity is categorized as leisure it is defined as leisure for everybody. However, it is clear that there are a large number of activities, such as gardening, household maintenance, sewing or reading which might be leisure activities for some people, but work for others. In fact, it is difficult to think of any specific activity which could not be considered as either work or as leisure by different people. Accordingly, this would suggest that no categorization of activities could be one hundred percent "correct" because of individual differences in attitudes towards specific activities.

A related problem is that of temporal and spatial specificity. It is quite possible that the same individual

participating in the same activity could consider it to be leisure at one particular time or location, whereas at another time or location he or she may consider it to be work, or at least as non-leisure. This change in the definition of the activity could be related to differences in the objective situation, e.g. whether or not there was payment involved, or it could be a change in attitude which is not related to any observable objective condition.

Underlying all of the above criticisms of objective definitions of leisure is the question of meaning. In other words, the issue is the extent to which the division of activities into leisure and non-leisure is meaningful to the participant. Activity and residual time definitions of leisure are objective in that leisure is defined according to observable phenomena, but they are still based on an unstated assumption that the categorization of activities is in some way meaningful. It is assumed that the researcher somehow knows which activities constitute leisure and which are non-leisure. Rarely, does this assumed knowledge appear to be based on any empirical data. In addition, the arguments with regard to individual differences and temporal and spacial specificity suggest that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to develop a meaningful definition of leisure based simply on residual time or activity categorization.

(b) The Attitudinal Approach to the Definition of Leisure

Although almost all empirical leisure research uses some kind of free time or activity definition of leisure, there is practically no support for these definitions in the sociological, psychological, or philosophical literature concerned with the conceptualization of leisure. Instead, there is criticism of the "misuse" of the term leisure by empirical researchers (e.g. Neulinger, 1981a; LaVasseur, 1980; Murphy, 1981; Arnold, 1980; and Kelly, 1980).

The subjective or attitudinal approach to the definition of leisure is one that is concerned with experiences, feelings and attitudes. Within this general approach, the "classical" view incorporates notions of leisure as a "state of mind" or as a "state of being". There is considerable support in the literature for this classical conceptualization of leisure. The main proponents of this view are de Grazia, (1964) and Pieper (1952). Pieper, for example, describes leisure as both "an attitude of contemplative celebration" (1952: 42) and as "an attitude of non-activity, of inward calm, of silence; it means not being "busy" but letting things happen" (1952: 41).

For both Pieper and de Grazia the term leisure has an entirely different meaning from that of free time or non-work time. According to de Grazia:

Leisure and free time live in different worlds. We have got in the habit of thinking them the same. Anybody can have free time. Not everybody can have leisure. Free time is a realizable idea of democracy. Leisure is not fully realizable, and hence an ideal not alone an idea. Free time refers to a special way of calculating time. Leisure refers to a state of being, a condition of [human life], which few desire and fewer achieve.⁷

Pieper, similarly, states that a break or pause in one's work cannot be considered as leisure since it has a utilitarian function:

The pause is made for the sake of work and in order to work, a [person] is not only refreshed from work but for work. Leisure is an altogether different matter; it is no longer in the same plane, it runs at right angles to work.⁸

There seem to be two main roots in this "classical" attitudinal conceptualization of leisure. The first root can be traced back to the Greek philosophers, especially to the ideas of Aristotle and Plato (Farina 1969 and 1973). The second root can be traced to the works of contemporary social psychologists such as Maslow (1968) and Csikszentmihayli (1975). Maslow's hierarchy of needs, placed "self actualization" as the peak experience, and some

~~~~~  
7. Sebastian de Grazia. Of Time, Work and Leisure. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books. 1964: 5.

8. Josef Pieper. Leisure: The Basis of Culture. New York: Random House. 1952: 43.

writers (e.g. Farina, 1973) have equated this concept with the state of leisure. Csikszentmihayli's theory of anxiety, boredom and "flow" has also been used in a similar way by defining leisure as the psychological state of "flow" (e.g. Mannell, 1979).

Other attitudinal approaches to the conceptualization of leisure which are not within the classical philosophical tradition have described the experience of leisure in different terminology. Perhaps the most common term that is used is that of "freedom of choice". For Neulinger (1981a), Parker (1972), Kelly (1972) and Iso-Ahola (1980a) and others, freedom of choice represents the primary defining criterion of the leisure experience. Other terms which have been used to define leisure experiences include intrinsic motivation (Neulinger, 1974; Kelly, 1972), enjoyment (Smith, 1980; Roadburg, 1982a), satisfaction (Dumazedier, 1974 and Kaplan, 1960) and social interaction (Cheek and Burch, 1976).

An attitudinal definition of leisure does have the advantage of being independent of the objective situation including the activity type. Thus it allows for a holistic orientation within which it is possible for any activity in any situation to be considered leisure according to the feelings or state of mind of the individual. Clearly the type of activity does have an effect on whether the

situation is perceived as leisure, and a phenomenological approach allows for this, but it rejects the notion that leisure is defined by the activity per se or by any objective situational factor. On the other hand, many proposed attitudinal definitions of leisure are still based on the assumption of universality. Whichever feelings or attitudes are thought to best describe or capture the experience of leisure are assumed to describe leisure for everybody.

A major problem for researchers with regard to the adoption of an attitudinal approach to the conceptualization of leisure revolves around the issue of methodology. There are the practical problems of data gathering, sampling and respondent cooperation when subjective or attitudinal data are required.<sup>9</sup> There is also the more basic problem of how to measure subjective states and whether measurement techniques can be developed that satisfy the criteria of reliability and validity (Neulinger, 1982; Kelly, 1980). Nevertheless, if the measurement of attitudes and subjective states is considered essential in the identification of leisure experiences and in the examination of leisure behaviour, methodology has to be

~~~~~  
9. For a discussion of the methodological issues in leisure research, see Foote (1961).

adapted or developed to take these factors into account. Smith and Haley (1979) have criticised the tendency in leisure research to fit reality to the methodology rather than the other way around. In addition, support for more qualitative methodology and interpretive approaches to the study of leisure comes from Kelly (1980) and Harper (1982) who stress that leisure should be studied with methods that correspond to its nature.

If the need to analyze subjective states is accepted in leisure research, there remains the problem of which attitudes or feelings should be taken into account. Some of the terms associated with the experience of leisure, such as "self actualization" and "state of being" are extremely difficult to operationalize. Acceptance of these concepts simply leads to the replacement of one difficult to define term, i.e. leisure, with other terms that are themselves equally difficult to define. But even if these more problematic terms are rejected, a decision still has to be made with regard to the relative importance of concepts such as freedom of choice and intrinsic motivation, and subsequently with how to operationalize the selected concepts. In addition the issue of universality of meaning or individualistic definitions of leisure has to be addressed.

Related to this problem of operationalization is the

problem of meaningfulness. It may seem on an intuitive level that the attitudinal approach is more meaningful than the activity approach, but there has been surprisingly little empirical research concerned with how people conceptualize leisure or with the testing of definitions found in the theoretical or philosophical literature.

There have been a number of studies into the satisfactions derived from leisure (e.g. Donald and Havighurst, 1959; Hawes, 1978; Tinsley and Kass, 1978; Pierce, 1980; Beard and Ragheb, 1980; and Francken and van Raaij, 1981), and Robinson (1977) examined the satisfactions attached to everyday activities using a time-budget instrument. The kind of satisfactions which have been reported include "the pleasure of doing it", "a welcome change from work", "peace of mind", "gives new experience", "contact with friends", and "chance to achieve something". The results also indicate that people get similar satisfactions from both leisure and work, leading Havighurst (1961) to propose the principle of the "equivalence of work and play". However, this very equivalence may mean that the concept of satisfaction is not important in the defining of leisure or in the differentiation of leisure from work.

Apart from studies of satisfaction, there are only a few researchers who have empirically examined the meaning of leisure. Neulinger (1981a) and Dumazedier (cited in

Friedman, 1961) have done research looking at individual definitions of leisure by asking the question "What is leisure?" The responses to these open-ended questions were categorized to indicate the types of definition that people used. Neulinger (1981a) for example found that 77% of his sample of 69 subjects emphasized leisure as "discretionary time", 18% put the emphasis of leisure as "discretionary activity", while only 5% saw leisure as a "state of mind".

This approach to discovering the meaning of leisure, however, has a number of problems. First, it is not clear whether the response given by the participant is meaningful to him or her, or whether it is based on what the respondent believes to be society's view of leisure. Second, it tends to assume that the initial response given by respondents represents the only meaningful component of leisure to him or her. It is possible, however, that a number of factors may be relevant. That is, the type of activity may be very important in determining leisure for an individual but the feelings about and attitudes towards that activity may also be relevant, or even more salient. If this is the case, though, it is likely that in many instances the respondent will still only provide one definition if that is all that is requested. Also, since feelings and attitudes are more difficult to verbalize, it is likely that activity or residual-time definitions of leisure will be offered more

frequently than attitudinal definitions.

Neulinger (1982) has more recently developed a new instrument called "what am I doing?" which examines the perceived freedom and the degree of intrinsic motivation associated with everyday activities. But results of any research using this instrument have yet to be published. Berk and Berk (1979) used a time-budget technique with married women to look at the content and organization of the household day. They also had respondents check, for each activity, whether it was pleasant, tiring, boring, satisfying, difficult, or frustrating. They found that, of these adjectives, "pleasant" was by far the best predictor of leisure. However, they were not primarily concerned with the meaning of leisure and other factors which might have predicted leisure more accurately, such as freedom of choice, were not included.

Other researchers who have empirically tested attitudinal definitions of leisure include Kelly and Iso-Ahola. Kelly (1972) explored the relevance of the freedom-constraint continuum and the leisure-work relationship in determining different types of leisure. He later replaced the work-relation dimension with an intrinsic motivation dimension (1978a) which distinguished between leisure undertaken for intrinsic reasons and that undertaken for social reasons. He found the freedom factor

and the intrinsic motivation factor to be relevant in terms of people's orientation towards leisure. Iso-Ahola (1979a and 1979b) tested two different models of leisure and found that freedom of choice, intrinsic motivation and work-related factors all account for some portion of the total variance of subjects' definitions of leisure. Iso-Ahola's intrinsic motivation factor, though, differed from that of Kelly in that it was an intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy rather than an intrinsic-social dichotomy.

Kelly and Iso-Ahola's research represent an important first step towards an understanding of the meaning of leisure, but there are limitations associated with both studies. Kelly's research used a wide range of leisure activities, but he was not concerned with defining leisure in terms of differentiating it from non-leisure. There is also an underlying implication of the universality of the meaning of leisure activities. Iso-Ahola did examine the effect of sex, and found a sex-difference with regard to the work-relation factor. However, his research involved the use of eight hypothetical leisure situations rather than real-life situations, and generalizability is limited because of the use of undergraduate subjects. In addition, both studies tested theoretical models which included two or three dimensions of leisure. Although the studies provide support for the relevance of these factors, other salient

factors may have been missed in the process. This argues for the need for more basic exploratory research examining all possible dimensions of leisure and allowing for unforeseen factors to emerge.

(c) The Interactionist Perspective

The above review of objective and phenomenological approaches to the definition of leisure indicates the need to develop a meaningful conceptual definition of leisure. This is important not only in terms of understanding how people themselves conceptualize leisure, but also in terms of developing a valid definition or definitions of leisure, that could be used for research concerned with all aspects of leisure behaviour. As Harper (1981) states, a phenomenological approach to the study of the experience of leisure has the potential to "ground" leisure science by providing a conceptual base for future research.

It would seem that exploratory research is called for which would examine all possible dimensions of the leisure experience. In addition, a holistic approach is required in which all activities can potentially be leisure in the view of the participant, while no activities are necessarily defined a priori as leisure.

Part of the inadequacy of the activity-type definition of leisure is the implicit assumption that the

same type of activity always has the same meaning, but this ignores the reality of the effect of the specific situational dimensions of an activity on the individual's perception of that activity. Another unwarranted assumption of much leisure research is that of universality regarding the definition of leisure, but such consensus over the meaning of leisure is, in fact, an empirical question which also needs to be explored in any research on definitions of concepts of leisure.

These arguments in favour of a grounded theory approach, and emphasizing the need to develop a meaningful conceptual definition of leisure suggest the usefulness of an interactionist perspective. This perspective provides a framework for considering leisure as a meaningful symbol or concept and thus corresponds to the view of leisure as a subjective attitudinal phenomenon. The interactionist paradigm has, in fact, been used previously by Roadburg (1977) to look at the question of the meaning of work and leisure among professional and amateur football players and gardeners.

Within interactionist theory, the term "meaning" is used in a particular way. To quote Mead, "meaning is that which can be indicated to others while it is by the same process indicated to the indicating individual",¹⁰ and Troyer (1972) further emphasizes that meaning arises through

~~~~~  
10. George H. Mead. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: The

communication. The meaning of a significant symbol, therefore - including leisure - has its origins in interaction or communication. It is through communication with others that the meaning or significance of leisure becomes defined by individuals within a society or within a subgroup of that society.

Symbolic interactionism also allows the meaning of leisure to be explored in terms of "the definition of the situation". This term refers to a mentalistic or subjective phenomenon, and is based on the assumption that people respond not to an objectively given environment, but to a symbolic transformation of that environment (Thomas and Thomas, 1970): or, as McHugh says, the assumption is ". . . that no one-to-one correspondence between an objectively real world and people's perspective of that world exist".<sup>11</sup> Thus the concern is with attitudes towards the situation, or as Waller (1970) prefers, attitudes "in the situation."

On the other hand, the objective situational factors, or the "structural container" (Bennett and Bennett, 1970) in which an interaction takes place does have some effect on the way in which the situation is defined, and

~~~~~  
University of Chicago Press. 1934: 89.

11. Peter McHugh. Defining the Situation. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. 1968: 8.

cannot be ignored in the process of attempting to understand the meaning of leisure.

This means that any exploration of how people come to define certain situations as leisure situations primarily involves explaining their attitudes and perceptions towards particular situations. The leisure literature does provide some leads in terms of the types of perceptual dimensions which may be relevant, such as freedom of choice and intrinsic motivation etc., but it is also important to allow relevant dimensions of leisure to emerge during the research process. In addition, though, examination of the relationship between the objectively real world and people's perceptions of that world may also help to explain the meaning of leisure. In other words, objective situational factors such as the type of activity, when and where and with whom the activity took place may be thought to have some bearing on the definition of the situation as a leisure situation.

Waller (1970) and Thomas (1972), among others, also emphasize the processual nature of the definition of the situation: that is, that in each situation its definition must be worked out anew through a stage of examination and deliberation. This emphasizes the need to be concerned with specific time and space frames in research related to leisure or any other type of situation.

However, despite the dynamic process of the defining of the situation, this process is also influenced, according to Waller (1970) by pre-existing definitions of similar situations. Types of situations come, through experience and communication, to be viewed in a particular configuration, and these configurations, says Waller, differ in their stability.

A similar view is expressed by Stebbins (1972) who has developed a scheme for categorizing situational definitions. According to Stebbins, "cultural definitions" are "collective representations" that are "consensually shared to the extent that those who are members of a particular group are aware that others in it recognize and utilize the definition in the same way they do" .12 On the other hand, "habitual personal definitions" are non-consensual sharings of meanings and refer to "circumstances in which the same category of situation holds roughly the same meaning for a particular class of actor participating in it, but in which each individual participant is more or less unaware that people like him [or her] who are having the same kind of experience elsewhere

~~~~~  
 12. Robert A. Stebbins. "Studying the Definition of the Situation: Theory and Field Research Strategies." In Symbolic Interaction. Edited by J.G. Manis and B.H. Meltzer. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1972: 338.

define them in the same way" .13

It would seem from the problems involved in defining leisure, and from the tendency of apparent fusion of work and leisure activities, that the definitions of leisure situations are habitual personal definitions rather than cultural definitions, at least in modern society. Another possibility, though, is that there is another type of situational definition which might be seen as the converse of "habitual personal definitions". This would occur when an artificial definition is developed which is not consensually shared by members of a group although it is believed by some to be consensually shared. With regard to the concept of leisure, it is possible that leisure researchers who develop and utilize particular definitions of leisure believe these to be cultural definitions. Nevertheless, these definitions may in fact bear little relationship to the real meaning of leisure to other members of society.

The question of consensus, therefore, is an important one in terms of understanding the meaning of leisure as a significant symbol. Since meanings originate and change through communication, some degree of sharing of meanings might be expected even if total consensual sharing

~~~~~  
13. Stebbins, op.cit. 1972: 338-9.

or "collective representations" are thought to be unlikely. Also, some consensual sharing might be expected even if these shared meanings do not correspond to any imposed artificial meaning believed by researchers to be consensual. Thus individuals in subgroups which have a relatively high level of within-group interaction might be thought to develop meaning systems similar to other members of the same subgroup. In addition, lifestyle factors affect the type of day-to-day situation which people experience, i.e. they affect the "structural container" in which leisure situations are defined. Consequently, variables such as sex, employment status, occupation and family situation (such as the presence or absence of children) might be relevant in the identification of subgroups which possess some commonality of meaning with regard to leisure.

(d) The Exploration of Meaning

Consideration of the meaning of leisure from an interactionist perspective means that the perceptions of the individual person in the particular situation must be taken into account. Accordingly, meanings were explored in this study through the in-depth discussion of specific events taken from the diary of each respondent. The situations analyzed, then, were real situations which the respondent had experienced, and they were situations which the

respondent had previously defined as "leisure" or as "work" or as some other designation. The particular situations were selected at random and could have included any type of activity combined with any definition of the situation. Thus a holistic orientation was maintained.

The objective conditions of the situations were known since they were recorded in the diary. That is, for each situation discussed, information was available with regard to what day it took place, the time of day, the type of activity or combination of activities that the respondent was involved in, and how long the activity continued for. In addition, it was also known where the situation took place, and who else was present at the time. These situational factors represent the "structural container" of the leisure or non-leisure situation. The relevance of these factors was not discussed specifically, but only if they were seen to be relevant to the respondent. However, the data collected allow for the relationship between the situational factors and the definition of the situation to be examined.

The central focus of the discussion of the specific situations revolved around the attitudes towards and perceptions of these situations. Since this was essentially an exploratory analysis of meanings, respondents were encouraged, initially, to express their feelings about the

particular situation without the interviewer leading the discussion towards possible leisure dimensions. That is, respondents were asked how they felt about the particular situation in question, and why they felt that the situation was "leisure", "work" or "a mixture of leisure and work", etc., for them.

Nevertheless, there are differences in people's willingness or ability to verbalize about perceptions. In addition, there are a number of perceptual factors suggested in the literature to be components of the leisure experience. Consequently, these possible leisure dimensions were raised for discussion with regard to each situation if they were not raised by the respondent himself or herself.

The particular perceptual dimensions of leisure which interviewees were asked to respond to were as follows:

(1) Freedom of choice or lack of obligation:

This is probably the most common attitudinal definition of leisure to be found in the literature either in terms of this being thought to be the one factor that distinguishes between leisure and non-leisure, or at least in terms of it being a major essential component of leisure. In addition there is some empirical support for this perceptual dimension (i.e. Kelly, 1972 and 1978a and Iso-Ahola, 1979a and 1979b).

The concept of freedom of choice in the leisure literature seems to mean that the individual does not feel obliged to participate in a certain event, but has a choice between two or more activities. Neulinger (1974) stresses that the relevant concept with regard to the leisure experience is perceived freedom of choice rather than complete or absolute freedom. Similarly, Roberts (1978) has modified the freedom dimension by defining leisure as "relatively self-determined" behaviour.

Related to an investigation of the meaningfulness of freedom of choice is the question of habit. It was thought that there is probably a need to distinguish between activities which are consciously chosen, and those which are simply a matter of habit even though they are not obligatory. Habitual activities might be expected to be defined as leisure less frequently than other types of free choice activities.

(2) Spontaneity:

Another possible aspect of leisure was thought to be spontaneity. This is related to the notion of freedom of choice since it implies such a freedom, but it adds a further dimension of immediacy. There is not any particular support for this in the literature, but on an intuitive level it seemed possible that pre-planned scheduled events,

like routine events, would be less likely to be defined as leisure than spontaneous activities.

(3) Lack of evaluation or lack of consequentiality:

This possible leisure dimension arises out of the literature on drinking behaviour, particularly with regard to the notion of "time out" (McAndrew and Edgerton, 1969; Cavan, 1966). The "time out" concept implies lack of consequentiality since during time out "...the foreseeable future need not automatically exert any control over the immediate present".¹⁴ This means that the individual is absolved of the consequences of his or her behaviour.

Apart from being completely absolved from the consequences of any action, however, the less extreme situation of not being judged or evaluated may also be relevant to the experience of leisure. That is, if it matters how well something is done, or if the performance of a particular activity is being judged either by the participant or by someone else, this may cause the situation to feel less like a leisure situation. Again, this dimension makes sense intuitively, although there is little direct discussion of it in the leisure literature.

~~~~~  
14. Sherri Cavan. Liquor License: An Ethnography of Bar Behavior. Chicago: Aldine. 1969: 11.



(4) Intrinsic motivation:

The intrinsic motivation dimension as used by both Kelly (1978a) and Neulinger (1974) refers to the reason for participation as being simply for the sake of the activity itself. Neulinger sees this concept in terms of its opposition to participation for some extrinsic reason or external purpose, and this is the way it was used in this research. Kelly differentiates between the intrinsic and the social meaning of an activity, but the social context of a leisure situation appears to be a separate conceptual dimension.

(5) Enjoyment, pleasure:

This dimension of leisure is related to the intrinsic motivation and freedom of choice dimensions in that non-obligatory participation, and participation for the sake of the activity itself, presumably implies that pleasure is derived from the activity. Nevertheless, the corollary of this suggestion is not necessarily true, and it is quite possible that obligatory and extrinsically motivated activities may also be enjoyable. Enjoyment or pleasure, therefore, can be seen to be a separate and distinct dimension.

Surprisingly, there is not a great deal of support for this dimension in the traditional leisure literature,

despite the fact that it seems to be an "obvious" component of leisure on a common sense level. However, Dumazedier (1976) included pleasure as a component of the leisure experience, and more recently there has been a growth of interest in the notion of pleasure of enjoyment as an essential aspect of leisure (e.g. Smith, 1980; Godbey, 1981; Roadburg, 1982a). In addition, Berk and Berk (1979) report that pleasure is a significant factor in differentiating work from leisure for married women.

(6) Effortlessness, non-activity or relaxation:

Piëper (1952) includes an "attitude of non-activity" and "effortlessness" in his definition of leisure. This potentially meaningful definition of leisure has tended to be excluded in the leisure literature which puts a great deal of emphasis on participation in "activities". However, it was included in this study because it was considered to be potentially relevant to people's definitions of leisure experiences.

In addition, the notion of relaxation or effortlessness was not considered to be just one single dimension. This notion can refer to the lack of physical effort or to the lack of mental effort, or to the feeling of relaxation resulting out of the lack of stress or emotional tension. Consequently, it was decided to explore all three

aspects of relaxation and effortlessness in this study.

(7) Satisfaction:

The relationship between satisfaction and leisure has received considerable attention in the leisure literature. This is largely in regard to the satisfactions derived from leisure, but Dumazedier (1974) also includes satisfaction in his definition of leisure. Satisfaction, therefore was included as a possible leisure dimension, although there is some evidence that it is not a relevant factor in differentiating work and leisure because similar satisfactions are derived from both kinds of activity (Havighurst, 1957, Berk and Berk, 1979, Tinsley, and Kass, 1978).

(8) Personal development and creativity:

Linked to the above notion of satisfaction is that of personal development, personal growth, achievement or accomplishment. Dumazedier (1967) and Kaplan (1975) both regard personal development as an important aspect of leisure, and, in a similar manner, de Grazia (1964) sees creativity as being part of the leisure experience. In one sense this dimension of personal development can be seen to conflict with other possible leisure dimensions such as lack of evaluation and effortlessness. Consequently, it would seem unlikely that both these types of perceptual dimensions

would be meaningful, at least not at the same time for the same individual.

(9) Social interaction:

The social context of leisure has not received a great deal of attention in the literature, though Cheek and Burch (1976) strongly suggest the need to be concerned with this aspect in understanding leisure behaviour. Empirical work by Kelly (1978a, 1978b) indicates the importance of social interaction, and particularly family associations, with regard to the meaning of leisure. In addition, Henderson's (1981) study of volunteerism as a leisure activity showed volunteers to be highly motivated by affiliation needs.

The social interaction dimension in this research was separated into two components, that is interaction with other adults and interaction with children.

These nine possible leisure dimensions are clearly not mutually exclusive. Although some are contradictory, others are very similar but implying a somewhat different perspective on the same type of general attitudinal concept. The expectation was that no single dimension would explain why situations become defined as leisure situations. Rather, that some combination of the suggested dimensions

and other dimensions arising spontaneously out of the research process would prove to be more salient than others in terms of the meaning of leisure and non-leisure experiences.

The directed and undirected discussions with regard to perceptions surrounding the selected diary situations provide the framework for the exploration of the meaning of leisure, while incorporating an interactionist perspective. Within this model there is no assumption of universality of meaning. Instead the data allow for the question of consensus to be empirically examined both for the sample as a whole and for specific subgroups defined by sex or employment status, etc.. Understanding the meaning of leisure to individuals was considered to be of theoretical importance by itself. However, it was also considered to be a necessary first step before the analysis of other aspects of leisure behaviour, for example analysis of the distribution of leisure time, could be meaningfully examined.

2

### CHAPTER 3. FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANALYSIS OF LEISURE TIME

If leisure is seen as a scarce and valued resource, and if "leisure lack" is a problem closely associated with the "quality of life" in modern society (Neulinger, 1982), then the distribution of leisure among different groups in society becomes an important question. The social indicators movement, which developed rapidly during the 60's (Wilcox, et al., 1972 ) has moved in the last decade towards a greater concern with humanistic aspects of life rather than simply with materialistic aspects, (Neulinger, 1982) and this may be related to a higher value being placed on leisure. Thus a distribution of leisure index may be increasingly meaningful and comparable with concepts such as the division of labour and the distribution of income.

One of the first sociologists to address this issue of the distribution of leisure was Wilensky (1961). Using a non-work time definition of leisure, he detected two trends; first, the bunching of predictable leisure for elites because of increasingly late entry into the labour force and increasingly early retirement. The second trend was towards intermittent, unpredictable, unstable leisure for the masses who had longer worklives, but who also had a higher rate of unemployment. However, Wilensky's definitions of work as being strictly market labour and of leisure as being simply

"non-work" are clearly problematic.

Other more recent studies, especially time budget studies, have also looked at leisure time and the relationship between time and various socio-demographic variables (e.g. Szalai, 1972; Robinson and Converse, 1977; Elliott et al., 1976; Meissner et al., 1975; Robison, 1977). These studies have reported differences in the use of time with regard to social class, occupation, education, age and gender (e.g. Dumazedier and Samuel, 1976; White, 1955; Graham, 1959; Gerstl, 1961; Cunningham, et al., 1970; Burdge, 1969; Wippler, 1968; Kirsh et al., 1972; Schliewan, 1977). However, they almost invariably use a residual-time definition of leisure, and to date, there seems to be no research into the distribution of leisure time that utilizes an attitudinal or phenomenological definition of leisure. The evidence that is currently available, therefore, with regard to leisure time, predominantly refers to the distribution of particular activities and to the distribution of non-work time.

#### (a) Sex Differences in Leisure Time

Traditionally, sex has always been an important determinant of behaviour with regard to the day-to-day activities participated in (Oakley, 1972). Even in modern society, time budget research has shown sex to be associated

with greater differences in time use than any other socio-demographic characteristic (Robinson, 1977). This suggests the possibility of a sex difference with regard not only to the use of leisure time, but also to the amount of leisure time available. In addition, although sexual differentiation does not necessarily imply sexual inequality, there is substantial evidence of the lower status of women in modern society in terms of such factors as income (e.g. Gunderson, 1976; McDonald, 1977; Connelly, 1978), political power (Champagne, 1980), occupation (Armstrong and Armstrong, 1978) and education (Robb and Spencer, 1976), etc.. Logically, then, this would seem to indicate that women would have less access than men to leisure as they have less access to other resources.

The empirical evidence that is available to date, though, provides little support for this proposition. In terms of the types of leisure activities that people participate in, the 1975 Canadian Leisure Study (Schliewan, 1977) indicates few sex differences. The only substantial difference found in this survey was that women outnumber men by a factor of four in their degree of participation in "crafts" activities. But the usefulness of this statistic is questionable because of the problem in differentiation between leisure-time crafts and craft-like activities that might be part of a woman's responsibilities as a wife or

mother, or simply as a woman. The 1972 Canadian Leisure Survey (Kirsh, et al., 1974), which included sports and physical activities also showed a sex difference in participation rates in these activities, but otherwise few distinctions between the leisure behaviour of males and females were evident. A similar picture emerges from the time budget studies. A sex difference is indicated in active sports participation (e.g. Robinson, 1970), but otherwise patterns of leisure time use appear to be similar for men and women (e.g. Clark and Harvey, 1976).<sup>15</sup> In addition, the needs which are satisfied through participation in leisure activities also appear to be similar for males and females (e.g. Tinsley and Kass, 1978).

With regard to differences in leisure time, most empirical research has revealed little or no overall sex difference. The Canadian leisure surveys show males and females to be fairly evenly represented in both the high participation groups and the low participation groups (Kirsh et al., 1974; Schliewan, 1977). In addition, the results of

~~~~~  
 15. One of the few differences in leisure time use that was found in the Halifax time-budget study was that single employed males spend more time in leisure activities outside the home than single employed females or any other marital status-sex-employment status groups (Clark and Harvey, 1976).

the Ontario Recreation Survey showed males to have only a slight advantage over females in total free time, although free time for males tended to come in bigger blocks and more often in "prime leisure time" than the free time for females (Heit and Malpass, 1975).

Time budget studies have also indicated little overall sex difference in total leisure time. The Halifax time budget study for example, showed males to have only slightly more leisure time than females: men were shown to have an average of 5.5 hours of leisure per day, while the average for women was 5.1 hours (Clark and Harvey, 1976). In addition, Robinson (1969) reports that the total number of leisure activity hours are similar for males and females, although males spend more time in market work than females.

However, when employment status is taken into account, time-budget studies have shown a consistent interaction effect between sex and employment status on leisure time (e.g. see Szalai, 1972; Clark and Harvey, 1976; and Robison, 1980). The group which is shown to have the least "leisure" is that of employed women, while housewives are shown to have the most "leisure" time. Employed men fall somewhere between these two groups in terms of total leisure.¹⁶ These results are consistent

~~~~~  
16. Empirical research also shows unemployed males to have

with Meissner et al.'s Vancouver study (1975) which showed that increased family workload through children or through the employment of both parents, affected the wife's free time considerably more than the husband's free time. They are also consistent with the notion of the "dual job" situation faced by employed women in terms of working in both the labour market and in the home (e.g. Cook, 1976).

A major problem, though, with all these studies of leisure participation and leisure time, as already stated, is their approach to the definition of leisure which fails to take perceptions and attitudes into account. This is basically a problem of "inaccuracy" arising out of the disregard of meaning, since activities designated as leisure may not be perceived as leisure by participants. However, a further problem, is that these inaccuracies may lead to systematic biases. In particular, activity and residual-time definitions of leisure tend to bias leisure time estimates in favour of non-employed populations. That is, they tend to overestimate the amount of leisure experienced by unemployed and non-employed people. Among retired populations, for example, the excess of free time or

~~~~~  
a considerable amount of "leisure time" - similar to that of housewives - but such findings are based on much smaller samples compared to those of the other sex-employment status groups.

"time on one's hands" does not necessarily translate into more leisure time (Parker, 1979; Roadburg, 1981). Gognalons (1979), indeed, identified a significant group of retired workers for whom free time meant a time of emptiness, boredom and illness. For unemployed populations too, it is clear that decreased labour market activity does not necessarily mean increased "leisure" even if it does mean more "free time" (Hunnicut, 1980; Jenkins and Sherman, 1981).

Housewives represent another group for whom an activity or residual-time definition of leisure time is particularly problematic. The fact that they do not participate in labour market activity clearly does not mean that they necessarily enjoy more leisure time than employed males or employed females. In addition, the distinction between "work" and "non-work" for housewives is especially unclear.

Apart from the more obvious problems of whether to categorize a particular activity, such as sewing, as work or leisure, Meissner (1977) suggests that much of the housewife's so-called "free time" is actually work in the less obvious form of attention to husband's and children's emotional and physical needs. He goes on to say that the role of the housewife/mother who is "on call" at any time may be completely incompatible with leisure. This

perspective on the responsibilities of the housewife role may help to explain the contradiction found in the Lundberg et al. study of 1934, that:

Suburban housewives are conspicuously of the leisure class. They are also the most ready to assure the investigator that they have "no leisure at all".¹⁷

The authors of this study dismissed this contradiction lightly, preferring to put confidence in the "objective" findings of their research rather than in the expressed attitudes of the housewives.

Clearly, then, there is a problem in determining the amount of leisure enjoyed by housewives, and this problem is reflected in the two conflicting views which society seems to hold about the role of the housewife. To quote Oakley:

Two conflicting stereotypes of housework exist in popular thinking today. According to one, the housewife is an oppressed worker: she slaves away in work that is degrading, unpleasant and essentially self-negating. According to the other, housework provides the opportunity for endless creative leisure pursuits. In this view housework is not work but homemaking, and the home is the treasure house of "unsuspected joys".¹⁸

The "positive" view of the housewife gains support from most

17. G.A.Lundberg, M.Komarovsky and M.A.McInerny. Leisure: A Suburban Study. New York: Colombia University Press. 1934: 99.

empirical studies of leisure time, such as the time budget studies. It is also supported by other writers in the area of leisure sociology, such as Roberts (1970), who says that not only are household duties fairly elastic, but that women treat some of their household chores as leisure activities. He continues ". . . for this reason we should be cautious before jumping to the conclusion that women are deprived of their fair share of leisure by the burden of looking after their homes and families".¹⁹ Similarly, Meis and Scheu (1973) from their analysis of time budget data, suggest that domestic work is subject to Parkinson's Law. The implication is that housework expands to fill the time, and that not all housework can be viewed as necessary, obligatory work.

