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Abstract

The ‘leisure society thesis’ was developed primarily in the 1960s and ’70s and a recent article in the World Leisure Journal summarised the relevant literature from that period and analysed contemporary recollections of it (Veal, 2011). This paper follows the story of the leisure society thesis since 1980. Set against the background of discussions of work and leisure in periods of high unemployment, the work ethic, working hours, post-work and work-life balance, the paper reviews the post-1980 offerings of proponents, analysts and critics of the leisure society thesis. A four-fold typology of leisure society conceptualisations and reduced-work future scenarios is proposed, comprising: A. the current leisure society; B. the evolutionary leisure society; C. leisure society as political project; and D. other reduced-work scenarios/projects. The second half of the paper reviews literature which is analytical, ambivalent and/or definitional regarding the leisure society thesis and that which is critical. This involves discussion of the failure of paid working hours to fall in the second half of the twentieth century as had been predicted, and appraisal of a range of critical theoretical/conceptual issues. It is concluded that, while the significance of the leisure society thesis as an early project of leisure studies is debatable, and it is clearly now an historical reference point rather than a current project, but the question is raised as to why the leisure studies community has failed to join with others who are pursuing the cause of reduced paid working hours for all.

Key words: Leisure society thesis, post-work, work-life balance, working hours.

Introduction

An earlier paper (Veal, 2011a, hereafter referred to as Leisure Society I) drew attention to the tendency of contemporary scholars to recall the leisure society thesis as a significant feature of leisure studies in the 1960s and ’70s period, but which, for a number of reasons, has since been rejected by the leisure studies community. By reference to the relevant literature of that period, the paper discussed a number of myths and misconceptions associated with such recollections. While the 1960s and ’70s are widely seen as the heyday of the leisure society thesis, it has had a life beyond this period, in the writings of persistent proponents, particularly in the 1980s, but increasingly of critics. This paper seeks to consider the evolution of the leisure society thesis since the 1980s. The aim is to provide four things: 1. an outline of concurrent contextual discussions in the wider literature on work/leisure issues during the study period; 2. as comprehensive a record as possible of the leisure society literature of the period, including suggestion of a typology of leisure society theses and other reduced-work scenarios; 3. an identification and analysis of the range of definitional criteria deployed in the leisure society literature; and 4. a summary and appraisal of the views of those authors who have been critical of the leisure society thesis and who have been the dominant voices on the topic in the leisure studies literature of the last 25 years. While the critical literature is discussed at the end of the paper, it was in fact the starting point of the project, but in order to undertake the appraisal it was first necessary to document what exactly had been the target of the critique, a task which had generally been somewhat neglected by proponents and the critics alike.
The concluding section of the paper discusses the question of whether, in view of the considerable critical onslaught it has received in recent decades, the leisure society thesis, or related ideas, still have relevance to contemporary society.

**Work/leisure issues, 1980-2011**

Table 1 lists indicative examples of the substantial literature, from the period 1980 to the present, which has discussed work-leisure issues but without considering the leisure society thesis as such. It indicates the broader background against which the discussion of the leisure society thesis took place, although there was little cross-referencing between the two bodies of literature. The table, and the discussion below, is divided into five sections: a. the 1980s, unemployment and structural change; b. alternatives to the work ethic; c. the truth about working hours; d. the 1990s and post-work; and e. work-life balance. The table includes a number of features of each literature item, including date of publication, country and discipline of author, type of publication (book, refereed article, etc.) and a brief summary of key features of the argument. Within each section, items are listed in chronological order of publication.

**INSERT: Table 1**

a. *The 1980s, unemployment and structural change*

As shown in Figure 1, the 1980s began with Western economies experiencing substantial increases in unemployment. While the USA had almost recovered from the effects of the first, 1973, OPEC oil price crisis, the UK had not, and the second crisis of 1979/80 resulted in an even stronger downturn in economic activity and a corresponding increase in unemployment. In the early 1980s, particularly in the UK, it was argued by a number of commentators that the high levels of unemployment being experienced at the time reflected not just cyclical factors but long-term structural unemployment, caused particularly by the advent of micro-electronic technology in the economy. It is not the aim of this paper to provide a detailed discussion of this issue, but it can be seen that the unemployment rates in the developed economies have been quite volatile during the study period and trajectories have differed cross-nationally.

**INSERT Figure 1**

The prospect of permanent structural unemployment was the theme of a number of books published by British trade unionists Clive Jenkins and Barrie Sherman (1979, 1981, Sherman, 1986) with crisis-evoking titles, such as *The Collapse of Work* and *The Leisure Shock*, the latter paying tribute to Toffler's (1970) *Future Shock*. Although a number of later commentators have associated Jenkins and Sherman with the leisure society thesis, they did not discuss the idea as such but argued that, to avoid a permanent labour surplus and high levels of long-term unemployment, UK governments should implement policies on work-sharing, education and the provision of leisure services to enable society to cope with the emerging challenges. They also argued that, for these changes to come about, it would be necessary for attitudes towards work and leisure to change and that the traditional 'work ethic' would need to be replaced by a 'usefulness ethic'. Keane and Owens (1986), whose work has been generally ignored by leisure scholars, reviewed a range of political perspectives on dealing with the problem of structural unemployment, finding them all wanting, but in the case of Gorz’s ‘socialist utopia’ (see below) the main shortcoming was deemed to be lack of detail.
b. Alternatives to the work ethic
Other writers of the 1980s shared the views of Jenkins and Sherman regarding the need to respond to the unemployment crisis by dislodging the work ethic and replacing it with an alternative. There was, however, no-cross-referencing between these proposals and little advice offered as to how such a change in supposedly deep-seated cultural values might be brought about. None of the commentators questioned the existence or strength of the work ethic, even though there was a literature doing precisely that (see Veal, 1987, pp. 66-73). For example, at the time, Peter Kelvin argued:

The position is this: if indeed British society is moving into a time of much less demand for human labour, a time of widespread unemployment and, eventually perhaps, of leisure, it is not necessary to get rid of the Protestant Work Ethic. What has to be got rid of is the notion of the Protestant Work Ethic – a notion which, as an explanatory concept has the status of phlogiston; but which, by virtue of being invoked, has in relatively recent times, attained the potency of the myth; and has thus become, to some extent, a self-fulfilling prophecy. The concept of the Protestant Work Ethic is a classic instance of the social construction of reality, which itself distorts reality, and which is thus a barrier to the ability to grasp and cope with reality. (Kelvin, 1982, p. 16)

c. The truth about working hours
While these debates were being conducted in the UK, Benjamin Hunnicut (1980, 1988) published the results of careful analysis of trends in the United States, which established that, contrary to popular and academic ‘accepted wisdom’, and the assumptions of leisure society thesis proponents, paid working hours had not fallen in the post-World War II era, but had increased or, at best, been static. However, these findings had little impact on the academic debate until similar findings were published in Juliet Schor's (1991) bestselling Overworked American. There has, however, been some disagreement between authors such as Hunnicutt and Schor, who rely on labour force survey data, and those, such as Robinson and Godbey (1997, 2005) and Aguiar and Hurst (2007), who, relying on US time-budget survey data, conclude that working hours have indeed been falling. Zuzanek’s (2005) analysis of time-budget data from Canada, on the other hand, lends some support to the increasing working hours thesis, depending on the time-period examined. It should also be noted that the trends in working hours in European countries do not reflect exactly the north American experience (Schor, 2006). Nevertheless, Schor’s publication was most influential in bringing speculation about an imminent leisure society by leisure studies scholars virtually to an end.

d. The 1990s and post-work
As Figure 1 shows, while unemployment rates fell in the mid-1980s, they rose again as a result of the recession of the early 1990s. This brought forth a new spate of books concerned with joblessness.

