

# 18

## Leisure

*Jonathan Gershuny and Kimberly Fisher*

After dinner, he may find himself drinking Brazilian coffee, smoking a Dutch cigar, sipping a French cognac, reading *The New York Times*, listening to a Brandenburg Concerto and entertaining his Swedish wife – all at the same time, with varying degrees of success.

Staffan Linder, *The Harried Leisure Class*, 1970

Leisure started the century as the name of a class, and ends it as a category of consumption. Leisure was once assumed to be an attribute of the progress of civilization, in which we move, step by step, from a primitive world of unremitting toil toward a future of uninterrupted play. At earlier stages of civilization, leisure was the exclusive perquisite of the rich, progress, through the automation of production would mean that an ever-increasing proportion of the population of developed societies would achieve this desirable state, while the working hours of the remaining part would continuously decline. The Sabbath day of rest was considered to be a foretaste of this paradisaical state of society, and indeed the Babylonian Talmud identifies the start of the messianic era with the point in history that all abstain from work on one particular Saturday.

However, more recently – indeed almost immediately after the announcement (by the French sociologist Joffre Dumazedier) of the imminent arrival of the leisure society in the mid-1960s – some quite strongly dissenting views emerge. Does work time *necessarily* decline with technological progress and economic growth? Does leisure really ‘trickle down’ from superordinate classes to subordinate? What, anyway, is meant by the word ‘work’ in this context? In particular, what happens to those sorts of ‘work’ that have been traditionally carried out by women? Similarly, what is *not* leisure? Some people (indeed, a growing part of the population, as unskilled jobs disappear and the majority of women enter the labour force), may view their work as a major source of interest and recreation, and consider their nominally ‘free’ time as hopelessly

compromised by family requirements (this is the central thesis of Hochschild, 1997). Work *becomes* leisure, and leisure, work.

In what follows we shall examine the (surprisingly limited) statistical basis for the consideration of these competing assertions. But before the empirical evidence, let us consider, in a little more detail, the nature of the theoretical arguments.

### **Leisure theories and concepts**

Three fundamentally important concepts in the nineteenth-century discussions of leisure (whose echoes are still very present in the twentieth century) are the *saturation of wants*, the *exploitation* of a subordinate class by a superordinate, and the *diffusion* of leisure habits from the superordinate to the subordinate.

The first of these notions is most clearly articulated by John Stuart Mill in the chapter in his *Principles of Political Economy* (1871) entitled 'On the possible futurity of the labouring classes'. He makes a number of remarkably modern-sounding (or at least 1960s-sounding) claims about the prospects for the saturation of wants. He asserts, quite straightforwardly, that the growth of productive capacity means that all the material wants of the next generation of the whole populations of modern economies could be fully satisfied. Hence, there is a very serious prospect of substantial reductions in hours of paid work.

The second of these notions, rather more clearly *political* economy, comes from Marx's *Capital*. (1867 [1967]) Marx defines exploitation in terms of the employer's ability to force his workers to contribute work time over and above the level necessary to maintain and reproduce their own labour power. The capitalist's profit results directly from his ability to enforce long working hours, and the ratio of this 'surplus' labour to total work time is Marx's 'rate of exploitation'. Reducing the rate of exploitation reduces profit and hastens the final crisis of capitalism. The reduction of working hours was thus advanced from the status of the pipe-dream of liberal triflers, to a major goal of socialist politics.

In short, both the 'positive' analysis of the liberal economists and the policies of the socialists were united in the view that 'progress' involved the reduction of working hours for the 'labouring classes'.

A somewhat similar expectation, though stemming from an utterly different analytical perspective, emerges from Thorstein Veblen's 1899 (1953) sociological classic *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Here the mechanism for the diffusion of leisure through the social classes was to be through a process of 'emulation'. Leisure, in Veblen's analysis, had been in medieval times and previously, the exclusive right of feudal proprietors. These first deployed their own and their dependants' expertise in the 'leisure pursuits' of hunting and fighting, to maintain and extend their landed possessions. 'Exploits' (Veblen's

ironic term for the participation in these violent activities of a 'leisured' retinue of armed men) were a mechanism for exploitation and expropriation by the superordinate class. Over time the 'leisurely' characteristics of the dominant class and their hangers-on become reduced to mere *symbols* of social dominance; the landed rich come gradually to maintain not just themselves, but also large retinues of dependants, in an idle state, as a *demonstration* of their social pre-eminence. And so too (runs Veblen's argument) do those of lesser social status who aspire to greater, seek to emulate the idleness of their betters in the hope they may be mistaken for them. Not merely the lesser gentry but also the urban bourgeoisie seek spare time in which to demonstrate leisureliness. Thus, it is through the social-positional, rather than the intrinsic, characteristics of the relevant activities (so Veblen argued) that leisure becomes desirable, and 'trickles down' through the social orders.

Keynes' (1928 [1972]) essay 'Economic Possibilities for our Grandchildren' bears strong similarities to Mill's chapter of 50 years before (though it is not specifically cited as a source). He argues that technological progress works like compound interest, to increase productivity against a background of needs that can be satisfied. Keynes' major original addition to the line of argument in this essay is in fact the identification of a new sort of 'leisure problem': how are the working classes to use their leisure? Keynes' somewhat patrician view is that, having little experience of free time, the newly leisured classes won't know what to do with their leisure hours. Hence, he implies, a need for education for leisure, a need for mass training in leisure consumption (his views here prefiguring aspects of the discussion of the impact of human capital in the formation of consumption habits found in Pierre Bourdieu's (1979) *Distinction*).

All this discussion so far relates to the historical evolution of paid work time in the money economy. The classical economists assumed that 'work' was coterminous with paid employment. Some sociologists, even in the 1930s, took a broader view, to include unpaid work, cooking and cleaning within the household. But as with paid work so with unpaid; the rate of technical progress in household production would outstrip the rate of growth of household wants. The dominant view in the 1930s was that automation would reduce the burden of domestic chores. The Lynds (1937), for example, in their classic *Middletown* study, provided an extensive statistical account of how housework time had been reduced by the acquisition of new items of domestic equipment.

Bertrand Russell's 'In Praise of Idleness' (1960) followed this trend of argument about the *possibility* of the coming mass leisured state, adding to it an almost moral sense of its *desirability*. And more than a century of enlightened argument from liberal and progressive thinkers reached its apogee in the optimistic 1960s, during which Dumazedier's (1967, 1974) *Society of Leisure* was seen as an almost inevitable correlate of the unavoidable coming of Bell's *Post-Industrial Society* (1976).

It would have been nice. But unfortunately, there is a trend of counter-argument that specifically denies the inevitability of a leisurely future, and suggests that perhaps the future will turn out to be even busier than the present. The argument starts from the evidence of economic anthropologists who observe that in fact the least economically 'developed' cultures tend to have the least work time. Marshall Sahlins' hugely entertaining *Stone Age Economics* – which in 1972 propounded an image of a Neolithic leisure society in contrast to the then more prevalent assumption that this was a post-industrial phenomenon – is perhaps the best introduction to this literature. But the foundations of the counter-thesis date from around the same time that Dumazedier proclaimed the leisure millennium, social historians (for example, Thompson, 1973) and sociologists (for example, Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965) were suggesting that the primary effect of industrialization was in fact to *increase and intensify* labour time.

A substantial theoretical argument to the same effect was not long in following. In 1970 Staffan Linder's *The Harried Leisure Class* presented a full-blown argument explicitly reversing Veblen's, portraying the whole of the development process as involving increase in work pressures, and also growing pressures of consumption. Based on a rather simple 'marginalist' proposition, Linder argues that a rational individual will maximize the return on the marginal moment in each activity. There is a continuous growth of productivity of work in the money economy, and hence there must be tendencies either (i) to shift time towards paid work, or (ii) to increase the intensity of leisure consumption so as to increase its marginal productivity – so even leisure becomes unleisurely.

A distinct strand in this counter-thesis is the explicit discussion of unpaid work. Two different arguments disturb the cosy image of leisure growth from the reduction of domestic work time.