On the other hand, a number of studies of housework and of the housewife provide support for the negative view of this "occupation". Oakley (1974 and 1976), for example, emphasizes the repetition, monotony, fragmentation and loneliness of housework, and Gavron, in her book The Captive Wife (1966) concentrates on the lack of freedom of choice experienced by housewives. Stephenson's study of housewives (1977) lends further support for this view. She says that

~~~~~  
18. Ann Oakley. The Sociology of Housework. New York: Pantheon Books. 1974: 41.

19. Kenneth Roberts. Leisure. London: Longman. 1970: 43.

the housewife role of service is enormously time- and energy-consuming, and that the housewife finds she can " . . . invest little of herself into herself".<sup>20</sup> Lopata's (1971) research brought her to somewhat different conclusions. She presents a multidimensional picture of the housewife experience in which some women are shown to be overwhelmed by the negative aspects of housework, while others, she says, appear to work out a life style which is enjoyable and satisfying.

The literature pertaining to the housewife role clearly indicates a need to investigate attitudes, perceptions and definitions if any meaningful study of the leisure time of this group of women is to be carried out. Despite the fact that the contradictions are especially evident for this social group, though, the same argument for the need to develop meaningful definitions of leisure can also be made with regard to employed women and men as well.

The current literature is contradictory with regard to the effect of labour market employment on the leisure time of women. As previously stated, time budget studies indicate that employed women have considerably less leisure

---

20. Marylee Stephenson. "Housewives in Women's Liberation." In Women in Canada. Edited by M. Stephenson. Don Mills, Ontario: General Publishing. 1977 (revised edition): 112.

time than housewives or non-employed women (e.g. Meissner et al., 1975). Luxton (1980) supports this contention in her study of women's work in the home in a northern mining community. She refers to the "double day of labour" that women experience when they enter the labour market, but still have to maintain being responsible for the household labour as well. In addition, Weyl-Willett reports that housewives perceive that they have more leisure than married employed women,<sup>22</sup> and Gregory (1982) says that housewives have the advantage of being able to combine work and leisure.

On the other hand, Robinson and Godbey (1978) reported that working women have more opportunities to participate in leisure time activities than non-employed women. Kessler and McRae (1982) have shown an association between employment and improved mental health for married women, and Weyl-Willett (cited in Murphy, 1981) says that employed married women find self-definition through their work.

This contradiction in the literature may reflect a contradiction in reality. That is, as Deem (1982) has

---

22. Margaret Weyl-Willett. "Leisure Attitudes of a Selected Sample of Married Women in Sant Clara County, California." Unpublished Masters Thesis, San Jose State University, San Jose, California, 1977. Cited in Murphy, 1981: 144.



argued, labour market activity may have a two-way effect on women: it may mean less free time, but at the same time it may mean more independence. This leads back to the question of the definition of leisure. That is, if attitudinal definitions of work and leisure are utilized, the view of the employed woman as being over-worked and over-stressed because of her dual role may prove to be not quite as negative. Berk and Berk, for instance, in their study of Labor and Leisure at Home (1979), report that working women view their market labour activities as both work and leisure, while they view housework more negatively as always being "work".

Unfortunately, the Berks do not have comparable data on the attitudes of men towards work in the labour market, although Neulinger (1981a) reports that men are more satisfied with the amount of perceived leisure in their lives than women. It is possible that certain aspects of labour market activity may be perceived by men as "leisure". Parker (1972) incorporated the notion of "leisure-in-work" into his scheme for the analysis of "life space", and some empirical support for this concept has been found by Young and Willmott (1973) at least for people in higher status occupations and professions. It is also possible that certain household activities may be more likely to be perceived as "leisure" by men than by women because men tend

not to view these tasks as obligations and personal responsibilities in the same way that women do.

Overall, it can be said that the literature pertaining to the distribution of leisure between males and females is both sparse and contradictory. It is difficult, for example, to reconcile findings of time budget studies and other leisure research which uses objective definitions of leisure with some of the in-depth studies looking at the housewife experience. In addition, there are few studies concerned with the leisure of employed men and women which have taken into account attitudes and perceptions of leisure. By taking attitudinal factors into account, some resolution of the contradictory expectations and findings with regard to the sexual division of leisure may be possible. It is also evident from the literature that employment status needs to be taken into account as well as sex in the consideration of the distribution of leisure time.

#### (b) The Development of a Theoretical Model

The interactionist perspective discussed earlier provides a framework for exploration of the meaning of leisure and the process through which people come to define situations as leisure situations. An understanding of people's perceptions of leisure is necessary, it has been

argued, in order to analyze patterns of leisure distribution in a meaningful way and in order to examine the controversy surrounding the question of sex differences in leisure time. Consequently, the model developed here concerning the sexual distribution of leisure is based on the assumption that the term leisure is being used in an interactionist sense. That is, that the concept of leisure time refers to the amount of time that is perceived by the individual to be leisure time. It does not refer simply to residual time nor to the participation in any particular set of activities.

However, interactionism, as it has been developed so far, is inadequate with regard to such questions as differential distribution or inequality. If the distribution of leisure is conceptualized in terms of limitations, the assumption is that leisure is desirable, but not always possible because of particular limitations or constraints. From the interactionist perspective, the structural container surrounding a situation and the individual's perceptions of his or her social role affect and limit the way in which the situation is defined (Thomas and Thomas, 1970). Thus, social structures and social roles (e.g. sex roles, class roles, parental roles), or at least the perceptions of these constraining phenomena, can be seen to limit the types of situations that are likely to be defined as leisure. The inadequacy of this perspective,

though, is that it does not provide any theory or possible hypotheses which would predict the type of relationship between structure or roles and the amount of leisure time experienced. There is clearly a need for further concepts, such as status or power, to account for distribution patterns.

The socialist-feminist theoretical framework, although still in the early stages of development, does provide an empirically-based explanation for the differential status of men and women.<sup>23</sup> Based on the dual notions of patriarchy and capitalism, this perspective is concerned with the effect of a number of related factors on the determination of women's status. First, female

~~~~~

23. Although the distinctions between socialist-feminism, radical-feminism and liberal-feminism are not always clear, the socialist-feminist approach, as used here, is identified as being based on a number of common assumptions. These are: first, the belief that Marxism alone cannot provide a complete explanation of sexual inequality, and that a strict Marxian mode of analysis is limiting and inadequate. Second, that although the sexual division of labour may be useful to capitalism, this does not mean that capitalism can be seen as the "cause" of female oppression. Third, related to this second point, is an acceptance of the fact that patriarchy existed before capitalism, though there are variations in its form, and it is not necessarily believed to have existed in all societies. Fourth, socialist-feminists do accept that there is some relationship between capitalism and patriarchy. Specifically, capitalism is believed to have brought about a change in the nature of female oppression and a decline in the status of women. Finally, there is the belief that the conjugal family, as it exists today, is an instrument of oppression for women.

contribution to the production of valued goods has been shown to be related to their social status (e.g. Sanday, 1973; Boserup, 1970). Second, their inferior status in modern society has been related to the separation of domestic and public spheres of activity, and the relegation of the majority of women to the less powerful and lower status domestic sphere (Reiter, 1975; Rosaldo, 1974). Third, women's reproductive and motherhood role within the family is seen to restrict women and contribute to their social definition as inferior and unproductive (e.g. Mitchell, 1971; Chodorow, 1974).

This approach does not view women's inferior status as inevitable, despite the biological fact of childbearing. This is because the motherhood role is not seen simply as a biological function, but as a cultural elaboration of that function. Consequently, the socialist-feminist perspective argues that women can increase their status through particular actions, and especially through increased participation in the public sphere of productive activity. Thus it implies that there is a status differential between women employed in market production and those who are non-employed or unemployed. In addition, status is affected by the value placed on the type of productive activity, or the type of occupation in which a person is employed. This approach, then, takes into account both sex and class

factors in predicting status.²⁴

With regard to the distribution of leisure, an individual's generalized status would be expected to affect their access to leisure as it affects their access to other resources. Indeed, Deem (1982) has recently argued that women's subordinate position in society leads to inequalities with regard to leisure participation. On the basis of interviews with women in an English new town she concluded that the constraints that women experience with regard to leisure are closely linked to other areas of women's oppression such as their domestic labour, their reproductive role, marriage and waged work.

The socialist-feminist framework, though, leads to a prediction not only of differential leisure time between males and females, but also also between employed women and non-employed women. Such a prediction would be consistent with the "negative" view of the housewife role as described by Oakley, Stephenson, Meissner and others. In terms of developing a theoretical model to examine the distribution of leisure time between males and females, this expected

~~~~~

24. The exact nature of the interrelationship between sex and class is not clear in many socialist-feminist works. Some attempts have been made, though, to address this problem - most notably, Eisenstein's (1977) attempt to provide a sythesis of capitalism and patriarchy in which she presents a "feminist class analysis".

difference between employed males, employed females and non-employed females forms the basis of the model (see Figure 1, p.71). Employed or non-employed males would theoretically be expected to fall between employed males and non-employed females with regards to status, and hence also to leisure time. Clearly, whether they rank higher or lower than employed females would depend on the relative effects of sex and employment status. However, unemployed males as a group have not been included in the model shown in Figure 1 since they were not considered in the present study.²⁴

Apart from sex and employment status, other factors which might also be thought to affect status and leisure time are income and occupational level. Eisenstein (1977), for example, includes the notions of wealth and type of occupation (professional or non-professional) in her "feminist class analysis". Presumably such variables also affect the status of men as well as of women. But apart from the indirect effect of these factors on leisure because of their relationship to status, income might also be thought to be related to the availability of leisure because

~~~~~  
 24. The main areas of concern in this present study revolved around the question of differences in leisure time between males (the majority of whom are employed) and females, and between employed and non-employed females. Consequently, unemployed males were excluded from selection into the sample. However, unemployed males could theoretically fit into the model as described in Figure 1.

higher income provides access to more varied and more costly leisure time activities. In addition, the suggestion that people in higher status occupational groups such as professionals have more leisure is consistent with the suggested notion of "leisure-in-work".

It is necessary here to distinguish between personal income and family income. Both factors may affect access to certain types of leisure activities. However, whereas family income may be thought to affect men and women equally, personal income relates to sexual inequality with regards to status and thus, it has been argued, to leisure participation as well. Family income, therefore, is included in the model as a factor which directly affects leisure time. Personal income, on the other hand, along with personal occupational status, is included as a variable which is expected to modify the original proposed relationship between sex, employment status and leisure time.

Personal income and occupational status can also be seen as a particular type of conditioning variable which might be labelled "reinforcing variables" because their predicted effect is in the same direction as the original predicted relationship between leisure time and the three sex-employment status groups. That is, employed males would be expected to have higher incomes and higher status

occupations than employed females. Unemployed females obviously score zero on both counts. Thus, the expected effect of these variables would be to expand and reinforce the original rank ordering of the three groups.

In terms of looking at the use of time, though, employment in the labour market can clearly have a negative effect on leisure because the labour market activity itself takes time, thus reducing the time available for leisure. This may be especially true for people in higher status and higher income occupations who tend to work longer hours. Despite the possibility of some degree of leisure during work and work-related activities, it seems unlikely that a large proportion of labour market activity would be perceived as leisure. Consequently, the effect of labour market participation on leisure can be conceptualized as some kind of "trade-off" between a gain in status and a loss of time.

In order to take this trade-off into account, a work time factor, which represents the amount of time devoted to labour market activity, is included in the model. This work time factor can be conceptualized as an "attenuating variable" since its effect is expected to be in the opposite direction to that of the original predicted relationship between leisure and employment status.

FIGURE 1. MODEL OF THE SEXUAL DIVISION OF LEISURE TIME

Other factors which relate to the status difference between husband and wife within the family, and might therefore be expected to affect differential leisure time, include spouse's occupational level and spouse's work time. According to Hunt (1980) women typically make adjustments to their husbands' work hours and Deem (1982) also found that women perceive the nature of their husbands' jobs and their husbands' hours of work to be constraints affecting their own leisure participation. There is little evidence that husbands feel constraints in the same way by their wives' occupations. In fact, it would appear that most men make few adjustments to their own daily schedules on the event of their wives entering the labour force (Meissner et al., 1975). Consequently, the effect of spouse's occupational level and spouse's work time would be expected to affect women's leisure time more than men's leisure time.

Similarly, increased family workload due to the presence of children would also theoretically be expected to affect wives more than husbands, both because of the status inequality that exists and because of the association of child care with the female sex role. Evidence for such an expectation comes from the Vancouver time budget study (Meissner, et al., 1975) and other studies concerned with sex role behaviour (e.g. Holter, 1970; Oakley, 1974 and Weitz, 1977). In addition, the socialist-feminist

perspective suggests that the motherhood role has a negative effect on status by decreasing female participation in labour market production. Consequently, an interaction effect is predicted between sex and family size or family workload with respect to leisure time.

Finally, the linkages between child care responsibilities, household responsibilities, the willingness of wives to adjust their own lives to their husband's work, lives and traditional sex role behaviour suggests the potential usefulness of considering sex role attitudes in the model of the distribution of leisure. The socialist-feminist literature has not given much attention to the role of individual attitudes, nor of ideology in a broader sense. However, sex role attitudes have been shown to affect the division of household chores and the entry of women into the labour market (e.g. Holter, 1970; Anderson, 1978). Logically, then it would be expected to affect leisure behaviour and leisure time as well. The expectation is that a traditional attitude towards sex roles would reinforce the predicted relationship between sex, employment status and leisure time, whereas a non-traditional attitude would lead to greater equality between men and women in terms of leisure.

The model which has been developed here, provides a framework for the analysis of leisure time, and in

particular of the distribution of leisure time between employed males, employed females and non-employed females. The model is essentially based on the socialist-feminist paradigm, but it incorporates other ideas as well in order to be applicable to the question of the use of time and the availability of leisure. In addition, an underlying assumption of the model is that a meaningful definition of leisure time is required which incorporates a holistic conceptualization of leisure and which allows for individual differences and situational differences in the definition of leisure situations.

CHAPTER 4. THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

The data that are used in this study came from interviews with sixty married couples living in the Halifax metropolitan area. For each couple, both husband and wife were interviewed separately, resulting in a total sample size of 120. These interviews, which were all recorded on tape, were carried out between March and December of 1981.

Since data were required with regard to both perceptions and definitions of leisure situations and with regard to leisure time, a time-budget technique was used in conjunction with the interviews. The time-diary, along with the individual's definition of each situation or activity listed in the diary, was used to determine leisure time. In this way each individual's definition of leisure was used to measure leisure time rather than any operational definition imposed by the researcher.

At the same time, some of the diary events were selected for the focus of questions concerning the definition of leisure and non-leisure situations. This means that the information collected with regard to the meaning of leisure was generated through the discussion of specific real situations which the respondent had experienced rather than through questions about hypothetical situations or generalized categories of activities.

Apart from the time-diary information and the questions concerning definitions of leisure and non-leisure situations, the interviews also included questions on other issues relating to work, housework, child care and leisure (see Appendix C). In addition, questionnaires were used to obtain demographic details and to measure the respondents' sex role attitudes (see Appendix B).

A pre-test was conducted in March 1981 with four interviewees (two males and two females). This led to some minor changes in the interview format and in the wording of some questions. The pre-test data were not included with the data from the final sample of 120 that were used for the analysis.

(a) The Sample

The sixty couples who took part in the study were obtained through the random sampling of households in two areas of metropolitan Halifax, namely the Cowie Hill area and the Clayton Park area. Cowie Hill can be identified as a "working class" suburb with relatively inexpensive housing, some of which is subsidized housing for low income families. The area consists mostly of single family dwellings including both detached and row houses. There are two large apartment blocks, but few, low rise apartments, flats or duplexes. Clayton Park, on the other hand, is a

"middle class" area with larger and more expensive housing. Almost all the houses in Clayton Park are three or four bedroom, privately-owned, single family dwellings. Each house has its own garden, and on the whole the gardens are well cared for with flower beds, hedges, lawns and some vegetable patches. There are a number of low rise apartment blocks and a few high rises as well in Clayton Park.

These two areas of Halifax were chosen in order to ensure some variance on socio-economic variables. In addition, there are some similarities between the two areas which help to control for other extraneous variables. Cowie Hill and Clayton Park are similar in that they are both fairly recent suburban developments (within the last twenty years), and they are both approximately four miles from the downtown Halifax area (thus controlling for differences in travel time and differences in access to downtown recreational facilities). In terms of life style, occupational distribution, income distribution and average educational level there is no reason to suspect that Cowie Hill and Clayton Park are substantially different from any other working class or middle class Halifax suburban areas. There probably are differences, though, between these two areas and the residential parts of downtown Halifax, the latter being characterized by more single people, students and single-parent families. Downtown Halifax is also more

of a university community with a higher average educational level. Thus, Cowie Hill and Clayton Park might be thought to be fairly representative of Halifax suburban areas, but not necessarily of the Halifax metropolitan area as a whole.

The selection of households from Cowie Hill and Clayton Park was done with the aid of enumeration area maps from the 1976 census. It was decided to exclude apartment blocks from the selection process. This was both in order to get a more homogeneous population and to increase the likelihood of selecting married couples and families with children. The Cowie Hill area, excluding the large apartment block, was contained in three enumeration areas (namely .E.A. numbers 106, 107 and 109). These enumeration areas also included some streets adjoining Cowie Hill and it was decided to include these streets as well in the population under consideration. This resulted in a population size, using 1976 census figures, of 785 households.

The Clayton Park suburb is larger than Cowie Hill both in terms of geographical area and in terms of population size. Excluding apartment blocks, though, only three enumeration areas (numbers 162, 163 and 166) were used for the selection of the sample. The population of interest from Clayton Park, again using 1976 figures, consisted of 1080 households.

In order to control for marital status and in order to obtain a matched sample of males and females (controlling for such factors as family size, family income, type of housing etc.), only married couples or couples living together were included in the sample. In addition, given the expected impact of employment status on daily time use, only couples in which the husband was employed full time in the labour force were included. On the other hand, since the employment status of females was a major factor of interest in the study it was important to include both couples in which the wife was employed and couples in which the wife was not employed. The 1976 census statistics indicated that the participation rate of married females in the labour force was 50.4% in Cowie Hill and 51.5% in Clayton Park. Accordingly, it was decided to randomly select eligible households with the expectation of obtaining roughly equal numbers of employed and non-employed females.

The percentages of single-parent families and the male unemployment rates in the two suburban areas were not expected to be equal. This meant, therefore, that the percentage of families eligible to participate in the study was expected to differ as well. Going by 1976 figures, it was expected that 85% of Clayton Park families would be eligible for participation, while only 75% of Cowie Hill families would meet the eligibility criteria.

Since it was not known which households in the two areas contained families which met the criteria for inclusion in the study, households were initially simply randomly selected from the six enumeration areas. A letter was distributed to each of the selected households explaining the general purpose of the study, requesting the cooperation of both husband and wife and giving some information about what involvement in the study would entail (see Appendix A).

A few days after receipt of the introductory letter the researcher called at the household in person. The purpose of this initial meeting was to establish eligibility, to request the participation of both husband and wife in the study and to give out the time-diary forms to couples who agreed to take part. At this time, also, the dates which the diaries were to be filled out were established and the date or dates of the interviews were agreed upon. Whenever possible the interviews were arranged for the day after the diary was to be completed, or at most a day or two later. In most instances the two interviews took place at the same time with one interviewer talking to the wife and a second interviewer talking to the husband in a separate room. In some cases this was not possible and two separate interviews had to be arranged on two different days or for two different times on the same day.²⁶ Also in

~~~~~  
26. This happened in five cases. Three were arranged this

a few cases interviews were never completed because either husband or wife changed their mind about participation. In one case the interview data were rejected and not used in the analysis because they were considered unreliable and much of the required information was missing.

During this process of selection of the sample, 212 introductory letters were distributed. In 16 cases the householders were never contacted either because the house was empty or because no-one was in after three or four attempted visits. In 46 cases the householders were found to be not eligible for participation, mostly because they were single, divorced or widowed. Of the remaining 150 households contacted there were 89 refusals and 61 acceptances. Basing calculations on these 150 eligible households only, this gives an acceptance rate of 41% (although some of the people who refused could in fact have been ineligible in any case).

The final sample size of 60 couples (after one set of interview data was rejected) consisted of 30 couples from Cowie Hill and 30 couples from Clayton Park. However, the ineligibility rates and refusal rates differed between the two areas. In Cowie Hill, 128 letters were distributed and

~~~~~  
 way to fit in with respondents' schedules, one interview had to be changed because of unexpected visitors and one had to be done later because the husband had forgotten about it.

27% of households were found to be ineligible. The acceptance rate in this area for those presumed to be eligible was 37%. The comparable figures for Clayton Park were 13% ineligible (out of a total of 84 households that received the initial introductory letter), and a 45% acceptance rate.

The 120 people interviewed in this study ranged in age from 21 years to 62 years, with a mean age of 39.6 years. The men were slightly older than the women, as might be expected, with a mean age of 40.6 years and an age range from 22 years to 62 years. For women, the mean age was 38.6 years, with ages ranging from 21 to 62 years. Within the sample, the Clayton Park residents, with a mean age of 42.6 years, were somewhat older than the Cowie Hill residents for whom the average age was 36.5 years.

The Clayton Park families also tended to be smaller: there were more families in Clayton Park with no children, more with only one child and less families with two or more children compared to the Cowie Hill families (see Table 1, p.83). In addition, there were more families with pre-school children in Cowie Hill than in Clayton Park. Overall, the average family size of 3.8 persons in the Cowie Hill sample and 3.4 persons in the Clayton Park sample was somewhat larger than the family sizes of 3.3 and 3.2 persons respectively as reported in the 1976 census figures. This

was presumably due to selecting only married couples and excluding apartment dwellers.

TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF FAMILY SIZE AND NUMBER OF
PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN BETWEEN COWIE HILL
AND CLAYTON PARK FAMILIES

Family Size:	Cowie Hill (N=30)	Clayton Park (N=30)	Total (N=60)
No children	20.0% (6)	26.7% (8)	23.3% (14)
1 child	16.7 (5)	26.7 (8)	21.7 (13)
2 children	36.7 (11)	26.7 (8)	31.7 (19)
3 children or more	26.7 (8)	20.0 (6)	23.3 (14)
	100.1 (30)	100.1 (30)	100.1 (60)
Number of Pre-School Children:			
No pre-schoolers	53.3% (16)	76.7% (23)	65.0% (39)
1 pre-school child	30.0 (9)	13.3 (4)	21.7 (13)
2 pre-school children	16.7 (5)	10.0 (3)	13.3 (8)
	100.0 (30)	100.0 (30)	100.0 (60)

Differences were also found in the Clayton Park sample and the Cowie Hill sample, as expected, with regard to income, occupation and educational level. Family incomes were considerably higher for the Clayton Park families than

for the Cowie Hill families. Over 50% of the Clayton Park couples had family incomes in excess of \$40,000 per annum, less than 15% had family incomes below \$30,000, and there were no families earning less than \$20,000 per year. In Cowie Hill, on the other hand, there was only one family (6.3%) with an income higher than \$40,000, nearly 63% of the families had incomes below \$30,000 and 29% of these had annual incomes below \$20,000 (see Table 2, p.85). This difference in family income was mostly due to the difference in husbands' incomes between the two areas. Those wives who were employed in the labour market not only earned considerably less than the employed men, but the differences between the two residential areas with regard to female incomes were smaller.