In The Jobless Future, Aronowitz and DiFazio (1994, p. 353) envisaged a society in which ‘shorter working days, longer vacations, and earlier retirement imply that most of us should never work anything like ‘full time’ as measured by the standards of the industrializing era’, and argued for a guaranteed minimum income to be provided by the state. But they did not explore the implications of extended leisure time and or discuss the concept of a leisure society.
Jeremy Rifkin's *The End of Work* was also written in the early 1990s, at a time when 'the ranks of unemployed and underemployed' were 'growing daily' (Rifkin, 1995, p. 5) in the Western industrialised economies. In a reprise of sentiments which had been expressed by commentators as long ago as the 1930s, Rifkin observes: 'Now, for the first time, human labor is being systematically eliminated from the production process. Within less than a century, 'mass' work in the market sector is likely to be phased out in virtually all of the industrialized nations of the world' (Rifkin, 1995, p. 3). While acknowledging Juliet Schor's (1991) findings on the static or increasing level of working hours of American workers over the previous 40 years, Rifkin nevertheless produced a disparate array of evidence to suggest that there remained an American, and worldwide, movement to reduce working hours and restore work-life balance, and concludes:

> With millions of Americans facing the prospect of working fewer and fewer hours in the formal market sector in the coming years, and with increasing numbers of unskilled Americans unable to secure any work at all in the automated high-tech global economy, the question of the utilization of idle time is going to loom large over the political landscape. (Rifkin, 1995, p. 235)

If unrest was to be avoided, policies would be required to enable workers to enjoy reduced working hours on adequate incomes and to 'renew the bonds of community and rejuvenate the democratic legacy' (p. 235). But these ideas were not pursued in any detail.

As Figure 1 shows, the high levels of unemployment of the early 1990s were short-lived in Western economies, although they did not return to the low levels seen in the 1960s and '70s. This, together with the recent return to high unemployment rates as a result of the 2008 Global Financial Crisis, suggests that unemployment levels in the global capitalist system have a significant cyclical component, so treating a steep, short-term upward trend, as seen in the early 1980s, the early 1990s or 2008-2011, as long-term trends indicative of an impending permanent labour surplus is invalid, as would be treating steep, short-term downward trends, as seen in the late 1980s or 1995-2005, as indicative of impending permanent labour shortages. Explaining the longer-term, but shallower, upward trend since the 1960s is, of course, another matter, but is beyond the scope of this paper.

Bowring (1999) argued that even when official unemployment levels fell, this disguised the growth of ‘unproductive labour’ in such forms as paid domestic work and advertising, and ‘defensive’ labour required to undo the environmental and other damage caused by economic growth. He therefore argued that ‘the continuation of work-centred society is an untenable position’ and that we are ‘indeed on the threshold of a post-work society’ (Bowring, 1999, p. 69). Society’s ‘moral authorities’ had failed to recognise this shift and had failed to ‘facilitate the humane and creative use of the time that is, despite capitalism’s best efforts, being inexorably freed’ (Bowring, 1999, p. 82).

A further perspective on the prospects for work under capitalism was offered by Ulrick Beck (2000) in *The Brave New World of Work*, in which he described the 'Brazilianization of the West', involving 'the spread of temporary and insecure employment, discontinuity and loose informality and ... insecurity in people's work and life' (Beck, 2000, p. 1), and predicted the end of the ‘work society’. This led him to make comments on the leisure society thesis, which are indicated in Table 2 and discussed below.
e. **Work-life balance**

From the 1990s onwards, a substantial literature emerged prompted particularly by the impact of the increasing involvement of women in the paid workforce, as well as other factors, such as the digitisation of the workplace and its spillover into supposedly non-work time, and the general ‘speeding up’ of life. Section (e) in Table 1 notes the contributions of Arlie Russell Hochschild, in the form of *The Second Shift* (1990) and *The Time Bind* (1997), which focused on the problems of the increasing numbers of women engaged in the paid workforce but still shouldering the bulk of domestic and child-care responsibilities. These concerns have been reflected in studies of women’s leisure (eg. Green, Hebron and Woodward, 1990), but these tend to concentrate on issues such as parent-friendly workplaces (flexibility, parental leave, child-care facilities) and the sharing of domestic responsibilities between men and women, rather than on the overall societal balance between work and leisure. Exceptions to this tendency are the contribution of Henderson et al. (1996), among leisure studies feminists, and Bryson (2007) and the Shorter Work-Time Group (nd), founded by Women for Economic Justice, discussed further below. On an historical note, Weigelt (1991, pp. 208, 218) reports that in Sweden in the 1960s and ’70s there were union campaigns, later abandoned, for minimum working hours and for a maximum 30-hour week for all, aimed at eliminating the idea of ‘part-time’ and ‘full-time’ workers and hence reducing the differences between men and women in regard to benefits (social insurance, holiday entitlements) and income.


It is not possible to explore the above issues in detail here: the literature is highlighted simply to make the point that the broad issues with which the leisure society thesis is concerned have been the focus of continuous debate during the study period.

**Leisure society and reduced-work futures literature, 1980-2011**

Table 2 summarises the 1980-2011 literature on the leisure society thesis and other reduced-work scenarios and can be seen as a continuation of a similar table in Leisure Society I. The table and the discussion which follows, are divided into three sections: a. leisure society/reduced work-time theses; b. analytical/ambiguous/definitional discussions; and c. critics of the leisure society thesis. The format is similar to that of Table 1, but also indicates any references to other writers on the leisure society thesis; it can be seen that there are remarkably few. Within each section and sub-section of the table the entries are presented in chronological order.

INSERT Table 2

**a. Leisure society/reduced work theses**

While the 1960s and ’70s are seen as the main period in which the leisure society idea was promulgated, it continued to attract proponents in the post-1980 period. The term *theses* is used in the table since it is possible to detect four distinct approaches to the leisure society/reduced work thesis, depending on the posited process and timing of the emergence of the envisaged society:
A. the present leisure society thesis argues that a leisure society already exists, so the implied process of emergence is historical;

B. the evolving leisure society thesis argues or, more typically, assumes, that a leisure society will evolve as a result of the economic application of technology enabling reduced paid working time;

C. the leisure society as political project views a leisure society not as evolving but as being achieved only by the conscious action of committed individuals or groups in the political, industrial, educational and/or cultural arena;

D. reduced work scenarios/projects propose a future society with reduced paid working hours releasing time for a variety of non-paid activities, including work and non-work, and, like group C, see its achievement as a political project.

A. The present leisure society thesis

As in the 1960s and '70s, some authors in the post-1980 period argued that Western societies had already become leisure societies. Ryken (1986) drew this conclusion on the basis of the level of consumer expenditure in the USA, but did not take the concept much further. Joffre Dumazedier (1989, p. 144) declared that a leisure society already existed in the West, since 'free time now exceeds work time' – the idea of an 'historical inversion', discussed further below, under definitions. However, he argued, a possible civilisation of leisure could be attained in the future, but only as a result of a conscious social, educational and political effort, as discussed under type C below. This distinction between the current leisure society and a possible future leisure civilisation, was made more than a quarter of a century after the publication of Dumazedier’s major work on the topic, Toward a Society of Leisure (Dumazedier, 1967 – original French edition published in 1962), in which this distinction had been less than clear. Indeed, it had been confused by the decision of the publishers of the English translation of the book to use the word ‘society’ in its title rather than ‘civilisation’ as in the original French edition (Dumazedier, 1962).

Dumazedier is not entirely alone in distinguishing between types of leisure society. Ian Henry, in a paper on sport and social inclusion, made such a distinction, albeit using different terms, when he declared, without further elaboration:

... it is important to clarify what we take the term 'leisure society' to mean. I refer to a society in which leisure is valued, or viewed as significant, with leisure forms giving meaning and a sense of identity to many individuals. This is to be distinguished from the notion of a leisured society in which access to leisure resources is increasingly available across the social spectrum. The former, rather than the latter, can be said to characterise the contemporary context in the UK. (Henry, 1999, p. 283)

Ravenscroft and Gilchrist (2009) recently introduced a new concept to the field when they coined the term 'working society of leisure' to describe cultural workers, in fields such as craft, writing and music-making, who gravitate to low-cost regions and live an economically marginal existence based on casual work and intermittent commissions. This concept is clearly not in the mainstream of leisure society conceptualisations, but is arguably more clearly defined than most of the available references to the leisure society.
B. The evolving leisure society thesis

Authors who have envisaged a leisure society as evolving, typically in the near future, have invariably failed to discuss in any detail the processes by which this evolution would take place. As with the authors discussed in Leisure Society I, most seem to have assumed that the processes that had achieved substantial reductions in paid working hours in capitalist industrial economies over much of the twentieth century would continue into the future.

Two authors, while adopting a critical stance towards the leisure society thesis in general, nevertheless saw its advent as highly likely, or even inevitable, so they are included here as well as among the critics below. Otto Newman (1983, p. 97) stated: 'It may be too early to speak of the advent of a leisure society, though the breakthroughs of technology are bringing it very close'. Similarly, Lawrence Haworth (1984, p. 320) referred to ‘the leisure society, which (it is supposed) will certainly be ushered in by automation, and in some measure is already upon us'.