The first relates to the supposedly labour-saving characteristics of domestic equipment. Joann Vanek (1974) observed that in the US, housewives' daily domestic work time total had not reduced at all between the late 1920s and the mid-1960s. In her own and in others' subsequent work, it has emerged that part at least of this surprising effect is to be explained by the virtual disappearance of private paid domestic service over this period. But despite this, and despite also the gathering body of international evidence that there is indeed some quite substantial historical reduction in domestic work time associated (at least temporally) with the diffusion of domestic equipment, it is still widely believed that domestic work time does not reduce in this way.

The second relates specifically to the gendered distribution of unpaid work. It has been clear that the various categories of unpaid 'housework' have, with just a few minor exceptions, been carried out predominantly by women. If those women who specialize in unpaid work are not also employed in the

money economy, there is the possibility of a degree of symmetry between men's role in the workplace and women's in the home. But through much of the second part of this century, women have been entering the workforce in increasing numbers. First Young and Willmott, in *The Symmetrical Family* (1973), then Meissner et al. (1975) demonstrated conclusively that the consequence of this has been the accumulation of a dual burden of paid and unpaid work which specifically reduces *women's* leisure. Subsequent work in this area through the 1980s and 1990s (Hochschild, 1989; Gershuny et al., 1994; Gershuny, 1995) produces the slightly less pessimistic conclusion that there is gradual change, as women reduce and men slightly increase their unpaid work in response to changes in the gender distribution of paid work. But aspects of this dual burden phenomenon persist and remain important.

So, while our progressive forebears in the nineteenth century, and the earlier part of the twentieth, confidently looked forward to a continuous growth of free time, this prospect is no longer uncontested. Juliet Schor's 1993 *Overworked American* – subtitled 'The Unexpected Decline of Leisure' – combines most of the distinct lines of the counter-thesis; increasing paid work time, women's dual burden, less, and more hurried, leisure. It is by no means uncontroversial, even in the US context (see for example, Robinson and Godbey, 1997), but it stands nevertheless as a not-implausible description of the UK position.

### **Definitions of leisure**

From the literature, we can distinguish three distinct approaches to a definition: leisure as a series of recreational categories; leisure as an aspect of consumption; and leisure as the residual category of what is left as 'free' time once 'work' is completed. The last of these is by no means non-problematic, but is used as the organizing principle for the evidence provided in this chapter. The former two have considerable appeal, nevertheless.

Young and Willmott (1973) encourage us to take the strongly principled view that leisure is whatever people consider it to be. In the time-use diary they gave to their survey respondents, they asked, throughout the day, what activities were taking place, and then quite separately, whether their respondents considered each of these activities to be work, or leisure, or neither, or both. This discussion was not in fact taken very far in the text itself, but the data show fairly clearly that even within the quite narrowly selected group of 25–45-year-old Home Counties couples, quite a wide range of different perceptions of what activities were or were not leisure activities emerged. To choose just two examples, some considered their paid employment as leisure, while others excluded watching television from their list of leisure activities. This sort of finding has theoretical implications that would take us well outside the

scope of this chapter. But it is also true that this same data source provides a reasonable level of agreement that *most* people take leisure to consist of a limited (and predictable) set of recreational activities, extending from relatively passive home-based activities such as watching television, via out-of-home spectator or audience activities, to active participation in hobbies and sports. It is possible to go further, and distinguish among these categories according to some supposed functional significance (for example, Parker, 1976). Perhaps some are seen as being involved in physical recuperation from work stress and strain, others in providing an alternative source of personal identity (as where the office worker becomes a cricketer), or as the literal recreation of the spirit (where a consciousness inured to the drabness of industrial surroundings is reawakened by exposure to beautiful sights or sounds). But genuine evidence to support any such attributions of purpose to people's play is in very short supply.

The second definition relates to the use of leisure in assertions of social status or of social differentiation. In this view, leisure is pretty well coterminous with consumption, and includes, in addition to explicitly recreational activities, acts of domestic eating and drinking, the wearing of particular clothes, and also the use of particular sorts of domestic equipment. The 'trickle down' model in which the leisure/consumption habits of higher status groups are emulated subsequently by lower, stems most recently from Veblen, and certainly forms a substantial part of Linder's 'harried leisure' argument, as it does of Hirsch's (1977) *Social Limits to Growth*, with its darkly pessimistic view of economic 'development' as the endless increase of consumption in the ultimately unachievable pursuit of individual social advancement.

Perhaps the most interesting modern use of this second definition is that of Bourdieu in *Distinction*. In this account, status, or at least distinctiveness, is not achieved by emulation of a social superior, but through the establishment of a style of leisure consumption, based on a combination of cultural knowledge ('human and social capital') with financial resources, to establish patterns of daily activity which assert the individual's 'distinction'. The Anglophone trickle-down model implies a strong unidimensional hierarchy of social statuses. In helpful contrast, this Gallic view of leisure as the means through which the individual deploys various different personal resources to construct a distinctive life-style, and hence asserts a distinctive social position, implies a more realistic-seeming complex, multiple and ambiguous status order. Leisure, for Bourdieu, is the means for asserting individuality in a modern society.

### **Residual definition**

But perhaps the most appropriate conceptualization of leisure, for present purposes at least, is simply as the *free time* remaining once all work – in the broadest sense – is accomplished. The inclusive use of 'work' to cover all work-

like activities, whether paid-for or unpaid, is of some importance in this context. The alternative 'leisure equals consumption' approach of course includes much of what might alternatively be considered as 'domestic production'. Status asserted through life-style, demands the Aga as well as the Opera. By contrast, the residual definition concentrates exclusively on acts of *final* consumption, on the meal as opposed to the cooking.

The straightforward statement of this approach is in the so-called 'third person criterion' (Hawrylyshn, 1978). Leisure, in this view, is 'activity that could not be undertaken by someone else without losing the essential intrinsic benefit accruing from it'. Hence leisure, in what follows, is equivalent to 'free time', time outside paid and unpaid work obligations. Also, though this is a matter of convention and certainly does not follow from the Hawrylyshn rule, sleep time is customarily excluded from this notion of leisure!

### **Sources of leisure data**

In the remainder of this chapter, we shall be considering data from three distinct sources.

The first category of evidence is, paradoxically, on employment (often, though not necessarily, deriving from administrative sources). These are, of course, in themselves not leisure statistics at all. But, given the 'residual' nature of our conceptualization of leisure, and in combination with evidence on unpaid work (see below), work time statistics provide us with evidence about a precise complement to our subject, and hence by subtraction, evidence on the subject itself. The evolution of employment patterns and of changing work time is discussed more fully by Gallie in Chapter 8 of this book.

However, employment statistics also provide evidence on leisure in a very different, considerably less direct, but still quite obvious manner. There is employment in those industries which produce the goods and services used in leisure consumption – what we might call 'leisure jobs'. Change in employment levels in these particular sectors provides an indirect indicator of change in rates and levels of leisure participation. Somewhat more directly, the official sources also give us information collected for administrative purposes on holiday entitlements.

A second general category of evidence, output or consumption indicators, also sometimes is collected for administrative purposes. This category includes 'pure' output indicators (for example, Board of Trade statistics on film attendance), and also statistics on consumption expenditures. Expenditure on particular categories of leisure-related commodities offers a more direct indicator than employment in these leisure industries. In combination series of data on price levels, data from the Family Expenditure Survey (collected on a national scale for the first time in 1951, and subsequently on a continuous basis since 1954) give us a picture of changing rates of purchase of leisure-

related commodities, both goods and services. We can, to a limited degree, tell from these categories of leisure expenditure – and also from statistics from this and similar sources of ownership of leisure goods – something about the distribution of leisure activities across the population.

But of course, expenditure is not itself strictly consumption. Commodities may be purchased, and then stored rather than used. An increased rate of expenditure on sports equipment, for example, might almost as well be a symptom of a short-term reduction in leisure time – as where the increasingly time-pressured executives purchase their golf clubs as a symbol of their thwarted *intent* to increase their recreation. Strictly speaking, ‘consumer’ expenditure even on leisure commodities is only evidence of consumption in that limited number of examples of short-term perishable services such as restaurant meals or seats at the theatre. Otherwise, like those hoards of unused book tokens, leisure expenditures, strictly interpreted, yield information only on projected leisure, and not on actual leisure practices.