Turning to occupational level, the differences between the two area are evident for both males and females (see Table 3, p.86). It is clear that professionals, semi-professionals, proprietors and managers came largely from Clayton Park, while the blue collar workers mostly lived in Cowie Hill.²⁷ Table 3 also shows the traditional pattern of occupational sex segregation with women being

~~~~~  
27. The occupational categories used in Table 3 come from Peter C. Pineo and John Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada", The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4:1, 1967.

2

heavily concentrated in clerical and sales, semi-professional occupations, and semi-skilled or unskilled blue collar occupations.

TABLE 2: COMPARISON OF FAMILY AND PERSONAL INCOME LEVELS BETWEEN COWIE HILL AND CLAYTON PARK RESIDENTS

Family Income:

	Cowie Hill (N=27)	Clayton Park (N=27)	Total (N=54)
\$10,000 - 14,999	7.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	3.7% (2)
\$15,000 - 19,999	11.1 (3)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (3)
\$20,000 - 24,999	18.5 (5)	7.4 (2)	13.0 (7)
\$25,000 - 29,999	25.9 (7)	7.4 (2)	16.7 (9)
\$30,000 - 34,999	25.9 (7)	7.4 (2)	16.7 (9)
\$35,000 - 39,999	7.4 (2)	22.2 (6)	14.8 (8)
\$40,000 or more	3.7 (1)	56.6 (15)	29.6 (16)
	100.0 (27)	100.0 (27)	100.1 (54)

Personal income, males:

	(N=27)	(N=27)	(N=54)
\$10,000 - 14,999	25.9% (7)	0.0% (0)	13.0% (7)
\$15,000 - 19,999	33.3 (9)	3.7 (1)	18.5 (10)
\$20,000 - 24,999	11.1 (3)	22.2 (6)	16.7 (9)
\$25,000 - 29,999	11.1 (3)	11.1 (3)	11.1 (6)
\$30,000 - 34,999	18.5 (5)	11.1 (3)	14.8 (8)
\$35,000 - 39,999	0.0 (0)	22.2 (6)	11.1 (6)
\$40,000 or more	0.0 (0)	29.6 (8)	14.8 (8)
	99.9 (27)	99.9 (27)	100.0 (54)

Personal income, females:

	(N=15)	(N=18)	(N=33)
under \$10,000	26.7% (4)	38.9% (7)	33.3% (11)
\$10,000 - 14,999	60.0 (9)	33.3 (6)	45.5 (15)
\$15,000 - 19,999	13.3 (2)	22.2 (4)	18.2 (6)
\$20,000 - 24,999	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)	3.0 (1)
	100.0 (15)	100.0 (18)	100.0 (33)

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS BETWEEN
COWIE HILL AND CLAYTON PARK MALES AND FEMALES

Occupation group, males:

	Cowie Hill (N=30)	Clayton Park (N=30)	Total (N=60)
Professional	3.3% (1)	23.3% (7)	13.3% (8)
Proprietor, manager (lg)	3.3 (1)	33.3 (10)	18.3 (11)
Semi-professional	0.0 (0)	6.7 (2)	3.3 (2)
Manager, official (sm)	13.3 (4)	13.3 (4)	13.3 (8)
Clerical	10.0 (3)	3.3 (1)	6.7 (4)
Sales	13.3 (4)	3.3 (1)	3.3 (5)
Skilled	33.3 (10)	10.0 (3)	21.7 (13)
Semi-skilled	20.0 (6)	0.0 (0)	5.0 (3)
Unskilled	3.3 (1)	6.7 (2)	5.0 (3)
	99.8 (30)	99.9 (30)	99.9 (60)

Occupation group, females:

	(N=15)	(N=18)	(N=33)
Professional	0.0% (1)	5.6% (1)	3.0% (1)
Proprietor, manager (lg)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Semi-professional	0.0 (0)	33.3 (6)	18.2 (6)
Manager, official (sm)	0.0 (0)	5.6 (1)	3.0 (1)
Clerical	46.7 (7)	44.4 (8)	45.5 (15)
Sales	13.0 (2)	11.1 (2)	12.1 (4)
Skilled	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Semi-skilled	20.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	9.1 (3)
Unskilled	20.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	9.1 (3)
	100.0 (15)	100.0 (18)	100.1 (33)

The breakdown of the sample by educational level further reveals the expected differences with regard to both suburban area and sex (see Table 4, p.87). That is, Clayton

Park residents tended to have a higher educational level, on average, than Cowie Hill residents, and men tended to have a somewhat higher educational level than women.

TABLE 4: COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL LEVEL BETWEEN
COWIE HILL AND CLAYTON PARK MALES AND FEMALES

Educational level, males:

	Cowie Hill (N=30)		Clayton Park (N=30)		Total (N=60)	
grade 10 or less	23.3%	(7)	3.3%	(1)	13.3%	(8)
grades 11-13	20.0	(6)	16.7	(5)	18.3	(11)
post-sec educ(non-univ)	30.0	(9)	40.0	(12)	35.0	(21)
some univ, no degree	13.3	(4)	6.7	(2)	10.0	(6)
undergrad degree	6.7	(2)	13.3	(4)	10.0	(6)
some post grad educ	6.7	(2)	20.0	(6)	13.3	(8)
	100.0	(30)	100.0	(30)	99.9	(60)

Educational level, females:

	(N=30)		(N=30)		(N=60)	
grade 10 or less	16.7%	(5)	3.3%	(1)	11.0%	(6)
grades 11-13	36.7	(11)	10.07	(3)	23.3	(14)
post-sec educ(non-univ)	33.3	(10)	56.7	(17)	45.0	(27)
some univ, no degree	3.3	(1)	10.0	(3)	6.7	(4)
undergrad degree	6.7	(2)	16.7	(5)	11.7	(7)
some post grad educ	3.3	(1)	3.3	(1)	3.33	(2)
	100.0	(30)	100.0	(30)	100.0	(60)

The purpose of selecting two different suburban areas of Halifax was to ensure that the sample would vary with regard to socio-economic factors. Since this variation on income, education and occupational level was obtained, and since the two samples did not seem to differ substantially with regard to other factors (such as age and family size), it was decided to merge the data obtained from the two groups. Despite overall group differences, there was a considerable amount of overlap between the two groups with regard to income, occupational level and educational level. In addition, it was felt that these socio-economic factors were more important predictors of behaviour than residential area. Consequently, subsequent analysis of the data was carried out using variables such as income and occupation rather than suburban area per se.

The other important condition that the selected sample had to fulfill, in order to test the distribution of leisure model as set out in Chapter 3, was a fairly even breakdown of employed and non-employed females. The sample was not selected on the basis of female employment status, but it was hoped to obtain sufficient numbers of both employed and non-employed females using a simple random sampling procedure. The final sample of 60 couples, in fact, included 33 employed wives and 27 non-employed wives. This represented a somewhat higher proportion of employed,

married women (55%) than had been found in the 1976 census, where the average percentage for the two areas of the city under consideration was 51.2%. This may have been due to the increasing number of women re-entering the labour force in the intervening five years.

Of the 33 employed women in the sample, 21 had full-time jobs and 12 were employed part-time only. The 27 women who were not employed in the labour market all saw themselves as full-time housewives. None of these housewives were actively looking for a job at the time of the interview, although some were thinking about going back to work.

The employment status of the women was related, in part, to their family situation, and in particular to the presence of children in the family. Table 5 shows the differences between the full-time employed women, the part-time employed women and the housewives with regard to the presence and age of the children in the family. It can be seen that almost all the housewives had children at home, although less than half of them had pre-school children. Of the women who worked part-time, 75% had children at home and 25% had pre-school children. The women who were in full-time employment were more likely to have no children at home (42.9%), but in fact more than half of them did have children, and more than a quarter of them had pre-school

TABLE 5: EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF WIVES BY AGE, PRESENCE
OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SIZE

Presence of Children:

	Full-time emp wives (N=21)	Part-time emp wives (N=12)	Non-emp wives (N=27)	Total (N=60)
At least 1 pre-school child	28.6% (6)	25.0% (3)	44.4% (12)	35.0% (21)
At least 1 child no pre-schoolers	28.6 (6)	50.0 (6)	48.1 (13)	41.7 (25)
No children	42.9 (9)	25.0 (3)	15.4 (2)	23.3 (14)
	100.1 (21)	100.0 (12)	99.9 (27)	100.0 (60)

Number of Children:

No children	42.9% (9)	25.0% (3)	7.4% (2)	23.3% (14)
1 child	4.8 (1)	33.3 (4)	29.6 (8)	21.7 (13)
2 children	33.3 (7)	25.0 (3)	33.3 (9)	31.7 (19)
3 children or more	19.0 (4)	16.7 (2)	29.6 (8)	23.3 (14)
	100.0 (21)	100.0 (12)	99.9 (27)	100.0 (60)

Mean age:	35.0 yrs.	43.4 yrs.	39.3 yrs.	38.6 yrs.

children. In general, it can be seen that although the women without children were almost always employed in the labour market (80% employed), the women with children were

fairly evenly divided between those who were employed (45.7%) and those who were not employed (54.3%).

Table 5 also shows that the three female employment status groups differed in respect to mean age. The full-time employed wives were, on average, the youngest group of women with an average age of 35.0 years. Housewives were the next youngest with an average age of 39.3 years, while the average age of the part-time employed women was 43.4 years.

Although the differences between part-time and full-time employed women were in part related to age and family size, they were also related to socio-economic factors as well. The women who worked only part-time tended to come from Clayton Park rather than Cowie Hill, to be married to men in professional, managerial or white collar jobs rather than to blue collar workers, and to be married to men with higher rather than lower income levels (see Table 6, p.92). In addition, although their own incomes tended to be lower than those of the women with full-time jobs, they were much more likely to be in semi-professional or clerical occupations than in blue collar occupations. Consequently it can be seen that the relationship between socio-economic class and full-time or part-time employment is evident at least in this sample of employed women.

TABLE 6: COMPARISON BETWEEN FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME
EMPLOYED WOMEN WITH REGARD TO SUBURBAN AREA,
OCCUPATION, INCOME, HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION AND
HUSBAND'S INCOME

	Full-time empl females (N=21)		Part-time empl females (N=12)		Total (N=33)	
Suburban area:						
Cowie Hill	67.7%	(14)	8.3%	(1)	45.5%	(15)
Clayton Park	33.3	(7)	91.7	(11)	54.5	(18)
	100.0	(21)	100.0	(12)	100.0	(33)
Occupation:						
Prof, semi-prof, mgr	14.3%	(3)	50.0%	(6)	27.2%	(9)
Clerical, sales	61.9	(13)	41.7	(5)	54.5	(18)
Blue collar	23.8	(5)	8.3	(1)	18.2	(6)
	100.0	(21)	100.0	(12)	99.9	(33)
Income:						
under \$10,000	14.3%	(3)	66.7%	(8)	33.3%	(11)
\$10,000 - 14,999	61.9	(13)	16.7	(2)	45.5	(15)
\$15,000 - 19,999	19.0	(4)	16.7	(2)	18.2	(6)
\$20,000 - 24,999	4.8	(1)	0.0	(0)	3.0	(1)
	100.0	(21)	100.1	(12)	100.0	(33)
Husband's Occupation:						
Prof, semi-prof, mgr	43.0%	(9)	66.7%	(8)	51.5%	(17)
Clerical, sales	23.8	(5)	0.0	(0)	15.2	(5)
Blue collar	33.3	(7)	33.3	(4)	33.3	(11)
	100.1	(21)	100.0	(12)	100.0	(33)
Husband's Income:						
\$10,000 - 14,999	19.0%	(4)	9.1%	(1)	15.6%	(5)
\$15,000 - 19,999	38.1	(8)	0.0	(0)	25.0	(8)
\$20,000 - 24,999	19.0	(4)	18.7	(2)	18.8	(6)
\$25,000 - 29,999*	9.5	(2)	9.1	(1)	9.4	(3)
\$30,000 - 34,999	4.8	(1)	18.2	(2)	9.4	(3)
\$35,000 - 39,999	0.0	(0)	36.4	(4)	12.5	(4)
\$40,000 or more	9.5	(2)	9.1	(1)	9.4	(3)
	99.9	(21)	100.1	(11)	100.1	(32)

Overall, descriptive analysis of the sample of 60 couples with regard to the distribution of occupation, income and family-related factors does not reveal any unexpected results. Comparisons between the Clayton Park residents and the Cowie Hill residents, and between the males and the females show the expected differences in terms of occupation, income and education. In addition, the selected sample "corresponds fairly closely to the 1976 census figures with respect to employment, education and family conditions (see Appendix F). Despite the fairly low acceptance rate of 41%, therefore, there is little evidence of any systematic bias in this particular sample (at least in regard to the variables taken into consideration). This means that some confidence can be put in the sample with respect to it being fairly representative of the two Halifax suburban areas from which it was drawn.

(b) The Interview Process

The time-diary was a central part of the interview process, and an essential tool in the analysis of definitions and meanings of leisure and of leisure time. Given these types of analysis, and the relatively small sample size, the specific days for which the diaries were kept was an important part of the consideration. That is, it was important to obtain, as far as possible, a non-biased

sample of days as well as a non-biased sample of respondents.

The purpose of the 48-hour diary was to record one "work day" and one "non-work" day. Since Sunday is a "typical" non-work day for most people, in terms of the absence of labour market activity, whereas a greater number of people are involved in employment-related activities on Saturdays, it was decided to use Sundays as the non-work day or weekend diary day. The only exception to this rule was if the respondent had to work on Sundays, and in that situation another non-work day was selected to replace the Sunday. On the other hand, it was decided to try to get a range on weekdays, distributed as evenly as possible. Fridays were avoided because it was felt that Friday evenings could be considered as weekend time rather than weekday time. Another factor taken into account in selection of the weekday was that it should represent a "typical" work day for the respondent. Finally, it was decided that whenever possible the weekday selected should be the same for both husband and wife.

The actual decision about what days to use was made at the first visit of the researcher to the respondents' home. The importance of recording a typical weekday and a typical Sunday was stressed at this time. The actual diary days were then decided upon, but respondents were told to

substitute another day if the pre-selected day or days turned out to be very atypical (for example, if the respondent was sick and home from work).

TABLE 7: DISTRIBUTION OF DIARY DAYS WITH REGARD TO DAY OF THE WEEK AND MONTH

Weekend Day (N=120)		Week Day (N=120)	
(a)Day of week	# of diary days	(a)Day of week	# diary days
Saturday	3	Monday	23
Sunday	117	Tuesday	29
	120	Wednesday	34
		Thursday	25
		Friday	9
			120
(b)Month		(b)Month	
	# of diary days		# diary days
March	6	March	4
April	20	April	23
May	8	May	1
June	24	June	30
September	10	September	13
October	26	October	26
November	26	November	19
December	0	December	4
	120		120

Table 7 shows the actual distribution of days for the 120 respondents. Only three of the recorded weekend days were Saturdays. The three Saturdays were necessary for one couple who were both involved in shift work, and one woman who worked on Sundays, but whose husband worked on Saturdays. The weekdays recorded were fairly evenly divided between Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, although Fridays had to be used in nine instances. For seven couples, different weekdays were used for the husband and wife, but the same days were used for the remaining 53 couples.

Table 7 also shows the distribution of diary days by month. No interviews were carried out during the summer months of July and August because of the effect of the school vacation on the daily activities of parents. Otherwise interviews continued whenever they could be arranged between late March and early December.

Once the diary days had been established at the initial visit of the researcher, the respondents were instructed in how the diary forms were to be completed. Both husband and wife were given their own 2-day diary form (see Appendix B), and asked to list each activity that they did from when they first got up in the morning to last thing at night. Secondary activities were also to be listed. That is, if two activities were going on at the same time,

one was recorded as the primary activity and one as the secondary activity. It was left up to the respondent to decide which activity was the primary one. The time-diary also had columns in which to record the time each activity began, where it took place, and who else was present at the time.

The diary forms were divided into six pages, that is three pages (morning, afternoon and evening) for the weekday and three pages for the weekend day. Each page provided enough room for twelve separate activities, although few respondents used all twelve spaces for each segment of each day. On the back of each diary form was a demographic questionnaire, which asked details concerning such factors as age, ages of any children, educational level obtained, occupation and personal and family income. Respondents were asked to fill out this questionnaire prior to the interview.

On the day of the interview, the general pattern was that two interviewers went to the home of the respondents at a pre-arranged time in the evening. One of the interviewers talked to the husband and one to the wife, the interviews being conducted at the same time, but in different rooms. Initially the allocation of interviewer to interviewee was done randomly, but after the first set of interviews, interviewers alternated each time between talking to the husband and talking to the wife. All interviews were

tape-recorded and all were coded later by the researcher.

At the start of each interview, the respondent's time-diary was checked to make sure that it was complete. In some cases gaps that had been left were filled in, and sometimes one activity was split into two or more events. For example, if the activity listed was "dinner", this was split, where appropriate, into "preparing dinner", "eating dinner" and "cleaning up". The interviewer also checked to make sure that the days recorded were considered to be a "typical" or a "fairly typical" weekday and weekend day. In addition, as a check on accuracy, respondents were asked when they had filled out the diary.

The completed time-diary provided information concerning type of activity (and secondary activity where appropriate), the time of day the activity took place, duration time, location, and details concerning the presence of other people during the activity. This conforms to the type of information typically collected in time budget studies (e.g. Szalai, 1972; Elliott et al., 1976). The recorded activities were later coded into the 37 codes used in the international time budget study (see Appendix E), which could then be grouped into 1. employment-related activities, 2. housework and household obligations, 3. child care activities, 4. personal care activities, and 5. "leisure" or free time activities.

Once the diary was completed to the satisfaction of the interviewer, the respondent was asked, for each activity, whether he/she considered that particular activity to have been "leisure", "work", "a mixture of work and leisure" or "neither work nor leisure". In addition, if the situation was designated as a mixture of work and leisure the respondent was then asked if it was "more like leisure", "more like work" or "a roughly equal mix of work and leisure". This resulted in six categories of definition for each situation, i.e., 1. leisure, 2. mixed, but more leisure-like, 3. equal mix of work and leisure, 4. mixed, but more work-like, 5. work, and 6. neither work nor leisure. At this point, also, it was strongly emphasized by the interviewer that it was the respondent's own feelings about each situation that were important as well as his or her own feelings about what constituted leisure and work. Other people's definitions of leisure and work, such as the interviewer's definitions, were not to be taken into account.

The data regarding the definitions of each situation allowed for comparisons to be made between the objective activity and the definition of that activity for each respondent, for the sample as a whole, and for sub-groups of the sample. It thus allows for an examination of how consistently the activities normally designated as "work" or

as "leisure" by researchers are defined also by individual participants as "work" or as "leisure" respectively. Moreover, this process of individualized categorization of each situation allows for the amount of leisure time to be calculated for each 24 hour period according to the respondent's own definition of leisure.

After each situation had been defined by the respondent, the interview turned to the question of why certain activities had been defined as leisure and others as work and what it was that distinguished leisure activities from work activities. In other words, the interviewer tried to discover how the respondent personally defined the terms "leisure" and "work" with respect to their daily life activities. This was followed by some open-ended questions about the respondent's job, including the job of being a housewife where appropriate, and about family activities. In all cases, the concern was with how the respondent felt about these activities, and how consistently the activities were categorized as work or as leisure.

The next section of the interview revolved around the question of the perceptual dimensions of leisure situations and of work situations. In many ways this was the major focus of the interview. Not only did this section constitute the largest part of the interview in terms of time, but it also was the main source of data relating to

the analysis of the meaning of leisure.

In this section a minimum of six events were selected from the diary. This was done by selecting one activity from each page of the diary according to a pre-selected random number (from 1 to 12). If at least one "leisure" activity and one "work" activity was not included in this initial list of six events, one or two more activities were selected to ensure that this criterion was met. That is, for example, if there were no "leisure" activities in the initial list, one leisure event was selected, at random, from all the events categorized as leisure in the diary.

Once the six or more activities or situations were selected, they were discussed, one at a time, in terms of the perceptual factors which had led to the definition of that particular situation as leisure or as work or as a mixture of work and leisure etc.. Initially this was done by trying to get the respondent to talk about his or her feelings about the situation, and to talk about why he/she had called it a "leisure" situation (or a "work" situation etc.).

At this point, also, and throughout the discussion of the six activities, respondents were given every opportunity to change their definition of the situation if further consideration of the situation indicated that this

was appropriate. In other words, an activity originally called "leisure" could be redefined by the respondent as "mixed work and leisure" or "more work-like" etc., if he or she later decided this was a more accurate picture of the situation. Note was taken of any changes in definition, and although the later definitions were used in all analyses, the number of definitional changes was used as an indication of the reliability of the original definitional process.

With regard to getting respondents to talk about the perceptual dimensions of each of the selected situations, the initial approach of asking very general questions was successful in some cases, and led to a considerable amount of information regarding the respondent's perceptions of the situation. In other interviews more probing questions had to be used, and most of the perceptual dimensions of leisure that were of interest to the researcher had to be raised by the interviewer. In any case, in all interviews the interviewer attempted to ensure that all the perceptual dimensions previously designated as being of interest were discussed at some point: that is, that they were either raised spontaneously by the respondent or they were raised by the interviewer. The perceptual dimensions of each situation that were specified ahead of time to be raised by the interviewer if necessary included: pleasure, relaxation, mental and physical effort, satisfaction, personal

development, freedom of choice, spontaneity, intrinsic motivation, self evaluation, other evaluation (judgement or evaluation by someone else) and social interaction both with children and with other adults (see interview schedule, Appendix C).

Overall, this interview process meant that for each selected situation some response was obtained for each of these specified, possible perceptual dimensions of leisure. In addition, in a few cases the respondent raised other dimensions as well which were relevant to their definition of the situation as leisure or as non-leisure. The responses to each possible leisure dimension were coded in each case from a low of one to a high of five. For example, on the pleasure dimension a "very pleasurable" or "I enjoyed it a lot" response would score 5, "I hated it" or "very disagreeable" would score 1 and a neutral response or "I didn't like it or dislike it" would score 3. Similarly, with regard to freedom of choice a score of 5 would indicate a high level of perceived freedom of choice ("I didn't have to do it at all, I just wanted to"), a score of 1 would indicate little or no freedom of choice ("I had to do it" or "I had no other choice"), and scores of 2 to 5 would indicate the relevant position of the response along this freedom of choice continuum. In all cases a high score meant that the response was more towards the presumed

leisure end of the continuum (pleasurable, freely chosen, intrinsically motivated, satisfying, effortless, spontaneous, lacking in evaluation and involving interaction with others) and a low score indicated being towards the work end or the non-leisure end of the continuum.

These coded data on the perceptual leisure dimensions allowed for a different approach to the analysis of the meaning of leisure apart from directly asking how people define leisure or what leisure means to them. The responses to each leisure dimension for each of the situations (including both leisure and work situations) means that the dimensions which best distinguish between these different situational categories can be identified. That is, analysis of these data can show which perceptual dimensions are most salient in distinguishing between leisure and work or between leisure and non-leisure.

The next section of the interview, following the perceptual dimension questions, involved the definition of certain selected activities, such as mass media activities, reading, music, crafts, hobbies, sports and exercise. The particular activities selected were those that had been typically used in previous leisure research studies to operationally define leisure. (In particular, the activity list included all those activities defined as leisure in the federal government leisure surveys, i.e. Kirsh et al., and

Schliewan, 1975.) Respondents were asked for each of the selected activities that they participated in themselves, whether the activity was "always leisure" for them, "sometimes leisure" or "not leisure". These questions provided some indication regarding the validity of certain activity-type operational definitions of leisure. That is, they relate to the issue of validity where validity refers to the correspondence between the researcher's designation of an activity as "leisure" and the participants' definition of the same activity.

Other information obtained from the last section of the interview included some perceptual data with regard to the importance of leisure and the perceived breakdown of leisure time and work time between husband and wife. In particular, respondents were asked whether they or their spouse spent more time, on average, involved in 1. labour market activities, 2. housework activities, 3. child care activities, and 4. leisure activities. Responses to these questions can be used to compare perceptions of husband and wife for each couple, and to compare perceived leisure time and work time with the actual time devoted to leisure and to work in the period covered by the time-diaries.

At the end of each interview the respondent was asked to complete a sex role attitude questionnaire. This consisted of a Likert-type scale with seventeen statements

to which the respondent had to agree or disagree (see Appendix D). This particular questionnaire had been used previously to measure sex role attitudes, and had been shown to have a coefficient of reliability of 0.88 with a Canadian sample (Nelson, 1979).

At the start of the research process, and in the early interviews, respondents completed this questionnaire on their own after the interview was over. However, since it appeared that some respondents had difficulty understanding some of the statements and others chose to talk about the statements as they completed the questionnaire, it was later decided to include the sex role attitude questions as part of the interview process itself, but after the rest of the interview had been completed. The respondent was still given a copy of the questions, but each statement was read out by the interviewer and a verbal response was obtained with regard to agreement or disagreement. The responses to the seventeen statements were used to compute a sex role attitude score for each respondent which could then be related to the question of the sexual division of leisure time.

Most of the interviews took somewhere between one and one and a half hours to complete, although some were shorter (the shortest being 45 minutes), and a few were considerably longer (2 hours or more). The tapes of all the

interviews were coded by the researcher as soon as possible after each interview. This was to protect against the loss of information resulting from poor recordings or questions left out by the interviewer. In a few cases it was necessary to contact respondents again after the interview to obtain information that was missing.

The immediate coding of each tape was also done so that on-going feedback could be given to each interviewer after each interview. This helped to ensure standardization between interviewers with regard to the amount of detailed information collected and to the extent to which probing questions were used at different points in the interview process. Half of all the interviews were done by the researcher, but four other interviewers were also used, including one male and three female interviewers. There was little difference between interviewers with regard to length of interviews or the amount of information collected, probably because of the feedback system. In addition, the data were later analyzed for any interviewer effects, and no significant individual or sex differences were found with regard to factors such as the amount of leisure time or work time recorded, or perceptions as to which spouse enjoyed more leisure.

A large part of the interview data was quantifiable through the coding procedures, but qualitative data were

also recorded. The data were used to examine definitions of leisure, the meaning of leisure and the sexual distribution of leisure time. The first general question that was analyzed concerned the situations that were defined by respondents as leisure situations. This included examination of which activities were defined as leisure, and the effect of objective situational factors on the definition of the situation. This type of analysis was also used to examine the "accuracy" or "validity" of certain operational definitions of leisure found in the literature. The second type of analysis revolved around the six activities selected out of each diary. This analysis, then, was concerned with the perceptual dimensions of leisure and the importance of particular dimensions and combinations of dimensions with regard to distinguishing between leisure and non-leisure situations. The third general question concerned the distribution of leisure time, and in particular the division of leisure time between males and females.

CHAPTER 5. THE ANALYSIS OF DIARY EVENTS:

THE DEFINITION OF ACTIVITIES

Time-diaries can be considered to consist of a record of events or activities participated in over a certain period of time. The events for any one individual on any one day are limited in terms of time and location: that is, the sequencing of events is not random, but a particular event is related (and often dependent upon) both its preceding event and its subsequent event. For example, a family dinner at home is not possible, in most cases, unless somebody spends the time before dinner involved in food preparation activities, and the event is usually followed by clearing up activities.

Nevertheless, where time budget data have been used to estimate free time or leisure time, the assumption has generally been made that each activity is a separate and independent event. Accordingly, in this analysis of the relationship between activities and the definitions of events, the same assumption of independence is made. This assumption, also, allows for the activities for all recorded days for all respondents to be combined.

The total number of events recorded in the 2-day diaries for all 120 respondents was 4117, giving an average of 34.3 events per person. This included all events during

waking hours, but excluded sleep times both at night and periods of sleep during the day time.²⁸ More events were recorded on weekdays than on weekend days (a total of 2302 on weekends as compared to 1815 on weekdays), and women tended to record more separate events (an average of 35.9) compared to men (who averaged 32.7 events). These differences are probably, in large part, a reflection of reality in that Sundays tend to be characterized by fewer separate events and longer events (for example watching sports on television) than weekdays, and that women tend to be involved in a greater number of shorter events than men. The sex difference, though, may also mean that women tended to take more time and care in completing their diaries.

Turning to individual definitions of each event, Table 8 (p.111) shows that the great majority of events (95.2%) were designated as either work or as leisure or as some kind of mixture of work and leisure. Only 196 events

~~~~~  
 28. Sleep was excluded because it was felt to be meaningless to ask respondents how they defined a sleep event. Periods of time just before sleep and just after waking may be meaningfully defined, but sleep itself is not consciously experienced. On the other hand, rest times and periods of just sitting down or lying down were included as diary events. With regard to the breakdown of time, the average number of hours spent sleeping per day was 8.6, and although there were individual differences with regard to sleep time, differences between groups (e.g. between males and females) were not found to be significant. Sleep time and sleep events, therefore, were excluded from all analyses.

(4.8%) were defined in terms other than work and leisure. Of these 196 activities that respondents chose to call neither work nor leisure, most, if fact, were "personal care" activities such as getting up, washing, shaving, and getting dressed etc. (see Table 10, p.115). In a number of cases, also, meal times were defined as neither work nor leisure by the respondent (38 out of a total of 521 recorded meal times).

TABLE 8: THE DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUAL DEFINITIONS
OF EVENTS BY SEX

	Males (N1=60,n1=1964)		Females (N=60,n=2153)		Total (N=120,n=4117)	
Leisure	58.2%	(1144)	42.5%	(914)	50.0%	(2058)
Mostly leisure	5.4	(106)	4.8	(103)	5.1	(209)
Equal work and leisure	5.7	(112)	10.5	(225)	8.2	(337)
Mostly work	2.7	(53)	4.2	(90)	3.5	(143)
Work	22.9	(450)	33.6	(724)	28.5	(1174)
Neither work nor leisure	5.0	(99)	4.5	(97)	4.8	(196)
	99.9	(1964)	101.1	(2153)	100.1	(4117)

1. Here and in all other Tables, N refers to the number of subjects while n refers to the number of diary events recorded by these subjects.

This high degree of utilization of work and leisure categories may have been related to the fact that these terms were mentioned, initially, by the interviewer. On the other hand, respondents were encouraged to use other categories of definition or simply a "neither work nor leisure" category if this seemed more appropriate to them. The results, then, can be taken as an indication that the terms "leisure" and "work" are meaningful in terms of defining most daily activities, at least among this particular sample of Halifax residents.

Respondents not only related to the terms leisure and work, but they also tended to dichotomize daily activities into leisure and work categories (Table 8). That is, while 78.5% of all events fell into either a work or a leisure category, only 16.8% were defined as some kind of mixed work and leisure event. This dichotomization of daily events is somewhat less true for females, who recorded a total of 418 mixed events (19.4% of all females events), than for males who recorded only 271 mixed events (13.8%). Also, of the total number of mixed events, the largest group consisted of activities described as a roughly equal mixture of work and leisure (337). The next largest group was called "mostly leisure" (209), while relatively few mixed events were described as "mostly work" (143).

This breakdown of events according to the

definitional label should not be confused with the breakdown of time between work, leisure and other definitional categories. Clearly there is a relationship between the number of events and the amount of time allotted to different types of situation, but this is not a one-to-one relationship.

TABLE 9: COMPARISON OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF EVENTS AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF TIME ACCORDING TO INDIVIDUAL DEFINITIONS OF EVENTS

	Average # events per person over 2 days		Average # hours per person over 2 days	
Leisure	17.2	(50.0%)	15.8 hours	(51.3%)
Mostly leisure	1.8	(5.1%)	1.5 hours	(4.9%)
Equal work and leisure	2.8	(8.2%)	2.2 hours	(7.1%)
Mostly work	1.2	(3.5%)	0.9 hours	(2.9%)
Work	9.8	(28.5%)	9.6 hours	(31.2%)
Neither work nor leisure	1.6	(4.8%)	0.8 hours	(2.6%)
Totals	34.4	(100.1%) events	30.8 hours	(100.0%)

1. The total number of hours does not sum to 48 because of the exclusion of sleep.

The relative amounts of leisure and of work increase

somewhat when the calculation is made according to time rather than according to the number of events (Table 9). On the other hand, time consideration means that the relative amount of mixed events decline. This is because events defined as mixed tend to be shorter, on average, than either leisure or work events. Since the mean duration time for events described as neither work nor leisure is less than for any other type of definition, the relative size of this residual category shows the greatest decline from 4.8% to 2.6% of total time. This, again, is indicative of the relative lack of importance of this category in terms of people's definitions of daily events.,

In addition, the breakdown of events by time lends further support to the conclusion that the population under consideration in this study tended to dichotomize most of their daily activities. That is, situations were defined either as leisure or as work, with only a relatively small number of situations defined as a combination or mixture of work and leisure.

(a) The Relationship between Activity Type and Situational Definition

Looking at the types of activities that were defined as leisure, or as work, or as a mixture of work and leisure etc., shows that there is some relationship between

definitions and activity type. However, not all leisure situations are experienced during free time activities, nor is all non-leisure experienced during occupation-related activities.

TABLE 10: COMPARISON OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF DEFINITIONS OF EVENTS ACCORDING TO CATEGORY OF ACTIVITY

	Empl- oyment	House- work	Child care	Personal care	Free time	Total
Leisure	8.4% (173)	9.0 (185)	5.2 (108)	26.4 (553)	50.5 (1039)	100.0 (n=2058)
Mostly leisure	12.0% (25)	23.0 (48)	12.9 (27)	31.6 (66)	20.6 (43)	100.1 (n=209)
Equal work and leisure	12.0% (58)	23.0 (125)	12.9 (42)	31.6 (67)	20.6 (45)	100.1 (n=337)
Mostly work	18.9% (22)	35.0 (50)	9.8 (14)	23.8 (34)	12.6 (18)	100.1 (n=143)
Work	35.7% (419)	46.8 (549)	4.7 (55)	9.7 (114)	3.2 (37)	100.1 (n=1174)
Neither work nor leisure	10.7% (21)	10.2 (20)	4.1 (8)	61.7 (121)	13.3 (26)	100.0 (n=196)

Table 10 uses five major groupings of activities typically used in time budget studies. It indicates that, for the sample under consideration, only half of all leisure

situations occurred during participation in "free time activities". Nearly 38% of leisure situations occurred during "personal care" activities which include eating and travelling as well as washing and dressing etc.. In addition, 22.6% of leisure situations occurred during employment-related activities, housework or child care activities.

Situations defined as "work" more consistently fell into employment related activities (35.7%), or housework (46.8%), but still the remaining 17.5% of "work" situations fell outside these types of activity and 3.2% actually occurred during free time activities.

Of all the situations defined as some combination of work and leisure, the largest percentage (32.4%) occurred during housework activities, 24.2% occurred during personal care activities, and the remaining 43.4% were fairly evenly divided between job-related activities, child care and free time activities. It is clear, then, that although the definition of the situation is affected by the type of activity, any type of definition can, in fact, apply to just about any type of activity.

TABLE 11: DEFINITIONS OF ALL DIARY EVENTS ACCORDING TO
TYPE OF ACTIVITY

Activity code	Leisure	Work	Residual	Total
			Definitions (n)	(n)
1.job	3.6% (14)	84.8 (334)	11.7 (46)	107
3.at work,other	65.4% (70)	8.4 (9)	26.2 (28)	107
4.travel to job	40.1% (89)	34.2 (76)	25.7 (57)	222
5.cooking	19.9% (65)	47.5 (155)	32.5 (106)	326
6.Home chores	5.9% (18)	77.2 (237)	16.9 (52)	307
7.laundry	4.0% (4)	78.8 (78)	17.2 (17)	99
9.garden,animal care	52.7% (39)	24.3 (18)	23.0 (17)	74
10.shopping,errands	34.2% (26)	31.6 (24)	34.2% (26)	76
11.other house	34.7% (33)	38.9 (37)	26.3 (25)	95
12.child care	33.9% (57)	28.6 (48)	37.5 (63)	168
13.other child	59.3% (51)	8.1 (7)	32.6 (28)	86
14.personal care	40.9% (133)	18.8 (61)	40.3 (131)	325
15.eating	73.3% (382)	5.6 (29)	21.1 (110)	521
17.personal travel	34.9% (38)	22.0 (24)	43.1 (47)	109
18.leisure travel	80.4% (152)	2.6 (5)	16.9 (32)	189
19.study	51.7% (15)	31.0 (9)	17.2 (5)	29
20.religion	47.5% (19)	2.5 (1)	50.0 (20)	40
21.organization	62.5% (15)	20.8 (5)	16.7 (4)	24
22.rádio	62.5% (10)	0.0 (0)	37.5 (6)	16
23.TV(home)	93.0% (293)	1.3 (4)	5.7 (18)	315
24.TV(away)	100.0% (5)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5
25.read paper	86.1% (31)	5.6 (2)	8.3 (3)	36
26.read magazine	94.7% (18)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (1)	19
27.read books	100.0% (77)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	77
29.social(home)	88.1% (37)	2.4 (1)	9.5 (4)	42
30.social(away)	96.1% (73)	0.0 (0)	3.9 (3)	76
31.conversation	85.4% (70)	2.4 (2)	12.2 (10)	82
32.active sports	80.0% (32)	5.0 (2)	15.0 (6)	40
33.outdoors	91.8% (45)	0.0 (0)	8.2 (4)	49
35.culture events	100.0% (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	3
36.resting	89.8% (79)	0.0 (0)	10.2 (9)	88
37.other leisure	83.3% (65)	7.7 (6)	9.0 (7)	78

Turning this description of the definition:activity relationship around, Table 11 (p.117) shows the frequency with which particular types of activity were defined as leisure or as work, or given some other definition. In this Table, the situational definitions are treated more as a leisure-work dichotomy with a residual category which includes all mixed leisure and work definitions and situations defined as neither work nor leisure.

Also in Table 11, the 37 time budget codes were used to identify the type of activity. Code number 2 (second job) was combined with code number 1 (main job) since there were only two second job events. Code number 8 ("marketing") is also excluded, and all marketing activities were combined with "shopping" (i.e. code 10). Codes 28 ("movies") and 34 ("entertainment") are missing because no events fell into these categories. In addition, code number 16, "sleep", is also excluded from the analysis. This leaves a total of 32 codes by which the activities recorded in the diaries were identified.²⁸