In the context of high levels of unemployment in Britain in the early 1980s, educationist Tony Watts (1983, p. 120) noted that the idea of a 'new leisure age' had been 'promoted by a number of writers in the twentieth century'. He outlined four alternative possible future scenarios, one being the 'leisure-orientated scenario', in which he envisaged a minority of the population working in managerial and technical roles, while the majority lived lives of leisure. He discussed, but did not resolve, the potential challenges and contradictions of educating the latter group for a life of leisure.

Cor Westland (1987, p. 230), a Canadian academic who was also Secretary-General of the World Leisure and Recreation Association (now World Leisure Organisation), in a paper focussed on leisure education, provided only minimal details of how an envisaged 'leisure-centred' society would work, when he stated: 'If we are moving towards a society in which 'work for wages' for growing numbers of people will no longer be available, it goes without saying that work as a criterion for social status will also lose its value'.

In a lone contribution in the 1990s, Robert Stebbins (1999, pp. 76-77), in the context of a discussion of 'serious leisure', was even more brief, when he stated, without further elaboration: ' ... to the extent that people are willing to regard leisure in a more favourable light, it is possible to argue that the Information Age is on the verge of giving birth to the Leisure Age'. This idea is not pursued in Stebbins' other writings.

Two sources in this group based their prediction of the unproblematical evolution of a leisure society based on the criterion that people would be spending more time in leisure than in paid work – the 'historical inversion' idea discussed further below. The UK-based Henley Centre predicted this as imminent for Britain in 1986 (Darton, 1986, p. 7) and Graham Molitor (2000, 2008a, 2008b) predicted it for the United States in 2015.

With the exception of Watts, these proponents and predictors of the leisure society idea, like those of the 1960-79 period, make no reference to earlier proponents, let alone critics, and present little detail as to what a leisure society might actually be like. As Rojek (2004, p. 53) has observed, ‘the institutional form, fiscal arrangements, citizenship rights and obligations’ of the leisure society ‘remain substantially under-theorised’. Indeed, they are barely discussed...
at all in the literature. The lack of detail includes lack of explicit discussion as to what the ‘leisure’ in a leisure society might comprise. For the most part, authors' views on leisure in current society is implicitly carried over into the leisure society. Thus Newman and Haworth, are critical of the likely leisure scenario because they see it as reinforcing current tendencies for leisure to be used a means of social control and reinforcing of class divisions in an increasingly consumerist capitalist society (Newman) and because life would lack meaning for the majority without work as its focus (Haworth). Both Watts and Westland see education for leisure, which has a long and strong tradition in leisure service practice, especially in Europe (see Sivan and Ruskin, 2000), as being in even more demand in a leisure society. The need for education for leisure, both now and in a future of increased leisure time, suggests that, left to their own devices and the pressures of a consumer society, people are likely to make leisure activity choices which are, by certain criteria, unwise. Leisure education is believed by its proponents to offer a superior model. Thus, for example, Westland (1987, p. 230) indicates that such an education would involve instilling a ‘change of attitude towards one’s fellow man, Nature and society as a whole’ in the context of a ‘steady state’ economy. However, the efficacy of education for leisure, even in its own terms, can be questioned (Veal, 198, pp. 77-84), but it is not possible to pursue these matters here. Stebbins (1999) equates the growth of leisure time with the growth of ‘serious’ leisure, at the expense of ‘casual’ leisure, which he seems to assume would happen automatically. Molitor (2008b, p. 122) is alone among this group in seeing current trends towards a consumerist leisure future in the USA as unproblematical, as ‘travel and tourism, hospitality, recreation, entertainment and so many other pastime activities and diversions assume increasing national economic importance and will eventually attain economic dominance’.

C. The leisure society as political project

Three examples can be identified which view the leisure society not as an inevitability, but as a desirable future state requiring political action for its realisation.

As discussed in Leisure Society I, John Neulinger developed his initial ideas on the leisure society in the 1970s, although later contributions were published in the 1980s. He suggested that many in Western society would be reluctant to accept the idea of a leisure society, so it would need to be vigorously championed. In 1990 he made this much clearer with the publication of *The Road to Eden, After all: a Human Metamorphosis* (Neulinger, 1990b), which, while distinctly personal in places, is, in effect, a political manifesto for the achievement of a leisure society. This called for political action: ‘... each of us must enter the political arena, to influence societal goals and government policies’ (Neulinger, 1990b, p. 145); and for education: ‘At this point in time, our most important task is one of education: I call it leisure education’ (p. 151). He also provided details of an associated pressure group, the Society for the Reduction of Human Labor (p. 139).

We have already noted Dumazedier’s (1989) view that, while the leisure society could already be said to exist, the achievement of a leisure civilisation was a political project. He saw it as the means to avoid the materialist future offered to the world by America:

Americans have plunged in[to] the race for consumption of objects which often satisfy less a personal need than a need for conformity or prestige. … The race seems endless. … It is in the area of leisure that this race runs the danger of producing the most frightful effects on the social and cultural aspirations of the mass of the people. Henceforth a
dangerous social mimicry will threaten to determine the cultural life of every country, each one imitating today or tomorrow the beneficial or malignant aspects of leisure à l’américaine. (Dumazedier, 1967, pp. 237-40)

If a ‘gadget civilisation’ was to be avoided, he argued, it was not only necessary to manage production and consumption:

It is equally necessary ... to include a broadened educational program among the list of social objectives. The fact is, the promotion of leisure for the mass of the people has forced upon us the vast problem of cultural democratization in this second half of the twentieth century. It is just as important as economic, social, and political democracy. (Dumazedier, 1967, p. 243)

The potential of cultural democracy was discussed in the context of French popular education and cultural development. In the context of pluralist democracy, Dumazedier called for the establishment of a cultural council to stand as a ‘bulwark both against totalitarian propaganda and free-enterprise incoherence’ (p. 249).

Eric Corijn (1987), in a paper specifically on education for leisure, notes the long-term structural unemployment in the West and the need to reduce working hours in order to share the available jobs. He equates the leisure society with an emancipated society in which there is 'minimal work', leisure is 'an essential part of life' and there is full income support for all. He notes that 1960s predictions were 'to say the least somewhat over-optimistic' but argues that, since the leisure society conditions will not arise automatically under capitalism, 'education for leisure' must be developed to educate for an understanding of the fundamental social and economic change which would enable an emancipated leisure society to come about.

Perhaps surprisingly, this group of contributors are no more forthcoming about the details of the proposed leisure society and the nature of leisure in it than those in group B. But all three reject the idea that the leisure society should simply be ‘more of the same’ as regards leisure activity. Dumazedier in particular, is clear about the need to engender alternative leisure patterns to those existing in consumerist capitalist society. All three would rely on education for leisure as a means to bring about change, unlike those among the evolutionists for whom it is a response to change. Both Neulinger and Dumazedier were professionally involved in the leisure education field. Dumazedier also espouses cultural development and cultural democracy, while Corijn adopts a broader, more overtly radical political approach.

D. Reduced work-time scenarios/projects

The 15 listed contributions in this group have a number of features in common:

1. They all recognise an existing or anticipated labour surplus in Western economies and call for a future with reduced working hours for all in the formal economy.

2. They do not use the term leisure society. Indeed, they generally avoid use of the word leisure when speaking of activity to be undertaken in the time released from paid work, preferring various collective terms, such as 'self-service' activity (Gershuny 1978),
‘ownwork’ (Robertson 1985), ‘self-defined’ or ‘autonomous’ activity (Gorz 1982, 1985, 1989), and ‘self-provision’ (Schor, 2010), to cover domestic work, community and political involvement and creative activity, including leisure.

3. Their exegeses invariably involve a critique of the materialism and consumerism of Western capitalist societies on environmental, cultural or political grounds, although they vary in the extent to which they engage with the substantial literature on the topic. Promotion of the above non-paid-work activities is seen very much as an antidote to the excesses of the consumer society.

4. As with leisure society type C theorists, they do not merely observe, critique or call for change but, to varying degrees, outline a political and/or practical program for its achievement, or for beginning the process of change.