The essence of consumption is ultimately as a category of personal experience. The act of purchasing something is of course itself a leisure or consumption experience. But when we buy the golf clubs, what we experience is shopping, not golf. We experience golf only when we play golf. There is ultimately, therefore, no real substitute for the third category of evidence: direct indication of leisure consumption activities from specific individual survey data. There are two distinct sorts of evidence that fall into this category. First, there is questionnaire-based evidence on rates of participation in leisure activities (as, for example, provided by the General Household Survey (GHS) at irregular intervals since 1973 – though as we shall see in a moment, even this evidence is only of limited use as a time-series), which establishes frequencies or rates of participation in leisure. And there is also a second category of evidence, on the time devoted to leisure activities as revealed by the nationally representative time-diary (or ‘time-budget’) surveys.

These two sorts of population activity indicators might fit together straightforwardly into an overall national-level system of accounting of leisure or leisure change. If the questionnaire-based participation data were sufficient to establish reliable population-level estimates of participation frequency (that is, the mean time between acts of participation in specific leisure activities), then the frequency multiplied by the mean duration of each particular class of leisure event (as estimated from the time-diary data) would give the average time devoted by the population to the category of event. Or alternatively, we can calculate population mean time even if the questionnaire evidence is only sufficient to establish a participation rate (for example, the proportion of the population who might be expected to participate in the activity in a given week), as long as we can establish the amount of time devoted to the activity in the given week by those who participate in it.

P mean participation rate over a period

F mean frequency of participation over a period

D mean duration of each instance of participation

T' mean time spent in an activity by participants

T mean time spent in an activity by population

$T = P.T'$

$T = F.D$

In other words, by combining the results of quite simple questions carried in large sample surveys of the sort employed from time to time in the GHS ('How often do you go to the cinema? – once per week/month/three months?') with evidence from even quite small time-diary surveys, it would in principle be possible to construct quite substantial and well founded accounts of leisure use patterns. In this chapter however, while we present both kinds of data separately, we do not take the final step of bringing them together to produce this sort of integrated leisure time use account.

### **An aside on the official treatment of leisure statistics in the UK**

The ambiguities in the construction of an operational definition of leisure pursuits are highlighted in the shifting opinions towards leisure statistics adopted by the compilers of *Social Trends*. The first six editions included a leisure section following the employment section, identifying the leisure statistics as a 'complementary extension of the data on people's working lives' which 'can only be understood in relation to time spent in employment, whether paid or unpaid' (No. 4, 1973, p.94). In its early editions, *Social Trends* concentrated on paid holidays from work, holiday destinations, and reading activities. By 1976, editorial staff at *Social Trends* elected to move the leisure to follow the 'environment' section later in the volume. The seventh issue redefines leisure to encompass 'the complete area in which an individual can exercise choice over his activities – including the working environment' (No. 7, 1976, p.173). Accordingly, the leisure statistics for that year included more references to club and society membership, and participation in physical activities, as well as updating the previous offerings. From 1977–87, the table of paid holiday entitlements was moved to the 'employment' section, yet was returned to the 'leisure' section from 1988. From 1981, statistics of membership in organizations appear in several sections. The publication was reorganized for the 1996 edition, and since that year no longer includes a 'leisure' section. Most statistics relating to product ownership (cars, video machines, televisions, and so on), organization membership, and non-work activities now appear in a 'lifestyles' chapter, which also includes statistics on voting trends and affiliations to religions and political parties.

## **Paid work, free time and holidays**

In this section, we consider leisure from the vantage point of the residual definition; leisure time viewed as, in effect, the *outcome* of the evolution of unpaid and paid work over the century. Gallie, in Chapter 8, has highlighted a substantial growth in the rate of women's participation in paid employment. By contrast, over most of the century, while men's labour market participation rate increased during the mid-part of life (25–55), it has actually fallen at the start of the working life (that is, ages 14 to 24, because of growth of educational participation) and at end (that is, 55+, because of earlier retirement).

Women now constitute nearly half of the paid workforce, yet around 40 per cent of all employed women work part-time. Women thus supply considerably less than half of all paid work time. By contrast, while the percentage of employed men working part-time quadrupled between 1961 and 1991, this percentage none the less accounts for about only 4 per cent of employed men, around one-tenth of the equivalent women's rate. The official employment hours statistics show reductions in work-hours for both full-time men (from 47.7 hours/week in 1938 to 42.8 hours/week in 1997) and full-time women employees (from 49.3 to 39.2 hours per week). In summary, we can say that from the point of view of the official statistics: (1) for men, the reduction in working hours, a small growth in part-time work, and a small overall decline in participation rate, mean that the paid work week has become considerably shorter over the century; (2) for women, the overall increase in the participation rate, combined with the general reduction in working hours, probably means a small increase in paid work time.

We cannot draw any direct inference about leisure from these data since we need also to know what happened to unpaid work over the same period; and the official statistics are entirely mute on this subject. Fortunately, there is an alternative source of data. The best way of estimating of how people spend their time is through a 'time-budget' or 'time-diary' survey, in which a sample of individuals is asked to maintain a complete schedule of all their activities for a given period (usually one day, but in the case of most of the surveys used here, a complete week). The UK government (unlike most other European administrations) has never yet conducted a full-scale national time-diary study (though a national study is planned for the year 2000). Nevertheless, other organizations have conducted large-scale, nearly national studies since the early 1960s. The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) Audience Research Department conducted what it called 'viewer/listener availability studies' in 1961 and 1974/75 (published in 1965 and 1978 respectively) using a seven-day diary method and a national sample, and the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) funded comparable (not strictly national, but reasonably representative nevertheless) studies, in 1984, and again in 1987, as part of its 'Social

Change and Economic Life Initiative' (SCELI) (these two are combined to produce a synthetic '1985' in what follows) (SCELI, 1984; 1987). And the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) at Essex University, in conjunction with the Office of National Statistics (ONS), conducted a small national one-day diary study in 1995. (Note that these studies are all based on samples of people based at home: the time use of people away from home – notably those on holidays – is not included.) We can combine the results of these studies to give a more general picture of change in work patterns than we get from the official statistics.

These studies provide a mass of information about the time-use patterns of different sorts of people at different sorts of time. To simplify the presentation of this complex evidence we use a straightforward statistical technique, multiple classification analysis (MCA) (which is in fact just a simple way of presenting multiple regression results: Andrews et al., 1967). Table 18.1 presents MCA models of the paid work time of British adults aged 20–60, at four historical time-points, broken down by sex, age and family status and employment status (these are the variables known to be the main determinants of paid work time (Gershuny et al., 1994; Gershuny, 1995)). The 'grand mean' statistics give estimates of the overall average time spent in paid work by British adults at each time-point. The remaining coefficients show the effects of belonging to particular sub-groups of the population, controlling for all of the other categories (in a manner analogous to partial regression coefficients).

**Table 18.1 Average minutes spent in paid work per day by British adults, 1961–95**

	1961	1975	1985	1995
Grand mean =	296	271	250	246
Family status				
Aged <40, no children	1	3	25	20
Co-resident child under 5	5	1	-11	-8
Co-resident child under 15	-6	-5	-8	6
Aged 40+, no children	0	3	-4	-15
Employment status				
Full-time	140	133	96	118
Part-time	-108	-83	-52	-56
Other, non-employed	-277	-245	-183	-205
Sex				
Man	23	23	24	19
Woman	-23	-23	-24	-18

Sources: BBC Audience Research, 1965; 1978; SCELI, 1984; 1987; ISER and ONS, 1995.

The table can be read in a very simple manner. Take, for example, the 1961 column: we can straightforwardly estimate, to choose a specific case, the average daily paid work time of a man employed full-time with a small child. This is the grand mean (296 minutes) plus the small-child effect (5 minutes) plus the full-time employment effect (140 minutes) plus the male effect (23 minutes), giving a total of 464 minutes. By contrast, the same sum for 1995 gives a total of 375 minutes, meaning, over the 35-year period, a reduction of about 90 minutes per day – rather more than the approximately 60 minutes per day reduction that we would have expected from the official figures. This modelling technique ignores interaction effects – the fact that, for example, part-time jobs have different effects for men and women – but the consequences are relatively unimportant for this particular analysis (since virtually all of the part-time workers *are* women).