Not all employment-related activities (codes 1-4) were defined as "work" (Table 11). However, the data show that there are substantial differences between actual work

~~~~~  
28. For an expanded list of activities falling within each of the 37 time budget codes, see Appendix E.

on the job (code 1) and other employment-related activities such as coffee breaks and lunch breaks at work (code 3) and travel to and from work (code 4). Although work on the job was almost always defined as work (84.6%), and rarely defined as leisure (3.6%), work breaks were usually considered to be leisure (65.4%) and travel to work was also frequently defined as leisure (40.1%).

These results correspond to responses to the interview question on job perceptions. Only one respondent considered her job to be leisure or mostly leisure. This was a 37 year old woman with two young children, who worked part-time as a travel counsellor. She said that,

working is leisure because I don't have to think about children or babies or hazards or whatever. . . I see work as my mental health . . . There's seven of us there and I talk to everybody. That's leisure too - talking to adults all the time and not being hassled.

This was not a typical response, though, and the majority of employed respondents saw their job as "work", or as "mostly work".

For approximately 40% of respondents, their job was seen as mostly negative. This was either because they felt their work to be very "boring" or "routine", or because it was seen as being too stressful. For another 40% of workers, their job was mostly perceived as "work", although

some parts of their job were seen as leisure, or as mixed work and leisure. For example, a 61 year old male electrician said,

It's mostly all work. Well, there are some leisure parts to the job - the things that I enjoy - if it's new stuff. If it's something I already know and have done lots of times it's more boring.

And, a 43 year old female substitute school librarian said her job was,

. . . a mixture of work and leisure. If you go in for a day or two there's no pressure, it's more like leisure. But right now it's work. The school is not set up. There's no materials or anything. So, it depends on the situation and whether there's a lot of pressure. Also the discipline problems in the school.

For these respondents, then, their definition of work activities depended on the situation.

. Another group of respondents (approximately 18%), though, defined all job activities as "work" even though they found many aspects of their job enjoyable. These respondents tended to be male and to belong to the professional or managerial class. A typical response here was that of a 51 year old male president of an insurance company, who said,

I thoroughly enjoy it. . . I get a lot of pleasure out of work, but I wouldn't call it leisure. You reach a stage where you know what

you're doing. You've got confidence in what you're doing. You're recognized by others as being pretty good and there's tremendous amount of satisfaction from the whole thing.

Despite the fact that the majority of job activities were seen as "work", though, about two-thirds of all employed respondents said that work breaks were leisure or were usually leisure. The diary data and the qualitative data, therefore, both indicate that most of the leisure aspects of job-related activities are the coffee breaks and lunch breaks rather than work on the job itself. Among this particular sample, actual job activities were only occasionally seen as leisure by some people, and never seen as leisure by many people.

Turning to housework activities, Table 11 lists six separate activity codes (numbers 5 through 11), which together constitute "housework and household obligations". It can be seen that there are significant differences between these six activities with regard to situational definitions. Although "home chores" and "laundry" were rarely seen as leisure, and almost always seen as work, over 50% of gardening and animal care activities were defined as leisure. In addition, "cooking", "shopping" and "other household obligations" are more evenly divided between work definitions, leisure definitions and the residual category of mixed work and leisure or neither work nor leisure. In

would seem, then, that household work and obligations should not be considered as one type of activity, but as different activities which are defined differently, and therefore have different meanings.

Again, these definitions of housework correspond fairly well to the responses given by housewives with regard to their perceptions of their "occupational role". While about 30% of all housewives saw their "job" as being mostly work or all work, the remaining 70% said that there were some leisure or mixed work and leisure aspects to this job as a housewife. One typical response from a 45 year old housewife was,

I guess you'd say housework is mixed. Like cooking.
. . . I enjoy it and get satisfaction from it. But
some of it is definitely work - I mean like
cleaning, and the laundry.

The two child care codes, "child care" and "child, other" (the latter including talking to children, playing with children and helping with homework) are also not consistently defined in the same way by parents. Neither of these activity codes can be thought of as typically being "work", but only 33.9% of "child care" activities were defined as leisure, whereas 59.3% of "child, other" activities were defined in this way. Also, approximately a third of all child care activities were not defined as

either definitely work nor leisure, but fell into the residual category.

There are basically two possible explanations for this lack of consistency in the definition of child care activities (and other activities where definitions vary). One is that child care activities have very different meanings for different people: for some it is leisure, and for some it is work. The other possible explanation is that the definition of child care events is very dependent upon situational factors, that is, for any one parent, child care may be seen as leisure in one situation, as work in another situation, and as a mixture of work and leisure in yet another situation. Also, of course, it is possible that there is some truth to both of these explanations, and they will be further considered later in this chapter.

The total personal care category includes "personal care" (code 14), "eating" (code 15) and "personal travel" (code 17). Personal care and personal travel include a high percentage of events defined residually (41%), and nearly the same number of events defined as leisure (39%). The remaining 20% of events were defined as work. Eating, on the other hand, is characterized by a high degree of leisure. This activity code includes meals at home and meals at restaurants which are basically eating events rather than social events (social events being coded as 29

or 30). Nearly three-quarters of all eating events were defined as leisure, while only about one in every twenty eating events was defined as work.

The codes 18 through 37 represent the activities normally defined as "free time" in time budget research. Sometimes travel, study, religious activities and organizational activities are excluded and the remaining codes 22 through 37 are defined as "leisure". It can be seen from Table 11 that "free time" and "leisure" activities tend to be defined by participants more often as leisure than given any other definitional label. However, study, religion and organizational activities were only seen as leisure approximately half of the time. In addition, hardly any of the free time activities were always defined as leisure. A hundred percent of leisure definitions was found for only reading books, watching television away from home (of which there were only 5 events) and cultural events (which only totalled 3 events). Other activities, such as reading the paper, active sports participation and social events at home were quite often defined as non-leisure (14%, 20% and 12% non-leisure respectively).

Overall, then, examination of the definitions of diary events according to the activity codes indicates some of the problems associated with the use of an activity-type definition of leisure. If employment or other types of

obligatory activities are operationally defined as those activities that fall into codes 1 through 17, and free time or leisure defined as activity codes 18 through 37, it is clear that these activities do not always correspond to individuals' definitions of leisure and work events. Among the sample used in this study, only 86% of all "free time" events (n=1208) were defined as leisure, while 35% of all employment and obligatory activities (n=2909) were also defined as leisure. Overall, this gives an accuracy of prediction for this sample (i.e. using type of activity to predict the definition of the situation) of 71.1%. The accuracy of prediction is higher for free time activities than for employment and obligatory activities.

Analysis of responses to the interview questions concerning recreational activities provides somewhat similar results. Respondents were asked whether participation in each of the recreational activities listed would be leisure for them or not. Only those people who did participate, at least occasionally, were asked for their definitions.

The results show that these activities were not always perceived to be leisure (Table 12), and no activity was universally perceived as leisure. Listening to records, and participation in music, sports and hobbies were seen to be leisure by over 80% of respondents. On the other hand, listening to the radio, reading books and magazines, and

participation in crafts and physical activities other than sports were defined as always leisure by less than two-thirds of respondents. In addition, only 38% felt that taking part in lessons or some kind of formal instruction was always leisure. These recreational activities were not generally perceived to be never leisure, but for many respondents they were mixed work and leisure or only sometimes leisure depending on the particular circumstances.

TABLE 12: DEFINITIONS OF RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES BY PARTICIPANTS

	Always Leisure	Sometimes Leisure	Rarely or Never Leisure	Total (n)
radio	56.3% (63)	38.4 (43)	5.4 (6)	112
records	86.2% (94)	11.9 (13)	1.8 (2)	109
books	52.3% (56)	45.8 (49)	1.9 (2)	107
magazines	64.5% (69)	33.6 (36)	1.9 (2)	107
music	92.9% (26)	3.6 (1)	3.6 (1)	28
sculpture	77.8% (7)	28.6 (2)	0.0 (0)	9
crafts	66.2% (45)	32.4 (22)	1.5 (1)	68
hobbies	80.4% (37)	17.4 (8)	2.2 (1)	46
lessons	37.9% (25)	34.8 (23)	27.3 (18)	66
sports	88.9% (56)	9.5 (6)	1.6 (1)	63
phys. activities	64.5% (40)	22.6 (14)	12.9 (8)	62

A number of research studies have used a list of recreational activities, such as the list used in Table 12, to operationally define leisure. However, the inaccuracies of such a definition are obvious if these activities are presumed to be always leisure for all participants. Among the respondents in this study, the "accuracy" of such an operational definition of leisure (that is the overall percentage of subjects who defined the activities as always leisure) would be 66.7%. The lower percentage of leisure definitions for certain recreational activities in Table 12 compared to the time-diary data (e.g. for book reading and magazine reading) may be due to the fact that all participants were asked to define each recreational activity however infrequently they participated. On the other hand, the time-diaries would tend to pick up events for people who participated in these activities more frequently, and who might therefore be more likely to see these activities as leisure.

In general, analysis of the relationship between the type of activity and individual definitions of the activity event shows that leisure cannot be conceptualized simply in terms of activity type. Although the majority of free time activities are defined as leisure, and the majority of work and housework activities are not defined as leisure, there are many exceptions to this rule. In fact, just about any

activity can be defined as leisure in some instances and as work in other instances. To define leisure in terms of activity participation, therefore, for research purposes leads to certain inaccuracies and the definition is not a meaningful one with respect to the meaning of leisure to participants.

(b) The Effect of Objective Situational Factors on the Definition of Leisure and Work Events

The time-diaries provided other information with regard to each diary event apart from the type of activity. These included the day of the week, the time of day, the location of the activity and details about the presence or absence of other people. These objective situational factors also bear some relationship to the definition of the situation, and might be seen as influencing the definitional process.

Table 13 shows the effect of the day of the week and the time of day on the definitions of diary events. There are a greater percentage of leisure events on weekend days than on weekdays. The reverse is true for events defined as work. The percentage of mixed work and leisure events are somewhat similar for weekends and for weekdays (15.6% as compared to 17.6% respectively). With regard to the time of day, the greatest percentage of leisure events occurs during

the evenings as might be expected, while work events mostly occur in either the mornings or the afternoons. Also, 21% of morning events were defined as some mixture of work and leisure, while the corresponding percentages for afternoons and evenings were 16.8% and 11.8% respectively.

TABLE 13: THE DEFINITION OF EVENTS ACCORDING TO
THE DAY OF THE WEEK AND THE TIME OF DAY

	Day of the Week			Time of Day	
	Weekend (n=1815)	Weekday (n=2302)	Mornings (n=1382)	Afternoon (n=1540)	Evening (n=1195)
Leisure	60.8% (1104)	41.4% (954)	34.8% (481)	49.6% (764)	68.0% (813)
Mostly leisure	4.8 (87)	5.3 (122)	6.4 (88)	4.4 (68)	4.4 (53)
Equal work and leisure	8.2 (149)	8.2 (188)	9.0 (124)	9.5 (146)	5.6 (67)
Mostly work	2.6 (48)	4.1 (95)	5.6 (77)	2.9 (44)	1.8 (22)
Work	19.0 (345)	36.0 (829)	35.9 (496)	31.0 (477)	16.8 (201)
Neither work nor leisure	4.5 (82)	5.0 (114)	8.4 (116)	2.7 (41)	3.3 (39)
	99.9 (1815)	100.0 (2302)	100.1 (1382)	100.1 (1540)	99.9 (1195)

TABLE 14:- THE DEFINITION OF EVENTS ACCORDING TO
LOCATION

	Home (n=2554)	Place of employment (n=494)	Outside (n=746)	Other (n=323)
Leisure	51.3% (1310)	23.7% (117)	55.4% (413)	67.5% (218)
Mostly leisure	4.7 (119)	2.0 (10)	7.9 (59)	6.5 (21)
Equal work and leisure	8.6 (220)	7.1 (35)	7.6 (57)	7.7 (25)
Mostly work	3.6 (93)	3.6 (18)	3.1 (23)	2.8 (9)
Work	26.4 (675)	62.1 (307)	20.2 (157)	12.7 (41)
Neither work nor leisure	5.4 (137)	1.4 (494)	5.8 (43)	2.83 (9)
	100.0 (2554)	99.9 (494)	100.0 (746)	100.0 (323)

The relationship between the location of the event and its definition is shown in Table 14. The majority of recorded events took place in the home, and of these events 51.3% were seen as leisure events, 26.4% as work events and 16.9% as mixed events. The majority of events which occurred at the place of employment were defined as work (62.6%), although 23.7% of these events were seen as

leisure. Of the events that took place outside (either in the respondent's back yard, at a park or beach, or travelling between one location and another etc.), the majority (55.4%) were defined as leisure events. However, the residual category of "other location" had the greatest percentage of leisure events (67.5%). These events were fewer in number, and many of them were occasions on which the respondent was visiting friends or members of his or her extended family.

The presence of other people was also found to be related to the definition of the situation (see Table 15). While the presence of friends increases the likelihood of an event being defined as leisure, the presence of work colleagues or the presence of children alone (i.e. no other adults), decreases this likelihood.

It should also be noted that although the percentage of events with children alone that were defined as leisure was only 31.0%, the corresponding percentage for events with the family (i.e. with children plus spouse) was 60.6%. This may be related, in part, simply to the presence of the other parent (who can help look after or entertain the children), but it is probably also related to the fact that the parent tends to be involved in different activities when the whole family is present from when he or she is alone with the children. The latter situation is more likely to consist of

housework activities or other types of household obligations.

TABLE 15: THE DEFINITION OF EVENTS ACCORDING TO THE PRESENCE OF OTHER PEOPLE

	Family (n=734)	Spouse (n=645)	Children (n=510)	Friends or friends+ family (n=441)	Work Coll- eagues (n=447)	Total (n=1340)
Leisure	60.6% (445)	68.1% (439)	31.0% (158)	79.1% (349)	26.2% (117)	41.0% (550)
Mostly leisure	6.7 (49)	4.3 (28)	6.3 (32)	5.2 (23)	3.6 (16)	4.6 (61)
Equal work and leisure	9.0 (66)	6.4 (41)	15.3 (78)	4.3 (19)	7.2 (32)	7.5 (101)
Mostly work	2.7 (20)	2.6 (17)	6.3 (32)	2.9 (13)	3.1 (14)	3.5 (47)
Work	17.3 (127)	12.2 (79)	36.7 (187)	6.3 (28)	59.1 (264)	31.5 (489)
Neither work nor leisure	3.7 (27)	6.4 (41)	4.5 (23)	2.0 (9)	0.9 (4)	6.9 (92)
	100.0 (445)	100.0 (439)	100.1 (158)	98.8 (349)	100.1 (117)	100.0 (550)

Events where only the spouse was present tended to be defined as leisure events (68.1%). At the same time,

events for which the participant was alone were fairly evenly distributed between leisure and work events (41.0% as against 36.5% respectively), with about 20% defined according to one of the residual categories.

The objective situational factors, then, do appear to affect the definition of the situation. However, none of these factors alone can predict leisure with any accuracy. Leisure situations can occur at any time, on any day, in any location, and in any interactional setting. It might be thought that these situational factors, in combination with knowledge of the activity type, might lead to a more accurate operational definition of leisure. Accordingly, discriminant analysis was applied to these data. The time of day, location and "with whom" variables were recoded to become ordinal variables with the lowest value corresponding to the least likelihood of an event being defined as leisure, and the highest value corresponding to the greatest likelihood of a leisure definition. The activity variable was dichotomized into 1. work and other obligatory activities, and 2. free time activities. The discriminant analysis procedure was used to discriminate between events defined as leisure and those defined in some other way (i.e. non-leisure). Nevertheless, even using this somewhat questionable procedure, the results were not very encouraging. The unbiased classification procedure with all

independent variables included resulted in a correct classification figure of only 73.25%. This was only slightly higher than the accuracy of prediction using type of activity alone. Clearly there are other factors as well which account for some of the variance in the definition of the diary events.

(c) Individual Differences in the Definition of Diary Events

Some of the lack of consistency with which particular activities are defined can be explained by the fact that different categories of people define the activities in different ways. There are differences, for example, between the way men tend to define certain activities and the way women tend to define the same activities. Other individual factors which have some effect on definitions include employment status for women (and probably for men as well, although this study does not include any data to examine this question), age, and the presence of children in the family.

In Table 16 the percentage of times particular activities were defined as leisure by male participants is compared with the percentage of leisure definitions of the same activities by female participants. A number of the comparisons are not very reliable because of low sample sizes (i.e. the low total number of events for a particular

activity). However, the data do indicate substantial differences between males and females with regard to the leisure definitions of certain activities. Cooking and home chores, for example, are much more frequently defined as leisure by males than by females, although males recorded significantly fewer of these events than females. The same trend can be seen for child care activities, with males participating less frequently, but defining these activities as leisure more often than females. Conversely, females tended to define gardening and animal care more often as leisure, but they did less of these activities than males.

These results may indicate a relationship between frequency of participation and leisure perceptions for some activities. On the other hand, these findings may relate to the association of sex roles with certain activities. In other words, if a male participates in what is traditionally seen as a "female activity", such as cooking or child care, he may feel less obligation, and may do it more out of choice compared to female participants. Consequently it may be experienced more often as a leisure event by males than by females. In the same way, females may feel less obligation with regard to gardening activities. Thus, they may participate more often out of choice and therefore tend to define the situation more often as leisure than do males.

TABLE 16: PERCENTAGE OF LEISURE DEFINITIONS FOR EACH
ACTIVITY BY SEX

Activity code	Males (N=60)		Females (N=60)	
	Percentage	n	Percentage	n
1.job	3.2	14	4.4	113
3.at work,other	68.4	79	57.1	28
4.travel to job	40.1	161	44.3	61
5.cooking	51.5	66	11.9	260
6.Home chores	19.6	46	3.4	261
7.laundry	0.0	3	4.2	96
9.garden,animal care	47.4	51	70.6	17
10.shopping,errands	44.0	25	29.4	51
11.other house	39.1	69	23.1	26
12.child care	50.0	50	27.1	118
13.other child	70.0	30	53.6	56
14.personal care	43.0	149	39.2	176
15.eating	78.6	285	66.9	236
17.personal travel	44.7	38	29.6	71
18.leisure travel	82.5	97	78.3	92
19.study	56.3	16	46.2	13
20.religion	50.0	18	45.5	22
21.organization	75.0	12	50.0	12
22.radio	50.0	10	83.3	6
23.TV(home)	96.4	194	87.6	121
24.TV(away)	100.0	3	100.0	2
25.read paper	86.4	22	85.7	14
26.read magazine	92.3	13	100.0	40
27.read books	100.0	37	100.0	40
29.social(home)	84.6	13	89.7	29
30.social(away)	92.1	38	100.0	38
31.conversation	93.3	30	80.8	52
32.active sports	86.4	22	72.2	18
33.outdoors	96.2	26	87.0	23
35.culture events	100.0	1	100.0	2
36.resting	96.6	50	81.6	38
37.other leisure	100.0	23	76.4	55

TABLE 17: PERCENTAGE OF LEISURE DEFINITIONS FOR EACH
ACTIVITY BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS FOR WOMEN

Activity code	Full-time employment (N=21)		Part-time employment (N=12)		Non- employed (N=27)	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
1.job	3.3	90	8.7	23	----	---
3.at work,other	56.0	25	66.7	3	----	---
4.travel to job	47.7	44	35.3	17	----	---
5.cooking	17.5	63	15.1	53	8.3	144
6.Home chores	6.5	62	3.2	63	2.2	136
7.laundry	7.1	28	0.0	23	4.4	45
9.garden,animal care	88.9	9	75.0	4	25.0	4
10.shopping,errands	33.3	12	26.7	15	29.2	24
11.other house	0.0	3	22.2	9	28.6	14
12.child care	28.6	21	24.1	29	27.9	68
13.other child	84.6	13	30.0	10	48.5	33
14.personal care	45.3	25	41.2	34	31.3	67
15.eating	72.1	86	67.9	53	61.9	97
17.personal travel	29.4	17	26.7	15	30.8	39
18.leisure travel	88.6	35	75.0	8	71.4	49
19.study	100.0	2	50.0	4	28.6	7
20.religion	60.0	5	0.0	4	53.8	13
21.organization	100.0	1	40.0	5	50.0	6
22.radio	100.0	41	0.0	0	83.3	6
23.TV(home)	100.0	2	73.3	30	96.0	50
24.TV(away)	100.0	2	0.0	0	0.0	0
25.read paper	100.0	2	100.0	3	77.8	9
26.read magazine	0.0	0	100.0	4	100.0	2
27.read books	100.0	2	100.0	19	100.0	19
29.social(home)	100.0	5	100.0	4	85.0	20
30.social(away)	100.0	14	100.0	5	100.0	19
31.conversation	87.5	16	60.0	10	84.6	26
32.active sports	80.0	5	66.7	3	70.0	10
33.outdoors	100.0	5	71.4	7	70.9	11
35.culture events	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	2
36.resting	81.8	22	77.8	9	85.7	7
37.other leisure	80.0	10	78.6	14	74.2	31

TABLE 18: PERCENTAGE OF LEISURE DEFINITIONS FOR EACH
ACTIVITY BY FAMILY TYPE

Activity code	Families without children (N=14)		Families with children (N=46)	
	Percentage	n	Percentage	n
1.job	1.6	127	4.5	267
3.at work,other	54.3	35	70.8	72
4.travel to job	38.1	63	40.9	159
5.cooking	28.8	66	17.7	260
6.Home chores	7.7	78	5.2	229
7.laundry	11.8	17	2.4	82
9.garden,animal care	52.3	44	53.3	30
10.shopping,errands	35.0	20	33.9	56
11.other house	45.0	20	32.0	75
12.child care	----	---	33.9	168
13.other child	----	---	59.3	86
14.personal care	48.4	95	37.8	230
15.eating	76.5	132	72.2	389
17.personal travel	25.9	27	37.8	82
18.leisure travel	86.5	37	78.9	152
19.study	66.7	9	45.0	20
20.religion	62.5	8	43.8	32
21.organization	60.0	5	63.2	19
22.radio	66.7	3	61.5	13
23.TV(home)	97.5	79	91.5	236
24.TV(away)	100.0	2	100.0	3
25.read paper	60.0	5	90.3	31
26.read magazine	100.0	4	93.3	15
27.read books	100.0	10	100.0	67
29.social(home)	88.9	9	87.9	33
30.social(away)	100.0	9	95.5	67
31.conversation	92.0	25	82.5	57
32.active sports	83.3	6	79.4	34
33.outdoors	100.0	10	89.7	39
35.culture events	0.0	0	100.0	3
36.resting	100.0	17	87.3	71
37.other leisure	66.7	12	86.4	66

TABLE 19: PERCENTAGE OF LEISURE DEFINITIONS FOR EACH
ACTIVITY BY AGE

Activity code	35 years and under (N=45)		36-45 years (N=48)		46 years or more (N=27)	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
1.job	3.2	155	4.3	138	3.0	101
3.at work,other	57.8	45	68.4	38	75.0	24
4.travel to job	39.2	79	37.5	80	44.4	63
5.cooking	17.1	140	26.0	123	14.3	63
6.Home chores	8.6	128	5.5	110	1.4	69
7.laundry	5.1	39	4.7	43	0.0	17
9.garden,animal care	46.9	32	58.3	24	55.6	18
10.shopping,errands	32.3	31	34.6	26	36.8	19
11.other house	36.0	25	32.6	43	37.0	27
12.child care	35.2	108	31.0	58	50.0	2
13.other child	63.6	55	53.3	30	0.0	1
14.personal care	39.0	136	41.7	132	43.9	57
15.eating	67.4	187	76.2	206	77.3	128
17.personal travel	35.7	42	31.1	45	40.9	22
18.leisure travel	77.2	79	83.7	86	79.2	24
19.study	40.0	5	47.1	17	71.4	7
20.religion	63.6	11	38.5	13	43.8	16
21.organization	55.6	9	100.0	8	28.6	7
22.radio	66.7	6	25.0	4	83.3	6
23.TV(home)	8.20	127	96.3	107	96.3	81
24.TV(away)	100.0	3	100.0	2	0.0	0
25.read paper	100.0	7	85.0	20	77.8	9
26.read magazine	100.0	7	100.0	6	83.3	6
27.read books	100.0	19	100.0	39	100.0	19
29.social(home)	84.2	19	100.0	14	77.8	9
30.social(away)	95.1	41	97.1	34	100.0	1
31.conversation	84.8	33	85.7	28	85.7	21
32.active sports	64.7	17	95.2	21	50.0	2
33.outdoors	88.9	18	95.2	21	90.0	10
35.culture events	100.0	2	100.0	1	0.0	0
36.resting	84.2	38	91.4	35	100.0	15
37.other leisure	85.7	28	96.4	28	63.6	22

With regard to free time activities, the males, in general, tended to define these events somewhat more often as leisure than did females. This is true, for example, for television watching, sports and exercise, outdoor activities and "other leisure". The "other leisure" category, in fact, included hobbies such as sewing and knitting, and it was these activities that tended to be defined as non-leisure by females. On the other hand, females tended to define social events (codes 29 and 30) as leisure more often than did males.

Looking at Table 16 as a whole, it can be seen that there are some substantial sex differences in leisure definitions. But there are also considerably more activities with higher leisure ratings among the men than among the women. This indicates, not only that activity definitions of leisure are inaccurate with regard to leisure meanings, but also that they appear to incorporate a systematic sex bias. That is, they appear to over-estimate the leisure experienced by females and to under-estimate, by comparison, the leisure experienced by males.

In Table 17 the same data are examined, but for women only, comparing full-time employed women with those employed part-time only and with housewives. A somewhat similar trend can be observed here with women employed full-time tending to define cooking, housework and child

care activities more often as leisure than did part-time employed women or housewives. It may be that the housewives, especially, not only did more of these activities, but that they also tended to see these activities more often as their "job" or their duty. Housework and child care do not appear to be seen so negatively by employed women, perhaps because they do these activities less frequently, and because such activities do at least represent a change or a contrast relative to job-related activities. Full-time employed women also defined meal times as leisure more often than the other two groups, while housewives had the lowest percentage of leisure definitions with regard to meal times.

The overall differences among these three groups of females are not as great as between males and females. However, again, some bias is indicated with regard to an activity definition of leisure. In this instance, the bias works in favour of full-time employed women (i.e. over-estimating the leisure experienced by this group as compared to the other groups) and against housewives, at least with regard to certain types of activity.

Tables 18 (p.138) and 19 (p.139) show the percentage of leisure definitions for each activity according to family type and age group. Some differences can be detected between groups with regard to the factors. Employed

people from families with children, for example, tend to perceive more leisure events at their job than people without children at home. This is true for both work on the job itself and for work breaks. This difference does not appear to be directly related to age. Differences in definitions of job activities are small between the three age groups, with the middle age group experiencing slightly more leisure. However, it is the oldest age group which reports the most leisure with regard to work breaks.

Some differences with regard to age and family type are also evident for housework activities. Home chores were more often defined as leisure by younger people and by people without children. In addition, people without children tended to define cooking and laundry more often as leisure; presumably, in part, because of the difference in the total amount of cooking and laundry that needs to be done.

Overall, the data displayed in Tables 16 through 19 show that there are some differences between demographically defined groups of individuals with regard to leisure definitions. The most substantial differences appear to be between males and females, and these differences indicate a systematic sex bias when activity definitions of leisure are used for research purposes.

(d) Specific Situational Differences in the Definition of Diary Events

Although there are clearly differences among groups of individuals with regard to the definition of particular activities, the same individual may also not always define the same activity in the same way. That is, there may be specific situational differences which affect the definition of the event as well.

In order to look at this question of specific situational differences, a number of the more commonly recorded diary activities were selected. These included two activities that were often defined as "work" by participants (i.e. code 1, job activities, and code 5, home chores), one activity that was usually defined as "leisure" (i.e. code 23, watching television), and two activities that were more evenly distributed (i.e. code 5, cooking, and code 12, child care).

For each of these activities, only those individuals who participated in the activity in two or more recorded events were selected. These individuals were then divided into two groups: 1. those people who defined the activity in the same way for both or all of their recorded events, and 2. those who defined the activity differently on at least two separate occasions.

TABLE 20: THE INCIDENCE OF DIFFERENT DEFINITIONS OF THE SAME ACTIVITY BY THE SAME INDIVIDUAL

Activity code	Individuals using consistent activity definitions		Individuals using different activity definitions		Number of individuals with two or more activity events (N)
1.Job activities	77.9%	(67)	22.1	(19)	86
6.Home chores	62.5%	(40)	37.5	(24)	64
23.T.V. (home)	88.0%	(73)	12.0	(10)	83
5.Cooking	30.9%	(21)	69.1	(47)	68
12.Child care	14.7%	(5)	85.3	(29)	34

The results of this analysis show that television watching, home chores and job activities are more consistently defined by individuals than the cooking and child care activities (Table 20). However, even among the former group of activities, there remains a significant proportion of individuals (22.7%) who did not consistently use the same definition for these activities. In addition, cooking activities were defined differently on different occasions by 69% of individuals, and child care was defined differently by 85% of individuals: an indication that the

definition of these activities is very highly dependent upon specific situational factors.

It should also be remembered that these data refer to activities recorded over only two days. If diaries were kept for longer, the chances are high that more individuals would be seen to use different definitional labels for the same activity on different occasions.

Clearly, then, there are specific situational differences in an individual's definition of events, as well as differences between individuals in terms of the way they tend to define particular activities. Evidence for these individual and situational differences serves to emphasize the problems associated with defining leisure according to type of activity.

The data analyzed in this chapter show not only that many day-to-day activities are defined inconsistently by the respondents as a whole, but also that both individual and situational factors affect the meaning of a particular activity to the participant. Given this definitional inconsistency, the development of a meaningful definition of leisure based on activity type appears to be highly problematic. Even combining activity type with certain objective situational factors does not lead to a very accurate prediction of individual leisure definitions.

Moreover, any analysis which takes into account only the type of activity and the objective situational conditions, ignores the subjective state of the individual. It is the individual's perceptions of a situation which cause him or her to define the situation in a particular way. Examination of which perceptual dimensions are significant in this definitional process, therefore, constitutes an important step towards understanding the meaning of leisure in people's lives. This type of understanding of meaning cannot be accomplished through the analysis of activities alone. The analysis of perceptions of leisure situations, on the other hand, can lead to both conceptual and operational definitions of leisure which are more meaningful, which allow for individual and situational differences, and which, therefore, overcome many of the problems associated with the activity type of definition of leisure.

CHAPTER 6. THE MEANING OF LEISURE:

DEFINING LEISURE SITUATIONS

If leisure is considered to have symbolic value with respect of people's daily life experiences, then understanding the meaning of leisure refers to understanding people's perceptions of the experience of leisure. In addition, the consideration of leisure as an experience means that it is associated with particular situations: that is, in the process of the definition of the situation a decision is made by the individual as to whether the symbol of leisure is one that he or she attaches to the particular situation or not.

Evidence was presented in Chapter 5 which indicates that the term leisure is meaningful within the context of people's daily life experiences, at least with regard to the particular population under consideration in this study. There is also evidence that certain activities tend to be defined more often as leisure than other activities, although there is considerable inconsistency with respect to the definition of certain activities. However, examination of the question of meaning does not refer to the association between activities per se and leisure designations, but rather to the subjective factors which cause a particular activity in a particular situational context to be defined

as leisure or as non-leisure. In other words, the question of meaning can be seen as a question of examining the subjective or perceptual dimensions present within situations, and in determining which dimensions are most important in the definition of the situation as a leisure situation.

In this study there are two types of data which relate to the meaning of leisure. First, there are the responses to the interview question which simply asked why certain activities or events, in general, were seen by the respondent as leisure, and what distinguished leisure events from other types of events. That is, these data provide individual definitions of leisure. Second, there are the data collected on the six selected diary events for each respondent. These include information on a range of perceptual dimensions for each event, as well as the individual's definition of each event. Both types of data are examined in this chapter.

(a) Types of Individual Definitions of Leisure

The great majority of respondents in this study used some kind of attitudinal definition of leisure when asked what distinguished leisure events from other events for them. There were eleven instances (11 males and no females out of a total sample size of 120) where a non-work time

residual type of definition was used. However, even among these 11 males who defined leisure in terms of time away from their labour market activities, most of them (8 out of the 11) also incorporated attitudinal aspects into their definitions as well. For example, a bomb disposal officer with the armed forces incorporated notions of relaxation and freedom of choice in his definition of leisure as,

. . . when you're not at work. When you're away from work. You can relax and there's nothing really that you have to do.

Other examples of combined residual-time and attitudinal definitions include those of a 46 year old ice rink engineer, who said,

Anything I do at home is leisure . . . But what I consider leisure may not be someone else's idea . . . If it's relaxed, like watching television, even if you're not really watching. At home I can do what I want. There are things around the house I enjoy doing;

and a 36 year old counsellor with Canada Manpower who said that leisure is,

. . . when I'm away from work. I'm not thinking about work or anything else I have to do. . . It can be physical work like going jogging, but it's away from the routine. . . If it's not to anyone else's schedule, then you're in control of it yourself.

Looking at these responses it would seem that the

use of non-work time definitions of leisure should not be interpreted as indicating that subjective or attitudinal factors are irrelevant to the meaning of leisure. Rather, the explanation is that labour market activity, for these respondents, is closely associated with particular types of feelings or experiences. That is, that situations perceived as non-relaxing, as not very enjoyable, or as being scheduled by someone else, are mostly job-related situations, while the reverse is true for situations unrelated to labour market activities. It therefore becomes unnecessary for the individual, in a pragmatic sense, to distinguish between type of activity and feelings associated with leisure and non-leisure. Leisure is more easily defined as residual time or as non-work time activities.

This explanation for the use of residual time definitions of leisure may also be true for the three people who were the only respondents in this study not to include attitudinal factors in their definitions of leisure. One such definition was that of a 31 year old salesman, who said that leisure is,

. . . not doing anything associated with my job.
I could be working hard, but it's still leisure.
Work around the house, like snow shovelling, is
leisure . . . going out to dinner with my wife .
. . . going out to a show, or to a friend's house.

It may well be that for these people the feelings associated

with "leisure" are consistently absent in their labour market activities, while they are consistently present in their non-labour market activities.

This interpretation also explains why there were no females who used a non-employment time definition of leisure. Even for women employed full-time in the labour market, family and household responsibilities associated with the female sex role almost invariably mean that there is a considerable amount of "work" which they have to do outside of their labour market activities.

There were a number of respondents who cited particular activities in their definitions of leisure. However, except for the case cited above of the 31 year old salesman, all these activity type of definitions also incorporated attitudinal factors, mostly as a means of explaining why the particular activities referred to were perceived as leisure.

The individual definitions of leisure found in this study are very different from those that have been reported in other studies. In particular, they differ substantially from Neulinger's (1981) findings that only a small minority of subjects saw leisure as a "state of mind", while most subjects saw leisure either as discretionary time or as discretionary activities.

The lack of correspondence between the two sets of

results may relate to Neulinger's categorization of definitions which was concerned with where individuals placed the most emphasis in their definitions. It is possible, then, that among his subjects "discretionary time" definitions could have incorporated some attitudinal aspects as well. A more powerful explanation, though, relates to the research setting. The interview setting in this present study was one which encouraged long, detailed responses rather than a quick single response to questions. Interviewers were instructed to use probing questions and to explore definitions of leisure, rather than simply accepting the first response. Moreover, respondents were asked to define leisure immediately after they had gone through their diaries and designated each event as leisure or as work or as some other category of event. They had, therefore, already given some thought to the practical problem of categorizing leisure and non-leisure events. It was also clear, in most cases, from the earlier categorization process, that a simple residual time or activity-type definition was not appropriate.

The research process in this present study, therefore, encouraged respondents to define leisure in terms of subjective factors. It should be stressed, though, that these definitions were generally provided readily. It was a process of eliciting the relevant and meaningful dimensions

of leisure rather than forcing respondents to refer to subjective factors that might have had little meaning to them. In many ways, in fact, the separation of leisure definitions into discretionary time, activity and attitudinal definitions is an artificial separation. If leisure is seen as a type of experience, then it will be associated with particular subjective feelings, but this does not negate the possibility of it also being associated with particular time periods or particular activities as well for some individuals.

(b) Attitudinal Factors Associated with Leisure Definitions

The three most common types of attitudinal factors that were incorporated into respondents' definitions of leisure were enjoyment, relaxation and freedom of choice. Enjoyment or pleasure was mentioned by 58% of all respondents, including 52% of the males and 63% of the females. Relaxation was mentioned by 25% of the males and 45% of the females, while some notion of free choice, being in control or being self directed, was included in the definitions of 30% of the males and 13% of the females (including both employed and non-employed females).

In some cases, leisure was defined according to just one of these dimensions, but many respondents referred to two or more factors in explaining what leisure meant to

them. Typical definitions included the following:

[Leisure is] something I enjoy doing. It's not a chore for me to do it. I love a challenge at work, but not at home. At home I want to rest. Leisure is when you're resting your body, when you can watch television and lose all your day's troubles. (38 year old male electrician).

[Leisure is when I'm] not involved in something that I just have to do. I'm in control of it rather than it controlling me, so that I can choose the times and how long to do it. When I'm home with the family that's leisure time - it's an enjoyment thing. That's probably the main thing (35 year old male auditor).

[Leisure is] anything I enjoy . . . and if it's relaxing and not hectic or rushed (30 year old female secretary).

[It's leisure] if it's enjoyable. Whether or not you have to do it. If it's not rushed. Being by myself - when the children are not there - is leisure (33 year old housewife).

Other factors incorporated occasionally into people's definitions of leisure included satisfaction and a lack of physical and mental effort. In a couple of cases, the concept of satisfaction was linked to a sense of accomplishment or achievement, but in general there was a lack of support for this notion of "personal growth and development" through leisure. The lack of physical and mental effort in leisure was sometimes linked to the idea of leisure as relaxation. However, although there was

considerable support for linking leisure and relaxation, there were a number of respondents who specifically said that relaxation was not necessarily the same thing as physical inactivity or rest.

Some of the definitions of leisure provided by respondents can be seen as "residual" in that the significant or valued aspects of leisure events were those aspects that were felt to be lacking in other daily activities, and especially in activities perceived as "work". This was sometimes evident in relation to people's jobs. A man who worked as a labourer for the city of Halifax, for example, said that leisure is, "when you don't have to do certain things. When there's nobody there telling me to do certain things"; while the male regional manager for a large international corporation said that leisure was, "when there's no pressure. When I have the time to appreciate things".

For women, the residual aspects of leisure were more often evident in relation to children and family responsibilities. For example, one housewife said, "when I'm sitting down and the kids are quiet, that's leisure to me", and a female bank teller said that leisure is,

. . . rest, relaxation. When it's peaceful.
When the kids are in bed and I'm sitting down and
watching television . . . or I can go out. It
can be something that involves a lot of energy. .

. Leisure is getting away from responsibilities, like taking a bath. You can relax and not worry about anybody or anything. Some housework can be leisure if I can do it without anybody in the way.

Another factor mentioned by three of the housewives, which can also be considered residual in this way, given the isolation of the housewife role, is interaction with others. One of these housewives, for example, defined leisure as "being with other people". She added: "I enjoy that. For me, leisure is . . . well I suppose it's the things that I enjoy."

Looking at how the respondents defined "work", and comparing this with their leisure definitions, also supports the notion of some residual aspect to the meaning of leisure, or at least some interdependency between work experiences and leisure experiences. It was clear that many people perceived leisure and work as two ends of a continuum, and sometimes as a strict dichotomy. That is, if they saw leisure essentially as enjoyment, work became those activities that they did not like to do; and if work was defined as stress and time pressure, leisure was seen as relaxing situations where there was no stress. There was a high degree of correspondence, therefore, between definitions of leisure and definitions of work.

Overall, individual definitions of leisure emphasized three major attitudinal factors; namely

enjoyment, relaxation and freedom of choice. For some people, the experience of leisure was closely associated with certain time periods or with certain activities, but in many cases this type of relationship was not clear.

The data do indicate some sex differences in the emphasis placed on particular attitudinal factors, as well as some occupational differences. These differences seem to be related to differences with respect to daily life activities, especially labour market activities, and family and household responsibilities. The attitudinal factors emphasized appear, in many cases, to be the factors which are perceived to be lacking in the situations defined by the individual as "work" situations. Accordingly, this indicates a residual aspect which may be significant in terms of understanding the process of the definition of leisure situations. This should not be confused with a residual time definition of leisure, but rather to a "residual attitudinal" conceptualization. Furthermore, this proposed residual aspect of leisure is not simply an additional leisure dimension akin to the enjoyment or freedom of choice dimensions. Rather it appears to be a separate factor which helps to determine, for the individual, which particular attitudinal dimensions are the most salient for him or her in the process of defining a particular situation as leisure or as non-leisure. In some

ways this is similar to the compensation thesis, which has been previously proposed with respect to the work-leisure relationship (e.g. Wilensky, 1962; Bacon, 1975; Parker, 1975 and 1976). However, the type of compensation suggested here refers strictly to attitudes and subjective factors rather than to types of activity.

(c) The Relationship Between Perceptual Factors and
Definitions for Selected Diary Events

In each interview, six diary events were randomly selected to be the focus of questions relating to a range of perceptual dimensions thought to be associated with the leisure experience. However, data obtained do not include information on all six activities for all 120 respondents. In some cases, one or two of the six diary events were dropped because the interviews ran on so long. In other cases, the data on a particular event were considered insufficient or inadequate for inclusion in the analysis. In addition, one couple refused long interviews, and this section of the interview was cut out for both husband and wife. As a result, the total number of selected events analyzed was 679, representing an average of 5.8 events per respondent.

For each respondent, at least one "leisure" event and one "work" event was included in this total, and in all

except two cases this arose naturally out of the original random selection procedure involving all diary events. In the two exceptional cases, an additional "work" event had to be selected.

TABLE 21: THE DISTRIBUTION OF DEFINITIONS OF SELECTED DIARY EVENTS BY SEX

Definition of events	Males (N=59,n=336)		Females (N=59,n=343)		Total (N=118,n=679)	
Leisure	56.8%	(191)	46.4%	(159)	51.5%	(350)
Mostly leisure	4.8	(16)	5.8	(20)	5.3	(36)
Equal work and leisure	6.0	(20)	7.3	(25)	6.6	(45)
Mostly work	4.2	(14)	4.7	(16)	4.4	930)
Work	25.9	(87)	34.7	(119)	30.3	(206)
Neither work nor leisure	2.4	(8)	1.2	(4)	1.8	(12)
	100.1	(336)	100.1	(343)	99.9	(679)

Of the 679 selected events, the breakdown between leisure, work and other definitional categories was similar to the breakdown for the total number of 4117 diary events (Table 21). There were somewhat more leisure events than non-leisure events (350 and 329 respectively), and slightly

more recorded events for females than for males (343 as compared to 336).

TABLE 22: CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS BETWEEN PERCEPTUAL DIMENSIONS AND THE DEFINITION OF SELECTED DIARY EVENTS

Perceptual Dimension:	Kendall's Tau		Total Sample (N=118)
	Males (N=59)	Females (N=59)	
Enjoyment	.65 (n=328)	.70 (n=339)	.68 (n=667)
Relaxation	.65 (n=328)	.60 (n=339)	.66 (n=667)
Freedom of choice	.66 (n=328)	.67 (n=339)	.67 (n=667)
Motivation	.64 (n=328)	.71 (n=339)	.68 (n=667)
Self Evaluation	.54 (n=323)	.49 (n=331)	.53 (n=654)
Other Evaluation	.58 (n=320)	.38 (n=326)	.53 (n=646)
Physical Effort	.37 (n=328)	.53 (n=338)	.52 (n=666)
Mental Effort	.46 (n=328)	.25 (n=338)	.38 (n=666)
Satisfaction	.20 (n=323)	.36 (n=334)	.32 (n=657)
Interaction with Adults(1)	.16 (n=205)	.35 (n=165)	.24 (n=370)
Interaction with Adults(2)	.09 (n=76)	.06 (n=124)	.03 (n=200)
Interaction with Children(1)	.35 (n=75)	.44 (n=80)	.44 (n=155)
Interaction with Children(2)	-.20 (n=49)	.15 (n=71)	-.44 (n=120)

The relationship between the definition of situations represented by each diary event and the responses to each perceptual dimension question was initially examined using correlational analysis (see Table 22). This was possible because the perceptual variables had been coded as ordinal measures, as was the definition variable.²⁹

29. For this analysis, the 12 situations defined as neither work nor leisure were excluded.

The results show enjoyment, relaxation and freedom of choice to have high positive correlations with the definition of the situation. That is, the more perceived enjoyment, relaxation and freedom in a situation the more likely it was to be defined as leisure rather than as work. This is shown to be true for both sexes, although the relationship between enjoyment and leisure is somewhat stronger for females than for males. These results correspond to the respondents' definitions of leisure as discussed earlier.

The motivation factor also correlates highly with the definition of the situation, meaning that if the activity was seen to be intrinsically rather than extrinsically motivated it was more likely to be called leisure. The concept of motivation was operationalized in terms of the reason for doing the activity, i.e. whether it was done for the sake of the activity itself or for some other purpose. Intrinsic motivation appears to be closely associated with leisure definitions although it is a concept that was never raised spontaneously by respondents in discussing leisure or non-leisure situations. It may be a meaningful concept in terms of defining situations, therefore, although it is not one that is readily or easily verbalized.

Another type of perceptual dimension that was rarely

mentioned spontaneously was that of evaluation or lack of evaluation. The question that was used to tap this concept was "did it matter how well you did this?" And, "if so, was it important to you (i.e. self evaluation), or to someone else (i.e. other evaluation), or both?" Table 22 shows that both evaluation dimensions are related to the definition of the situation. In this instance, it is the lack of evaluation that is associated with leisure definitions, and high levels of evaluation that are associated with "work". Evaluation, especially evaluation by others, shows a stronger relationship to the definition of the situation for males than for females.

The lack of physical effort and the lack of mental effort also show a positive relationship with leisure definitions, although the correlation coefficients show these relationships be weaker than for some of the other perceptual dimensions. Physical effort is associated more strongly with situational definitions for females, while the reverse is true for mental effort.

The correlation coefficients between leisure definitions and satisfaction are fairly low, although the relationship is stronger for females ($r=.36$) than for males ($r=.20$). In addition, the "personal development" factor which had been thought to be associated with satisfaction in leisure, was excluded from the analysis because there were

so few cases for which this dimension appeared to have any meaning. The personal development dimension had been operationalized by asking respondents who said that a situation was satisfying, why it was satisfying, or what it was about the situation that made it satisfying. Since there were only two or three people who responded to this question with any notion of challenge, achievement, accomplishment or creativity, it was decided not to include this dimension in the analysis of leisure situations. On the whole, the concept of satisfaction seemed to be either associated with enjoyment and with "leisure" (i.e. the activity was seen as satisfying because it was enjoyable), or alternatively it was associated with getting something done that had to be done. In this latter instance, then, it was more likely to be applied to "work" situations, for example, to employment and housework activities. Rarely was satisfaction associated with "personal development".

The spontaneity dimension (spontaneous versus planned or routine activities) was also excluded from most of the analysis of leisure and non-leisure situations. The correlation coefficient for this factor was only .01, and this low relationship was largely due to the fact that there were so few situations perceived to be spontaneous.

The interaction factor had to be split into four separate dimensions. This was because, first, interaction

with adults was obviously very different from interaction with children, and second, because the interaction question for any particular situation was very different depending on whether other people were present or not in the situation. For an activity which involved at least one other person, the interaction dimension was a question of whether or not the presence of that other person (or people) made the situation more enjoyable, more positive or more "leisure-like". On the other hand, if the activity was done alone, the question became whether the respondent would have preferred someone else to be there or not: that is, whether the fact of being alone affected the definition of the situation in any way.

Looking at the interaction with adults dimensions in Table 22, the first dimension (referring to activities with other people), shows that the presence of others generally had a positive effect in terms of the situation being more likely to be defined as leisure. This relationship, though, was not very strong ($r=.24$). In terms of those situations where the respondent was alone (interaction with adults (2)), the fact of being alone seemed to have no overall effect on the definitions of the situation ($r=.03$).

The interaction with children dimensions are somewhat different. When children were present, this appeared to increase the likelihood of the situation being

defined as leisure, especially for females ($r=.44$ for females, $r=.35$ for males). When children were absent, however, this tended to be seen somewhat positively by females ($r=.15$) and somewhat negatively by males ($r=-.20$). Relationships here are low, but could be interpreted as meaning that parents, especially mothers, choose to do activities that fit in with their children when they know the children are going to be there, and, as far as possible, to do those activities in which they feel the children would interfere when they are alone.

The interaction dimensions differ from the other leisure dimensions in that they were only relevant to certain situations. In addition, the interaction with children dimensions were only relevant to parents who had children at home, and even then, there were many situations, (e.g. work at the office) where the question of the presence or absence of children was not meaningful. Because of this, and because the interaction relationships did not appear to be very strong in any case, these dimensions were not used in further analysis of the definition of the situation.

(d) The Discriminating Power of each Perceptual Dimension

The remaining nine perceptual dimensions that were shown to be associated with leisure definitions were further

analyzed in terms of how well they could be seen to discriminate between leisure and non-leisure situations. This was done by comparing the distribution of each dimension in leisure situations and in non-leisure situations. For example, for the pleasure dimension, the percentage of all leisure situations that were defined as enjoyable was computed, and then the percentage of all non-leisure situations (including work situations, mixed work and leisure and neither work nor leisure situations) that were defined as enjoyable was also computed. By subtracting one percentage from the other, the difference between the two types of situations, or the "discriminating power" (i.e. "d") of the dimension can be calculated. This is essentially a descriptive technique which allows for greater insight into the relationship between perceptual dimensions and leisure situations than simple correlational analysis.

Table 23 (pp.167-168) shows the discriminating power (d) calculated as described above, for each of the nine perceptual dimensions. It can be seen that the enjoyment and relaxation dimensions are the best discriminators. Leisure situations are characterized by high levels of enjoyment and relaxation, while non-leisure situations are low on both factors.

TABLE 23: THE DISCRIMINATING POWER OF EACH PERCEPTUAL DIMENSION WITH REGARD TO LEISURE AND NON-LEISURE SITUATIONS FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE (N=118)

Perceptual Dimension:	Leisure Situations	Non-Leisure Situations
Enjoyment (Enjoy): percentage of situations perceived as enjoyable.	86.6%	15.2% $d^1 = 71.4$ (n = 679)
Relaxation (Relax): percentage of situations perceived as relaxing.	81.4%	10.9% $d = 70.5$ (n = 679)
Freedom of Choice (Choice): percentage of situations perceived as freely chosen.	57.4%	3.6% $d = 53.8$ (n = 679)
Motivation (Motiv): percentage of situations perceived as intrinsically motivated.	45.4%	2.1% $d = 43.3$ (n = 679)
Self evaluation (S.eval): percentage of situations perceived as no self evaluation.	76.4%	23.8% $d = 53.6$ (n = 666)

TABLE 23: (CONTINUED)

Perceptual Dimension:	Leisure Situations	Non-Leisure Situations
Other evaluation (O.eval): percentage of situations perceived as no evaluation from others.	85.9%	42.6%
	d = 43.3 (n = 658)	
Physical effort (Phys.eff.): percentage of situations perceived as lacking any physical effort.	82.0%	33.8%
	d = 48.2 (n = 678)	
Mental effort (Ment.eff.): percentage of situations perceived as lacking any mental effort.	80.6%	50.3%
	d = 30.3 (n = 678)	
Satisfaction (Satis): percentage of situations perceived as satisfying.	64.6%	33.0%
	d = 31.6 (n = 689)	

1. d refers to the discriminating power of each perceptual dimension.

Freedom of choice and intrinsic motivation are also shown to discriminate fairly well. However, for these two factors the pattern of discrimination is different. Only approximately half of all leisure situations are perceived as freely chosen or as intrinsically motivated, while almost no non-leisure situations are perceived in this way.

Self evaluation discriminates somewhat better than evaluation by others, although there are more situations (both leisure and non-leisure situations) which are seen to lack evaluation from others compared to those lacking self evaluation. In addition, the physical effort factor can be seen to discriminate better between leisure and non-leisure than the mental effort factor. This is not so much because there is a difference in the lack of the two types of effort in leisure situations, but because non-leisure situations are characterized by more perceived physical effort than perceived mental effort.

The satisfaction dimension does not discriminate as well between leisure and non-leisure as most of the other perceptual dimensions. Only about two thirds of all leisure situations were perceived to be satisfying, while one third of all non-leisure situations were also perceived to be satisfying.

TABLE 24: THE DISCRIMINATING POWER OF EACH PERCEPTUAL
DIMENSION BY SEX

Perceptual Dimension:	Males (N=59)	Females (N=59)
Enjoy:	84.8 - 15.2% d = 69.6 (n=336)	88.7 - 15.2% d = 73.5 (n=343)
Relax:	80.1 - 12.4% d = 67.7 (n=336)	83.0 - 9.8% d = 73.2 (n=343)
Choice:	57.6 - 4.1% d = 53.5 (n=336)	57.2 - 3.3% d = 53.9 (n=343)
Motiv:	46.6 - 2.1% d = 44.5 (n=336)	44.0 - 2.2% d = 41.8 (n=343)
S.eval:	80.9 - 33.6% d = 47.3 (n=331)	71.0 - 16.1% d = 54.9 (n=335)
O.eval:	88.8 - 38.3% d = 50.5 (n=328)	82.5 - 46.0% d = 36.5 (n=330)
Phys.eff:	84.8 - 47.6% d = 37.2 (n=336)	78.6 - 23.0% d = 55.6 (n=342)
Ment.eff:	80.1 - 40.7% d = 39.4 (n=336)	81.1 - 57.9% d = 23.2 (n=342)
Satis:	58.2 - 33.1% d = 25.1 (n=331)	72.4 - 33.0% d = 39.4 (n=338)

In Table 24 (p.170), the same calculations of the discriminating power of each dimension are calculated, but for males and females separately. This type of data analysis shows the enjoyment and relaxation dimensions to be somewhat more significant for females than for the males, a finding which corresponds to the individual definitions of leisure reported earlier. The freedom of choice and intrinsic motivation dimensions, on the other hand, seem to have a very similar effect on the situational definitions of both males and females.

The self evaluation factor is shown to have greater discriminating power for females than for males, while the other evaluation factor is stronger for males. The other evaluation factor is higher for males both because their leisure events are more likely to lack evaluation than are female leisure events, and because their work events are more likely to include an evaluation aspect than are female work events. Self evaluation, on the other hand, is perceived to be present more often in leisure by women than by men. In addition, though, very few female "work" events are perceived to lack self evaluation (only 16%), while a third of all male work events are perceived as lacking self evaluation. Females, therefore, appear to perceive more self evaluation in their daily activities, and especially in the activities they define as work, while men perceive more

evaluation from others in their work activities than do women.

The physical effort and mental effort dimensions also vary by sex. Physical effort is a stronger discriminator for females than for males, largely because females perceive fewer of their work activities as lacking physical effort than do males. Mental effort, on the other hand, discriminates better for males because a greater percentage of male work situations are perceived as incorporating mental effort than are female work situations.

In addition, the satisfaction factor can be seen to be stronger for females than for males. The data show that this is because females report more satisfaction in their leisure activities than do males. Satisfaction in "work" events is similar for both males and females.

Table 25 (p.174) shows the discriminating power of each perceptual factor for females employed full-time in the labour market, for those employed only part-time, and for housewives. Similarly, Table 26 (p.175) shows the same data for men broken down according to occupational group.

Although less confidence can be placed in the interpretation of these data because of the small sample sizes, some differences between groups are indicated. The perceived freedom dimension can be seen to be strongest for full-time employed women compared to the other females

groups. This is because full-time employed females, in this sample, perceived the most freedom in their leisure situations. The part-time employed women, on the other hand, had the lowest level of perceived freedom in leisure.

The discriminating power of both self evaluation and other evaluation is also shown to be highest for the females employed full-time. This is especially evident for the other evaluation factor. Full-time employed females tended to perceive less evaluation by others in their leisure and more evaluation by others in their work situations compared to the other female groups. For this dimension, they were more similar to the employed males than they were to the other female groups.

Table 25 also indicates that the physical effort dimension has the greatest effect on the definitions of housewives compared to those of the other female groups. The housewives perceived the great majority of their work situations as including at least some physical effort, and they rated higher in this respect than employed females. Finally, both housewives and part-time employed women rated higher with regard to the discriminating power of satisfaction compared to women employed full-time. This is because they reported less satisfaction in the activities they defined as work than did full-time employed females.

TABLE 25: THE DISCRIMINATING POWER OF EACH PERCEPTUAL
DIMENSION FOR FEMALES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Perceptual Dimension:	Full-Time Employed Females (N=21)	Part-Time Employed Females (N=12)	Non-Employed Females (Housewives) (N=27)
Enjoy:	90.3 - 16.9% d = 73.4 (n=121)	87.1 - 21.2% d = 65.9 (n=64)	87.9 - 12.0% d = 75.9 (n=158)
Relax:	87.1 - 15.3% d = 71.8 (n=121)	80.6 - 3.0% d = 77.6 (n=64)	80.3 - 8.7% d = 71.6 (n=158)
Choice:	62.9 - 0.0% d = 62.9 (n=121)	45.2 - 6.1% d = 39.1 (n=64)	57.6 - 4.3% d = 53.3 (n=158)
Motiv:	43.5 - 1.7% d = 41.8 (n=121)	35.5 - 6.1% d = 29.4 (n=64)	48.5 - 1.1% d = 47.4 (n=158)
S.eval:	70.0 - 15.8% d = 61.2 (n=118)	76.7 - 33.3% d = 43.4 (n=63)	62.5 - 10.0% d = 52.5 (n=154)
O.eval:	83.6 - 29.8% d = 53.8 (n=118)	76.7 - 57.6% d = 19.1 (n=63)	84.1 - 52.3% d = 31.8 (n=149)
Phys.eff:	80.6 - 37.3% d = 43.3 (n=121)	77.4 - 27.3% d = 50.1 (n=64)	77.3 - 12.1% d = 65.2 (n=157)
Ment.eff:	79.0 - 49.2% d = 29.8 (n=121)	77.4 - 57.6% d = 19.8 (n=64)	84.8 - 63.7% d = 21.1 (n=157)
Satis:	72.6 - 40.7% d = 31.9 (n=121)	72.4 - 25.8% d = 46.6 (n=60)	72.3 - 30.4% d = 41.9 (n=157)

TABLE 26: THE DISCRIMINATING POWER OF EACH PERCEPTUAL DIMENSION FOR MALES BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

Perceptual Dimension:	Professionals + Managers (N=29)	White Collar Occupations (N=9)	Blue Collar Skilled (N=12)	Blue Collar Semi-skilled + Unskilled (N=9)
Enjoy:	58.6-15.6% d = 70.0 (n=161)	89.3-34.6% d = 54.7 (n=54)	88.9- 3.2% d = 85.7 (n=67)	73.3- 8.3% d = 65.0 (n=54)
Relax:	80.4-15.6% d = 64.8 (n=161)	75.0-11.5% d = 63.5 (n=54)	86.1- 3.2% d = 82.9 (n=67)	76.7-16.7% d = 60.0 (n=54)
Choice:	50.5- 4.7% d = 45.8 (n=161)	64.3- 0.0% d = 64.3 (n=54)	61.1- 0.0% d = 61.1 (n=67)	70.0-12.5% d = 57.5 (n=54)
Motiv:	41.2- 1.6% d = 39.6 (n=161)	42.9- 0.0% d = 42.9 (n=54)	61.1- 3.2% d = 57.9 (n=67)	50.0- 4.2% d = 45.8 (n=54)
S.eval:	77.9-23.4% d = 54.5 (n=159)	78.6-34.6% d = 44.0 (n=54)	91.7-50.0% d = 41.7 (n=66)	79.3-39.1% d = 40.2 (n=52)
O.eval:	85.3-25.4% d = 59.9 (n=158)	88.9-36.0% d = 52.9 (n=52)	94.4-50.0% d = 54.4 (n=66)	93.1-60.9% d = 32.2 (n=52)
Phys.eff:	82.5-53.1% d = 29.4 (n=161)	75.0-46.2% d = 28.8 (n=54)	97.2-45.2% d = 52.0 (n=67)	86.7-37.5% d = 49.2 (n=54)
Ment.eff:	77.3-31.3% d = 46.0 (n=161)	78.6-46.2% d = 32.4 (n=54)	86.1-45.2% d = 40.9 (n=67)	83.3-54.2% d = 29.1 (n=54)
Satis:	68.0-41.0% d = 27.0 (n=158)	53.6-46.2% d = 7.4 (n=54)	44.1-19.4% d = 24.7 (n=65)	46.7-16.7% d = 30.0 (n=54)

Turning to the effect of the perceptual dimensions on the situational definitions of different male occupational groups (as described in Table 26, p.175), perhaps the most obvious differences between groups concern the other evaluation factor and the physical effort factor. The discriminating power of the other evaluation dimension is low for the unskilled and semi-skilled group because evaluation is lacking in work situations as well as in leisure situations. In addition, the power of physical effort is high for both blue collar groups (skilled as well as semi-skilled and unskilled) because for these groups leisure is characterized by a lack of physical effort, while work activities tend to involve more physical effort than for the other occupational groups. These findings make sense in terms of the job situations and job activities of the various occupational groups.

This type of descriptive analysis as shown in Tables 23 through 26 can be seen as incorporating the residual-attitudinal notion of leisure. That is, it looks at the factors that are lacking in situations defined as work as well as the factors that are present in leisure situations. Both types of factors are taken into account in the calculation of discriminating power (d). A particular dimension will be shown to discriminate best between leisure and work if it is perceived to be both lacking in one

situation and to be present in the other situation. In terms of understanding how people differentiate between work and leisure in their own day-to-day lives, this kind of comparison between work and leisure situation may be more meaningful than simply examining leisure events.

(e) The Combined Effects of Perceptual Dimensions

The above analysis was concerned with "only" the independent effect of each perceptual dimension. However, it is clear that these dimensions are not independent of each other, but are in fact inter-related. The inter-correlation matrix between all nine dimensions (see Table 27, p.178) shows that the four factors with the greatest discriminating power in terms of situational definitions, namely enjoyment, relaxation, freedom of choice and intrinsic motivation, are all fairly highly inter-correlated, especially choice and motivation. In addition, the correlation coefficient for the two evaluation factors is fairly high as well ($r=.66$). This means, then, that leisure situations are generally perceived positively with regard to several of the perceptual dimensions at the same time.

TABLE 27: CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN ALL PERCEPTUAL DIMENSIONS

Kendall's Tau Coefficients (n=679)									
Perceptual Dimension:	Enjoy	Relax	Choice	Motiv	S.eval.	O.eval.	Phy.eff.	Ment.eff.	Satis
Enjoy:	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Relax:	.63	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Choice:	.57	.57	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Motiv:	.59	.57	.80	---	---	---	---	---	---
S.eval:	.31	.47	.43	.44	---	---	---	---	---
O.eval:	.28	.42	.39	.41	.66	---	---	---	---
Phys.eff:	.46	.47	.41	.45	.37	.28	---	---	---
Ment.eff:	.23	.45	.30	.31	.46	.43	.22	---	---
Satis:	.45	.30	.29	.29	-.06	-.05	.18	.02	---

The inter-relationships between perceptual dimensions further suggests the usefulness of combining dimensions, and examining their combined effect on the definition of the situation. The fairly high correlations between some of the factors meant that, in terms of predicting leisure, it may not be necessary to know how all perceptual dimensions are perceived.

Discriminant analysis allows for examination of the combined effect of several perceptual dimensions on situational definitions. That is, the discriminatory power of combinations of dimensions can be tested.

This type of analysis was initially used to discriminate between all six categories of definition (i.e. leisure, mostly leisure, equal work and leisure, mostly work, and neither work nor leisure). The results of this analysis showed the centroids of the five leisure and work definitional categories to fall on a straight line with respect to the computed canonical discriminant functions, indicating a continuum from all leisure to all work definitions with regard to perceptual dimensions. In addition, the centroids of the mixed work and leisure groups were closer to the work group than to the leisure group. Because of this initial analysis, and because the main focus of interest was to differentiate between leisure and other situational definitions, it was decided to use discriminant

analysis to discriminate simply between leisure and all non-leisure situations.

TABLE 28: DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS, DISCRIMINATING BETWEEN LEISURE AND NON-LEISURE SITUATIONS FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND FOR MALES AND FEMALES SEPARATELY

Males (N=59) (n=322)		Females (N=59) (n=324)		Total Sample (N=118) (n=646)	
Std. Discriminant Function Coeff.		Std. Discriminant Function Coeff.		Std. Discriminant Function Coeff.	
Enjoyment	.60	Choice	.58	Enjoyment	.57
Choice	.51	Enjoyment	.55	Choice	.56
O.Evaluation	.44	S.Evaluation	.36	S.Evaluation	.39
wilks lambda =	.35	wilks lambda =	.33	wilks lambda =	.34
canonical corr. = .81		canonical corr. = .82		canonical corr. = .81	
chi-squared=335.99 (df = 3, p<.01)		chi-squared=358.15 (df = 3, p<.01)		chi-squared=698.95 (df = 3, p<.01)	

The results of this analysis, distinguishing between the two groups of definitions, is shown in Table 28 for the total population and for males and females separately. A stepwise procedure was used in this analysis. Variables were selected for inclusion according to the minimum computed wilks lambda, and the minimum F ratio for variables to enter or to be removed at each step was set at .01.

For the total sample, a discriminate function was calculated, including just three of the perceptual variables, which gave a value of wilks lambda of 0.34, and a canonical correlation coefficient of 0.81. The three variables included were enjoyment, choice and self evaluation. Moreover, it can be seen from comparison of the standardized discriminant function coefficients, that a greater proportion of the discrimination between situations was accounted for by the enjoyment and choice factors compared to the self evaluation factor.

For the females, the same three perceptual dimension variables are shown to have approximately the same ability to discriminate between leisure and non-leisure situations. For the males, other evaluation rather than self evaluation is included in the computed discriminant function. With the inclusion of enjoyment, choice and other evaluation, then, discriminant analysis gives a wilks lambda of 0.35 and a canonical correlation of 0.81 for males.

Overall, then, the combination of perceptual variables provides a powerful means of discriminating between leisure and non-leisure situations. The best combination of variables in terms of maximizing discriminatory power is shown, for this sample, to be a combination of the enjoyment dimension, freedom of choice and one of the evaluation dimensions. The differences

3

between males and females with regard to the discriminatory ability of the perceptual dimensions are small. For both groups, choice and enjoyment are shown to contribute the most to the computed discriminant function. For females, self evaluation contributes the most of all the other perceptual variables net of choice and enjoyment, while for males other evaluation was the third variable to be selected. Given the fairly high correlation between self evaluation, and other evaluation, this is not a very major difference, although it does correspond to earlier analysis showing other evaluation to discriminate better for males than for females.

The three perceptual dimension variables selected for the total sample were further used to examine the ability of the discriminant function to classify events according to their definitional label. This was done by randomly selecting 60% of the cases to compute the discriminant function, and then testing this function on the remaining 40% of the cases. This produced a comparison between predicted group membership and actual groups membership for leisure and non-leisure situations, from which the percentage of cases correctly classified can be calculated.

The results of this analysis (see Table 29, p.183) show that combining enjoyment, choice and self evaluation

factors leads to an unbiased classification accuracy of 92.8%. This is considerably higher than when the same analysis was performed using the objective predictor variables (see Chapter 4) which resulted in an accuracy of prediction of only 73.3%.

TABLE 29: THE CLASSIFICATION OF EVENTS FOR LEISURE AND NON-LEISURE SITUATIONS FOR PERCEPTUAL DIMENSIONS VARIABLES USING DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficients:

Freedom of choice	-.49
Enjoyment	-.51
Self Evaluation	-.28
(constant)	3.27

Actual Group Membership:	Predicted Group Membership:		
	Leisure	Non-Leisure	n
Leisure	94.9% (130)	5.1% (7)	137
Non-Leisure	9.4% (12)	90.6% (115)	127
	Total		264

Percentage of events correctly classified = 92.8%

In order to ensure that the three selected perceptual dimensions were relevant to the leisure definitions of different subgroups of the population, classification analysis was run for different groups broken

down by family type, by age, by employment status for women and by occupational group for men. In all analyses the same three predictor variables (i.e. choice, enjoyment and self evaluation) were used. The results show that the combination of these three variables leads to a high degree of accuracy of prediction of leisure and non-leisure situations for all groups tested (see Table 30, p.185). The lowest prediction accuracy was 86.54% for the semi-skilled and unskilled occupational group, and the highest was 95.45% for the skilled blue collar workers.

The classification analysis using discriminant functions indicates the potential for developing an operational definition of leisure using responses to certain perceptual dimension questions. That is, whether a situation will be defined as leisure or not can be predicted from information regarding certain perceived aspects of the situation. For this particular sample, the best accuracy of prediction was obtained from the enjoyment, choice and self evaluation factors. It should be remembered, though, that fairly accurate predictors of leisure can also be obtained using some of the other perceptual dimensions shown to be associated with the leisure experience, such as relaxation, intrinsic motivation and the lack of evaluation by other people.

TABLE 30: THE CLASSIFICATION ACCURACY OF DISCRIMINANT
FUNCTIONS USING EMPLOYMENT, FREEDOM OF CHOICE AND
SELF EVALUATION FOR FAMILY TYPE, AGE, EMPLOYMENT
STATUS AND OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

Percentage of cases correctly classified as
leisure or as non-leisure:

Family Type:

1. Without children	2. With children
92.5%	90.20%
(N=28, n=156)	(N=92, n=516)

Age:

1. 35yrs. and under	2. 36-45yrs.	3. 46yrs. and older
89.41%	90.48%	92.03%
(N=45, n=255)	(N=48, n=237)	(N=27, n=138)

Employment status (females only):

1. Full-time	2. Part-time	3. Not employed
93.22%	90.48%	89.61%
(N=21, n=118)	(N=11, n=63)	(N=27, n=154)

Occupational group (males only):

1. Prof., mgr.	2. White collar	3. Blue collar skilled	4. Blue collar semi- and unskilled
92.45%	88.89%	95.45%	86.54%
(N=29, n=159)	(N=9, n=54)	(N=12, n=66)	(N=9, n=52)

(f) The Question of Consensus of Meaning

The above analysis concerning the classification predictability for different population subgroups also has implications regarding the consensus of meaning. In particular, it shows that there is a considerable degree of shared meaning between and among different groups in terms of the meaning of leisure. The combination of enjoyment, freedom of choice and self evaluation was found to predict leisure with a high degree of accuracy for all the population subgroups that were considered in this analysis. Moreover, other perceptual dimensions, such as relaxation and intrinsic motivation were also found to be closely associated with leisure situations for the sample as a whole and for various subgroups of the sample.

There were some differences between groups in terms of some of the perceptual dimensions. For example, there were some sex differences and employment status differences with respect to self and other evaluation, mental and physical effort and satisfaction. These differences appear to reflect differences in daily life activities, and, in particular, differences in the types of activities perceived to be "work" activities. However, on the whole, these differences were more evident among those perceptual dimensions that only discriminated moderately between leisure and non-leisure situations. The perceptual

dimensions that were shown to be the best discriminators; namely, enjoyment, freedom of choice, relaxation and intrinsic motivation, appeared to be more consistently associated with the leisure experience for all sample subgroups.

Overall, then, the meaning of leisure, at least for the population under consideration in this study, can best be understood in terms of these four perceptual dimensions that consistently differentiate leisure situations from non-leisure situations. Freedom of choice is closely associated with intrinsic motivation in that nearly all activities perceived to be freely chosen were also perceived to be intrinsically motivated and vice versa. In addition, enjoyment is closely associated with relaxation. This means, then, that leisure can be understood, and fairly well predicted, simply in terms of enjoyment and freedom of choice. Not only are these two concepts the two best predictors of leisure, but the interviews revealed that they are also more readily and unambiguously understood than relaxation and intrinsic motivation.

The concept of evaluation is also relevant to the meaning of leisure in that leisure is associated with the lack of evaluation. Inclusion of this concept leads to a better understanding of the meaning of leisure and to a better prediction of leisure definitions.

This high degree of shared meaning with regard to leisure experiences indicates that the process of defining a situation as leisure tends to be similar for different individuals (at least among the people interviewed in this study). Although day-to-day activities may vary, and although the way in which specific activities are defined by individuals may vary, the feelings associated with a situation, or the particular perceptions of that situation which cause it to be defined as a leisure situation, appear to be very similar for different individuals.

This general consensus with regard to the meaning of leisure can be seen to represent "habitual personal definitions" rather than "cultural definitions". This is because, although people tended to define leisure situations in the same way, they were generally unaware that other people used similar definitions. Evidence of the lack of awareness of the consensual sharing of meaning came from the interviews themselves. First, it was evident at the start of the interviews when respondents were first asked to categorize their diary events as leisure or as work etc.. At this point, it was very common for respondents to ask what the interviewer meant by the term leisure, and it often had to be explained that what was wanted was the individual's own feelings about leisure and work. Second, the lack of awareness about the leisure consensus was clear

when respondents were asked to explain what leisure meant to them. In many cases they emphasized that this was their own personal definition, implying that they thought it might be different from other people's. They were clearly aware of the fact that different people defined certain activities in different ways, but they were less aware that the perceptions and feelings associated with leisure were similar.

It should also be noted that this consensual sharing of meaning was less evident from the analysis of respondents' initial definitions of leisure than from the later analysis of the selected leisure and work events. This may have been because the factors mentioned in the initial definitions of leisure were only those factors perceived to be the most relevant to each individual. Or, the factors mentioned could simply have been those that were first thought of. However, the analysis of diary events shows that certain perceptual dimensions were closely associated with the definition of leisure situations, even if they were not always mentioned spontaneously as the most important factors.

(g) The Question of Reliability and Validity

Assessing the reliability of any measure of the definition, of specific situations, or the perceptions

'surrounding specific situations, is clearly problematic. Specific situations are not repeatable. Moreover, the consistency, or lack of consistency, of the definition of situations that include the same objective activity was an empirical question addressed in the study: it cannot be related in any way to the question of reliability.

Nevertheless, there was one part of the interview process that can be used to indicate the reliability of individual's definitions of diary events. At the beginning of the interview all diary events were defined. But later in the interview, when the six diary events were selected for further in-depth questioning, respondents had a chance, and were in fact encouraged, to re-evaluate their original definitions of these six activities if this seemed appropriate to them. A record was kept of all those events that were redefined at this later point in the interview, although in all statistical analyses it was the later definitional label that was used.

Of the total number of 679 events selected for the focus of interview questions in all 118 interviews, 33 were redefined by respondents. This gives a redefinition rate of only 4.86%, implying that the great majority of the original definitions of diary events were reliable. The redefinition rate for males (5.01%) was slightly higher than the corresponding rate for females (4.66%). In addition, it can

be seen from Table 31 that most of the situations that were redefined were initially defined as leisure, and later redefined as having some work aspects as well. There may, therefore, tend to be an overrepresentation of events defined as leisure out of the total number of 4117 diary events.

TABLE 31: COMPARISON OF THE ORIGINAL DEFINITIONS OF
SELECTED DIARY EVENTS WITH LATER DEFINITIONS
FOR THOSE EVENTS THAT WERE REDEFINED

Original Definition	Redefinition						Total (N=33)
	Leisure	Mostly Leisure	Equal Work, Leisure	Mostly Work	Work	Neither Work, Leisure	
Leisure	--	10	5	3	1	1	20
Mostly leisure	1	--	0	0	0	0	1
Equal work and leisure	1	3	--	2	0	0	6
Mostly work	0	0	0	--	0	0	0
Work	1	0	0	3	--	0	4
Neither work nor leisure	0	1	1	0	0	--	2

With regard to the question of validity, the use of

individual definitions of specific and real diary events can be defended in terms of "face validity". That is, this particular technique was used because it was believed to give a more meaningful operational definition of leisure. In addition, the consistency with which certain perceptual dimensions were shown to be associated with respondents' definitions of leisure can be seen to lend some support to this claim of validity. Some confidence can be placed, therefore, in this technique for the measurement of leisure. It is this same technique of individual definitions of diary events that was used to operationally define leisure for the analysis of the distribution of leisure time that is reported in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 7. THE DISTRIBUTION OF LEISURE TIME

The interviews provided some data concerning the perceived importance of leisure in people's lives and the desire for more leisure time. Of the 118 respondents who answered the question about the importance of leisure, only three said that leisure was not particularly important. The great majority of respondents, though, said that leisure was important to them. In addition, roughly half of all respondents, both male and female, emphasized that leisure was a "very important" part of their lives.

Of the three dissenting opinions, one was expressed by a 58 year old male who had a management position with the CBC, and who claimed that he was a "workaholic".³⁰ The second dissenter was a 60 year old male who worked full-time as a union official, and who said that his work took precedence over his leisure. Thirdly, a 42 year old woman