5. In most cases they address a particular political audience. Thus:
   - Clarke and Critcher’s (1985, pp. 234) intended audience is the British socialist movement which is exhorted to incorporate leisure concerns into its agenda;
   - Macarov (1988) was the founder of the Society for the Reduction of Human Labor (see Neulinger, 1990, p. 139) which addressed a global audience;
   - the Shorter Work-Time Group (nd), now apparently inactive, was established in 1988 by the Women for Economic Justice organisation and addressed its message broadly to the United States polity;
   - Schor’s (1991, p. 164; 2000, p. 32-33) message is directed at environmental, consumer and community activists in the United States – one of her books (Schor, 2000) includes a foreword by consumer activist Ralph Nader and she is a founding board member of the Center for a New American Dream (nd), which campaigns for ‘community, ecological sustainability, and a celebration of non-material values’;
   - Gorz (1989, pp. 219-42) addresses his urgings to ‘trade unionists and other left activists’ in France;
   - both Aznar (1990) and Hayden (1999) are part of the environmental movement, in France and Canada respectively and the latter addresses not only 'greens, environmentalists or ecologists' but also 'all those who seek alternatives to the socially and environmentally destructive neo-liberalism that has spread, like a virus, into so many nations and so many minds' (Hayden, 1999, p. 10);
   - Aronowitz and DiFazio (1994) address the USA labour movement and an 'active, conscious and militant citizenry' (Aronowitz et al., 1998, p. 72);
   - Reid (1995) is alone in seeing the leisure services professions as agents for bringing about his proposed Post-materialist Society;
   - Henderson et al. (1996, p. 280-81) put forward the ‘Wanderground’ scenario as a ‘radical feminist’ agenda for the twenty-first century, while Bryson (2007) proposes a feminist ideal time culture or 'uchronia' (combining utopia and the Greek chronos, time);
   - Beck’s (2000, pp. 176-79) prime audience is likeminded ‘cosmopolitans’ in Europe who will seek to ‘found transnational interest-groups and political parties or reorient and reorganize existing ones’; and
   - the New Economics Foundation’s (2010) call for a 21-hour work-week is addressed to the UK polity.

It is not possible to expand on the detailed proposals for all 15 authors in this group, but four contrasting examples are discussed briefly.
While she is best known for her historical research on trends in working hours in the United States, as mentioned earlier in the paper, in a series of books, Juliet Schor (1991, 2000, 2010) has also made substantial contributions to the debate about the future implications of the changing work-leisure environment. In her latest book, she discusses the idea of ‘plenitude’ (equivalent to David Riesman’s (1964) ‘abundance’ used some 50 years ago); she proposes four principles: 1. a reduction in paid working hours; 2. more ‘self-provision’ outside the market system; 3. adoption of ‘true materialism’, involving taking into consideration the environmental impact of goods and services purchased; and 4. restoration of some of society’s lost community-based social capital – all summarised in the phrase ‘work and spend less, create and connect more’ (Schor, 2010, pp. 4-7).

In a series of books published in the 1980s, André Gorz (1982, 1985, 1989) argued that, in conditions of increasing labour surplus under industrial capitalism, the labour movement, rather than fighting for ‘full employment’ in the traditional sense, should seize the opportunity to reduce the input of labour into the formal economy, thus releasing time for individuals to engage in autonomous activity:

The outlines of a society based on the free use of time are only beginning to appear in the interstices of, and in opposition to, the present social order. Its watchword may be defined as: let us work less so that we may all work and do more things for ourselves in our free time. ... people's major occupation may be one or a number of self-defined activities, carried out not for money but for the interest, pleasure or benefits involved. The manner in which the abolition of work is to be managed and socially implemented constitutes the central political issue of the coming decades. (Gorz, 1982, pp. 3-4)

In a later volume, Gorz (1989, pp. 101) labels the transformed society as ‘the utopia of a society of free time’ and argues that its achievement should be the main goal of the labour movement and the political left.

In Sharing the Work, Sparing the Planet, Anders Hayden (1999) addresses the issues from a green perspective, as do Aznar (1990) and, in part, the New Economics Foundation (2010). He observes: ‘Technological advance, which once promised to bring on an ‘Age of Leisure’, instead seems to be depositing a downsized and devastated scrap heap of humanity in its wake’ (p. 7). But work-time reduction (WTR) is a key component of the program required to reverse current trends:

People need, then, to be reminded of the successful movement for WTR in the past century and a half and the current examples of shorter hours at home and abroad. Awareness of these examples ... should not lead anyone to believe that an ‘Age of Leisure’ is imminent, that achieving WTR will be simple, or that it will always serve green rather than productivist ends. But the awareness is needed to overcome the overly pessimistic view that it simply cannot be done – the first necessary step in building an effective movement for shorter hours. (Hayden, 1999, p. 103)

Valerie Bryson's (2005, pp. 169-73) discussion of the idea of a feminist ‘uchronia’, or ‘temporal utopia’ provides a link between the reduced work idea and feminism and the work-life balance literature. While her emphasis is understandably on women and carers, of both children and others, her vision encompasses everyone, when she envisages a society in which
the state would regulate working hours for all, such that 'someone who spends 60 hours a week in paid employment will be seen as an irresponsible citizen' (p. 173).

b. Analytical/ambivalent/definitional
A number of writers offer a diverse range of discussions of the leisure society concept which are ambivalent, analytical and/or definitional in a relatively detached way. These include the following.

- Thomas Kando (1980, p. 136), in a detailed analysis of the leisure society thesis, concludes that, while the material conditions for a leisure society existed in the USA in the 1970s, it would not actually come about because of the very nature of capitalism: 'the same elements that were instrumental in creating the prerequisites for leisure – a materialistic and aggressive civilization ... are now the obstacles to reaping the logical and beneficial outcome of these conditions'.

- Barry Jones, science minister in the Australian federal government in the 1980s, initially suggested that a future 'post-service' society could be a 'golden age of leisure and personal development based on co-operative use of resources' (Jones, 1982, p. 6), but subsequently foresaw problems if working hours were to be substantially reduced for the mass of workers (Jones, 1982, pp. 209-10).

- Leland Ryken (1986), having declared the twentieth century to be the 'age of leisure', nevertheless observed that mid-century predictions of falling working hours had been 'naively optimistic', but then concluded that, on the basis of available empirical evidence, trends in available leisure time were unclear.

- The UK consultancy organisation, the Henley Centre for Forecasting, having announced the arrival of the leisure society in the 1980s (Darton, 1986, p. 7), later observed that leisure time in the UK had fallen between 1985 and 1993, stating: 'in recent years we have not witnessed progress towards the leisured society' (Tyrell, 1995, p. 71). At the end of the decade the organisation further distanced itself from the idea, posing the rhetorical question: 'The leisure society, what leisure society?' (WTO, 1999, p. 145).

- In Veal (1987, p. 1) the leisure society thesis is neither endorsed nor criticised, but it is observed that, compared with the long working hours of the nineteenth century, current society could be called a leisure society. Turning to the future, it is suggested that a future society dominated by 'quaternary activities', as envisaged by Kahn, Brown and Martel (1977, p. 23), could be described as a leisure society (Veal, 1987, p. 61).

- Gianni Vattimo (2003), Italian philosopher and Member of the European Parliament, in discussing the EU policy of creating a 'knowledge society', argues that, while the more routine dimension of this policy requires the development of IT systems and associated trained personnel, the more demanding task of thinking, engaging with and creating knowledge requires time and space, which Vattimo associates with the notion of a 'leisure society', alternatively called a 'thinking society'.

- John Tribe (2005, pp. 71-75) argues that 'Our economic circumstances surely permit us to live in a Leisure Society', but observes that Western societies are insufficiently 'contemplative' and too 'frenetic' to actually become leisure societies.

- Geoffrey Godbey (2006, pp. 197-98) argues that a leisure society would not necessarily resolve the challenges likely to be thrown up by possible future declines in the demand for labour in America, but suggests that the lifestyles of the growing numbers of retired people demonstrate that a work-free existence is possible for some, given appropriate conditions.
• Karl Spracklen (2011, p. 176) summarises Rojek’s critique of the leisure society thesis, but adds his own features by, first, erroneously linking the thesis to Smigel (1963) and, second, arguing that, while leisure society proponents had envisaged the leisure society as positive and moral, there is no guarantee of this. He uses examples from science fiction and fantasy literature to illustrate the idea that, conceptually, a leisure society could be amoral or immoral (pp. 182-92).