The table shows an overall, though not an entirely regular, decline in paid work time. Full-time workers experienced a reduction in working time from the 1960s to the 1980s, then faced some increases in hours again through the mid-1990s. Even so, full-time workers of the 1990s worked fewer hours than their counterparts in the 1960s. Women's part-time work held approximately constant at around 165 minutes throughout the period (though the numbers of part-time workers have increased dramatically over the period). What is important about Table 18.1, however, is that it provides a series of estimates that we can add to the parallel changes in unpaid work over the period, so as to calculate leisure time as the residual category.

### **Holiday entitlements**

However, before we do so, we should note briefly that these reductions in weekly paid work time have been accompanied by a growth in holiday entitlements. In 1938, 40 per cent of employees in the UK had some form of paid holiday entitlement; this rose to 91 per cent in 1950, and 95 per cent in 1970. Subsequently this total has if anything fallen slightly, leaving approximately 10 per cent of employees without such entitlements in the early 1990s (*Ministry of Labour Gazette*, 1938; 1952; *Employment Gazette*, 1981; 1993).

How long are these holidays? Historical statistics in this field are in short supply. But an indication of the extent of growth of these entitlements is given by Table 18.2 which shows the changing distribution of holiday entitlements for full-time manual workers covered by national agreements on terms of service. Even by 1990, only half of all employees were covered by such agreements, and the coverage was substantially lower in the 1950s, so the sample is undoubtedly a biased one. Nevertheless, the table does give some indication of the very substantial increase in the level of holiday entitlement considered appropriate by employers over the last half-century.

**Table 18.2 Paid holiday entitlement for full-time manual workers covered by national agreements, 1951–90**

	%								
	1951	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
<2 weeks	31	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 weeks	66	96	97	75	41	1	0	0	0
2+ to 3 weeks	2	2	2	22	59	18	2	0	0
3+ to 4 weeks	1	1	1	3	0	81	43	17	9
4+ to 5 weeks	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	63	64
5 weeks up	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27

Sources: *Social Trends*, 1971, no. 2, p.64; *Employment Gazette*, December 1981, vol. 89 (12), p.534; April 1985, vol. 93 (4), pp.154–6; April 1990, vol. 98 (4), p.228; April 1992, vol. 100 (4), p.152.

By 1996, all European Union (EU) states had passed statutory entitlements for paid holidays for their workforces except Italy and the UK. *The Working Time*

**Table 18.3 Time spent on unpaid work, 1961–95**

minutes per day	Shopping, domestic travel			
	1961	1975	1985	1995
Grand mean	25	35	46	49
Aged <40, no children	-1	-3	-9	-2
Co-resident child under 5	-1	1	7	8
Co-resident child under 15	2	4	4	9
Aged 40+, no children	1	-4	-3	1
Full-time	-10	-11	-7	-9
Part-time	6	8	5	7
Other, non-employed	21	19	14	14
Man	-7	-7	-7	-9
Woman	7	6	7	8

  

minutes per day	Other unpaid work (odd jobs, garden)			
	1961	1975	1985	1995
Grand mean	35	31	39	35
Aged <40, no children	-12	-1	-9	-8
Co-resident child under 5	3	-2	-7	-7
Co-resident child under 15	9	0	5	-5
Aged 40+, no children	4	3	9	14
Full-time	-5	-8	-5	-11
Part-time	9	6	2	-2
Other, non-employed	8	13	10	23
Man	17	17	13	12
Woman	-17	-17	-13	-12

Sources: BBC Audience Research, 1965; 1978; SCELLI, 1984; 1987; ISER and ONS, 1995.

*Directive* Research Report released to the Commons in November 1996 concluded that enacting paid holiday legislation in the UK would not significantly affect employment or the economy (Lourie, 1996), and in October 1998, British workers, with some limited exceptions, gained the right to four weeks' annual paid holiday (*Labour Market Trends*, 1998).

In summary, the reduction in weekly work hours, which excludes holiday time, certainly underestimates the overall reduction in the annual total of paid work undertaken in Britain over the century. However, in the discussions of time use that follow, we shall simply ignore this fact, and concentrate specifically on changes in time use in 'normal' (that is, non-holiday) weeks.

### Unpaid work

Table 18.3 gives the breakdowns for the unpaid work of the working-age population, summarized in exactly the same form as in Table 18.1. The usefulness of the modelling is perhaps more limited in this case, because here the inter-

Cooking				Other domestic work (cleaning, laundry)			
1961	1975	1985	1995	1961	1975	1985	1995
63	59	56	48	55	47	44	47
-16	-14	-14	-15	-18	-9	-14	-17
6	-1	2	5	12	1	4	8
14	6	3	6	14	2	6	8
3	6	8	5	1	3	2	3
-24	-17	-12	-11	-21	-17	-13	-12
22	9	18	15	14	5	18	18
48	34	18	13	41	33	19	15
-37	-36	-22	-13	-33	-30	-23	-25
37	35	21	12	32	28	24	24
Child care				All unpaid work			
1961	1975	1985	1995	1961	1975	1985	1995
13	15	25	39	191	187	210	218
-8	-8	-20	-32	-55	-35	-66	-74
33	27	54	85	53	26	60	83
2	-5	-8	14	41	7	10	32
-13	-14	-21	-33	-4	-6	-5	-10
-6	-6	-5	-8	-66	-59	-42	-51
-3	-2	-8	5	48	26	35	43
14	15	14	14	132	114	75	79
-6	-5	-10	-11	-66	-61	-49	-46
6	5	10	10	65	57	49	42

action effects are important. We know, for example, that the relationship between having small children and various sorts of domestic work is quite different for men and for women. Nevertheless, the grand means, employment and sex effects are reasonably representative of the actual differences between the various groups. (A more detailed discussion of trends in unpaid work in a number of countries can be found in Gershuny, 1995.)

Consider first the means. Shopping and domestic travel time have been increasing (because of the growth of self-service shopping and the fact that the bigger the shop the more distant it must be from its average customer). Cooking time has decreased (partly because of lighter, and more pre-cooked, meals, but also because of a particular leisure trend that we shall turn to in a moment). 'Easy care' domestic materials have reduced other domestic work such as house cleaning. Time devoted to other non-routine domestic jobs has remained reasonably constant over the period. And time devoted to child care (as a 'main activity') has increased regularly and substantially through the period (partly because of perception of increasing dangers to children; partly because of new child-raising concepts like 'quality time'; and partly because the reduction of core housework and cooking time allows the conversion of formerly 'secondary' child care activities – for example, preparing the supper *while* supervising the toddler – into primary activities). Add together these five categories of unpaid work, and we find an increase in the total of domestic work of the order of half an hour per day, over the period.

Now consider the influence of gender. The gender effects for shopping remain roughly constant – which, given the doubling of the total time devoted to this activity, implies a convergence in the proportions done by the two sexes. A similar gender convergence emerges with 'odd jobs'. For cooking and housework, the gender gap declines. Despite the absolute increase in the gender gap for child care, the overall increase reported is such that men were doing a larger proportion of the child care in the mid-1990s than they were in the early 1960s. Overall, the absolute gap between men's and women's unpaid work was around 130 minutes in 1961, and has decreased by reasonably regular steps to 90 minutes in 1995. Add the gender effects to the means to see changes controlling for employment and family effects, and we find men's unpaid work increasing substantially from 125 minutes per day to 172, while women's remains pretty much unchanged at 256 minutes per day in 1961, 260 minutes in 1995. Women still do more unpaid work, but the gap has narrowed.