~~~~~

30. The issue of the "workaholic" is a complex one, and one that is outside the boundaries of consideration of this particular study. It should be noted, however, that other research indicates that there are different types of workaholics: for some, their work is perceived as stress and they are constantly struggling to "prove themselves"; for others, though, the long hours devoted to employment-related activities are more a matter of choice. In this latter instance, the job is perceived to be enjoyable and rewarding, and is thus more akin to "leisure" than to "work" (for further discussion of this issue, see Machlowitz, 1978 and 1981).

with three school aged children, who worked full-time as a cashier, also said that leisure was not particularly important for her. In her case, it was the family that took precedence in her life rather than her job. However, none of these three respondents recorded particularly low amounts of leisure time in their 2-day diaries, and clearly many of their daily activities, including some employment and family activities, were perceived by them to be leisure. In general, then, the interview data indicated that leisure is a valued, or even highly valued, aspect of life, at least among this particular population.

With regard to the question concerning the desired amount of leisure time, 46 out of the 118 respondents said that they were satisfied with the amount of leisure time that they had. These 46 respondents who were generally satisfied consisted of 27 males (46% of all males), 8 employed females (36%) and 11 housewives (41%). There were a larger number of respondents, though, (69 out of 118) who said that they would like to have more leisure time. In addition, 38 of these respondents felt that they had much too little leisure time, and that they wanted and needed much more. The 38 individuals who felt that they were greatly deprived with regard to leisure time were made up of 10 males (17% of all males), 12 employed females (55%) and 6 housewives (22%).

These results, correspond in general, to Neulinger's studies of leisure attitudes (1974 and 1980a) in which he found both a desire for more free time and a recognition that there is not enough leisure. Neulinger also found that males tended to be more satisfied than females with regard to the amount of leisure they had.

There are some problems associated with questions asking whether more leisure time is desired, and these problems surfaced, to some extent, in this study. One problem is that more leisure time does not necessarily translate into more leisure. There were two male respondents, for example, (one a janitor and the other a sign painter) who said that they had too much free time, but that they could not afford to do the things that they wanted to do. In another case, a housewife with one teenage son also said that she had too much leisure time, but not enough activities to fill the time. In all three cases, therefore, although time was not perceived to be the problem, there remained a lack of leisure in the lives of these individuals for other reasons.

Another problem associated with asking whether people are satisfied with their leisure time is that respondents may interpret the question in a relative sense. That is, if they perceive that they have a reasonable amount of leisure relative to other individuals, they may tend to

express general satisfaction. This does not necessarily mean that they would not like to have more leisure time if they thought that it was realistically possible, or if it was possible without attendant "guilt".

Nevertheless, despite the problems associated with these particular qualitative data, they do provide some indication with regard to leisure attitudes. First, they do indicate that leisure is perceived as a valued aspect of daily life, and second, they show that there are a significant number of people who experience "leisure lack".³¹ This lends some support, then, to the notion of ~~leisure~~ as a valued and scarce resource, and to the contention that the distribution of leisure time is an important and significant research question.

(a) The Division of Daily Time

Data concerning the division of time into different categories of situation were obtained from the time diaries for the two 24-hour periods, one representing a weekday, and the other a weekend day. Events were categorized according to each individual's definition of each situation.