Defining the leisure society
A number of these contributions raise the question of definitions. Table 3 brings together definitional criteria distilled from the literature, including literature from the whole 1960-2011 period and including proponents and critics, divided into quantitative and qualitative groups. In many cases authors do not formally present definitions as such, but their implied definitions have been inferred from their discussions. Multiple entries for Corijn and Henry indicate components of the same definition rather than multiple definitions.
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Quantitative definitional criteria
Quantitative criteria are sub-divided into those based on time and those based on access to, and expenditure on, goods and services. The time-based criteria include three sub-groups based respectively on: the 'historical inversion'; reduced paid work time; and zero paid work time for the masses.

As noted in Leisure Society I, the 'historical inversion' of the work-time/leisure-time ratio was first used as a definitional criterion by Kaplan (1960, p. 3) and subsequently by the Henley Centre (Darton, 1986) and Molitor (2000, 2008a, 2008b). However, none of these authors used the actual term 'historical inversion', which was introduced in this context by Dumazedier (1989, p. 144), who attributed it to Herbert Marcuse5. While this idea sounds quantitatively precise, none of the authors presents actual data to indicate how they define work time and leisure time; in particular, whether the measurements refer to weekdays only or whole weeks (including weekends) or whether holidays are taken into account. While Molitor is clear in relating his analysis to the whole life-time, it is not clear how childhood time is treated. In no case is the issue of unpaid domestic/childcare work referred to. Furthermore, in no case is the use of the historical inversion point discussed and justified as the key criterion for defining a leisure society. Others have identified the arrival of the historical inversion in the 1980s, for some groups in the community (eg. Veal, 1987, pp. 12-15) or for all (Ruthven, 1983; Gershuny, 2000, p. 25), but without using the particular term or linking it to the idea of a leisure society. However, it is clear that the advent of the historical inversion, however defined, has not been accompanied by widespread recognition of the advent of a leisure society.

The second group of work-time-based definitional criteria in Table 3 refers to reduced paid working hours generally, but only one source, Kahn and Wiener (1967), offers a specific figure, of 1100 hours per year in the year 2000. However, as noted in Leisure Society I, Kahn and Wiener do not provide a justification for the choice of this particular figure.

With the exception of Godbey's (2006) observations on the lifestyles of retired people, contributions in the third group of work-time-based criteria assume that a leisure society
would be characterised by a small élite engaging in paid work while most adults live in idleness, typically viewed as unemployed and living in comparative poverty. However, such a definition is assumed by certain critics of the leisure society rather than proponents, who generally envisage reduced working hours, not zero work, for the masses, and without reductions in income, indeed, the leisure society idea is generally seen as a means of avoiding the divided society scenario.

This is reflected in the views of the fourth quantitative group, which is concerned with access to resources in a leisure society. The criterion put forward by Neulinger (1981), Corijn (1987) and Henry (1999) indicate that members of a leisure society would have access to goods and services at a suitable level. Whether this would be achieved via the wage/salary system or other forms of support, such as pensions, student grants or a ‘guaranteed income’, is a detail which is not discussed by these authors, although the guaranteed income idea is extensively discussed elsewhere in the literature.

The fifth quantitative measure is based on the level of consumer expenditure on leisure and is offered by two authors, Neulinger (1981, p. 147) and Ryken (1986, p. 82). Neither justifies the use of consumer expenditure or the particular level chosen as an indicator of the existence of a leisure society. Indeed, since members of a leisure society, however defined, would continue to require such non-leisure goods and services as education, health, transport, food, clothing and housing, it is arguable that that expenditure on leisure would not be at a particularly elevated level.

Leaving aside those definitions which envisage zero paid work commitment for the masses and those dependent on consumer expenditure, it is clear that definitions dependent on a reduction in working hours leave open the question of the particular level of working hours at which the leisure society would be deemed to have arrived. While it would seem that the quantitative ratio between work time and leisure time must form part of a definition, the existence of a leisure society would also require the consideration of qualitative criteria.

Qualitative criteria

The qualitative criteria in Table 3 are sub-divided into two groups based respectively on: the social significance of leisure and the nature of leisure.

In the first group, in a leisure society leisure must be significant to individuals' identities and to society as a whole, but it is not clear how 'significance' is to be assessed. Some researchers in the past have sought to assess the significance of leisure at the individual level via surveys, finding that, for manual workers, ‘central life interest’ was shifting from work to leisure (Dubin, 1963; Moorhouse, 1983), while for white-collar workers this was not the case (Orzack, 1963). Others have seemed less concerned with empirical verification: thus, Roberts (1970, pp. 101-02) stated that: 'Britain has become a society of leisure in that activities in which people elect to participate during their free time play a significant part in the development of their sense of self-identity', while more recently, Blackshaw (2010, p. xii), while not subscribing to the leisure society thesis, declared: 'Today it is the pursuit of pleasure and happiness – much more than work – that appears to shape our sense of ourselves'.

The second group of qualitative criteria is concerned with the nature of leisure, including such qualities as flexibility, spontaneity and a sense of freedom. These subjective indicators
also present problems of assessment, particularly since it can be argued that they can be experienced in leisure in current societal conditions. Dieser's (2011) view is quite idiosyncratic in equating the leisure society thesis entirely with the contested conceptualisation of leisure as 'freedom, free time and freedom of choice'.

The final qualitative criterion is Dumazedier's (1989) unique distinction between a materialist leisure society and a culturally democratic leisure civilisation, as discussed above.

Definitions: conclusions

It would seem that quantitative and qualitative criteria are inter-related and both would be involved in developing a coherent definition of the leisure society/civilisation. Thus, it seems unlikely that a society would be seen as a leisure society unless full-time paid working hours were significantly less than the current typical 35-45 hours per week. But even substantially reduced working hours would not result in a consensus that a leisure society existed unless members of the society generally felt that leisure was qualitatively as significant as, or more significant than, paid work.

This raises the wider, neglected question of how, or under what circumstances, a type of society attracts a particular descriptor. In this regard, Dumazedier, in apparent criticism of his own practice, stated:

... it is arbitrary to characterize a society, a culture or a civilisation, by reference to one single feature. The type of civilisation which emerges with the predominance of the tertiary sector in the economy may be characterised in various ways ... It is equally legitimate to speak of a neo-technical, an atomic, an electronic or a cybernetic civilisation ... or to single out mass consumption, the sexual revolution, the generational conflict etc. as major features. (Dumazedier, 1974, p. 211)

When an individual commentator or group of commentators decide, on whatever basis, to give a label to a society, whether or not the label 'sticks' depends not only on the empirical or analytical basis for the proposition but on the extent to which the label catches the public imagination. In the same way that recognition of the existence of 'industrial society' is reflected in the national political and policy agenda, recognition of the existence of a leisure society would be similarly reflected, in which case, in Dumazedier's terms, it would be a leisure civilisation.

A final definitional point: most of the authors putting forward the ‘zero paid work’ criterion see such a society as either simply not viable or unacceptably divisive, giving a dystopian view of the leisure society. This is reflected in the views of Dumazedier and Neulinger that the existing patterns and tendencies of leisure under capitalism are undesirable, requiring the input of leisure education to achieve a desirable future. Other dystopian perspectives are presented in Barry Jones’s (1995, pp. 209-10) discussion of the possibility that substantially reduced working hours might threaten law and order and Clarke and Critcher’s (1985) ‘devil makes work’ argument discussed below. As noted above, Spracklen (2011, pp. 182-92) also discusses the proposition that a leisure society could be dystopian. Thus, like existing work-orientated society, whether or not a hypothetical future leisure society would be a ‘good’ society would depend on more than simply the amount of leisure time enjoyed by its citizens.
c. Critics of the leisure society thesis

The largest group, of 18 authors in Table 2, comprises critics of the leisure society thesis. While Leisure Society I indicated that such critics existed in the 1960s and ’70s, they are a more significant feature of the post-1980 period. Criticisms can be divided into two groups based respectively on: current or retrospective empirical/historical evidence on working hours; and theoretical features of the leisure society thesis.

Before considering these two groups in turn, it should be noted that any critique of the three versions of the leisure society thesis discussed above logically calls for three different types of argument. In fact, however, critiques tend to focus, implicitly, on type B, the evolutionary leisure society thesis. Furthermore, critics tend not to consider the type D reduced work scenarios.