Now we can make the final step, and put together the paid and unpaid work into a single total, shown in Table 18.4. The total work burden dropped about 30 minutes between 1961 and 1975, then inched upward by increments of a few minutes over the subsequent decades. Now add in the gender differential. When we take all sorts of work together, we find what the standard sociolog-

ical notion of 'the dual burden' would lead us to expect, women do substantially more work than men. Over the period, the differential substantially declines from about 85 minutes to about 50 minutes. Overall, men, worked a total of 445 minutes per day in 1961, and, controlling for changes in the distribution of employment and family status, around 440 minutes per day in 1995. Women respectively worked 530 and 488 minutes.

**Table 18.4 Time spent on all paid and unpaid work, 1961–95**

	1961	1975	1985	1995
Grand mean	487	458	460	464
Aged <40, no children	-54	-32	-41	-54
Co-resident child under 5	58	27	49	75
Co-resident child under 15	35	2	2	38
Aged 40+, no children	-4	-3	-9	-25
Full-time	74	74	54	67
Part-time	-60	-57	-17	-13
Other, non-employed	-145	-131	-108	-126
Man	-43	-38	-25	-27
Woman	42	34	25	24

Sources: BBC Audience Research, 1965; 1978; SCELL, 1984; 1987; ISER and ONS, 1995.

Assuming (as in fact the evidence approximately confirms) that sleep remains unchanged, then the residual, leisure time, has increased overall across the population by just about 20 minutes over the last 35 years. But when we add in the gender effects, we find that men's leisure time stays pretty much unchanged, varying only by a few minutes, as their reduction in paid work time is taken up by their increase in unpaid work. Women gained some 40 minutes per day of extra leisure time, though, in absolute terms, they still have some 50 minutes less leisure per day than men. None the less, something approaching half of the gender differential has disappeared over the last third of a century.

### **Leisure participation: alternative indicators**

In this section we turn our attention to some other indicators of leisure participation.

#### **Employment in leisure industries**

As we suggested previously, there are some grounds for scepticism about the use of output or expenditure data as indicators of consumption (since the producers may stockpile or the purchasers may store). But in a sub-set of the

cases (which in fact corresponds precisely to the economists' definition of a 'final service', which is 'consumed directly as it is produced'), evidence of economic activity is also evidence of consumption: restaurant meals, purchase of tickets to live performances, hotel bedrooms taken for the night, may be reliably assumed to have been consumed by their purchasers. The Family Expenditure Survey yields data on these categories of expenditure back to the early 1950s. In fact we can compile a comparative data series going back considerably further if we concentrate on employment data. (Indeed, on the assumption that productivity growth in these final service industries is inconsiderable, this is the preferable of the two approaches, since it avoids the important problem with the expenditure data, of coping with changes in relative prices over the period.)

**Table 18.5 Numbers employed in leisure services, 1930-97 (000s)**

	Catering, hotels, restaurants, pubs, clubs, etc.	Entertainment, sports and recreation
July 1930	351	78
July 1939	507	157
Dec 1950	629	212
Nov 1960	562	220
Dec 1970	568	242
June 1980	922	299
Dec 1990	1219	469
Dec 1997	1285	515

Sources: *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, January 1931, vol. 30 (1), pp.27-8; January 1940, vol. 48 (1), pp.22-3; January 1952, vol. 60 (1), pp.15-16; January 1962, vol. 70 (1), pp.15-16; *Employment Gazette*, February 1971, vol. 79 (2), pp.161-3; January 1981, vol. 80 (1), pp.S11-13; May 1991, vol. 99 (5), pp.S12-13; *Labour Market Trends*, April 1998, vol. 106 (4), pp.S12-13; Jones (1986).

**Table 18.6 Percentage of workforce in leisure industries, 1930-97**

	Catering, restaurants and hotels	Entertainment, sports and recreation	% employed in leisure
July 1930	2.8	0.6	3.5
July 1939	3.4	1.0	4.4
Dec 1950	2.9	1.0	3.9
Nov 1960	3.9	1.5	5.4
Dec 1970	4.6	1.9	6.5
June 1980	4.2	1.4	5.6
Dec 1990	5.5	2.1	7.6
Dec 1997	5.7	2.3	8.0

Sources: *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, January 1931, vol. 30 (1), pp.27-8; January 1940, vol. 48 (1), pp.22-3; January 1952, vol. 60 (1), pp.15-16; January 1962, vol. 70 (1), pp.15-16; *Employment Gazette*, February 1971, vol. 79 (2), pp.161-3; January 1981, vol. 80 (1), pp.S11-13; May 1991, vol. 99 (5), pp.S12-13; *Labour Market Trends*, April 1998, vol. 106 (4), pp.S12-13; Jones (1986).

The question of productivity in the leisure services is of very considerable importance. To the extent that we can accept the traditional assumption that there is effectively no growth in productivity over time in final services, Tables 18.5 and 18.6 showing a more than doubling of the proportion of employees in various categories of leisure services, provide us with altogether the clearest and most unambiguous empirical evidence of the growth of leisure over the century. If, under this assumption, a larger proportion of the working population is employed in leisure production, then a larger part of the society's consumption must, *in some sense*, be devoted to these specific leisure activities.

The exact meaning of 'a larger part' in this case, depends on what sort of productivity change, if any, is taking place. There is, first, the sort of productivity change that allows the same, or an equivalent, quality of service to be provided with fewer labour inputs. For example, a new larger and more automated theatre may produce the same play, to the same or a higher standard, for a larger audience, and employ fewer stagehands. With this sort of productivity growth, the same employment would provide services to more people, and more of the society's time would be devoted to leisure consumption – and in this case, an increase in labour would imply an unequivocal increase in the 'leisureliness' of the society – simply *more* consumption of the same leisure services.

There is, however, a second sort of productivity growth, in which the nature of the service is changed, generating more complex consequences. The emergence of fast-food restaurants provides one obvious example. In this case, the labour of a leisure-service worker provides for more consumers per unit of labour time. There are more leisure consumers per leisure-service worker, but what happens to the society's leisure time depends on the relationship of the change in employment level to the change in consumer time per unit of output (that is, if the meal takes half the time to eat, but there are twice as many restaurant workers, the time the society devotes to eating out remains unchanged). We then would face the Linder/Hirsch question of whether the society is in fact more leisurely when twice as many people dine out, but diners eat twice as fast. Ultimately, such changes in leisure provision and consumption raise political questions. Sympathizers with the *ancien régime*, as Hirsch himself appears to have been, might well consider this simply a loss of true leisureliness. Alternatively, one might view such change as creating wider access to new leisure.

And the reality is of course that accompanying the growth in the number of leisure-service workers there has been some of both sorts of productivity growth – an increase in the number of traditional restaurants as well as in fast-food joints. We will turn in a moment to look more directly at the evolution of leisureliness in terms of the time devoted to different sorts of leisure activity. Before this, we should consider some more potential indirect indicators.

**Provision and use of leisure facilities****Table 18.7 Service establishments, 1980–94**

	Number of businesses			
	1980	1985	1990	1994
Hotels and pubs	54889	55061	54599	48593
Camps & caravan sites	1587	1571	2027	2038

Source: *Annual Abstract of Statistics* 1988; 1992; 1998, Table 11.4.

Curious trends in the numbers of various types of establishments emerge. The number of hotels and pubs, for example, has fallen (Table 18.7) during the same period that the numbers of people employed in such facilities has increased substantially – which suggests a growing scale, if not necessarily scale economies. During the 1980s, the number of camping and caravan sites grew considerably. These new sites undoubtedly created some of the jobs identified in the previous section, though on a much smaller scale, since the leisure consumers in this case provide most of the leisure services themselves. This is an example of the second sort of productivity growth mentioned above, which has involved an increase of leisure consumer's time (in something quite akin to unpaid work) and a relatively small growth in paid work.

**Table 18.8 Cinemas and admissions, 1937–96**

	No. of cinemas	Admissions (millions)	
1937	4734	1950	1396
1939	4901	1955	1182
1944	4728	1960	510
1949	4659	1965	327
1954	4509	1970	193
1959	3414	1975	116
1964	2057	1980	96
1969	1581	1987	67
1974	1535	1990	79
1979	1564	1995	97
1983	1432	1996	112
1989	481	n/a	n/a
1994	505	n/a	n/a
1996	495	n/a	n/a

Sources: *Annual Abstract of Statistics* 1937–47, Table 79; 1938–49, Table 96; 1957, Tables 90 and 91; 1967, Table 84; 1977, Table 10.72; 1984, Table 10.40; and 1998, Table 19.3.