Table 32 (p.197) shows the division of time on

~~~~~  
31. This term was originally coined by Neulinger (e.g. see Neulinger, 1982).

weekdays for the sample as a whole, and for males and females separately. It can be seen that, in general, weekdays are divided fairly evenly between leisure, work and sleep. Other situational categories, such as mixed work and leisure, take up a relatively small amount of the 24 hour period.

TABLE 32: THE DIVISION OF TIME ON WEEKDAYS FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND FOR MALES AND FEMALES

|                             | Males<br>(N=60) | Females<br>(N=60) | Total<br>(N=120) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Leisure                     | 6.37 hours      | 6.02 hours        | 6.19 hours       |
| Mostly leisure              | 0.72 hours      | 0.69 hours        | 0.70 hours       |
| Equal work<br>and leisure   | 0.72 hours      | 1.51 hours        | 1.12 hours       |
| Mostly work                 | 0.57 hours      | 0.57 hours        | 0.57 hours       |
| Work                        | 7.63 hours      | 6.95 hours        | 7.29 hours       |
| Neither work<br>nor leisure | 0.52 hours      | 0.45 hours        | 0.48 hours       |
| Sleep                       | 7.40 hours      | 7.78 hours        | 7.59 hours       |
|                             | 23.93 hours     | 23.97 hours       | 23.94 hours      |

It can also be seen that the differences in time use

between males and females are small. On average; males are shown to have approximately 20 minutes more leisure time than females and about 40 minutes more work time. Females, on the other hand, spent about 20 minutes more than males sleeping; and they also spent somewhat more time in activities defined as mixed work and leisure events.

---

TABLE 33: THE DIVISION OF TIME ON WEEKENDS FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND FOR MALES AND FEMALES

|                             | Males<br>(N=60) | Females<br>(N=60) | Total<br>(N=120) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Leisure                     | 11.78 hours     | 8.10 hours        | 9.94 hours       |
| Mostly leisure              | 0.66 hours      | 0.85 hours        | 0.75 hours       |
| Equal work<br>and leisure   | 0.84 hours      | 1.47 hours        | 1.15 hours       |
| Mostly work                 | 0.22 hours      | 0.56 hours        | 0.39 hours       |
| Work                        | 1.51 hours      | 3.38 hours        | 2.45 hours       |
| Neither work<br>nor leisure | 0.29 hours      | 0.35 hours        | 0.32 hours       |
| Sleep                       | 9.04 hours      | 9.48 hours        | 9.26 hours       |
|                             | 24.34 hours     | 24.19 hours       | 24.26 hours      |

---

Table 33 provides the same information concerning

the division of time on weekend days (which were almost all Sundays). The pattern of time usage is clearly different for these weekend days compared to the weekdays. On weekends there is considerably more leisure time (an average of nearly 10 hours as compared to just over 6 hours), more sleep time (approximately 9 hours, 15 minutes compared to just under 8 hours), and less time spent in "work" activities (2 hours 27 minutes compared to 7 hours 17 minutes) than on weekdays. There remains, though, only a small proportion of time spent on activities defined as mixed work and leisure or as neither work nor leisure.

Comparison between males and females with regard to weekend time usage also indicates that there are some substantial sex differences. For this sample, males are shown to have had 3 hours 40 minutes more leisure time per day, on average, than the females. Accordingly, the females are also shown to have spent more time in work activities than the males (nearly 2 hours more on average). Some smaller sex differences are evident, as well, for sleep time (the females spent about 45 minutes more per day sleeping), and for time spent in mixed work and leisure activities (the females spent nearly an hour more per day in these types of activities).

In general, then, although all groups are shown to have more leisure time and less work time on weekends

compared to weekdays, this is less true for females than for males. That is, the differences between weekdays and weekends are not as great for females as they are for males. This also means that the major sex difference with regard to time usage is the difference in weekend leisure time between males and females.

(b) The Relationship between Leisure, Sex and Employment Status

The differences in weekend and weekday leisure time for males and females were tested using a one-way analysis of variance (see Table 34, p.201). Similarly, analysis of variance was also used to test for differences in leisure time between employed and non-employed females (Table 34).

Results show that the only statistically significant difference is between male and female leisure time on weekends. Males are shown to have enjoyed an average of 3 hours 42 minutes more leisure time than females on weekend days. The sex difference in mean leisure time on weekdays, though, is small and not statistically significant.

With regard to the question of employment status for women, also, differences between groups were not large. Non-employed females experienced, on average, about an hour more leisure on weekdays than the employed females, but this difference is not statistically significant. Weekend

leisure time for employed and non-employed females is almost exactly the same.

TABLE 34: THE EFFECT OF SEX AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS ON WEEKDAY AND WEEKEND LEISURE TIME

| Groups                                               | Mean Leisure Time | Sum of Squares | D.F.  | F.ratio | Sign. |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------|---------|-------|
| (a) Sex differences in weekday leisure:              |                   |                |       |         |       |
| 1.Males (N=60)                                       | 6.4 hours         | 3.68           | 1/118 | 0.53    | -     |
| 2.Females (N= 60)                                    | 6.0 hours         |                |       |         |       |
| (b) Sex differences in weekend leisure:              |                   |                |       |         |       |
| 1.Males (N=60)                                       | 11.8 hours        | 404.99         | 1/118 | 35.58   | p<.01 |
| 2.Females (N=60)                                     | 8.1 hours         |                |       |         |       |
| (c) Employment status difference in weekday leisure: |                   |                |       |         |       |
| 1.Empl. females (N=33)                               | 5.54 hours        | 16.81          | 1/58  | 2.55    | -     |
| 2.Non-empl.females (N=27)                            | 6.60 hours        |                |       |         |       |
| (d) Employment status difference in weekend leisure: |                   |                |       |         |       |
| 1.Empl. females (N=33)                               | 8.20 hours        | 0.68           | 1/58  | 0.06    | -     |
| 2.Non-empl.females (N=27)                            | 7.98 hours        |                |       |         |       |

The results indicate that the predicted relationship between status and leisure does not hold true in all cases.

There is both a substantial and a statistically significant sex difference in weekend leisure time in the predicted direction, and this lends some support to the original hypothesis relating status and leisure. The predicted effect of employment status on leisure, though, is not supported. In addition, although differences are small, there is a tendency for non-employed females rather than employed females to have more leisure time. This may possibly be because of the trade-off effect of labour market activity. That is, if the increased status associated with employment does tend to increase access to leisure, decreased free time because of time devoted to job-related activities (which, as has been shown earlier, are rarely perceived as leisure) concurrently decreases the availability of leisure time.

The sex difference in leisure time, as indicated by the time diaries, did not seem to be recognized by all respondents in the sample. At the end of each interview, respondents were asked who they thought had more leisure time between them and their spouse. These responses were later compared to the actual amount of leisure time as recorded in the 2-day diaries of both husband and wife.<sup>32</sup>

~~~~~  
32. For this analysis, weekend and weekday leisure time were combined to give each individual one single value for total leisure time. This was done in order to clearly

The diaries indicated that there were 42 couples in which the husband had more leisure time, and 18 couples where the wife had more leisure time. Of the 120 individual assessments of who had more leisure, 70 were "correct" in that they corresponded to the recorded leisure time in the diaries, but by this criterion 50 assessments were "incorrect". In addition, most of these "incorrect" assessments (38 out of 50) were by individuals who said that the wife had more leisure, when the diaries indicated that, in fact, the husband had more leisure time. Only 12 of the "incorrect" assessments were in the other direction, i.e. attributing more leisure to the husband than he appeared to have from the diaries.

Although some "incorrect" assessments of leisure time might be expected because of inferring total leisure time for each individual based on only two diary days, the fact that most incorrect assessments were in one particular direction indicates some systematic bias in perceptions of leisure time. That is, there appears to be a tendency to underestimate the perceived leisure time of males, and to

~~~~~  
determine, for each couple, whether the husband or the wife had more leisure. Recorded leisure times for the two days were combined by multiplying weekday leisure time by 5, and weekend leisure time by 2, and then summing these amounts to give what could be considered to represent "weekly leisure time".



overestimate the perceived leisure time of females. This bias in perception, though, did not appear to be based on the sex of the perceiver: 23 of the "incorrect" assessments came from males, while 27 came from females. Also, incorrect perceptions were common among both couples in which the wife was employed (30 incorrect assessments out of 66), and couples where the wife was non-employed (20 incorrect assessments out of 54).

The data concerning the relationship between sex and leisure time, therefore, indicate that males do have more leisure time (at least among this population), and specifically that they have more leisure time on weekends. However, this advantage that males seem to have with regard to leisure is not always recognized by either males or females. The data further indicate that there is no clear relationship between employment status and leisure for females. Women tend to have less leisure time on weekends than males regardless of whether they are employed in the labour market or not.

#### (c) Other Factors Affecting Leisure Time

The model developed in Chapter 3 indicated that other variables, including occupation-related, family-related and attitudinal factors, might also be expected to affect leisure time apart from sex and employment status

effects. The effect of these additional factors on leisure time was examined using multiple classification analysis (MCA). This particular type of analysis was selected because it can be used with categorical independent variables (such as occupational group and family type), and because it makes no assumptions with regard to the linearity of relationships or the normality of distribution of variables.<sup>33</sup>

Initially, MCA was used to examine each independent variable separately, adjusting only for sex. This was done because the significance of the effect of each separate variable is not readily derived from MCA analysis when several independent variables are included simultaneously. Table 35 (p.208-209) shows the results of the MCA analyses for weekday leisure time for each of the independent variables in the model. It also gives both the unadjusted deviations from mean leisure time for each variable as well as these same deviations adjusted for sex.

The analyses show that none of the independent variables have a statistically significant effect on weekday leisure time, although some trends are indicated. Both work time and spouse's work time (both variables referring to

~~~~~  
33. For further discussion of multiple classification analysis see Andrews et al. (1973).

time devoted each week to employment-related activities) tend to have a moderate effect on weekday leisure time in the direction predicted. Specifically a long work week tends to decrease leisure time, and being married to someone who has a long work week also decreases personal leisure time. This effect of high work time is evident when deviations are both unadjusted and when they are adjusted for sex, indicating that the relationship holds true for both males and females. The effect of falling into one of the other work time categories or spouse's work time categories, however, is less clear, although there is a slight tendency for housewives to have more leisure, and for part-time employed females (those working 30 hours or less a week) to have less leisure than other groups.

The family workload variable represents a combination of both the number of children in the family and the ages of the children. These two factors were combined because they both appeared to have some effect on leisure time. The workload variable was computed by weighting the number of preschool children by a factor of 3, weighting the number of elementary school children (aged 6 through 12) by a factor of 2, and that of older children (over 12 years of age) by a factor of 1. The weightings for each family were then added together and recoded into three groups (low, moderate and high family workload).³⁴ The analysis

~~~~~  
34. As an indication of the meaning of each family workload

indicates that, for families with children, leisure time tends to decrease as family workload increases, but the differences between groups are not large. The effect of having no children appears to be similar to that of having only a low family workload.

The individual status variables of personal income and occupation do not appear to affect leisure time in the predicted direction of a positive relationship between leisure and status. In fact, both high income and low income individuals tend to have reduced leisure compared to middle income and zero income groups. On the other hand, occupational group comparisons show that skilled blue collar workers had somewhat more weekday leisure than other groups, while unskilled and semi-skilled workers had the least leisure. Differences between other occupational groups are small. This effect of occupational category is not related to sex, as is clear from the adjusted deviations, but it could possibly be related to other factors, such as part-time and full-time employment status or work time etc..

~~~~~  
group, a family with only 1 child would fall into the low workload group whatever the age of the child, or a family with a maximum of three older children (all over 12) would also fall into this group. To fall into the high workload group, a family would have to have at least three children, and at least one of them would have to be of preschool age.

TABLE 35: MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS OF WEEKDAY
LEISURE TIME FOR VARIOUS OCCUPATION-RELATED
AND ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES, ADJUSTED FOR SEX

Grand Mean = 6.19 hours of leisure

Independent Variable	Unadjusted Deviation from the Mean	Deviation Adjusted for sex
(a) Personal income:		
No income (N=25)	0.38	0.71
Under \$10,000 (N=11)	-1.54	-1.21
\$10,000-19,999 (N=38)	0.06	0.09
\$20,000-29,999 (N=16)	0.80	0.49
\$30,000-39,999 (N=14)	0.21	0.14
\$40,000 or more (N=8)	-1.35	-1.71
Beta ratio ¹ = .27/.13 Multiple R = .28		
(b) Occupation:		
Prof, mgr. (N=37)	0.04	-0.10
White collar (N=28)	-0.28	-0.19
Skilled (N=13)	1.29	1.04
Un-, semi-skilled (N=15)	-1.43	-1.48
Housewife (N=27)	0.41	0.66
Beta, ratio = .27/.10 Multiple R = .28		
(c) Work time (employment):		
No employment (N=27)	0.41	0.87
30 hours or less (N=12)	-0.96	-0.58
31-45 hours (N=34)	0.19	0.03
46-55 hours (N=37)	0.16	-0.03
56 hours or more (N=10)	-1.19	-1.65
Beta ratio = .25/.18 Multiple R = .24		
(d) Spouse's Work time (employment):		
No employment (N=27)	-0.04	-0.21
30 hours or less (N=12)	0.10	-0.04
31-45 hours (N=34)	0.14	0.20
46-55 hours (N=37)	0.33	0.40
56 hours or more (N=10)	-1.69	-1.52
Beta ratio = .20/.06 Multiple R = .21		

TABLE 35: CONTINUED

(e) Spouse's Occupation:

Prof, mgr.	(N=37)	-0.41	-0.31
White collar	(N=28)	0.65	0.58
Skilled	(N=13)	0.46	0.64
Un-, semi-skilled	(N=15)	-0.53	-0.49
Housewife	(N=27)	-0.04	-0.22

Beta ratio = .17/.07

Multiple R = .18

(f) Family Workload:

No children	(N=38)	0.24	0.24
low workload	(N=32)	0.34	0.34
moderate workload	(N=42)	-0.28	-0.28
high workload	(N=8)	-1.04	-1.04

Beta ratio = .15/.07

Multiple R = .16

(g) Sex-Role Attitude:

Traditional	(N=35)	0.50	0.48
Average	(N=45)	-0.68	-0.72
Non-traditional	(N=40)	0.33	0.39

Beta ratio = .21/.09

Multiple R = .22

(h) Family income:

\$10,000-19,999	(N=10)	0.65	0.65
\$20,000-29,999	(N=32)	-0.74	-0.74
\$30,000-39,999	(N=34)	0.73	0.73
\$40,000 or more	(N=32)	-0.24	-0.24

Beta ratio = .24/.07

Multiple R = .25

1. The Beta ratio refers to the ratio of the Beta value for the independent variable under consideration to the Beta value for sex.

Table 35 also shows that spouse's occupation appears to have little effect on weekday leisure time. Even the effect of having a wife who is employed or non-employed is

negligible for male workers. In addition, the relationship between family income and leisure time is not very clear, and is weak. The very high family income group has a slight tendency towards less leisure, and the very low income group has a slight tendency towards more leisure, but this trend does not hold true for other family income levels.

The scores on the sex role attitude scale were coded into three groups representing "traditional", "non-traditional" and "average" attitudes. The results of the MCA analysis show little effect of sex role attitudes on weekday leisure time, even adjusted for sex. However, an interaction effect between sex and sex role attitudes was predicted in the model, and since MCA does not take into account interaction effects, the effect of sex role attitudes needs to be tested further for males and females separately.

Table 36 (p.213-214) displays the same MCA analysis as Table 35, but with respect to weekend rather than weekday leisure time. It can be seen that, with regard to weekends, not only is sex a strong predictor of leisure time, but also that family workload and spouse's work time also have a significant effect on leisure. For families with children, there is a clear relationship between family workload and weekend leisure time: whereas for families with a low workload, mean leisure time is 11 hours, for families with a

high workload, mean leisure time is only approximately 7 hours 30 minutes. Families with a moderate workload fall in between these two extremes with a mean of about 9 hours 15 minutes of leisure time, while for families without children, mean leisure time on weekends is about 10 hours 15 minutes.

The weekend leisure time of individuals is also significantly affected by the work time of their spouse, that is by the hours that their spouse devotes to his or her labour market activities per week. Spouse's work time, in fact, has a stronger effect on individuals' leisure time than does their own work time, their own income or occupation, or their spouse's occupation. The MCA analysis indicates that, on average, being married to someone who worked 56 hours a week or more decreased that individual's own leisure time by nearly 3 hours, while being married to someone who worked less than 30 hours increased their own leisure time by nearly 1 hour 30 minutes a day, even when deviations were adjusted for the effect of sex.

The individual's own work time does also affect their weekend leisure time negatively, net of the effect of sex, but the effect is somewhat weaker than that of spouse's work time, and is not statistically significant. The deviations from overall mean leisure time for the various work time groups range from a low of -2.0 hours for those

who spend at least 56 hours a week in labour market activity, to a high of +0.57 hours for those who spend less than 30 hours a week on employment-related activities.

The personal income and occupational level status factors, again, do not show a clear relationship between status and leisure time for weekend leisure. The unadjusted deviations for income groups do show that income tends to be positively related to leisure, but when these figures are adjusted for sex, the remaining relationship between income and leisure is very weak. Occupation group also shows only a weak relationship to weekend leisure time, although analysis of variance indicates that there may be an interaction effect between sex, occupation and leisure time.

The other three independent variables in the MCA table, i.e. family income, spouse's occupation and sex role attitudes, all show only weak relationships to weekend leisure time as well. For this sample, families with low incomes were shown to have slightly more weekend leisure time than other families, but differences between all groups are small. Differences between groups based on spouse's occupation are also relatively small. In addition, sex role attitudes appear from this analysis to have little effect on leisure time, although, again, the possibility of an interaction effect between sex and sex role attitudes needs to be tested further.

TABLE 36: MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS OF WEEKEND
LEISURE TIME FOR VARIOUS OCCUPATION-RELATED
AND ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES, ADJUSTED FOR SEX

Grand Mean = 9.94 hours of leisure

Independent Variable		Unadjusted Deviation from the mean	Deviation Adjusted for sex
(a) Personal income:			
No income	(N=25)	-2.05	-0.30
Under \$10,000	(N=11)	-2.47	-0.76
\$10,000-19,999	(N=38)	0.36	0.49
\$20,000-29,999	(N=16)	1.51	-0.11
\$30,000-39,999	(N=14)	1.52	-0.32
\$40,000 or more	(N=8)	2.27	0.43
Beta ratio = .11/.46		Multiple R = .50	
(b) Occupation:			
Prof, mgr.	(N=37)	0.97	-0.13
White collar	(N=28)	-0.02	0.67
Skilled	(N=13)	1.89	-0.05
Un-, semi-skilled	(N=15)	-0.47	-0.86
Housewife	(N=27)	-1.95	-0.01
Beta ratio = .12/.51		Multiple R = .50	
(c) Work time (employment):			
No employment	(N=27)	-1.95	0.08
30 hours or less	(N=12)	-1.13	0.57
31-45 hours	(N=34)	1.05	0.33
46-55 hours	(N=37)	0.82	-0.01
56 hours or more	(N=10)	0.04	-2.00
Beta ratio = .17/.53		Multiple R = .51	
(d) Spouse's Work time (employment):			
No employment	(N=27)	1.86	0.51
30 hours or less	(N=12)	2.56	1.44
31-45 hours	(N=34)	0.26	0.74
46-55 hours	(N=37)	-1.30	-0.75
56 hours or more	(N=10)	-4.18	-2.84
Beta ratio = .29/.35		Multiple R = .55	

TABLE 36: CONTINUED

(e) Spouse's Occupation:

Prof, mgr.	(N=37)	-0.32	0.98
White collar	(N=28)	-0.23	-1.04
Skilled	(N=13)	-1.34	0.94
Un-, semi-skilled	(N=15)	-0.97	-0.52
Housewife	(N=27)	1.86	-0.42

Beta ratio = .22/.60 Multiple R = .52

(f) Family Workload:F

No children	(N=38)	0.36	0.36
low workload	(N=32)	1.06	1.06
moderate workload	(N=42)	-0.68	-0.68
high workload	(N=8)	-2.41	-2.41

Beta ratio = .25/.48 Multiple R = .54

(g) Sex-Role Attitude:

Traditional	(N=35)	-0.12	-0.29
Average	(N=45)	-0.04	-0.34
Non-traditional	(N=40)	0.16	0.64

Beta ratio = .12/.50 Multiple R = .50

(h) Family income:

\$10,000-19,999	(N=10)	1.01	1.01
\$20,000-29,999	(N=32)	-0.65	-0.65
\$30,000-39,999	(N=34)	0.43	0.43
\$40,000 or more	(N=32)	-0.12	-0.12

Beta ratio = .14/.50 Multiple R = .52

F. F ratio significant at $p \leq .05$

Overall, the independent variables in the model were shown to be only weak predictors of weekday leisure time for the sample as a whole. With regard to weekend leisure,

family workload and spouse's work time were shown to have a significant effect, net of the sex effect, while there also appeared to be a tendency for the amount of time devoted to labour market activity throughout the week to affect negatively an individual's weekend leisure time as well.

(d) The Combined Effect of Employment and Family Variables on Leisure Time

The above MCA analysis indicates the need to look at the effects of the independent variables for different sex and occupation status groups separately because of possible interaction effects (e.g. between sex and occupation and between sex and sex role attitudes), which are not taken into account in MCA analysis. In addition, there is a need to look at the combined effects of the independent variables in order to examine questions such as the suggested "trade off" between occupational status and employment time.

Accordingly, MCA was used to predict leisure time for males, employed females and non-employed females separately. The independent variables used were those which were shown to have a strong independent effect on leisure time, i.e. family workload, spouse's weekly work time and individual weekly work time. In addition, those variables that were thought to have an interaction effect with sex, i.e. occupation and sex role attitudes, were also included.

TABLE 37: MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS OF WEEKDAY
LEISURE TIME FOR MALES BY OCCUPATION, WORK TIME,
SPOUSE'S WORK TIME, FAMILY WORKLOAD AND SEX ROLE
ATTITUDE

Grand Mean = 6.37 hours of leisure Multiple R = 0.57

Independent Variable	Unadjusted Deviation from the Mean	Deviation Adjusted for all other vars
(a) Occupation:		
Prof, mgr. (N=29)	-0.06	-0.16
White collar (N=9)	-0.37	0.11
Skilled (N=13)	1.11	1.09
Un-, semi-skilled (N=9)	-1.06	-1.16
	eta = 0.26	Beta = 0.26
(b) Work time (employment):		
31-45 hours (N=24)	0.47	0.67
46-55 hours (N=26)	0.09	-0.17
56 hours or more (N=10)	-1.37	-1.20
	eta = 0.24	Beta = 0.25
(c) Spouse's Work time (employment):		
No employment (N=27)	-0.22	-0.27
30 hours or less (N=11)	-0.25	-0.48
31-45 hours (N=11)	-0.12	-0.06
46-55 hours (N=11)	0.91	1.19
	eta = 0.16	Beta = 0.22
(d) Family Workload:		
No children (N=19)	0.24	-0.08
low workload (N=16)	0.34	0.20
moderate workload (N=21)	-0.25	-0.02
high workload (N=4)	-1.18	-0.32
	eta = 0.15	Beta = 0.05
(e) Sex-Role Attitude:		
Traditional (N=19)	0.98	1.19
Average (N=26)	-1.14	-1.29
Non-traditional (N=15)	0.73	0.72
	eta = 0.38	Beta = 0.43

TABLE 38: MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS OF WEEKEND
LEISURE TIME FOR MALES BY OCCUPATION, WORK TIME,
SPOUSE'S WORK TIME, FAMILY WORKLOAD AND SEX ROLE
ATTITUDE

Grand Mean = 11.77 hours of leisure Multiple R = 0.44

Independent Variable	Unadjusted Deviation from the Mean	Deviation Adjusted for all other vars
(a) Occupation:		
Prof, mgr. (N=29)	0.07	0.03
White collar (N=9)	-0.44	0.81
Skilled (N=13)	0.05	-0.52
Un-, semi-skilled (N=9)	0.14	-0.16
	eta = 0.06	Beta = 0.12
(b) Work time(employment):		
31-45 hours (N=24)	0.69	0.34
46-55 hours (N=26)	0.05	0.51
56 hours or more (N=10)	-1.80	-2.14
	eta = 0.26	Beta = 0.29
(c) Spouse's Work time(employment):		
No employment (N=27)	0.02	0.26
30 hours or less (N=11)	0.75	0.90
31-45 hours (N=11)	0.34	0.18
46-55 hours (N=11)	-1.14	-1.72
	eta = 0.18	Beta = 0.26
(d) Family Workload:		
No children (N=19)	0.05	0.11
low workload (N=16)	1.13	1.13
moderate workload (N=21)	-0.72	-0.66
high workload (N=4)	-1.02	-1.60
	eta = 0.23	Beta = 0.24
(e) Sex-Role Attitude:		
Traditional (N=19)	-0.27	-0.47
Average (N=26)	-0.36	-0.29
Non-traditional (N=15)	0.98	1.11
	eta = 0.17	Beta = 0.19

Tables 37 and 38 show the effect of these independent variables on the weekday and weekend leisure time of males. The variables included are shown to explain somewhat more of the variance in weekday leisure time for males ($R=.57$) than that of weekend leisure ($R=.44$).

The factor which appears to have the most consistent effect on the leisure time of males is that of employment time. The analyses show that males who work the longest hours at their job have the least leisure and vice versa. In addition, this negative effect of work time is true for both weekday and weekend leisure. This finding makes sense in terms of the fact that employment-related activities are rarely defined as leisure. It also corresponds to the tendency of males to define leisure in terms of time away from their labour market activities.

The negative relationship between employment time and leisure holds true even when deviations are adjusted for occupation. The expected trade-off, therefore, between occupational status and work time is not evident. In fact, the effect of occupational group on weekend leisure time is very small ($\eta=.06$, $\beta=.12$). On weekdays the effect is larger, and the data show skilled workers to have more leisure time than males in other types of occupations, while semi-skilled and unskilled blue collar workers have the least leisure time. This could possibly be a status related

effect among blue collar workers. It could also be that, for some unskilled blue collar workers, the generally negative attitude towards their job carries over into their free time and reduces the likelihood of leisure.³⁵

Family workload is shown to have some effect on the weekend leisure time of males, with increased family workload for families with children, reducing their leisure time. The differences in mean leisure time here range from a high of nearly 13 hours of leisure for men with a low family workload to a low of just over 10 hours of leisure for men with a high family workload. On the other hand, family workload appears to have very little effect on the weekday leisure time of males ($\eta^2=.15$, $\beta^2=.05$).