Empirical/historical evidence on working hours

The most commonly used quantitative and empirically observable characteristic used in discussions of the leisure society is the level of paid working hours. We have already noted that a number of authors have observed that 1960s predictions of rapidly falling working hours were over-optimistic (Hunnicutt, 1980; Schor, 1991; Basso, 2003; Ryken, 1986; Corijn, 1987; Henley Centre, 1994). This is also observed by a number of the critics listed in Table 2(c), namely Kelly (1987), Bramham (2008) and Rojek (2010a), while Aitchison (2010) describes the leisure society thesis as 'anachronistic in a world where those in employment work long hours and those without paid employment struggle to resource their 'leisure''. It was noted in Leisure Society I that the rate of reduction in average full-time weekly working hours in the pre-World War II period was about three hours per decade, but was much lower in the 1945-79 period. Table 4 contains UK and USA data on paid hours worked in employment for the period 1983-2008, and the final column shows that this slower rate of reduction continued in the post-1980 period, being only 0.6 hours per decade overall and one hour for men in the UK, and actually increasing or static in the USA.
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It was noted in Leisure Society I that technical flaws in the methodology used by leisure specialists and other researchers in the 1960s and ’70s resulted in exaggerated predictions of reductions in paid working hours. Typical predictions were for a 30-hour full-time paid working week by the year 2000. It can be seen that, for the UK and USA, while overall average working weeks in the post-1980 period were less than 40 hours, the figures for men remained well over 40 hours throughout the period. One of the features of post-World War II working hours trend analysis identified in Leisure Society I was the failure to take account of the changing composition of the labour force, in particular, the increasing proportion of women and students and the associated increase in part-time working. This can result in declining overall average working hours at the same time as working hours of particular groups are static or even increasing. Thus, while authors in the post-1980 period continued to predict reductions in overall average working hours – for example: Ruthven (1983) (Australia), Stonier (1983) and Handy (1983) (UK) and Asubel and Grubler (1995 (Austria) – this can be consistent with increasing group-specific average working hours for some or all groups of employees. This is illustrated by Table 4, which shows that, for the UK, while the overall weekly average fell by 1.6 hours, this is made up of a fall of 2.6 hours for men and an increase of 0.5 hours for women, whose share of the workforce increased by 5.5 per cent and among whom were increasing numbers of full-time workers.
The question arises as to the reasons why the trend toward reduced working hours slowed in the post-war era. Some critics of the leisure society thesis, notably Bramham (2008) and Rojek (2010a), have attributed its demise to the economic disruption caused by the oil price crises of the 1970s and subsequently to the effects of globalisation, especially the emergence of Asian economies and their impact on Western manufacturing sectors. However, this explanation requires some elaboration. It might be thought that for it to be valid these events would need to have caused a significant slowing of the rate of economic growth in Western countries, since it was increasing gross domestic product which had facilitated the simultaneous increase in incomes and reduction in working hours in the past. But real GDP per head in the UK and USA, for example, rose by over 90 per cent between 1973 and 2008. Even a hypothetical reduction of the full-time work-week by, say, 10 hours would still have allowed real income to increase by about 67 per cent. However, the comparatively high levels of unemployment, resulting in ‘jobless growth’ rather than lack of growth per se, at least from the 1980s onwards, are likely to have reduced the bargaining power of labour in setting the industrial relations agenda, which might otherwise have included reductions in working hours as it had in the past. Furthermore, the globalization trends referred to by Rojek and Bramham would have been an additional factor in trade-exposed industries, typically in the manufacturing sector. In earlier decades such industries had been at the forefront in setting the trend for shorter working hours but, as Rosenberg (1992) indicates, industrial bargaining in the USA from the 1980s resulted in increased working hours and shift-work in the manufacturing sector. The now quantitatively dominant service industry workforce is less unionised, more fragmented and less able to set the industrial relations agenda.

However, historians, notably Benjamin Hunnicutt and Gary Cross, have canvassed a wide range of other possible reasons why reduced working hours may not have been on the wage-bargaining agenda in the post-World War II era, including the following.

- Hunnicutt (1980, p. 205) indicates that in the USA the origins of the loss of momentum towards shorter working hours lay in events in the 1930s Great Depression years when proposals to legislate for reduced working hours to facilitate the sharing of the available work and thus eliminate unemployment were opposed by ‘most of the business community, many politicians and the economists and intellectuals in [President] Roosevelt’s ‘braintrust’”, resulting in the president blocking the legislation.
- Post-war, the shorter hours movement was further undermined by Western government promises, made under the influence of Keynesianism, to maintain full employment through the promotion of economic growth (Hunnicutt, 1980, p. 208; 1988, p. 310), thus undermining the idea that full employment should be achieved by reducing working hours and sharing the available work around.
- The war-time link between hard work, patriotism and national security was carried through into the Cold War era (Hunnicutt, 1988, p. 311).
- Once the 8-hour day had been achieved, there was a weakening of the arguments concerning long hours and fatigue, health and safety: more time simply for leisure had less moral force than time for adequate rest, recuperation and maintenance of health (Hunnicutt, 1988, p. 310).
- Unlike the pre-war belief that increased productivity enabled working hours to be reduced at the same time as wages increased, the post-war belief was that any reduction in working hours would entail loss of income (Hunnicutt, 1988, p. 310).
- There was greater availability and marketing of increasingly costly consumer goods,
linked with the idea of *embourgeoisement* of the working class in the context of the affluent society, thus making more income preferable to more leisure time for many (Hunnicutt, 1988, pp. 312-13; Cross, 1989, p. 229).

- A lack of desire for more leisure time was linked with the experience of, or fear of, boredom and even a 'fear of freedom' (Hunnicutt, 1988, p. 313).
- As noted above, the change in occupational structure away from manufacturing towards services, and including increasing numbers of women and part-timers, altered the industrial relations environment (Cross, 1989, pp. 229-30).
- Once the 8-hour day had been achieved, other priorities, such as vacations, parental leave, flexible hours and earlier retirement may have assumed priority (Cross, 1989, p. 230). It is notable that these claims have been more successful in Europe than in North America.
- There was a lack of a strong international drive for shorter hours comparable to that in the inter-war years (Cross, 1989, p. 231).
- In the USA, Juliet Schor (1991) blamed the change on the 'work-and-spend' culture of the United States, although this does not explain why this was, by implication, less powerful in the pre-war period.
- Basso (2003) draws attention to the weakened trade union movement, partly brought about by neo-liberal government policies associated with 'Reaganomics' of the 1980s, although, as long ago as the 1960s, Faunce (1963, p. 87) observed that: 'a further reduction in the work week has not become an immediate collective bargaining objective of American trade unions'.
- More recently, Paramio and Zofio (2008) have noted that in Spain, the leisure society thesis has been undermined by trends towards long hours, casualisation and low wages – the 'Brazilianization' process referred to by Therborn (1986, p. 32) and Beck (2000), but this experience seems to be more extreme in Spain, which has had the highest unemployment rate in western Europe for the last 25 years.

If just some of these observations are salient, then the drive to reduce working hours would have been weakened and successfully resisted by employers since, as Cross (1989, p. 231) observes: 'the goal of decreasing hours was (and remains) hard to obtain – often taking a generation or more of agitation, organizing, and coalition building. It has also required unique conjunctures – political, economic, and international'. Despite this history, however, the campaign for shorter working hours is not dead, as indicated by the activities of organisations, such as the Shorter Work-Time Group (nd), discussed above, and the New Economics Foundation (2010). Rather than focussing on the standard working week, however, trades unions and labour analysts appear to be concentrating on increasing flexibility and reining in the amount of unpaid overtime being worked (Trades Union Congress, nd; Coats, 2005, pp. 41-43).

**Theoretical/conceptual criticisms**

Theoretical and conceptual criticisms of the leisure society thesis are many and examples of these are discussed in turn below.

**Work versus leisure as a source of meaning**

From a psychological point of view, Haworth (1984), Robertson (1985, pp. 24-26), Handy (1989, p. 166) and Beck (2000, p. 62) argue that the leisure society is not viable because leisure is not capable of replacing work in providing the major source of meaning in people's
lives. As noted in the definitional discussion above, the proportion of the population for whom work is the main, or a major, source of meaning in life is itself an empirical question and is likely to be higher among professional, managerial, supervisory and skilled manual workers than among unskilled manual workers (see Dubin, 1963; Orzack, 1963). Arguably, there is a spectrum rather than a sharp divide between the two groups. Whatever their respective sizes, coexistence of the two groups has long been a feature of workplaces and society, but commentators who raise this as an issue tend not to put forward any argument or evidence as to why this disparity, even if taken further, is unsustainable. Furthermore, it should be noted that leisure and work are not the only sources of meaning in life: there is also care for family, and religious and community involvement, although both of these can involve leisure activity.