Cinemas provide something of a paradigm case of this sort of change, in which paid service work progressively disappears, as consumers move to new 'self-

servicing' or 'do-it-yourself' modes of provision of services (Gershuny, 1983). The 1930s to the 1990s saw a tenfold reduction in the number of cinemas, and an even larger fall in the number of admissions (Table 18.8) – pretty clearly associated with the spread of television in the 1950s and 1960s, and later of pay-per-view downloading from phone lines, video recorders, and new delivery routes for broadcast television programming. Here home-based provisions replace job-creating service consumption outside the home.

Another example of what was previously large-scale leisure provision outside the home, is professional football. Table 18.9 tells two different stories. Overall, there is a substantial reduction in 'live' attendance at matches. But the decline is concentrated at the bottom end of the league: attendance at Fourth Division matches is reduced by nearly one half from the 1951/52 season to the 1993/94 season. By contrast, Division 1 (now the Premier League) attendance is also reduced, but only by 10 or 20 per cent. Our conjecture is that we see here a consequence of the developing mixture of 'modes of provision' of this particular leisure service. Fewer people attend the lower divisions of the league – because of the availability of televised broadcasts of matches among Premier League clubs on television. There is a vastly larger audience for football overall (TV + live attendance) than there was previously; and the large television audience in turn feeds the enthusiasm of fans of the leading clubs, who as a result travel to attend matches in hardly reduced numbers.

**Table 18.9 Average number of fans attending football matches, Football League (England and Wales) 1961/62–93/94**

	1961/62	1966/67	1971/72	1976/77	1980/81	1986/87	1990/91	1993/94
Division 4	6060	5407	4981	3863	3082	3100	3253	n/a
Division 3	9419	8009	8510	7522	6590	4300	5208	n/a
Division 2	16132	15701	14652	13529	11202	9000	11457	11752
Division 1 <sup>a</sup>	26106	30829	31352	29540	24660	19800	22681	23040
Totals	57717	59946	59495	54454	45534	36200	42599	34792

Note: <sup>a</sup> Now the Premier Division; Division 2 is now Division 1, and so on.

Source: *Social Trends*, 1992, no. 22, Table 10.19.

We might guess that similar processes affect all live leisure-service provisions, not just sport, but also music, dance, and theatre. The broadcast of matches or performance on television does directly deplete the live audience, but brings a much larger number into indirect contact with the performance – which in turn influences and educates tastes, for a much wider group than just those who previously attended live, and as a result indirectly feeds back into the future audience for the live performance.

### Ownership of leisure equipment

The other side of this complex evolution of leisure consumption activities outside the home is the development of leisure facilities within the home. Of these, radio was the very first widely diffused example. Radio (or 'wireless', a term that carries an indirect reference to the 1920s competitor technology for broadcast entertainment – sound diffused by cable), and subsequently television licences provide a simple indirect way of tracking the long-term spread of these activities – covering, indeed, the whole of the period since their very first introduction in the UK. By the mid-1950s, virtually every household in the country had either radio or television, and by the mid-1970s, virtually all households had television. (The totals slightly above 100 per cent in Table 18.10 in the 1950s and 1960s probably reflect the very rapid spread of television ownership requiring a small number of households to buy two licences within one year.)

**Table 18.10 Broadcast licences as a percentage of the number of census households, 1926–97**

	1926	1937	1947	1957	1967	1977	1987	1997
Wireless	24.7	79.2	87.1	52.2	15.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
B&W TV	0.0	0.0	0.1	48.1	88.1	44.2	12.4	2.1
Colour TV	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.4	84.8	97.2

Sources: *Annual Abstract of Statistics* 1937–47, Table 232; 1938–50, Table 262; 1957, Table 257; 1962, Table 258; 1968, Table 261; 1973, Table 271; 1984, Table 10.38; 1994, Table 10.37; 1997, Table 10.33; 1998, Table 10.32; Jones (1986).

**Table 18.11 Percentage of General Household Survey respondents living in a household containing leisure equipment, 1973–97**

	1973	1980	1983	1987	1990	1993	1997
Satellite dish	–	–	–	–	–	–	22
Home computer	–	–	–	25	28	31	34
CD player	–	–	–	–	24	45	67
Video recorder	–	–	23	56	75	82	89
Phone	48	75	79	85	88	91	95
Car	61	67	66	69	74	75	78

Source: General Household Survey.

Table 18.11 uses the General Household Survey to chart the diffusion of various kinds of home leisure facilities over a somewhat shorter period. By 1997, around one-third of the population lived in a home containing a

computer. The rate of growth in this proportion, from 25 per cent in 1987, may seem surprisingly slow; but in fact the majority of those reporting computer ownership in 1987 were referring to machines rather less powerful than the basic personal computer, and many of those households have subsequently purchased more powerful equipment. The telephone is now the second most widely diffused item of equipment after the television, and the great majority of households now have CD and video players. The GHS data indicate that more than 20 per cent of the British population live in households without cars. Particularly for the elderly, rural dwellers, and the poor, lack of access to a car can greatly restrict possibilities for leisure (Chapter 13 discusses transport in greater detail).

### General Household Survey leisure participation evidence

**Table 18.12 Participation rates in various sporting activities in the past month, General Household Survey sample members aged 20–40, 1977–97**

	Walking	Team sports	Tennis, badminton	Skiing, skating	Cycling, running	Swimming, sailing	Non-comp. sports	All non-team sport
Mean	0.28	0.07	0.09	0.01	0.06	0.17	0.06	0.29
Men	0.27	0.14	0.11	0.01	0.08	0.17	0.09	0.34
1973	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.12	0.07	0.22
1977	0.18	0.12	0.14	0.01	0.03	0.16	0.07	0.32
1980	0.19	0.11	0.14	0.01	0.04	0.16	0.06	0.32
1983	0.16	0.10	0.11	0.01	0.06	0.16	0.05	0.29
1986	0.25	0.10	0.10	0.01	0.07	0.17	0.06	0.31
1987	0.35	0.22	0.13	0.01	0.10	0.19	0.09	0.37
1990	0.36	0.17	0.13	0.02	0.12	0.21	0.13	0.40
1993	0.38	0.16	0.10	0.02	0.15	0.21	0.14	0.42
1997		0.17	0.09	0.02	0.17	0.20	0.13	0.42
Women	0.29	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.05	0.16	0.03	0.24
1973	0.06	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.11
1977	0.20	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.10	0.02	0.18
1980	0.21	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.02	0.14	0.02	0.22
1983	0.17	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.15	0.01	0.21
1986	0.32	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.16	0.02	0.23
1987	0.33	0.04	0.07	0.01	0.08	0.19	0.03	0.29
1990	0.35	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.07	0.21	0.06	0.32
1993	0.34	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.08	0.21	0.06	0.31
1997		0.01	0.06	0.02	0.11	0.24	0.07	0.36

Source: General Household Survey.

The GHS periodically includes questions about respondents' leisure activities, providing, at least in principle, a unique long-term view of changing rates of participation in various sports over the last third of the century. These data have not been used widely, however, perhaps because the form of the questions and the range and specificity of the classification varies on every occasion. Nevertheless, with some caution, it is possible to construct a set of 'lowest common denominator' estimates of the distribution of sports participation in a given four-week period.

Table 18.12 considers people aged between 20 and 40, and shows how participation in some broad groups of activities has evolved from 1973 onwards. (We should say that, wherever we find substantial disjunctions between successive estimates, we assume that this results from differences in the form of the question, and striking leaps should be seen as artefactual. So the overall growth over the period in the activities covered by the first two columns, which show just such effects from 1983–87, probably do not adequately reflect long-term trends, and are for this reason excluded from the more aggregated analysis in the following table.)