The effect of spouse's work time on the leisure time of males is shown, in Tables 37 and 38, to be inconsistent. Whereas men whose wives work fairly long hours each week on their labour market activities (more than 45 hours per week) are shown to have reduced leisure on weekends, the reverse is true for their weekday leisure. The effect of sex role

~~~~~

35. This suggestion relates to the on-going controversy surrounding the compensation and spillover theories of the work-leisure relationship (for example, Wilensky, 1962; Gerstl, 1963; Kando and Summers, 1971; Young and Wilmott, 1973; Spreitzer and Snyder, 1974; Bacon, 1975; Parker, 1975 and Parker and Smith, 1976). In this instance the suggested relationship among blue collar workers refers to work and leisure attitudes and meanings rather than to activities or forms of leisure.

attitudes on male leisure time also lacks consistency. Males with traditional sex role attitudes are shown to have the most weekday leisure, but males with non-traditional sex role attitudes had the most weekend leisure.

Turning to the effect of these same independent variables on the leisure time of employed females, some differences between employed men and women are evident. For employed females, the length of their work week negatively affects their weekend leisure, but the effect is weaker than the same effect on males. In addition, work time is not shown to affect the weekday leisure time of employed females negatively. It may be that employed females who work fairly long hours at their jobs, tend to do their "other work", i.e. their housework, on weekends rather than using up their weekday evenings. This also corresponds to the inconsistent effect of wife's work time on husband's leisure. Employed women who work long hours on their jobs, and who do more housework on weekends, may also be affecting their husband's weekend leisure time negatively as well.

Looking at the effect of occupation on female leisure time, unskilled and semi-skilled workers are shown to have the least leisure of all occupation groups both on weekdays and weekend days. This effect is similar to the reduced leisure time that was evident for male semi-skilled and unskilled workers as well, and may be related to the

TABLE 39: MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS OF WEEKDAY
LEISURE TIME FOR EMPLOYED FEMALES BY
WORK TIME, SPOUSE'S WORK TIME, FAMILY WORKLOAD
AND SEX ROLE ATTITUDE

Grand Mean = 5.54 hours of leisure

Multiple R = .46

Independent Variable	Unadjusted Deviation from the Mean	Deviation Adjusted for all other vars
(a) Occupation:		
Prof, mgr. (N=8)	0.40	0.95
White collar (N=19)	0.33	-0.00
Un-, semi-skilled (N=6)	-1.58	-1.27
	eta = 0.31	Beta = 0.30
(b) Work time(employment):		
30 hours or less (N=11)	-0.15	-0.49
31-45 hours (N=11)	-0.40	-0.12
46-55 hours (N=11)	0.55	0.61
	eta = 0.17	Beta = 0.19
(c) Spouse's Work time(employment):		
31-45 hours (N=12)	0.59	0.14
46-55 hours (N=16)	-0.13	0.01
56 hours or more (N=5)	-0.99	-0.37
	eta = 0.22	Beta = 0.07
(d) Family Workload:		
No children (N=16)	0.68	0.60
low workload (N=5)	-0.84	-1.02
moderate workload (N=11)	-0.67	-0.43
high workload (N=1)	0.71	0.29
	eta = 0.29	Beta = 0.26
(e) Sex-Role Attitude:		
Traditional (N=7)	-0.57	-0.51
Average (N=11)	0.46	0.40
Non-traditional (N=15)	-0.07	-0.06
	eta = 0.16	Beta = 0.14

TABLE 40: MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS OF WEEKEND
LEISURE TIME FOR EMPLOYED FEMALES BY OCCUPATION,
WORK TIME, SPOUSE'S WORK TIME, FAMILY WORKLOAD
AND SEX ROLE ATTITUDE

Grand Mean = 8.20 hours of leisure   Multiple R = 0.66

Independent Variable	Unadjusted Deviation from the Mean	Deviation Adjusted for all other vars
(a) Occupation:		
Prof, mgr. (N=8)	-0.70	-1.69
White collar (N=19)	1.05	1.27
Un-, semi-skilled (N=6)	-2.41	-1.76
	eta = 0.44	Beta = 0.48
(b) Work time(employment):		
30 hours or less (N=11)	0.14	0.79
31-45 hours (N=11)	-0.17	0.53
46-55 hours (N=11)	0.03	-1.33
	eta = 0.04	Beta = 0.31
(c) Spouse's Work time(employment):		
31-45 hours (N=12)	1.49	1.22
46-55 hours (N=16)	-0.40	0.22
56 hours or more (N=5)	-2.30	-3.64
	eta = 0.42	Beta = 0.52
(d) Family Workload:		
No children (N=16)	0.52	-0.17
low workload (N=5)	-0.20	-0.16
moderate workload (N=11)	-0.88	0.49
high workload (N=1)	2.30	-1.79
	eta = 0.24	Beta = 0.14
(e) Sex-Role Attitude:		
Traditional (N=7)	-1.30	-1.27
Average (N=11)	0.76	1.08
Non-traditional (N=15)	0.05	-0.20
	eta = 0.24	Beta = 0.28

suggested general status effect. For women, though, professional and semi-professional workers are shown to have increased leisure on weekdays compared to other occupational groups; but decreased leisure on weekends. Again, this could be due to the use of weekends by this group of workers for housework and household activities.

The MCA analysis for employed females also show that spouse's work time affects the leisure time of these women negatively. On weekdays, the effect is small ($\eta^2=.22$, $Beta=.07$), but on weekends the effect of spouse's work time is strong ($Beta=.52$). It is considerably stronger than the effect of the woman's own work time, and much stronger, also, than the effect of spouse's work time on males. For employed women, their husbands' hours of labour market activity affects their weekend leisure time by nearly 5 hours: if their spouse's work week is less than 45 hours, the wives' mean leisure time is nearly 9 hours 30 minutes, whereas, if their husband works more than 55 hours a week, their own mean weekend leisure time is reduced to just over 4 hours 30 minutes.

The effects of family workload and sex role attitude on the leisure time of employed women are less clear and consistent than the other variables considered. There is a tendency for a traditional attitude towards sex roles to be associated with less leisure time both on weekdays and

TABLE 41: MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS OF WEEKDAY
LEISURE TIME FOR HOUSEWIVES BY SPOUSE'S WORK TIME
FAMILY WORKLOAD AND SEX-ROLE ATTITUDE

Grand Mean = 6.60 hours of leisure   Multiple R = 0.56

Independent Variable	Unadjusted Deviation from the Mean	Deviation Adjusted for all other vars

(a) Spouse's Work time(employment):

31-45 hours (N=12)	0.17	0.10
46-55 hours (N=10)	0.87	1.20
56 hours or more (N=5)	-2.15	-2.64

eta = 0.41

Beta = 0.51

(b) Family Workload:

No children (N=3)	-0.10	2.09
low workload (N=11)	0.57	0.37
moderate workload (N=10)	0.02	-0.52
high workload (N=3)	-1.85	-1.69

eta = 0.26

Beta = 0.37

(c) Sex-Role Attitude:

Traditional (N=9)	0.06	-0.43
Average (N=8)	-0.85	-0.52
Non-traditional (N=10)	0.62	0.80

eta = 0.23

Beta = 0.23

TABLE 42: MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS OF WEEKEND
LEISURE TIME FOR HOUSEWIVES BY SPOUSE'S WORK TIME
FAMILY WORKLOAD AND SEX-ROLE ATTITUDE

Grand Mean = 7.98 hours of leisure   Multiple R = 0.72

Independent Variable	Unadjusted Deviation from the Mean	Deviation Adjusted for all other vars

(a) Spouse's Work time(employment):

31-45 hours	(N=12)	1.14	0.67
46-55 hours	(N=10)	-0.18	0.64
56 hours or more	(N=5)	-2.37	-2.90

eta = 0.35

Beta = 0.38

(b) Family Workload:

No children	(N=3)	1.03	3.55
low workload	(N=11)	1.61	1.28
moderate workload	(N=10)	-0.36	-0.96
high workload	(N=3)	-5.73	-5.05

eta = 0.60

Beta = 0.62

(c) Sex-Role Attitude:

Traditional	(N=9)	0.55	-0.76
Average	(N=8)	-1.73	-0.92
Non-traditional	(N=10)	0.89	1.42

eta = 0.31

Beta = 0.30

weekend days, but non-traditional attitudes are not associated with increased leisure time as might be expected. In addition, increased family workload is not shown to consistently reduce leisure time. There is a slight tendency for employed women without children to have more leisure time, but otherwise the trend is not clear. The fact that the expected negative relationship between family workload and leisure is not evident may be associated with the earlier finding that employed women often define child care activities as leisure: these activities are generally not seen as a drudgery or a chore. However, the family workload variable for employed women is also problematic because of the sample distribution, and the fact that only one employed female falls into the high workload group.

By comparison, the family workload factor has a very strong and consistent effect on the leisure time of housewives (see Table 41, p.224 and Table 42, p.225). This is true for both weekday leisure and weekend leisure: but family workload has a particularly strong effect on the latter, and is shown to account for a large proportion of the total variance in housewives' weekend leisure time ($\eta^2=.60$, $\beta^2=.62$, Multiple $R=.72$). For housewives with no children under 18 years of age, mean weekend leisure time is approximately 11 hours 30 minutes (i.e. similar to the mean leisure time for males), while for housewives with a high

family workload, mean weekend leisure time is less than 3 hours a day. With regard to weekdays, mean leisure time ranges from a high of 8 hours 41 minutes for women without children to a low of 4 hours 55 minutes for women with a high family workload.

Spouse's work time also has a strong effect on the amount of leisure experienced by housewives. The leisure time of non-employed females whose husbands worked more than 56 hours a week was reduced by nearly 3 hours on weekends and by about 2 hours 30 minutes on weekdays relative to the mean leisure time for all housewives in the sample.

Finally, sex role attitudes also appear to have a more consistent effect on the leisure time of housewives compared to the other sex and employment status groups. The effect of sex role attitudes for housewives is weaker than the effects of either family workload or spouse's work time, but the analysis indicates that traditional attitudes tend to decrease the leisure time of non-employed women, while non-traditional attitudes tend to increase their leisure time.

In summary, the analysis of leisure time, using individual's definitions of leisure situations, indicates primarily, a significant sex effect, with men having more leisure time than women, especially on weekends. The

employment status of women was not shown to have a direct effect on overall leisure time, but the factors that affected the leisure time of employed females were somewhat different from those that affected the leisure time of non-employed females.

In terms of predicting leisure using the factors included in the theoretical model, these variables explained more of the variance in leisure time for housewives than for the other sex and employment status groups. Family workload and spouse's work time were both shown to have a significant and substantive effect on the leisure time of housewives. Sex role attitudes also affected the leisure time of non-employed females, with more traditional attitudes being associated with reduced leisure. Family workload was shown to have less effect on the leisure of employed people, both males and females, though it did affect the leisure time of employed males on weekends. For employed males, the main factor that was shown to consistently affect their leisure time was the number of hours they devoted each week to their employment-related activities. This work time factor also affected the leisure time of employed females as well, although for this group, a stronger predictor of leisure was spouse's work time rather than their own work time. Employed females, therefore, can be seen to be similar to non-employed females in some ways, in terms of the factors

that affect their leisure time, while there are also some similarities between employed females and employed males as well.

The predicted relationship between status and leisure is confirmed with regard to sex, at least for this particular population. But this relationship is not evident for other status factors such as occupation and income. The only support for these other status factors is the finding that semi-skilled and unskilled workers of both sexes tend to have reduced leisure time. Apart from sex, the main factors shown to affect leisure are time-related factors such as work time for employed people, family workload, especially for housewives, and spouse's work time, especially for women. The fact that women are strongly affected by their spouse's work time indicates that they compromise their own leisure according to the employment needs and demands of their husbands, which, again, may reflect the status difference between males and females.

CHAPTER 8. CONCLUSION

This study looking at perceptions and meanings of leisure and at the distribution of leisure time can be seen to be essentially an exploratory study. It looked at a wide range of possible perceptual dimensions of the leisure experience, and also allowed for additional dimensions to arise during the data collection procedures themselves. Thus, it can be seen as a process aimed at the development of a "grounded" definition of leisure that is meaningful to people in terms of their daily life experiences. The study also used this notion of a meaningful definition of leisure to look at the question of the distribution of leisure time, and in particular to examine sex differences in the availability of leisure.

Because of the nature of this study, and the particular time-diary and interview techniques that were employed, the sample size had to be limited. Thus the population under consideration was restricted to married couples in which the husband was employed, and who were also living in particular urban and suburban locations. Nevertheless, despite the limited and restricted sample, this study does provide some initial findings with regard to the broad question of the meaning of leisure in the everyday lives of men and women in modern society. First, it

provides some basis for the notion that leisure should be treated seriously since it appears to be an important part of people's lives, as suggested by the people interviewed in this study. Second, it indicates some of the problems associated with traditional ways of defining leisure for research purposes. Third, it shows considerable consensus with regard to the meaning of leisure among the particular population under consideration. And fourth, it indicates some of the factors associated with the unequal distribution of leisure time.

(a) Leisure Values

The term leisure appears to be a term that is both recognized and used by people in terms of their daily life experiences. The individuals interviewed in this research study did not have any difficulties in categorizing their daily activities into work and leisure situations, and there were few events which were defined in terms other than work or leisure.

The categorization of daily activities also showed that, on average, a significant proportion of each day was perceived as leisure by the respondents in this study. This was particularly true on weekends, but even on weekdays, waking hours were fairly evenly divided between "work" and "leisure" situations. Furthermore, the great majority of

respondents claimed ~~that~~ leisure was an important part of their lives, and for some, leisure was considered to be "very important".

These results indicate, therefore, that leisure is a significant and valued part of people's lives. Although this does not necessarily indicate the end of the Work Ethic, it does suggest that for many people, their leisure is important to them as well as their work. Many of the respondents said that they would like to have more leisure, and for some the lack of leisure in their daily lives was felt as a significant deprivation.

The presence of a relatively strong and positive leisure orientation, as was found in this study, corresponds to other research, especially research into leisure attitudes (e.g. Neulinger, 1980a and 1980b). It lends support to Neulinger's claim that leisure is a "quality of life" issue (Neulinger, 1982), and that "leisure lack" is a problem for a substantial number of individuals in modern society.

It also supports the contention that leisure research should be treated as a serious area of academic study. Relatively little research has been carried out with regard to leisure behaviour, but the positive value that appears to be placed on leisure suggests that the relationships between leisure, the economy, sex and social

class are significant questions as is the question of the distribution of leisure in society. However, the value, and usefulness of all these types of research is contingent upon the use of a meaningful and valid definition of leisure.

(b) Leisure Activities

It is very clear from the results of this study that leisure cannot be considered simply in terms of recreational activities, such as reading, sports, hobbies and entertainment etc.. Although it is not uncommon to find leisure defined in this way in recreation research, these activities actually constitute only a very small portion of daily leisure events. Except for watching television, most activities traditionally thought of as recreational activities are infrequent events with respect to daily activities. Moreover, some recreational activities, especially recreational and adult education classes and fitness activities, are not always defined as leisure by all participants.

Other activity definitions of leisure were also shown to be inadequate in terms of the relationship between the categorization of activities by researchers and the definitional labels attached to these activities by participants. The categorization of activities as used in the international time budget studies, for example, did not

always correspond to individual's definitions of diary activities in this study. "Free time" activities were generally, but not always, defined by respondents as leisure, but many "work and obligatory activities" were also often defined as leisure. Overall, this meant an underestimation of perceived leisure if time budget categories were used, and an "accuracy" of categorization (i.e. the correspondence between the activity label and the respondent's definition) of only approximately 70%.

These results cast doubt on the validity of a large proportion of the leisure research that has been carried out to date. Much of this research should be seen more as research on specific activity participation rates rather than research on "leisure" as it is experienced by people in their daily lives.

Part of the problem surrounding activity definitions of leisure is that different individuals define particular activities in different ways. Moreover, it is clear that there is an awareness among people that attitudes towards participation in certain activities vary: this awareness, indeed, is not unrelated to the general problem of confusion with regard to the definition of the term leisure.

Apart from simple individual differences in activity definitions, however, there do appear to be certain

systematic biases inherent in the use of activity definitions of leisure and non-leisure as well. First, the results of this study indicate a sex bias which leads to an underestimation of male leisure time, and a relative overestimation of female leisure time. This is because men tended to define many of their "work and obligatory activities", such as cooking, child care and home chores, more often as leisure than did women. In addition, women showed a greater tendency to define some of their "free time" activities, such as sewing, sports and watching television with children, as non-leisure than did men.

The second type of bias that was evident from the results of this study was related to employment status. In this instance, the leisure of non-employed women, or housewives, was overestimated by the activity type of operational definition relative to the leisure time of employed women. Again, the bias was largely due to the individual definitions of activities such as cooking, sewing, meal times and child care, which were more often defined as leisure by employed rather than by non-employed women. These results correspond to some of the research concerned with leisure among the elderly which indicates that not all "free time" or time away from labour market activity is experienced as leisure (e.g. Parker, 1979; Gognalons, 1979). They further suggest that activity

definitions would be particularly inappropriate for studying the leisure time of unemployed males as well as that of unemployed and non-employed females.

Another problem shown to be associated with activity definitions of leisure, apart from the problem of individual differences, is that of situational specificity. In other words, the same activity can be defined by the same individual in different ways at different times and in different situations. The findings suggested that certain objective situational conditions are associated with leisure experiences, such as weekends, evenings, home locations and interactions with friends and family. However, even taking these factors into account, in combination with knowledge about the activity itself, the accuracy of prediction of individuals' definitions of the situations is not very high.

The individual and situational problems surrounding activity definitions of leisure indicate that any activity definition would be problematic and "inaccurate" to some extent. This suggests, then, that the meaning of leisure in people's daily lives cannot be sought simply through consideration of the activities they participate in, nor in the objective situational factors. Instead, the findings of this study concerning leisure activities support the contention that the meaning of leisure needs to be explored in terms of perceptions of, and feelings about, leisure and

non-leisure situations.

(c) Leisure Meanings

The interactionist perspective that was used to guide and inform exploration of the meaning of leisure in this study led to the analysis of the perceptual dimensions associated with the definition of leisure situations. This approach showed that, for this particular population at least, there was a considerable amount of consensus with regard to the perceptual factors which led to the definition of a situation as leisure or as non-leisure. That is, that during the process of examination and deliberation leading to the definition of the situation, most respondents in most situations appeared to define leisure situations according to the same set of criteria. This consensus was shown to be present even though specific activities were not consistently defined. Accordingly, this lends considerable support to the attitudinal approach to the definition of leisure, and to the usefulness of the interactionist paradigm in examining leisure meanings.

The four predominant perceptual dimensions that were shown to be strongly associated with the experience of leisure were freedom of choice, intrinsic motivation, enjoyment and relaxation. The first two of these dimensions, i.e. choice and motivation, are factors which

have been frequently incorporated into definitions of leisure in the literature. The freedom of choice factor, in particular, is a central feature of the "classical" Aristotelian view of leisure, and of most attitudinal definitions of leisure. Its relationship to perceived leisure has also been supported by some empirical work (i.e. Kelly, 1972, 1978a and Iso-Ahola, 1979a and 1979b). However, examination of the relationship between freedom of choice and leisure in this study showed that this is not a simple one-to-one relationship. Whereas, almost all freely chosen activities were perceived to be leisure, a considerable number of leisure situations were not completely free choice situations, but some element of obligation was also present. Free choice, therefore, appears to be an element of leisure, but it cannot be equated with the concept of leisure.

The motivation dimension (previously suggested by researchers such as Neulinger, 1981a; Kelly, 1972, 1978a; and Iso-Ahola, 1979a and 1979b) showed a similar pattern in its relationship to leisure. In this instance, situations perceived to be intrinsically motivated were also perceived to be leisure situations. However, not all leisure situations were intrinsically motivated, and some extrinsic motivation was also perceived to be present in many cases.

The relationships between enjoyment and relaxation

and leisure have not generally received much attention in the leisure literature. There have been some recent suggestions with regard to the importance of enjoyment (e.g. Smith, 1980 and Roadburg, 1982), but Pieper's (1958) original view of leisure as "a state of inactivity" has been largely ignored in a field of research dominated by concerns about "activities", "recreation" and "participation rates". The influence of the early social problem approach to leisure research is evident here in terms of the continuing tendency to view inactivity (or "idleness") negatively, and the desire on the part of researchers to see leisure as something that is useful or worthwhile (or "wholesome").

Nevertheless, despite the lack of attention given to the role of enjoyment and relaxation, both these factors were shown to be closely associated with the leisure experience, at least for the population of married couples under consideration. In fact, these two factors were shown to discriminate somewhat better between leisure and non-leisure situations than either the freedom of choice or the intrinsic motivation factors.

The aspect of relaxation that was most salient with regard to differentiating leisure from other situations was that of emotional relaxation, or lack of stress and tension. Other types of relaxation, i.e. physical and mental relaxation, also showed positive relationships with leisure,

but these were much weaker than the relaxation-leisure relationship.

Apart from the four perceptual dimensions closely linked to the definition of leisure, other perceptual factors were also found to be associated with the leisure experience. In particular, the evaluation factors proved to be important in the process of differentiating between leisure and non-leisure situations. These factors should not be equated with the "time out" concept as it is used in the drinking literature, but the data indicate that activities in which the participant feels the outcome is being judged, tested or evaluated are less likely to be perceived as leisure than other activities where evaluation is perceived to be lacking. This feeling of evaluation may, in fact, be self imposed, i.e. self evaluation, and this dimension, on average, has as much impact on the definition of the situation as the perceived evaluation of other people.

Perceived evaluation is associated with labour market activities in many instances, and the saliency of this factor may relate to the non-work definitions of leisure put forward by several of the male respondents, and to the work-related factor incorporated into Kelly's original model of leisure (Kelly, 1972). However, perceived evaluation is much more widely applicable to daily

activities than a simple employment factor. That is, it is relevant to housewives and other non-employed or unemployed populations, and it affects the definition of housework and other obligatory activities as well as labour market activities. The notion of evaluation is not evident in the leisure literature, but this study clearly indicates the usefulness of such a factor in terms of understanding the meaning of leisure in people's lives.

Other factors tested in this study showed weaker relationships to the definition of leisure. The interaction factor proved to be relevant in some situations, but cannot be associated with the experience of leisure in a more general sense. Satisfaction, as indicated in previous literature (e.g. Havighurst, 1957), was shown to be present in many work situations as well as leisure situations, and consequently was not a good differentiator of leisure. Also, situations that incorporated either spontaneity or some notion of "personal development" were so rare that they had little effect on definitions of leisure situations in general. Moreover, of the few situations that were perceived in terms of personal growth or development, most were work rather than leisure situations.

The lack of support for any kind of personal development factor which might include notions such as challenge, accomplishment or creativity, casts doubt on the

meaningfulness of defining leisure in terms of "self actualization" or as some kind of "peak experience". Such concepts seem to bear little relationship to the meaning of leisure in everyday life.

Some differences were evident between sex and employment status groups with regard to the saliency of certain perceptual dimensions. For example, physical effort was shown to be more closely associated with leisure definitions for females than for males, and evaluation by others differentiated non-leisure from leisure more consistently for males than for females. These differences may reflect the suggested residual attitudinal aspect of leisure, where dimensions perceived to be lacking in situations defined as "work" become more important discriminators with respect to leisure and non-leisure situations.

Nevertheless, despite the differences between certain subgroups with respect to particular leisure dimensions, despite the lack of consistency with which specific activities were defined, there was considerable consistency within the sample with regard to the four major dimensions of leisure. The predisposition of individuals towards particular situations may help to account for the apparent inconsistencies with respect to specific activity definitions. In addition, these same predispositions may

also, in fact, account for the consistency of meanings and perceptions associated with the leisure experience.

The analysis revealed that the combination of freedom of choice, enjoyment and self evaluation factors led to a high degree of "accuracy" (over 90%) in predicting the definition of leisure situations. Furthermore, this combination of three perceptual dimensions was shown to accurately predict leisure designations for all population subgroups that were tested, thus verifying the general consensus found with regard to the meaning of leisure.

The considerable sharing of meaning that was found to exist with respect to leisure cannot be interpreted as representing a "cultural definition" of leisure situations. This is because there was a general lack of awareness that leisure situations were defined in the same way by different people. Instead, the shared definitions can be seen, using Stebbins' categorizations (1972), as "habitual personal definitions" where the same type of experience is defined in the same way, but individuals using these definitions are not aware of the general consensus regarding the meaning of leisure.

In summary, then, people appear to consistently use the dimensions of perceived choice, intrinsic motivation, enjoyment, relaxation and lack of evaluation in defining situations as leisure situations, although no one dimension

can be equated with the leisure experience. Other dimensions also bear some relationship to the definition of leisure in some circumstances. However, the general consensus with regard to the central dimensions of the leisure experience do not appear to be widely recognized: a fact that is reflected in the lack of consensus in the leisure literature with regard to the definition of the concept of leisure.

(d) Leisure Inequalities

The unequal distribution of leisure time was examined using the individual's definition of each diary situation as leisure or as non-leisure. This operational definition of leisure was assumed to be reliable because of the small number of diary events that were redefined during the interview process. It was also believed to be a valid definition since it was based on the meaning of leisure to the individual, and did not represent a definition imposed by the researcher. Moreover, the general consensus found with regard to the perceptual dimensions of leisure lent support to this claim of validity..

The problems that were shown to be associated with activity definitions of leisure, and particularly the problems of apparent systematic bias, suggested that findings with regard to leisure time would vary using this

individual attitudinal operational definition of leisure from those of traditional research into time usage. This, indeed, proved to be the case. For this particular population, females were shown to have less leisure time, with respect to weekend leisure, than males: a sex difference that was both statistically and substantively significant. This finding contradicts time budget research that has generally shown very little overall sex difference in leisure time (Elliott et al., 1976, Clark and Harvey, 1976). On the other hand, this finding does conform to Deem's (1982) contention of sexual inequality in leisure, and to the general inferior status of women in society which appears to affect their leisure time as well as other conditions of life.

The employment status bias that was indicated in the analysis of activity definitions of leisure as well was also evident. Whereas time budget research has consistently shown housewives to have more leisure time than employed females, this present study challenges these earlier findings. Although the sample size was small, the results for this sample at least indicate little overall difference between employed and non-employed women with regard to leisure time.

Despite the fact that males were shown to have more perceived leisure time than females, the other status

variables examined in the model of leisure time did not show such a clear relationship to leisure. The results regarding employment status, for example, challenge the myth that housewives have excess amounts of leisure, but they do not show employed women to have more leisure than housewives. One interpretation is that increased status due to employment increases access to leisure, but meanwhile, reduced free time because of time given to labour market activities, reduces access to leisure. Such an interpretation is not fully supported by examination of the effect of employment time on leisure, but there may possibly be a confounding effect of full-time versus part-time employment status. This factor is related to both the generalized notion of status and to the time devoted each week to employment-related activities. To separate out these factors more effectively, a larger sample would be required with more variance with respect to type of employment status, occupational group and work time.

The other status-related factors in the model, namely occupation and personal income, also showed only a weak relationship to leisure time. The one exception here was that semi-skilled and unskilled workers of both sexes were shown to have reduced leisure time compared to other occupational groups. This may be a status-related effect, though people in high status occupations (almost exclusively

males) were not shown to have increased leisure time net of the sex effect.

The analysis did indicate that the time devoted to labour market activities per week (i.e. work time) tended to have a general negative effect on leisure time as might be expected, although this effect was not statistically significant. This work time factor appeared to have a somewhat stronger and more consistent effect on the leisure time of employed males than of employed females. It also tended to affect male weekend leisure as well as male weekday leisure, even though job-related activities, themselves, did not necessarily take place on weekends.

Nevertheless, the main factors in the model that were shown to affect leisure time, apart from the sex effect, were those of spouse's work time and family workload. Both factors were shown to have a statistically significant effect on leisure time. Spouse's work time was shown to have a stronger effect on the leisure time of women than of men, and to affect housewives more than employed women. This conforms to Hunt's (1980) contention that women typically make adjustments to the demands of their husbands' jobs, and to Deem's (1982) research in England showing that women perceived their husbands' jobs and work hours to be constraints affecting their own leisure. The greater effect of husband's work time on their wives' leisure, rather than

vice versa, can be seen, again, to be related to the unequal status of males and females. This status effect is further supported by the greater impact of husbands' work hours on housewives than on employed wives with regard to leisure time.

The family workload factor was also shown to affect non-employed females more than either employed females or employed males. This is somewhat different from the results of Meissner et al.'s (1975) Vancouver time budget study where family workload was found to affect women in general more than men. The smaller effect on employed women found here may relate to the fact that the employed women tended to define child care and household chores more often as leisure than did the housewives.

The strong negative effect of both family workload and husband's work time on the leisure time of housewives leads to a picture of extreme "leisure lack" for some, but not necessarily all, housewives. Those housewives who have a large family, or who have young children, are deprived of their own leisure time. And this deprivation is particularly severe for those housewives with a high family workload who are also married to husbands who devote a lot of time to their employment-related activities. The negative view of the housewife role, then, appears from this research to be evident, at least for some housewives in some

situations.

Given the sex difference in leisure time in this study, and the greater effect of certain factors on females than on males, sex role attitudes might be expected to have a significant effect on leisure as well. In particular, a non-traditional attitude towards sex roles might be expected to reduce the overall sex inequality. This trend is indicated with regards to the attitudes and leisure time of housewives, but is not clearly apparent for either employed males or employed females. This may indicate that sex role attitudes do not necessarily translate into behaviour for employed males and females, or it may mean that the leisure time of housewives is, in fact, more susceptible to attitudinal differences than the leisure time of the other sex and employment status groups.

In summary, then, the analysis of leisure time indicated a situation of sexual inequality, at least for the particular population under consideration: a finding that differs from traditional time use studies. Women, on average, were shown to have less leisure time than men, largely because they have less leisure on weekends. Apart from this overall sex difference with regard to leisure time, though, women whose husbands spent a long time on job-related activities experienced an even greater reduction in their own leisure time, as did housewives with young

children or with large families. The inferior status of the female sex role, then, and to some extent with the housewife role, seems to be associated with reduced access to leisure, although there is less evidence with regard to the relationship between leisure and other types of status, such as class or occupational level.

(e) Limitations of the Study

In any exploratory research study relying on interview data, sample size is inevitably a limiting factor. In addition, the 41% acceptance rate of this particular study also means that findings have to be interpreted with caution and that generalizability is limited.

The relatively low acceptance rate in this study was, in part, due to the high time commitment requested of participants, and to the fact that both husband and wife were required to participate. However, although the sample bias and the particular characteristics of the population who declined to participate is unknown, no obvious biases which might affect the findings of this study were evident. Comparison of sample data with census tract data revealed no major differences on the factors taken into consideration. In addition, there was no evidence that the sample was particularly biased with regard to time usage. For example, the individuals who were interviewed did not appear to have

more than average "free time". Indeed, many of the participants were clearly experiencing a great deal of time pressure in their day-to-day lives. Consequently, there was no evidence to suggest that the sample selected should not be treated as being fairly representative of the population from which it was drawn, despite the 41% acceptance rate.

With regard to sample size, the analysis of leisure activities and the perceptions associated with the definition of leisure situations was less problematic than the analysis of leisure time. This was because of the large number of diary events recorded by each subject. In addition, the general consensus that was found with respect to the definition of leisure situations provided some confidence for the interpretation of these results. However, the actual number of respondents from whom these data were obtained was relatively small. Also, since the population was restricted with regard to geographic location, marital status and the employment status of husbands, generalizability to other populations cannot be assumed. Further research, therefore, is necessary, to determine whether the perceptual dimensions found to be associated with the leisure experience are also the relevant dimensions of leisure for other populations as well, such as single people, unemployed males, and rural populations etc..

The relatively small sample did present some

problems with respect to the question of the distribution of leisure time and other individual data. This was not so much true in terms of looking at sex and employment status differences, which were the main foci of the analysis. Rather, the sample size problems arose in the consideration of other population subgroups, such as occupational group, personal income and family size. Some factors, such as sex, family workload and spouse's worktime were shown to have a statistically significant effect on leisure time despite the small sample size. The impact of other variables on leisure time, however, can only be interpreted at this stage in terms of possible trend effects.

Despite the sampling problems, this study does provide an empirical grounding for research concerned with the conceptualization of leisure. It also indicates some of the problems associated with certain traditional leisure research methodologies. It therefore can be seen to have major implications for future research in the broad area of the sociology of leisure.

(f) Implications for Leisure Research

One of the central issues in leisure research has been, and remains, the issue of definition. This is closely related to other methodological issues since acceptance of an attitudinal definition of leisure, or of the notion that

leisure is essentially a qualitative experience, has substantial implications with respect to the appropriateness of different methodological approaches.

The results of this present study strongly support the conceptualization of leisure in terms of attitudes or perceptions rather than in terms of activities or residual time. This is important if definitions are to correspond to the meaning of leisure in people's everyday lives. The interactionist notion of the definition of the situation led to the identification of a number of perceptual dimensions closely associated with the definition of leisure situations. Furthermore, the overall consensus with regard to these perceptual dimensions of leisure for this particular population suggests that they may be meaningful for other populations as well, for example for single people, retired people and unemployed males etc.. Although this suggestion of broader societal consensus with regard to the meaning of leisure needs to be empirically tested, this initial exploratory study of leisure meanings can be seen to represent a first step towards the development of a "grounded" definition of leisure.

In the analysis of leisure time reported here, individual definitions of each diary event as leisure or as non-leisure were used. This was possible because of the particular data collection process. That is, diary events

were defined within an interview situation in which considerable emphasis was put on feelings and perceptions and personal definitions of leisure. It was clear, though, that this method of labelling activities would not be appropriate in other situations, for example in survey research, because of confusion between personal and perceived societal definitions of leisure. If consensus is confirmed, though, with regard to the perceptual dimensions associated with the leisure experience, this allows for a different approach to the measurement of leisure. Terms such as freedom of choice and enjoyment, which are clearer and less ambiguous than the term leisure, itself, may prove to lead to a reliable and valid operational definition of leisure. Although a number of perceptual dimensions have been shown to be relevant to the experience of leisure, the discriminant analysis procedure indicated that leisure definitions could be predicted with a high degree of accuracy using only three of these dimensions, i.e. choice, enjoyment and evaluation. This combination of dimensions, therefore, could be used to study leisure and leisure behaviour in different contexts.

Understanding the meaning of leisure, then, in terms of everyday life experiences, is not only of theoretical importance with regard to the sociological analysis of leisure, but also has practical significance in terms of

leisure research procedures and methodologies. The question of the distribution of leisure time, for example, has been shown to be highly dependent upon the operational definition of leisure used. Given the value placed on leisure, though, and the apparent leisure lack among certain segments of society, this would seem to be an important research question, and one that needs to be explored further with larger samples and different populations. If a meaningful and valid definition of leisure is used, the notion of the distribution of leisure time may be a significant concept relating leisure to the more general issue of the quality of life.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Nels.
1960 Western Man Faces Leisure. Journal of Comparative Sociology. 1:3-16.
- Andrews, F.M., J.N.Morgan, J.A.Sonquist and L.Klem.
1973 Multiple Classification Analysis (second edition). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Armstrong, Pat and Hugh Armstrong.
1978 The Double Ghetto. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Arnold, Serena.
1980 The Dilemma of Meaning In T.L. Goodale and P.A. Witt (eds.). Recreation and Leisure: Issues in an Era of change. State College, Penn.: Venture Publishing: 5-18.
- Bacon, A.W.