Class division

A number of authors are critical of the idea of a leisure society because it is envisaged that it would involve intensification of class divisions and inequalities. Thus Newman (1983) argued that the 'new leisure class lifestyle' would be enjoyed only by the middle classes. Porritt (1984) and Seabrook (1988) assumed that the leisure society would involve large numbers of unemployed people living in poverty, while Robertson (1985, p. 166) argued that those in work would resent supporting those who would be living in idleness. This is a vision of the critics rather than of leisure society proponents, who typically see available work and leisure being shared around, rather than work being reserved for an élite and leisure for the majority (see, for example, Neulinger, 1990a, pp. 173-74).

Incompatibility with capitalism

A number of authors argue that the leisure society thesis is flawed because it is incompatible with capitalism. They offer variations on the argument of Marcuse (1962, pp. vii-viii) that 'Advanced industrial society is in permanent mobilisation against ... the possibility of working time becoming marginal and free time becoming full time'. We have already noted above that Kando (1980) presents such a view. Ed Andrew (1981, p. 182) argues similarly that the 'iron cage' imposed by 'Taylorized' work under capitalism is incompatible with the freedoms implied by a 'civilisation of leisure'. Roger Sue (1982) has also argued that the individual freedoms that a leisure society implies would be inconsistent with the disciplines required by the capitalist system, which have traditionally been imposed by the work-consumption nexus. Some commentators, notably Sue (1982), Corijn (1987) and Dieser (2011), define the leisure and the leisure society in terms of freedom and an emancipated society so, for those who consider capitalist society to be intrinsically un-free, a leisure society would be incompatible with capitalism. Hunnicutt’s (1980, p. 205) account of the strong opposition of American business to shorter working hours legislation in the 1930s can be seen as evidence of the stance of capital on the issue. Corijn (1987) puts forward a similar argument but rather than using it as the basis for dismissing the leisure society, he puts his faith in education as a means of bringing about the changes necessary to achieve an emancipated leisure society. A number of commentators base their conclusions on the ‘labour theory of value’ which sees labour as the only source of economic value and hence of profit, or ‘surplus value’. This suggests that the owners of capital will always oppose increased leisure time and seek (successfully) to maximise labour time, since it is their only source of profits (see Basso, 2003, pp. 197, 206; Granter, 2008, p. 921; Bowring, 2002). However, while the labour theory
of value was favoured by early economists and Marx it is generally rejected by contemporary economists.

As noted in the discussion of the reduction of working hours above, this argument ignores, or at least leaves open, the question of how or why reductions in working hours have been gained under capitalism at various times in the past. Clearly, such gains have invariably been made in the face of opposition from employers and this has been recognised by leisure society proponents. Thus Dumazedier (1967, pp. 237-40) and Neulinger (1974, p. 165) were both of the view that materialist and work-related values intrinsic to the American capitalist system were a potential barrier to the achievement of a leisure society and that success would involve considerable effort, struggle and education.

‘The Devil makes work’

John Clarke and Chas Critcher (1985) argued that the leisure society proponents’ idyllic view of an imminent leisure society was undermined by the reality of contemporary leisure behaviour in the Britain of the 1980s, which was ‘inconveniently associated with the ‘devil’s work’ rather than emancipation: drunkenness, illicit sexuality, crime, violence, vandalism, physical and psychological demoralisation and urban riots. ... The dream of the leisure society is constantly undercut by the nightmare of idleness' (Clarke and Critcher, 1985, p. 4). A similar proposition is put forward by Barry Jones (1995, pp. 209-10). As a critique of the leisure society idea, this does not stand up to close examination. The idea that ‘the devil makes work for idle hands’ has been a very familiar theme in discussions of the growth of leisure since the 1930s and earlier, and has been a key part of the rationale of leisure policy since the nineteenth century. But the case that there is a relationship between the amount of leisure time in society and the amount of ‘devil’s work’ and remains to be proven. A number of leisure society proponents would see the debasement of leisure and the quality of life under current work-orientated conditions as part of the case for establishing a leisure society rather than an obstacle to its realisation, as noted above in discussion of the leisure society as political project.

Environmental impact

Curiously, it is sociologist John Kelly (1982), rather than representatives of the green movement, who first drew attention to environmental factors, arguing that leisure society proponents, in their vision of continued economic growth, assume that ‘no limits in energy resources, raw material, and productivity will keep economics from actualizing whatever is technically possible. ...The possible conflict between the production of endless consumer resources for leisure and the reduced productivity of a ‘leisure age' are seldom mentioned' (Kelly, 1982, p. 276). This argument would be applicable to any form of uncontrolled economic growth but it is in fact challengeable in the context of increasing leisure time, since any move towards more leisure at the expense of work would involve less rather than more production, and therefore less impact on the environment, than ‘business as usual’ – a point which is recognised by Schor (1991, p. 163) and, as noted above, is also argued by other commentators such as Aznar (1990), Hayden (1999) and the New Economics Foundation (2010). Furthermore, in regard to consumption, measures to limit environmental impacts of human activity – for example current proposals for the pricing of greenhouse gas emissions – apply to leisure goods and services as much as any other forms of consumption.
Chris Rojek's critique of the leisure society thesis has been sustained over 25 years (1985, 2010a) and, in addition to the above arguments about economic crises and globalization, consists of at least six themes: the link with post-industrial theory; ignoring the Third World; the unjustified dependence on ethical employers/government; ignoring class, race and gender; the assumption of leisure-for-all; and being utopian. These are discussed in turn below.

**Link with post-industrial theory**

The main theme of Rojek’s critique, partly echoed by Linhart (1988) and Bramham (2006, 2008), is its association with post-industrial theory. Post-industrial theory stands condemned by Rojek because of its over-optimistic vision of the future trajectory of capitalist industrial society. The leisure society thesis is thereby tainted by its inclusion in that vision. The link is, however, tenuous at best. In his earlier comments, Rojek (1985, p. 101; 2000, p. 28) groups Kerr et al. (1960, 1973) with post-industrialists and leisure society proponents, even though they were not post-industrial theorists, but industrial theorists who discussed the convergence between capitalist and communist industrial economies. They envisaged not a post-industrial society but a future of ‘industrial pluralism’ and made only passing references to leisure in a couple of paragraphs near the end of their book. Here there was talk of a ‘new bohemianism’, ‘more free time’ and leisure as the ‘happy hunting ground for the independent spirit’ offsetting the anticipated increasing regimentation of the workplace (Kerr et al. (1960, p. 232), but there is no use of the term ‘leisure society’. Rojek (1985, p. 101; 2005, p. 3) groups under the post-industrial label a number of authors who were not post-industrial theorists (Dower, 1965; Dumazedier, 1967; Kaplan, 1975) and those who were post-industrial theorists (Bell, 1974; Touraine, 1971) but did not discuss the leisure society thesis. When Rojek (2010a, p. 31) discusses the most well-known of all these, Daniel Bell, in more detail he fails to note that, as indicated in Leisure Society I, Bell held a quite pessimistic view of the trends in the use of time under capitalism, and did not envisage a leisure society (Bell, 1973, p. 475). Bell’s discussion of leisure, under the heading ‘The End of Scarcity?’, comprises a critique of the work of a number of authors, including the only post-industrial theorists who addressed the leisure society idea in any detail, Kahn and Wiener (1967). Bell (1974, p. 461) dismissed their work as an example of ‘technological euphoria’. He concluded: ‘Has the economic problem been solved? Will scarcity disappear? ... the answer is no, or not for a long time’ (Bell, 1974, p. 463). Thus, while the leisure society thesis and post-industrial theory belong to the same era, direct links between them are difficult to locate, and it is even difficult to find post-industrial theorists, beyond Kahn and Wiener, who envisaged increased leisure time as a central feature of post-industrial society. It is not possible to pursue this in detail in this paper, but suffice to say, that the key feature of the post-industrial society theory was the dominance of services (including leisure services) and knowledge industries in the economy at the expense of manufacturing and this observation, and the label ‘post-industrial society’, have, in fact, stood the test of time.