Walking is the most widespread activity. The predominance of men playing football accounts for the high gender divisions in team sports. Participation in tennis and badminton appears to have declined quite substantially over the period. Skiing and ice skating increased, albeit from a very low level. Swimming and sailing (very largely swimming) increased among both young men and young women, but with a much larger rate of increase among the women, who by 1997 constituted the majority of participants in this activity. Golf, ten-pin bowling and bowls have grown markedly. And finally, the overall rate of monthly participation in the sports, which we take to be the most reliable of the indicators, seems to have risen reasonably regularly from about 32 per cent of young men in 1977 to around 42 per cent in 1997, and from 18 per cent to 36 per cent of young women over the period. Clearly some gender convergence has occurred.

Table 18.13 looks at this aggregate sports participation rate, broken down further by age and social class. For each of the separate age, class and gender groups, we see the same phenomenon of substantial growth in participation. In each of the class and age-groups, we find that the growth for women has been rather faster than that for men. And while it remains true that the members of the professional classes are still substantially more likely to take exercise than are members of the working classes, the *rate of growth* in participation among the working classes has been generally much higher than among the professional classes. Therefore, in short, at the end of the century, British society as a whole was converging on higher levels of participation (in, at least, the non-team sports) than it had 30 years ago.

**Table 18.13 Participation rates in non-team sports in the past month, General Household Survey sample members, by age, class and sex, 1977–97**

General Household Survey sample members ages 20–39

	Men			Women		
	Professional	Intermediate	Working	Professional	Intermediate	Working
1973	0.29	0.23	0.15	0.14	0.12	0.05
1977	0.45	0.32	0.23	0.26	0.20	0.10
1980	0.48	0.32	0.23	0.29	0.25	0.14
1983	0.46	0.33	0.28	0.34	0.25	0.14
1986	0.47	0.33	0.29	0.37	0.26	0.21
1987	0.52	0.41	0.37	0.45	0.34	0.29
1990	0.57	0.46	0.38	0.44	0.39	0.23
1993	0.56	0.46	0.43	0.40	0.36	0.28
1997	0.51	0.43	0.33	0.45	0.37	0.30

General Household Survey sample members aged 40–59

	Men			Women		
	Professional	Intermediate	Working	Professional	Intermediate	Working
1973	0.25	0.14	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.03
1977	0.31	0.19	0.11	0.08	0.11	0.04
1980	0.34	0.19	0.14	0.15	0.12	0.05
1983	0.32	0.20	0.16	0.18	0.11	0.10
1986	0.38	0.21	0.18	0.23	0.19	0.09
1987	0.39	0.31	0.25	0.29	0.22	0.17
1990	0.45	0.31	0.25	0.27	0.27	0.15
1993	0.44	0.33	0.28	0.33	0.29	0.18
1997	0.42	0.29	0.27	0.31	0.26	0.16

General Household Survey sample members aged 60–79

	Men			Women		
	Professional	Intermediate	Working	Professional	Intermediate	Working
1973	0.15	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.01
1977	0.15	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.01
1980	0.16	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.02
1983	0.21	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.02
1986	0.22	0.12	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.03
1987	0.24	0.17	0.18	0.26	0.21	0.16
1990	0.28	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.12	0.07
1993	0.31	0.20	0.17	0.19	0.15	0.07
1997	0.27	0.19	0.14	0.21	0.15	0.08

Source: General Household Survey.

## Leisure time use

### Gender, family and employment status effect

Finally, we turn to the most comprehensive picture of the distribution of leisure across British society: that of how leisure time is used. For convenience, we again adopt the MCA technique discussed earlier. Table 18.14 shows the changing pattern for a number of leisure or consumption activities.

The first of these is eating at home. We find a remarkable – if entirely expected – reduction of 45 minutes per day in the time devoted to eating meals and snacks at home. This decline is by regular decrements through the decades. The underlying regression models for all four time-periods are very similar, showing exactly the expected pattern (for example, no gender difference, full-

**Table 18.14 Leisure activities, eating and socializing, 1961–95**

	Eating meals and snacks at home			
	1961	1975	1985	1995
Grand mean	96	79	69	52
Aged <40, no children	-2	-5	-15	-8
Co-resident child under 5	-1	-4	-4	-1
Co-resident child under 15	3	0	5	3
Aged 40+, no children	0	9	11	5
Full-time	-13	-6	-8	-8
Part-time	11	3	5	5
Other, non-employed	25	12	16	14
Man	-1	1	1	1
Woman	1	-1	-1	-1
	Sports, walking			
	1961	1975	1985	1995
Grand mean	9	10	14	10
Aged <40, no children	5	3	2	4
Co-resident child under 5	-2	0	-1	-3
Co-resident child under 15	-1	-1	0	1
Aged 40+, no children	-3	-1	-1	-2
Full-time	-1	-3	-1	0
Part-time	-2	3	0	4
Other, non-employed	3	4	2	-1
Man	3	4	4	4
Woman	-3	-4	-4	-3

Sources: BBC Audience Research, 1965; 1978; SCELL, 1984; 1987; ISER and ONS, 1995.

time employed people spending less time, older people spending more time). This, we can conclude, is a reliable trend: eating remains a substantial activity within the home – but occupies barely more than half the time it did two generations ago.

By contrast, activities in public service arenas – just as we were led to suspect by the ‘provision’ evidence – have been substantially rising. This trend is not quite so regular, since it is itself the aggregate of a number of conflicting trends over different parts of the period (pub-going rising through the 1960s and 1970s, cinema declining in the 1960s, restaurants growing through the 1980s, and so on). The gender gap remains substantial in this case: men having fully 25 minutes per day more of this sort of leisure than women do. Again, the underlying structures of the regression result are rather similar for the four,

Eating out, pubs, cinema, theatre, etc				Socializing			
1961	1975	1985	1995	1961	1975	1985	1995
28	47	42	61	35	42	35	40
15	14	21	24	11	9	7	16
-11	-11	-17	-21	-3	3	1	-3
-8	2	-2	-3	-8	-8	-5	-14
-4	-4	-3	-4	-4	-1	-1	-2
-1	-2	-1	-3	-8	-7	-5	-14
4	-1	0	3	-1	2	4	1
2	5	3	5	17	16	9	27
5	11	5	13	-2	-5	-5	3
-5	-11	-5	-12	2	5	5	-3
Other leisure at home				TV and radio			
1961	1975	1985	1995	1961	1975	1985	1995
74	79	84	65	139	128	135	129
7	-2	2	10	-13	-10	-2	-10
-13	-11	-15	-22	-15	-7	-7	-5
-6	-2	2	-14	3	4	2	7
5	16	10	14	21	10	6	7
-21	-15	-12	-17	-11	-14	-15	-17
7	8	6	14	-5	1	-4	-23
44	28	23	26	25	30	35	47
9	1	-2	2	17	17	19	8
-9	-1	2	-2	-16	-16	-19	-7

entirely separate surveys, and we can be reasonably confident that there has been a real change in the society. The meal at home provides an opportunity for one sort of sociability that has declined by 45 minutes per day. Participation in eating, drinking and collective spectacles provides the opportunity for another sort of leisure – sociability, which has increased, over the same period, by more than 30 minutes per day.

‘Socializing’ – visiting, or being visited by – members of other households, has remained roughly constant over the period, at an average of 35–40 minutes per day. Perhaps surprisingly, given the evidence in the previous section of the increased rates of monthly participation in various sports over the quarter-century, *time* devoted to playing sports does not appear to have increased at all. There is in fact no necessary contradiction here: we have evidence (Gershuny 1986) that in cases where the range of different types of leisure participation increases, the average amount of time spent in each of these activities decreases (since the day has a fixed 24 hours, if more activities are to fill it, each of them must take less time).

‘Other home leisure’ (games, hobbies, reading) shows no particularly clear trend, though overall it falls a little, from 74 minutes per day in 1961, to 65 minutes in 1995. Perhaps most surprising of all of these results, time devoted to radio and television (as a main activity) has not changed much over the whole of this period. A larger proportion of this was radio in 1961. Nevertheless, as we saw earlier, by 1961 three-quarters of the households in the UK possessed televisions. And it may well be that as the substantially higher ‘audience research’ estimates of lengths of time the television is switched on, irrespective of whether anyone is actively watching it, this sort of statistic underestimates the pervasive nature of the television. But nevertheless, though television watching is by far the largest single activity within the household in terms of time use, at the end of the television century it shows no sign of progressively taking over all life outside paid work.