1975 Leisure and the Alienated Worker: A Critical Reassessment of Three Radical Theories of Work and Leisure. Journal of Leisure Research. 7(3): 179-190.
- Beard, J.G. and M.G. Ragheb.
1980 Measuring Leisure Satisfaction. Journal of Leisure Research. 12(1): 20-23.
- Becker, G.
1965 A Theory of the Allocation of Time. Journal of Economics. 75: 493-517.
- Bélanger, Lucie et André Delisle.
1979 Les relations entre les activités obligatoires, les loisirs, la satisfaction de vivre et l'ennui, dans un groupe de personnes âgées. Loisir et Société. 2(2): 427-447.

- Bennett, D.J. and J.D. Bennett.
1970 Making the Scene. In Social Psychology Through Symbolic Interaction. Edited by G.P. Stone and H.A. Farberman. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn-Blaisdell: 190-196.
- Berk, Richard A. and Sarah Fenstermaker Berk.
1979 Labor and Leisure: Content and Organization of the Household Day. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Bergier, Michael J.
1981 A Conceptual Model of Leisure Time Choice Behaviour. Journal of Leisure Research. 13(2): 139-158.
- Best, Fred, Phillip Bosserman, and Barry Stern.
1979 Income-Free Time Trade-Off Preferences of U.S. Workers: A Review of Literature and Indicators. Leisure Sciences. 2(2): 119-142.
- Bishop, D.W. and M. Ikeda.
1970 Status and role factors in the leisure behavior of different occupations. Sociology and Social Research. 54: 190-208.
- Boserup, Esther.
1970 Woman's Role in Economic Development. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Bosserman, Phillip.
1980 The Division of Labour and Leisure in Modern Society: A New Form Solidarity. Loisir et Société, 3(1): 33-47.
- Brightbill, Charles K.
1960 The Challenge of Leisure. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Brightbill, C.K.
1961 Man and Leisure: A Philosophy of Recreation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Bull, C.N.

- 1973 The Non-Cumulative Nature of Leisure Research.
Society and Leisure. 5(1): 189-191.

Bull, C.N.

- 1971 One Measure for Defining a Leisure Activity.
Journal of Leisure Research. 3(2): 120-126.

Burch, W.R.

- 1969 The Social Circles of Leisure: Competing
Explanations. Journal of Leisure Research. 1(2):
125-148.

Burdge, Rabel J.

- 1969 Levels of Occupational Prestige and Leisure
Activity. Journal of Leisure Research. 1(3):
262-274.

Cavan, Sherri.

- 1969 Liquor License: An Ethnography of Bar Behavior.
Chicago: Aldine.

Champagne, Lyse.

- 1980 Not How Many But How Few: Women appointed to boards,
commissions, councils, committees and crown
corporations within the power of the federal
government. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on
the Status of Women.

Charlesworth, C.J.(ed.).

- 1964 Leisure in America: Blessing or Curse?
Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and
Social Science. Monograph 4.

Cheek, Neil H.

- 1971 Toward a Theory of Not-Work. Pacific Sociological
Review. 14(3): 245-258.

Cheek, N.H. and W.R. Burch.

- 1976 The Social Organization of Leisure in Human Society.
New York: Harper and Row.

Chodorow, Nancy.

- 1974 Family Structure and Feminine Personality. In M.Z. Rosaldo and L.Lamphere (eds.). Woman, Culture, and Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press: 43-66.

Clark, Susan and Andrew S. Harvey.

- 1976 The Sexual Division of Labour: The Use of Time. Atlantis. 2(1): 46-66.

Clark, Susan M., David H. Elliott and A.S. Harvey.

- 1980 Composite Variables: Simple Techniques for the Reduction and Analysis of Time Budget Data. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Research Group on Time Budgets and Social Activities, Sofia, Bulgaria.

Colley, Louise A.

- Work Occupation and Leisure Patterns of Self-Supporting Women in Pre-Retirement Years. Paper presented at the Canadian Congress on Leisure Research II, Toronto.

Connelly, Patricia.

- 1978 Last Hired First Fired: Women and the Canadian Work Force. Toronto: The Women's Press.

Conner, Karen A. and Gordon L. Bultena.

- 1979 The Four-Day Workweek: An Assessment of Its Effects. Leisure Sciences, 2(1): 55-70.

Cook, Gail C.A. (ed.).

- 1976 Opportunity for Choice: A Goal for Women in Canada. Ottawa: Statistics Canada and the C.D.Howe Research Institute.

Crandall, R. and J. Lewko.

- 1976 Leisure Research, Present and Future. Who, What, Where? Journal of Leisure Research, 8(3): 150-159.

Crandall, R. and K. Slivken.

- 1980 Leisure Attitudes and their Measurement. In S.E. Iso-Ahola. Social Psychological Perspectives on Leisure and Recreation. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas: 261-284.

Csikszentmihayli, M.

- 1975 Beyond Boredom and Anxiety: The Experience of Play on Work and Games. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cunningham, D.A., H.J.Mantoye, H.L.Metzner, and J.B.Keller.

- 1970 Active Leisure Activities as Related to Occupation. Journal of Leisure Research. 2(2): 104-111.

Cullen, Ian G.

- 1976 An Hierarchical Interpretation of Every Day Life. Society and Leisure. No 3: 127-144.

Cutten, George Barton.

- 1926 The Threat of Leisure. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Deem, Rosemary.

- 1982 Women, Leisure and Inequality. Leisure Studies. 1(1): 29-46.

DeGrazia, Sebastian.

- 1964 Of Time, Work, and Leisure. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.

Donald, M.N. and R.J. Havighurst.

- 1959 The Meanings of Leisure. Social Forces, 37(May): 355-360.

Dumazedier, Joffre.

- 1967 Towards a Society of Leisure. New York: The Free Press.

Dumazedier, Joffre.

- 1974 Sociology of Leisure. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Dumazedier, J. and N. Samuel.

1976 *Le loisir, et la ville*, Vol. II. Seuil, Paris:
Société Educative et Pouvoir Culturel.

Eisenstein, Zillah.

1977 *Constructing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and
Socialist Feminism. The Insurgent Sociologist.*
7(3): 3-17.

Elliott, David H., Andrew S. Harvey and Dimitri Proccoss.

1976 *An Overview of the Halifax Time-Budget Study.*
Society and Leisure. No 3.: 145-160.

Ellul, Jacques.

1964 *The Technological Society.* New York: Aalfred
A. Knopf.

Ennis, Philip, H.

1968 *The Definition and Measurement of Leisure.* In
Eleanor B. Sheldon and Wilbert E. Moore (eds.).
Indicators of Social Change. New York: Russell
Sage: 525-572.

Farina, John.

1973 *Towards a Philosophy of Leisure.* In *Leisure in
Canada*, Ottawa: Department of National Health and
Welfare: 3-16.

Foote, N.

1961 *Methods for study of meaning in the use of time.* In
Robert W. Kleemeier (ed.): *Aging and Leisure.* New
York: Oxford: 135-176.

Fourastié, Jean.

1965 *Les 40.000 Heurs.* Paris: Editions Gonthier.

Francken, D.A. and W.F. Van Raaj.

1981 *Satisfaction with Leisure Time Activities.* *Journal
of Leisure Research*, 13(4): 337-352.

Friedman, G.

1961 The Anatomy of Work. Glencoe: Free Press.

Fuchs, Victor, R.

1973 Differences in Hourly Earnings Between Men and Women. In N. Glazer-Malbin and H. Youngelson Waehrer (eds.). Woman in a Man-Made World. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company: 222-227.

Gavron, Hannah.

1968 The Captive Wife. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Gerstl, J.E.

1963 Leisure, taste and occupational milieu. In E.O. Smigel (ed.) Work and Leisure: A Contemporary Social Problem. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press: 146-167.

Glasser, R.

1970 Leisure: Penalty or Prize? London: MacMillan and Co. Ltd.

Glazer-Malbin, Nona, and Helen Youngelson Waehrer (eds.).

1973 Woman in a Man-Made World. Chicago/New York/San Francisco/London: Rand McNally and Company.

Godbey, G.

1981 Leisure in Your Life: An Exploration. Philadelphia, Pa.: Sanders College.

Gognalons, Maryvonne.

1979 Retraite-loisir ou retraite-maladie: les deux stratégies dominantes lors de la vieillesse. Loisir et Société. 2(2): 341-376.

Goodale, Thomas L., and Peter A. Witt (eds.).

1980 Recreation and Leisure: Issues in an Era of Change. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.

Graham, Saxon.

- 1959 Social Correlates of Adult Leisure Time Behavior.
In Marvin B. Sussman (ed.). Community Structure
Analysis. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.:
331-354.

Gregory, Sarah.

- 1982 Women Among Others: Another View. Leisure Studies,
1(1): 47-52.

Guinn, R.

- 1980 Elderly Recreational Vehicle Tourists: Life
Satisfaction Correlates of Leisure Satisfaction.
Journal of Leisure Research, 12(3): 193-204.

Gunderson, Morley.

- 1976 Work Patterns. In G.C.A. Cook (ed.). Opportunity
for Choice: A Goal for Women in Canada. Ottawa:
Statistics Canada and the C.D. Howe Research
Institute: 93-142.

Hantrais, Linda.

- 1982 Leisure and the family in contemporary France.
Leisure Studies, 1(1): 81-94.

Harper, William.

- 1981 The Experience of Leisure. Leisure Sciences, 4(2):
113-126.

Havighurst, R.J.

- 1957 The Leisure Activities of the Middled-Aged.
American Journal of Sociology, 63(2): 152-162.

Havighurst, Robert J.

- 1961 The Nature and Values of Meaningful Free-time
Activity. In Robert W. Kleemeir (Ed.). Aging and
Leisure. New York: Oxford Press: 309-344.

Hawes, D.K.

- 1978 Satisfaction Derived from Leisure-Time Pursuits: An Exploratory Nationwide Survey. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 10(4): 247-264.

Haworth, J.T. and M.A. Smith (eds.).

- 1975 *Work and Leisure*. London: Lepus Books.

Heit, Michael J. and Don Malpass.

- 1975 Do Women Have Equal Play? Toronto: Sports and Fitness Division, Ministry of Culture and Recreation.

Henderson, Karla A.

- 1981 Motivations and Perceptions of Volunteerism as Leisure Activity. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 13(3): 208-218.

Holter, Harriet.

- 1970 *Sex Roles and Social Structure*. Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.

Hunnicut, Benjamin.

- 1980 Historical Attitudes Toward the Increase of Free Time in the Twentieth Century: Time for Work, for Leisure, or as Unemployment. *Loisir et Société*. 3(2): 195-218.

Hunt, P.

- 1980 *Gender and Class Consciousness*. London: MacMillan.

Huxley, A.

- 1925 *Along the Road*. London: Chaton and Widdus.

Iso-Ahola, Seppo E.

- 1979a Basic Dimensions of Definitions of Leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 11(1): 28-39.

Iso-Ahola, Seppo E.
 1979b Some Social Psychological Determinants of Perceptions of Leisure: Preliminary Evidence. Leisure Sciences, 2(3/4): 305-314.

Iso-Ahola, Seppo E.
 1980a The Social Psychology of Leisure and Recreation. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. D. Brown.

Iso-Ahola, Seppo E. (ed.).
 1980b Social Psychological Perspectives on Leisure and Recreation. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Jenkins, Olive and Barrie Sherman.
 1981 The Leisure Shock. London: Eyre Methuen Ltd.

Kando, T.
 1975 Leisure and Popular Culture in Transition. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Co.

Kando, T. M. and W. C. Summers.
 1971 The Impact of Work on Leisure: Toward a Paradigm and Research Strategy. Pacific Sociological Review. 14(3): 310-327.

Kaplan, Max.
 1960 Leisure in America. New York: John Wiley.

Kaplan, Max.
 1975 Leisure: Theory and Policy. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Kelly, John R.
 1972 Work and Leisure: A Simplified Paradigm. Journal of Leisure Research, 4(1): 50-62.

Kelly, John R.
 1974 Sociological Perspectives and Leisure Research. Current Sociology, 22(1-3): 127-158.

Kelly, John R.
1975. Leisure Decisions: Exploring Intrinsic and Role-Related Orientations. Society and Leisure. No 4: 45-61.

Kelly, John R.
1978a A Revised Paradigm of Leisure Choices. Leisure Sciences, 1(4): 345-363.

Kelly, John R.
1978b Family Leisure in Three Communities. Journal of Leisure Research, 10(1): 47-60.

Kelly, John R.
1980 Leisure and Quality: Beyond the Quantitative Barrier in Research. In T.L. Goodale and P.A. Witt (eds.). Recreation and Leisure: Issues in an Era of Change. State College, Penn.: Venture Publishing: 300-314.

Kessler, R.C. and J.A. McRae.
1982 The Effect of Wife's Employment. American Sociological Review. 47(2): 216-227.

Kirsh, C., B. Dixon and M. Bond.
1974. A Leisure Study - Canada 1972. Toronto. Ontario: Published for the Arts and Culture Branch, Department of Secretary of State by A.E. Design and Cultural Publications.

Kleiber, Douglas A.
1980 Free Time Activity and Psycho-social Adjustment in College Students: A Preliminary Analysis. Journal of Leisure Research, 12(3): 205-212.

Kleiber, Douglas and Rick Crandall.
1981. Leisure and Work Ethics and Locus Control. Leisure Sciences, 4(4): 477-485.

Kraus, Richard.

1978 Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society. Santa Monica, C.A.: Goodyear Publishing.

Larrabee, E. and R. Meyersohn (eds.).

1958 Mass Leisure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Larson, Lyle E.

1972 The Family and Leisure in Post-Industrial Society. In S. Hameed and D. Cullen (eds.): Work and Leisure in Canada. Edmonton: University of Alberta: 132-142.

Lavasseur, Roger.

1980 Contributions à une sociologie de l'action culturelle. Loisir et Société, 3(1): 113-134.

Linder, S.B.

1970 The Harried Leisure Class. New York: Colombia University Press.

London, M., R. Crandall and D. Fitzgibbons.

1977 The Psychological Structure of Leisure: Activities, Needs, People. Journal of Leisure Research, 9(4): 252-263.

Lopata, Helena Z.

1971 Occupation: Housewife. London: Oxford University Press.

Lundberg, G.A., M. Komarovsky and M.A. McInerney.

1934 Leisure: A Suburban Study. New York: Colombia University Press.

Luxton, Meg.

1980 More Than a Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home. Toronto: The Women's Press.

- Lynd, Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd.
1929 Middletown. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Lynd, Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd.
1937 Middletown in Transition. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Machlowitz, M.M.
1978 Determining the Effects of Workaholism. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Yale University.
- Machlowitz, M.M.
1981 Workaholics: Living with them, working with them. New York: Mentor Books.
- Mannell, Roger.
1979 A Conceptual and Experimental Basis for Research in the Psychology of Leisure. *Loisir et Société*, 2(1): 179-196.
- Mannell, R.C.
1980 Social Psychological Techniques and Strategies for Studying Leisure Experiences. In S.E. Iso-Ahola (ed.). *Social Psychological Perspectives on Leisure and Recreation*. Springfield: Thomas: 62-88.
- Maslow, A.
1980 Towards a Psychology of Being. New York: D. Van Nostrand.
- Maslow, A.
1954 Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- MacAndrew, Craig and Robert B. Edgerton.
1969 Drunken Comportment: A Social Explanation. Chicago: Aldine.

McDonald, Lynn.

1977 Wages of Work: A Widening Gap Between Women and Men. In M. Stephenson (ed.). Women in Canada. Don Mills, Ontario: General Publishing (revised edition): 181-191.

McHugh, Peter.

1968 Defining the Situation. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Mead, George H.

1934 Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Meiss, S. and J. Scheu.

1973 All in a Day's Work. Paper presented to the Canadian Anthropology and Sociology Association Meetings.

Meissner, M.

1971 The Long Arm of the Job: a Study of Work and Leisure. Industrial Relations. 10(3): 239-260.

Meissner, M.

1977 Sexual Division of Labour and Inequality: Labour and Leisure. In M. Stephenson (ed.). Women in Canada. Don Mills, Ontario: General Publishing (revised edition): 160-180.

Meissner, M., E.W. Humphreys, S.M. Meiss and W.J. Scheu.

1975 No Exit for Wives: Sexual Division of Labour and the Cumulation of Household Demands. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12(4): 424-439.

Miller, Norman and Duane M. Robinson.

1963 The Leisure Age. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Miller, Norman R. and C.R. Robinson.

1967 The Leisure Age: Its Challenge to Recreation. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Milton, Brian Gerard.

- 1975 Social Status and Leisure Time Activities: National Survey Findings for Adult Canadians. Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Monograph Series. Sociology No. 3.

Mitchell, Juliet.

- 1971 Woman's Estate. London: Penguin Books.

Morgan, Carolyn S.

- 1980 Female and Male Attitudes Towards Life: Implications for Theories of Mental Health. Sex Roles. A Journal of Research, 6(3): 367-381.

Murdock, George P.

- 1937 Comparative Data on the Division of Labour by Sex. Social Forces. 15(4): 551-553.

Murphy, James F.

- 1981 Concepts of Leisure (second edition). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Myrdal, Alva and Viola Klein.

- 1956 Women's Two Roles. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Nelson, Susan H.

- 1979 Juror's Verdicts in a Mock Rape Trial Experiment: A Social Learning Approach. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University.

Neulinger, John.

- 1971 Leisure and mental health: a study in a program of leisure research. Pacific Sociological Review. 14(3): 288-300.

Neulinger, John.

- 1974 The Psychology of Leisure. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Neulinger, John.

1981a The Psychology of Leisure (second edition).
Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Neulinger, John.

1981b To Leisure: An Introduction. Boston: Allyn and
Bacon.

Neulinger, John.

1982 Leisure lack and the quality of life: the broadening
scope of the leisure professional. Leisure Studies
1(1): 53-64.

Neulinger, J. and M. Breit.

1969 Attitude Dimensions of Leisure. Journal of Leisure
Research. 11(3): 255-261.

Neulinger, J. and S. Kopp.

1981 Leisure experienced by an intellectual elite: a
survey of the Mensa society. Mensa Research Journal
(Spring-Summer): 25-33.

Oakley, Ann.

1972 Sex, Gender and Society. New York: Harper, and Row.

Oakley, Ann.

1974 The Sociology of Housework. New York: Pantheon.

Oakley, Ann.

1976 Housewife. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Oppenheim-Mason, Karen, John L. Czajka and Sara Arber.

1976 Change in U.S. Women's Sex Role Attitudes,
1964-1974. American Sociological Review, 41(4):
573-596.

Orthner, D.K.

1975 Leisure Activity Patterns and Marital Satisfaction
over the Marital Career. Journal of Marriage and
the Family. 37(1): 91-102.

Orthner, D.K. and J.A.Mancini.

1978 Parental Family Sociability and Marital Leisure Patterns. Leisure Sciences, 1(4): 365-372.

Orzak, L.H.

1963 Work as a central life interest of professionals. In Erwin O. Smigel (ed.). Work and Leisure. New Haven: College and University Press: 73-84.

Oggood, C., G.J.Suci and P.H.Tannenbaum.

1957 The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Parker, Stanley.

1972 The Future of Work and Leisure. London: Granada.

Parker, Stanley.

1975 Work and Leisure: Theory and Fact. In J. Haworth and M.A. Smith (eds.). Work and Leisure. London: Lepus Books: 23-35.

Parker, Stanley.

1976 The Sociology of Leisure. New York: Allen and Unwin.

Parker, Stanley.

1979 Retirement - Leisure or not? Loisir et Société. 2(2): 329-240.

Parker, Stanley R. and Michael A.Smith.

1976 Work and Leisure. In R.Dubin (ed.). Handbook for Work, Organization and Society. Chicago: Rand McNally: 37-62.

Picard, Michel.

1980 Sur quelques rapports entre la sociologie et l'économie politique dans l'étude du loisir. Loisir et Société, 3(2): 325-356.

- Pieper, Josef.
1952 Leisure: The Basis of Culture. New York: Random House.
- Pierce, Robert C.
1980 Dimensions of Leisure: Satisfaction. Journal of Leisure Research, 12(1): 5-19.
- Pierce, Robert C.
1980 Dimensions of Leisure II: Descriptions. Journal of Leisure Research. 12(2): 150-163.
- Pineo, Peter C. and John Porter.
1967 Occupational Prestige in Canada. The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4(1): 24-40.
- Prónovost, Gilles.
1981 Cultures, conditions de production et idéologies de la culture. Loisir et Société, 4(1): 11-23.
- Ragheb, Mounir G.
1980 Interrelationships Among Leisure Participation Leisure Satisfaction and Leisure Attitudes. Journal of Leisure Research, 12(2): 138-149.
- Rapaport, R. and R.N. Rapaport.
1975 Leisure and the Family Cycle. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Reiter, Rayna.
1975 Men and Women in the South of France: Public and Private Domains. In R. Reiter (ed.). Toward an Anthropology of Women. New York: Monthly Review Press: 252-282.
- Riesman, David, Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denney.
1950 The Lonely Crowd. New York: Yale University Press.

Riesman, David.

- 1958 Leisure and Work in Post-Industrial Society. In E.Larrabee and R.Meyersohn (eds.). Mass Leisure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press: 363-375.

Roadburg, Alan.

- 1979 Dereifying Work and Leisure. In E.M.Avedon, M.Lelièvre and T.O.Stewart (eds.). Contemporary Leisure Research. Proceedings of the Second Canadian Congress on Leisure Research. Ontario Research Council on Leisure: 44-50.

Roadburg, Alan.

- 1981 Perceptions of Work and Leisure Among the Elderly. The Gerontologist, 20(2): 142-145.

Roadburg, Alan.

- 1982a Freedom and Enjoyment: Disentangling Perceived Leisure. Journal of Leisure Research (in press).

Roadburg, Alan.

- 1982b Is there Leisure Without Work? (Unpublished paper).

Robb, A.Leslie and Byron G.Spencer,

- 1976 Education: Enrollment and Attainment. In G.C.A. Cook (ed.). Opportunity for Choice: A Goal for Women in Canada. Ottawa: Statistics Canada and the C.D.Howe Research Institute: 53-92.

Roberts, Kenneth.

- 1970 Leisure. London: Longman.

Roberts, Kenneth.

- 1978 Contemporary Society and the Growth of Leisure. London: Longman.

Roberts, K., F.G.Cook, S.C.Clark and E.Semeonoff.

- 1976 The Family Life-Cycle, Domestic Roles and the Meaning of Leisure. Society and Leisure, No. 3: 7-20.

Robinson, John P. and Philip E. Converse.

1966 Sixty-six Basic Tables of Time-Budget Data for the United States. Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Robinson, John P.

1966 Summary of United States Time Use Study. Survey Research Center. The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Robinson, John P.

1970 Daily Participation in Sport Across Twelve Countries. In G.Lüschen (ed.). The Cross-Cultural Analysis of Sport and Games. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes: 156-173.

Robinson, John P.

1971 Historical Changes in How People Spend Their Time. In M.Andree (ed.). Family Issues of Employed Women in Europe and America. Leiden: E.J. Brill: 143-153.

Robinson, John P. and Philip E. Converse.

1972 Social Change Reflected in the Use of Time. In Campbell, Angus and P.E. Converse, (eds.). The Human Meaning of Social Change. New York: Russel Sage: 17-86.

Robinson, John P.

1977 How Americans Use Time: A Socio-Psychological Analysis of Everyday Behaviour. New York: Praeger.

Robinson, John P.

1980 British-American Differences in the Use of Time. *Loisir et Société*, 3(2): 281-297.

Robinson, John P. and Goeffrey Godbey.

1978 Work and Leisure in America: How We Spend our Time. Leisure Today. *Journal of Physical Education and Recreation*, 49(October): 39-44.

Rodgers, D. T.

1974 The Work Ethic in Industrial America 1850-1920.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rosaldo, Michelle Zimbalist.

1974 Woman, Culture and Society. In M.Z. Rosaldo and
L. Lamphere (eds.). Woman, Culture and Society.
Stanford: Stanford University Press: 17-42.

Rosenburg, Morris.

1968 The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York, London:
Basic Books Inc., Publishers.

Rue, Beverly Root.

1980 What do Women Perceive as their Leisure Activities?
Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and
Anthropology Meetings, Montreal.

Sanday, Peggy R.

1973 Toward a Theory of the Status of Women. American
Anthropologist, 75(6): 1682-1700.

Schliewan, Rolf E.

1977 A Leisure Study - Canada 1975. Ottawa: Department
of the Secretary of State.

Schomaker, J.H. and R.C. Knopf.

1982 Effect of Question Context on a Recreation
Satisfaction Measure. Leisure Sciences, 5(1):
35-43.

Smigel, Erwin O. (ed.).

1963 Work and Leisure. A Contemporary Social Problem.
New Haven, Connecticut: College and University
Press.

Smith, Adam.

1776 An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth
of Nations. London.

Smith and David Horton and Jacqueline Macaulay.
 1980 Participation in Social and Political Activities. A Comprehensive Analysis of Political Involvement, Expressive Leisure Time, and Helping Behaviour. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss Inc.

Smith, M.A., S. Parker and C.S. Smith.
 1973 Leisure and Society in Britain. London: Allen Lane.

Smith, S.
 1980 On the Biological Basis of Pleasure. In T.L. Goodale and P.A. Witt (eds.). Recreation and Leisure: Issues in an Era of Change. State College Pennsylvania: Venture Publishings: 50-62.

Smith, S. and A. Haley.
 1979 Ratio ex machina: Notes on leisure research. Journal of Leisure Research, 11(2): 139-143.

Smith, S. and B. Smale.
 1979 Editorial (A surfeit of surveys). Recreation Research Review, 7: 8-9.

Smith-Lovin, Lynn and Ann R. Tickammyer.
 1978 Nonrecursive Models of Labor Force Participation. Fertility Behavior and Sex Role Attitude. American Sociological Review, 43(4): 541-557.

Sorokin, P. and C. Berger.
 1939 Time-Budgets of Human Behavior. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Spreitzer, E.A. and E.E. Snyder.
 1974 Work orientation, meaning of leisure and mental health. Journal of Leisure Research, 6(3): 207-219.

Stebbins, Robert A.
 1972 Studying the Definition of the Situation: Theory and Field Research Strategies. In J.G. Manis and B.H. Meltzer (eds.). Symbolic Interaction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon: 337-355.

Stephenson, Marylee.

- 1977 Housewives in Women's Liberation. In M. Stephenson (ed.). Women in Canada. Don Mills, Ontario: General Publishing (revised edition): 109-125.

Szalai, A. (ed.).

- 1972 The Use of Time: Daily Activities of Urban and Suburban Populations in Twelve Countries. The Hague: Mouton.

The Determinants of Leisure Demand and the Prospects for

- 1976 Leisure. Ottawa: Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Thomas, William I.

- 1972 The Definition of the Situation. In J.G. Manis and B.H. Meltzer (eds.). Symbolic Interaction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon: 331-336.

Thomas, William I. and Dorothy Swaine Thomas.

- 1970 Situations Defined as Real are Real in their Consequences. In G.F. Stone and H.A. Farberman (eds.). Social Psychology Through Symbolic Interaction. Waltham: Mass.: Ginn-Blaisdell: 154-155.

Tinsley, H.E.A., T.C. Bennett and R.A. Kass.

- 1977 Leisure activities and need satisfaction. Journal of Leisure Research, 9(2): 110-120.

Tinsley, H.E.A. and R.A. Kass.

- 1978 Leisure Activities and Need Satisfaction: A Replication and Extension. Journal of Leisure Research, 10(3): 191-202.

Troyer, W.L.

- 1972 Mead's Social and Functional Theory of Mind. In J.G. Manis and B.N. Meltzer (eds.). Symbolic Interaction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon: 321-327.

4 4

OF / DE

- Walizer, Michael H. and Paul L. Wienir.
1978 Research Methods and Analysis: Searching for Relationships. New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, London: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Waller, Willard.
1970 The Definition of the Situation. In G.P.Stone and H.A.Farberman (eds.). Social Psychology Through Symbolic Interaction. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn-Blaisdell: 152- 174.
- Watson, K.F.
1980 Leisure Reading Habits. Ottawa: Infoscan.
- Weber, Max.
1958 The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. (Translated by Talcott Parsons). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Weitz, Shirley.
1977 Sex Roles. Biological, Psychological and Social Foundations. New York: Oxford Univeresity Press.
- Weyl-Willett, Margaret.
1977 Leisure Attitudes of a Selected Sample of Married Women in Santa Clara County, California. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Son Jose State University, San Jose, California, December, 1977.
- White, R.C.
1955 Social class differences in the uses of leisure. American Journal of Sociology. 61(2): 145-150.
- Wilcox, L.D., R.M.Brooks, G.M.Beal and G.E.Klonglan.
1972 Social Indicators and Societal Monitoring: An Annotated Bibliography. San Francisco: Jossey-boss.
- Wilensky, H.L.
1961 The Uneven Distribution of Leisure: The Impact of Economic Growth on Free Time. Social Problems, 9(1): 32-56.

- Wilensky, H.L.
1962 Labor and Leisure: Intellectual Traditions.
Industrial Relations, 1(2):1-12.
- Wilson, John.
1980 Sociology of Leisure. Annual Review of Sociology,
6: 21-40.
- Winston, Gordon C.
1966 An International Comparison of Income and Hours of
Work. Review of Economics and Statistics, XLVIII:
28-39.
- Wippler, Reinhard.
1968 Social Determinants of Leisure Behavior. (English
Summary). Assin: Van Gorcum.
- Yewer, M. and M. Heit.
1975 Recreation Patterns in Ontario: A Statistical
Profile. Sports and Fitness Division, Ministry of
Culture and Recreation, Toronto.
- Young, M. and P. Willmott.
1973 The Symmetrical Family: A Study of Work and Leisure
in the London Region. London: Routledge and Kegan
Paul.
- Yu, Jih-Min.
1980 The Empirical Development of a Typology for
Describing Leisure Behavior on the Basis of
Participation Patterns. Journal of Leisure
Research, 12(4): 309-320.
- Yu, Jih-Min.
1981 A Leisure Demand Projection Model. Leisure
Sciences, 4(2): 127-142.
- Zuzanek, Jiri.
1978 Social Differences in Leisure Behavior: Measurement
and Interpretation. Leisure Sciences, 1(3):
271-293.

APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY LETTER

279

Carleton University
Ottawa, Canada K1S 5B6

Dear Household,

I am writing to ask for your cooperation in a study of work and leisure which is currently being undertaken in the Halifax Metropolitan Area. The study is concerned with the kinds of work, housework and leisure activities that people are involved with on a day-to-day basis, and with the attitudes that people have about these activities.

Your household has been randomly selected for this study. Participation would involve keeping an activity diary for a 2-day period, a short questionnaire and an interview for both husband and wife living in the household. Participation is, of course, entirely voluntary, and all information provided would be treated confidentially and anonymity would be strictly maintained.

I will be calling at your house within the next few days to see if you would be willing to participate, to provide you with additional information regarding this project and to answer any questions you may have. I look forward to talking to you further about this study at that time. In the meantime, if you would like to talk to someone about this research project you can call me (local number: 426-8733) or you can call Professor Bruce McFarlane at the department of sociology and anthropology, Carleton University (613-221-5540).

Yours sincerely,

Susan M. Shaw

Ph.D. student, Carleton University

APPENDIX B: TIME DIARY2-DAY TIME DIARY

FOR SUNDAY

(date)

AND WEEKDAY

(date)

INTERVIEW ARRANGED FOR

AT

DAY 1; DATE

WHAT YOU DID IN THE MORNING

[illegible]

WHAT YOU DID IN THE AFTERNOON

[illegible]

DAY 2: DATE

WHAT YOU DID IN THE EVENING

[illegible]

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE ANSWER ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. What is your year of birth? _____
2. In what year were you married? _____
3. How many children do you have living at home with you? _____
What are their ages? _____
4. What is the highest grade or year of secondary (high) or elementary school you ever attended? _____
5. How many years of education have you ever completed at university or other post-secondary institution? _____
Degrees, certificates or diplomas obtained? _____
6. What is your occupation? _____
7. What was your father's occupation? _____
8. What was your mother's occupation? _____
9. What was your total income before taxes and deductions in the last 12 months?

(a) personal income:(b) family income

no income _____	no income _____
under \$ 5,000 _____	under \$ 5,000 _____
\$ 5,000-9,999 _____	\$ 5,000-9,999 _____
\$ 10,000-14,999 _____	\$ 10,000-14,999 _____
\$ 15,000-19,999 _____	\$ 15,000-19,999 _____
\$ 20,000-24,999 _____	\$ 20,000-24,999 _____
\$ 25,000-29,999 _____	\$ 25,000-29,999 _____
\$ 30,000-34,999 _____	\$ 30,000-34,999 _____
\$ 35,000-39,999 _____	\$ 35,000-39,999 _____
\$ 40,000 or over _____	\$ 40,000 or over _____

PART A

With reference to the diary:

1. Were these two days which you have recorded "typical" days, that is was it a typical Sunday and a typical weekday?
2. When did you fill out the diary? . . at the end of the day, the next day, or a few days later etc?
3. I would like now to go through the diary with you and ask you how you felt about each of the activities you have listed. That is, I would like to know, for each activity, whether you saw it as leisure or as work or as a mixture of work or leisure, or whether it was neither work nor leisure. So, if we take this first activity _____ that you have listed, how did you feel about that activity?

If the activity is defined as a mixture of work and leisure:
Would you say it was about equally work and leisure, or more leisure-like or more work-like?

(Continue this process of obtaining definitions for each activity listed.
Write in the last column of the diary the definition of the activity:

L : leisure	M : a roughly equal mixture of work and leisure
W : work	ML : a mixture but more like leisure
N : neither work nor leisure	MW : a mixture but more like work

At the same time check to ensure that the diary is complete.

This includes checking:

- Whether there are any times during the two days which are not accounted for.
- Whether some activities have been left out (e.g. travelling from one place to another, preparing or clearing up after meals etc.)
- Whether secondary activities have listed where applicable (e.g. radio or TV as background, or conversation or child care as secondary activities).
- If 2 activities are listed for the same time period, whether they should be temporally separated or whether they did happen at the same time.
- Whether it is clear where the activities took place (e.g. at home, at work, outside, or elsewhere).
- whether it is clear who else was present during each activity, including both children and other adults.)

PART B

4. How easy is it for you to decide which things that you do are leisure and which are work? For example, would you say that most activities are easy to label or that there are a lot of activities that are difficult to label . . ?
What kinds of activities or situations are easy to label and which ones do you find difficult to label?
5. What is it about the activities or situations that you think of as "leisure" that makes them leisure?
What would you say is the main thing that distinguishes leisure situations from other situations? Is there anything else that distinguishes leisure . . ?
What kinds of things do you do for leisure apart from those listed in the diary?
6. What is it about the activities or situations that you think of as "work" that makes them work?
What would you say is the main thing that distinguishes work situations from other situations? Is there anything else that distinguishes work . . ?
What kinds of things do you do for work apart from those listed in the diary?
7. (a) For employed people:
What kind of job do you have? (job description)
Is that a full-time or a part-time job?
Do you consider all aspects of your job as "work"?
Are there any things that you do for your job, to times during the workday (e.g. coffee breaks or work breaks) that you consider to be leisure or partly leisure?

(b) For housewives:
Do you consider being a housewife to be your "job" or the equivalent of a job?
Do you consider housework to be always "work"? Do you consider child care to be always "work"?
Are there any types of housework, or aspects of your job as a housewife, that you consider to be leisure or partly leisure?

(N.B. For women who are employed part-time ask both 7(a) and 7(b))
8. What kinds of "family activities" do you do, apart from those listed in the diary?
Do you think of these activities as always leisure?
Why do you do them? (for your own sake, for your children or for your spouse etc)
Who decides on what family activities to do?

PART C

290

Select one activity from each of the 3 sections of each day (morning, afternoon and evening) according to pre-determined random number. If at least one "leisure" activity and one "work" activity are not included, randomly select one of each of these 2 types as well (i.e. this would mean 6-8 selected activities).

With reference to these activities (taken one at a time):

9. Why do you think of this activity as "leisure" (or "work" etc)?
(N.B. Make sure you allow for a redefinition of the situation here if appropriate. R should not be put in a position of having to "defend" their original definition).
10. How would you describe your feelings about this activity/ situation?
(Probe here as follows:)
Was it:
  - (a) Pleasurable or unpleasurable? enjoyable? boring? fun? disagreeable?
(PLEASURE FACTOR)
  - (b) Relaxing or stressful? restful? hectic? time pressure?
(RELAXATION FACTOR)
  - (c) Did it take a lot of effort or hardly any effort? physical effort?
mental effort? (PHYSICAL EFFORT FACTOR + MENTAL EFFORT FACTOR)
  - (d) Would you call it satisfying or dissatisfying or neither? Did you
feel good about it? (SATISFACTION FACTOR)
If it was satisfying, why? In what way? (PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT FACTOR)
11. Why did you do this activity? Was it something you had to do? Did you
have any choice? (OBLIGATION FACTOR)
  - (a) If there was some obligation:
In what way was it obligatory? (obligation to work, to the household
or to a family member or friend etc) (TYPE OF OBLIGATION)
  - (b) If not obligatory:
Was it planned ahead of time, was it spontaneous or was it more of
a routine activity? (SPONTANEITY FACTOR)
12. Why did you choose to do this? Was it just because you wanted to or
for some other purpose? (INTRINSIC MOTIVATION FACTOR)
13. (a) If another adult was present: Was it better (more enjoyable) having
_____ there, or would you have preferred to be on your own?
If alone: Would you have preferred someone else to be there at
that time? (ADULT SOCIAL INTERACTION FACTOR)
  - (b) (Where appropriate, repeat qu 13a with regard to the presence or
absence of children) (CHILD INTERACTION FACTOR)

14. Do you participate in the following activities? If so, do you consider them to be always leisure, sometimes leisure (under what circumstances) or not leisure?

- (a) Listening to the radio?
- (b) Listening to records?
- (c) Reading books?
- (d) Reading magazines?
- (e) Participation in music?
- (f) Participation in sculpture?
- (g) Participation in crafts?
- (h) Participation in hobbies?
- (i) Lessons or formal instruction of some kind?
- (j) Sports (bowling, curling, hockey, badminton etc.)?
- ~~(k)~~ Physical activities (jogging, bicycling, gymnastics etc.)?

15. Do you think of the following situations as being always leisure, sometimes leisure (under what circumstances) or not leisure?

- (a) Watching TV in the evening with your family?
- (b) Watching TV at home in the daytime alone?
- (c) Having a coffee at home during the morning alone?
- (d) Having a coffee break at work with a colleague or work friend?
- (e) Visiting your family (parents, brother, sister etc) or your husband's/wife's family at the weekend?
- (f) Visiting friends for the evening?
- (g) Entertaining your friends at home for the evening?
- (h) Entertaining your work colleagues or your husband's/wife's colleagues at home for the evening?

PART E

16. How important would you say your leisure time is to you?
Do you think that you have too much, too little or about the right amount of leisure time?
What would you do if you had extra time for leisure?
Are there other thing that you feel restrict your participation in leisure activities apart from lack of time?
17. Roughly speaking, how many hours do you work per week at your job or paid employment (including time at work, work breaks and travel to work)?
Who spends more time at work (paid employment), you or your husband/wife?
Who spends more time doing housework?
Who spends more time involved with child care activities?
Who would you say has more leisure time? Why do you say that?
What kinds of things do you think your husband/ wife thinks of as leisure?
Do you think he/she thinks of his/her job (or job as a housewife) as all work or as partly leisure?

PART F

Turn off tape recorder.

Hand R a copy of the attitude questionnaire.

Go through these questions with R and mark down responses.

APPENDIX D: SEX ROLE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDY OF LEISURE AND WORK

Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Carleton University

CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE READ EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS AND INDICATE WHETHER YOU
AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THEM. THERE ARE NO "RIGHT" OR "WRONG" ANSWERS.
SIMPLY CHOOSE THE RESPONSE WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR GENERAL FEELINGS
ABOUT EACH STATEMENT.

	strongly agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	strongly disagree
1. It is just as important for a woman to have a job outside the home as it is for a man.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Women should worry less about their rights these days and more about becoming good wives and mothers.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being promoted.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Realistically speaking, men can handle the duties of business executives better than women can.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Dirty jokes sound no worse coming from women than from men.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. In marriage ceremonies, brides should not promise to obey their husbands.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. It is silly for a married woman not to take her husband's name.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. In general, men are likely to make better Prime Ministers than women.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. In dating relationships, the man should take the initiative.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	strongly agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	strongly disagree
10. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. It is foolish to appoint women to police forces with the same duties as men.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. Men are more rational than women.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share equally in household tasks such as washing dishes, doing laundry and cleaning floors.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. It is natural for men to be more assertive than women.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX E: ACTIVITY CODE SHEETCode number
and name

Activities Included

WORK:

1. Main job	Regular work
	Work at home
	Overtime
	Travel for job
	Waiting, delays
2. Second job	Second job
3. At work, other	At work, other
	Work breaks
4. Travel to job	Travel to job
-
-

HOUSEWORK:

5. Cooking	prepare food
6. Home chores	Meal cleanup
	Clean house
	Outdoor chores
7. Laundry	Laundry
	Ironing
	Clothes upkeep
8. Marketing	Marketing
-
-

OTHER HOUSEHOLD OBLIGATIONS:

9. Garden, animal care	Gardening
	animal care
10. Errands, shopping	Shopping
	Administrative service
	Repair service
	Waiting in line
	Other service
11. Other house	Other upkeep
	Heat, water
	Other duties
	Care to adults
-
-

CHILD CARE:

12. Child care	Baby care
	Child care
	Child health
13. Other child	Help on homework
	Talk to children
	Indoor playing
	Outdoor playing
	Other, babysit
-

PERSONAL NEEDS:

14. Personal care	Personal care
	Medical care
	Personal hygiene
	Personal medical
	Private, other
15. Eating	Meals at work
	Meals, snacks
	Restaurant meals
16. Sleep	Night sleep
	Daytime sleep
-

NON-WORK TRAVEL:

17. Personal travel	Travel with child
	Travel, service
	Travel, personal
18. Leisure travel	Travel, study
	Travel, organization
	Travel, social
	Travel, pastime
	Travel, leisure
-

STUDY AND PARTICIPATION:

19. Study	Attend school
	Other classes
	Special lecture
	Political courses
	Homework
	Read to learn
	Other study
20. Religion	Religious organizations
	Religious practice
21. Organization	Union, politics
	Work as officer
	Other participation
	Civic activities
	Factory council
	Misc. organization
	Other organization
-

MASS MEDIA:

22. Radio	Radio
23. TV (home)	TV (when location home)
24. TV (away)	TV (when other location)
25. Read paper	Read paper
26. Read magazine	Read magazine
27. Read books	Read books
28. Movies	Movies
-

LEISURE

29. Social (home)	Visiting with friends at home Party at home, meals Parlor games at home
30. Social (away)	Visiting with friends, other location Party, meals, other location Cafe, pubs Other social, other location Parlor games, other location
31. Conversation	Conversation
32. Active sports	Active sports
33. Outdoors	Fishing, hiking Taking a walk
34. Entertainment	Sports events Mass culture
35. Cultural events	Theatre Museums
36. Resting	Resting Relax, think
37. Other leisure	Hobbies "Ladies" hobbies Art work Making music Other pastime Play records Letters, private
-

ADDITIONAL SUBTOTALS**WORK AND OBLIGATORY ACTIVITIES:**

(Categories 1 through 17)

TOTAL FREE TIME:

(Categories 18 through 37)

(N.B. This coding system is taken from Szalai *et al.*, 1972, pp.564-566, and is the system used by the multinational time budget study.)

APPENDIX F: COMPARISON OF SAMPLE DATA
WITH CENSUS TRACT DATA

1. COWIE HILL

	SAMPLE DATA	CENSUS DATA
Participation of married females in the labour force:		
	50.0% (N=30)	50.4% (N=720)
Average family size:		
	3.8 persons (N=30)	3.4 persons (N=720)
Number of children:		
No children	20.0%	24.1%
1 child	16.7%	29.1%
2 children	36.7%	27.8%
3 children	26.7%	17.4%
or more	(N=30)	(N=720)
Education level (males):		
grade 10 or less	23.3%	23.3%
grades 11-13	20.0%	32.8%
post sec.	30.6%	20.6%
univ, no deg.	13.3%	10.6%
univ degree	13.3% (N=30)	12.8% (N=900)
Education level (females):		
grade 10 or less	16.7%	24.5%
grades 11-13	36.7%	34.3%
post sec.	33.3%	24.7%
univ, no deg.	3.3%	8.8%
univ degree	10.0% (N=30)	7.8% (N=1020)

2. CLAYTON PARK

	SAMPLE DATA	CENSUS DATA
Participation of married females in the labour force:		
	56.7%	51.5%
	(N=30)	(N=900)
Average family size:		
	3.4 persons	3.2 persons
	(N=30)	(N=900)
Number of children:		
No children	26.7%	20.6%
1 child	26.7%	31.7%
2 children	26.7%	30.0%
3 children	20.0%	16.7%
or more	(N=30)	(N=900)
Education level (males):		
grade 10 or less	3.3%	2.0%
grades 11-13	16.7%	18.6%
post sec.	40.0%	28.6%
univ, no deg.	6.7%	18.3%
univ degree	33.3%	32.5%
	(N=30)	(N=1230)
Education level (females):		
grade 10 or less	3.3%	2.6%
grades 11-13	10.7%	12.5%
post sec.	56.7%	47.3%
univ, no deg.	10.0%	22.3%
univ degree	20.0%	15.4%
	(N=30)	(N=1365)

END

3 1 0 8 8 4

FIN