### **National time accounts**

We can now add up the different sorts of time use, to get an overall picture of the changing place of leisure in the society’s day. Paid work time (among the 20–60-year-olds covered in this comparative analysis) has declined substantially, by 50 minutes per day. But more than half of the potential gain in free time has been taken up by the growth in unpaid work, whether because of the increase in ‘self-servicing’ (as in the case of shopping) or, to put it at its lowest interpretation, ‘defensive time use’ (part at least of the explanation of the growth in child care time). Women’s unpaid work time has declined, and men’s has increased. So virtually the entire net 20-minute decline in the work total has accrued to women.

Quite the largest proportional changes are found in the growth in out-of-home leisure service consumption activities. The remaining leisure activities show small and irregular changes, to give a small net increase that pretty well mirrors the decline in work time. In both cases, the major gross shift happened in the 1960s and early 1970s.

And once we add the declining total of 'eating at home' to the residual – that, like non-social eating, could be described as 'reproductive activity' – sleeping, resting doing nothing, bathing and other personal care, we find a remarkable overall stability: these two categories overall vary by only a few minutes, by hardly 1 per cent of their total over the entire period.

So if there is any simple single conclusion to be drawn about what are in detail quite complex trends in leisure patterns over the last part of the century, it must be this: for that part of the twentieth century for which we have consistent and comprehensive evidence, it seems as if the more optimistic prophecies of the nineteenth-century writers are coming, slowly, to pass. By the end of the 1990s, British people had decreased their mid-century working hours by 23 minutes per day, or two hours 40 minutes per week, and gained two hours and 20 minutes more leisure per week over 34 years. We might perhaps define this change as *progress* – at a rate of seven extra weekly hours of leisure per century? There is a long way to go; but this is not grossly inconsistent with the view of the future set out in the first paragraph of this chapter.

**Table 18.15 National time accounts, 1961–95**

Activities	1961	1975	1985	1995
Paid work	296	271	250	246
Cooking	63	59	56	48
Cleaning, laundry	55	47	44	47
Other domestic work	35	31	39	35
Child care	13	15	25	39
Shopping, domestic travel	25	35	46	49
All work	487	458	460	464
Eating out, cinema, pubs, etc.	28	47	42	61
Socializing	35	42	35	40
Sports, walking	9	10	14	10
TV and radio	139	128	135	129
Other leisure at home	74	79	84	65
All specific leisure activity	285	306	310	305
Eating at home	96	79	69	52
Sleep, personal care, etc.	572	597	601	619
All reproductive activity	668	676	670	671
Work + leisure + reproduction	1440	1440	1440	1440

Sources: BBC Audience Research, 1965; 1978; SCELL, 1984; 1987; ISER and ONS, 1995.

## References

- Andrews, F., Morgan, J. and Sonquist, J. (1967) *Multiple Classification Analysis: A Report on a Computer Program for Multiple Regression Using Categorical Predictors*, Ann Arbor, Survey Research Center, Michigan.
- Bell, Daniel (1976) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1979) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) (1965) *The People's Activities*, BBC, London, data archived at the Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, UK.
- British Broadcasting Corporation (1978) *The People's Activities and The Use of Time*, BBC, London, data archived at the Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, UK.
- Dumazedier, Joffre (1967) *Toward a Society of Leisure*, Free Press, New York.
- Dumazedier, Joffre (1974) *Sociology of Leisure*, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Employment Gazette* (1981) 'Recent changes in hours and holiday entitlements', vol. 89 (4), pp.183–4.
- Employment Gazette* (1993) 'Working time and holidays in the EC: how the UK compares', vol. 101 (9), pp.395–403.
- General Household Survey, collected by the Office for National Statistics, London, 1973, 1977, 1980, 1983, 1986, 1987, 1990–91, 1993–94, 1996–97. Data supplied by The Data Archive, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, UK.
- Gershuny, Jonathan I. (1983) *Social Elevation and the Division of Labour*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gershuny, Jonathan I. (1986) 'Leisure: feast or famine', *Society and Leisure*, vol. 9 (2), pp.431–54.
- \*Gershuny, J. (1995) 'Economic activity and women's time use', in Niemi, I. (ed.) *Time Use of Women in Europe and North America*, UN/ECE, Geneva.
- \*Gershuny, Jonathan, Godwin, Michael and Jones, Sally (1994) 'The domestic labour revolution: a process of lagged adaptation', in Anderson, Michael, Bechhofer, Frank and Gershuny, Jonathan (eds) *The Social and Political Economy of the Household*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hawrylyshn, O. (1978) *Estimating the Value of Household Work in Canada 1971*, Statistics Canada, Ottawa.
- Hirsch, Fred (1977) *Social Limits to Growth*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Hochschild, Arlie (1989) *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*, Piatkus, London.
- Hochschild, Arlie (1997) *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*, Metropolitan Books, New York.
- Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) and Office for National Statistics (ONS) (1995) *Time Use Study*. Data archived at the Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ.
- \*Jones, Stephen G. (1986) *Workers at Play: A Social and Economic History of Leisure 1918–1939*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Keynes, John Maynard (1972) 'Economic possibilities for our grandchildren', in *Essays in Persuasion: The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes, Vol. IX*, Macmillan, London (first edition 1928).

- Labour Market Trends* (1998) 'Work and Leisure Time', vol. 106 (11).
- Linder, Staffan Burenstam (1970) *The Harried Leisure Class*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Lourie, Julia (1996) *The Working Time Directive: Research Paper 96/10*, House of Commons Library, London.
- Lynd, Robert S. and Lynd, Helen Merrell (1937) *Middletown in Transition*, Harcourt, Brace, New York.
- Marx, Karl (1967) *Capital*, International Publishers, New York, (first edition 1867).
- Meissner, M. et al. (1975) 'No exit for wives: sexual division of labour and the cumulation of household demands', *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 12, pp.424–39.
- Mill, John Stuart (1871) *Principles of Political Economy: With Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy*, seventh edition, Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, London.
- Ministry of Labour Gazette* (1938) 'Collective agreements providing for payment of wages for holidays', vol. 46 (3), pp.86–9.
- Ministry of Labour Gazette* (1952) 'Payment of wages for holidays', vol. 60 (5), pp.157–61.
- Parker, Stanley (1976) *The Sociology of Leisure*, Allen and Unwin, London.
- \*Robinson, John P. and Godbey, Geoffrey (1997) *Time for Life: The Surprising Ways Americans Use Their Time*, Pennsylvania State Press, University Park.
- Russell, Bertrand (1960) *In Praise of Idleness: and Other Essays*, Allen and Unwin, London.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1972) *Stone Age Economics*, Aldine-Atherton, Chicago, Ill.
- \*Schor, Juliet (1993) *Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*, Basic Books, New York.
- Social Change and Economic Life Initiative (SCELI), data collected by the Economic and Social Research Council in 1984 and 1987, and archived at the Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, UK.
- Thompson, Allan (1973) *The Dynamics of the Industrial Revolution*, Edward Arnold, London.
- Vanek, Joann (1974) 'Time Spent in Housework' *Scientific American*, December, pp.116–20.
- \*Veblen, Thorstein (1953) *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, The New York American Library, New York, (first edition 1899).
- Wilensky, Harold L. and Lebeaux, Charles N. (1965) *Industrial Society and Social Welfare: The Impact of Industrialization on the Supply and Organisation of Social Welfare Services in the United States*, Free Press, New York.
- Young, Michael, and Willmott, Peter (1973) *The Symmetrical Family*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

## Further reading

In addition to the asterisked items in the References.

- Pronovost, Gilles (1998) 'Trend report: the sociology of leisure', special edition of *Current Sociology*, July, vol. 46 (3).
- Rojek, Chris (1985) *Capitalism and Leisure Theory*, Tavistock, London.
- Veal, A. J. (1987) *Leisure and the Future*, Allen and Unwin, London.