**Third World**

The second theme of Rojek's (1985, p. 102; 2010, pp. 28, 188) critique of both the leisure society and post-industrial theory is their proponents’ apparent lack of concern for the global context, in particular Third World poverty. However, leading leisure society/civilisation proponents Dumazedier (1967, pp. 236-37) and Neulinger (1974, p. 164; 1981, p. 216) both noted that poverty in the Third World could be a practical and/or moral impediment to
implementation of a leisure society in the wealthy countries. Nevertheless, it might be noted that existing conditions suggest that wealthy countries seem to be quite content to enjoy their high levels of wealth and comparative leisure while making only limited efforts to address poverty in developing countries. Furthermore, as with the environmentally-based critique discussed above, the argument could be turned on its head: a leisure society involving reduced working hours in wealthy countries, would involve the foregoing of potential wealth creation, thus assisting in the process of developing countries ‘catching up’.

Ethical employers/government

Rojek (2010a, pp. 21, 29) argues that the leisure society thesis involves reliance on the goodwill of ‘ethical government’ and ‘ethical management’ to achieve reduced working hours. It has not been possible to find any mention of ethical government or management in the writings of leisure society proponents, but there is a unique reference to ‘benevolent’ administrators and political bureaucracy in Kerr et al. (1964, p. 228), who we have noted, Rojek considers to be leisure society proponents. However, the assumption that reductions in working hours must require some sort of beneficent motivation on the part of employers and/or government is not a necessary element of the leisure society thesis. Leisure society proponents observed that, under capitalism, working hours had fallen significantly since the beginning of the twentieth century, so it was simply assumed that, whatever the mechanism which had brought this about, it was reasonable to believe the trend was likely to continue into the future. This does not necessarily imply that the process was envisaged as smooth or automatic. Indeed, Dumazedier stated that increased leisure had not been 'created automatically' but had come about through 'a continuous struggle between opposed interests' (Dumazedier and Latouche, 1977, pp. 122-23), reflecting the observations of Cross (1989, p. 231) noted above.

Class, race and gender

Rojek (2010a, p. 188) argues that the leisure society thesis fails to ‘address the persistence of class, race, gender and status relations in positioning individuals and groups unequally in relation to scarcity’. It is true that most leisure society proponents did not address questions of class, race and gender inequality as they generally failed to address its ‘institutional form, fiscal arrangements, citizenship rights and obligations’ (Rojek, 2004, p. 53) in general. The only proponents to consider in any detail the sort of life patterns envisaged in a ‘leisure-oriented society’ were Kahn and Wiener (1967, pp. 202-20) and they did consider some of these dimensions. But if class, race and gender were to be considered, it does not follow that this would necessarily, of itself, invalidate the leisure society thesis. Two examples illustrate the point. Regarding gender, the Swedish trade unions’ 1970s campaign for reduced working hours, referred to above, was designed to reduce the differences in working conditions between men and women (Weigelt, 1991, pp. 208, 218). Regarding class, such reductions in working hours as have occurred in the post-World War II have tended to favour manual/clerical workers, with professional/managerial workers more subject to long working hours (Wilensky, 1961: 55; Roberts, 2007, p. 338).

Leisure-for-all

Rojek (2010a, p. 21) refers to the 'leisure for all' goal of the leisure society thesis in terms which imply that it lacks realism, and this is echoed by Bramham (2008, pp. 4-5). The
specific term, ‘leisure-for-all’, was not generally part of the lexicon of leisure society proponents, but the observation that extended leisure was once the privilege of small elites but was already increasingly enjoyed by the masses was recognised as far back as the 1930s, with the discussion of the phenomenon of the 'new leisure' (eg. Burns, 1932, p. 219; Faunce, 1963, p. 85). It was, of course, expected by leisure society proponents that future reductions in working hours would, as they had for the previous 60 or so years, apply across the whole labour force. However, as noted above, a number of authors have drawn attention to the fact that managerial and professional employees tend, on average, to have longer working hours than manual employees, while Gershuny (1993) has demonstrated a convergence in work-leisure time allocation between middle class and working class employees in Britain over the period 1930 to 1975. Dumazedier (1974, p. 21) outlined a future scenario in which working hours would vary among the members of a leisure society according to a variety of factors.

**Utopianism**

The final theme of Rojek’s critique is that the leisure society thesis was utopian. Thus, he states that the thesis has involved the field of leisure studies in 'studying a landscape that was ideal rather than real, wished-for rather than evidence-based' (Rojek, 2010a, p. 20). Blackshaw (2010, p. 122) says of this statement that, in other words, the leisure society thesis ‘remained an abstract utopia’. Rojek's aversion to utopian visions is further exemplified by his critique of Gorz's (1989, p. 101) ‘utopian society of free time’ on the grounds that it ignores the 'polymorphously perverse character of human beings' (Rojek, 2000, pp. 202-6). Other critics have referred to the leisure society as a 'chimaera' (Ecology Party, 1981, p. 18) and a 'mega-fantasy' (Porritt, 1984, p. 68). If the leisure society thesis is to be condemned for being utopian, this requires a consideration of utopianism.

Anti-utopian comments reflect the sentiments of the age: as Zygmunt Bauman (1987, p. 194) observes: ‘Ours is, decisively, not an age of utopias’. Anthony Giddens (1990, p. 21) suggests that utopianism has fallen from favour among social theorists in recent times because of Marx’s suspicion of ‘utopian socialism’. However, Marx's critique was aimed at specific genre of utopian writing, by the likes of St Simon, Morris and Fourier, which was not built on a political strategy involving the industrial proletariat (Mark and Engels, 1848/1952, pp. 89-93). Thus, it does not involve a rejection of utopian ideals in general. Indeed, André Gorz (1989, p. 8), defining utopia as ‘the vision of the future on which civilisation bases its projects, establishes its ideal goals and builds its hopes’, sees communism as Marx’s ‘utopian conception’ (p. 25). In one vision of the communist society well-known to leisure scholars, Marx envisaged he would be able to ‘hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming a hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic’ (Marx and Engels, 1846/1976, p. 53). But for Marx, this utopia was not just wished-for but an historical inevitability. For Marxist, neo-Marxist and other critical analysts the future of capitalist society will be increasingly dystopian and/or must end in collapse or fundamental change. Thus any positive vision of the future of capitalist society – such as a leisure society – is labelled ‘utopian’ in the sense of being unrealistic: the only acceptable utopia being post-capitalist socialism (Clarke and Critcher, 1985, p. 239). However, Anthony Giddens (1990, p. 21) argues that, in seeking to ‘rethink the future of socialism’ intellectuals of the left need ‘a new injection of utopianism if we are, as collective humanity, somehow to emerge from the turbulent and risky world into which modernity has launched us’ and calls for the adoption of ‘utopian realism’. He suggests various forms of
utopian realism with which the left should be concerned, including the vision of a world free of war, as pursued by peace movements, a more democratic and free world as pursued by civil rights and democratic movements, and a sustainable environment, as pursued by green movements. The proponents of the leisure society as political project and the various reduced-work scenarios and their audiences, can be seen as exemplars of Giddens' 'rainbow coalition' of groups seeking 'utopian realism'. As noted in Table 2, Gorz embraces the term utopia, as does Bryson (2007) in the form of 'uchronia', while Neulinger (1990b, rear cover) invokes the notion of 'an Eden on earth, a realizable Utopia' to avoid society ‘racing toward death and despair’.

In summary, the first part of the critique, that the predictions of the advent of a leisure society, probably by the beginning of the twenty first century, were mistaken due to the stalling of the trend towards shorter working hours, is clearly valid. However, the theoretical/conceptual objections to the leisure society thesis, while they raise questions which have generally not been extensively addressed by leisure society proponents, are capable of being addressed and do not of themselves constitute an unassailable argument against the leisure society thesis.

**Conclusion: the future**

The aim of this paper, as with Leisure Society I, has not been to come to definitive conclusions regarding the leisure society thesis, but to provide an overview of the relevant supportive and critical literature, both for the record and to inform any future debate on the topic. In pursuing this aim, however, some concluding observations arise.

First, it is concluded that the quality of discussion of the leisure society thesis would be improved if account were to be taken of the definitional criteria outlined in the paper, the three types of thesis identified – the current leisure society, the evolving leisure society and the leisure society as political project – and other reduced-work scenarios/projects which do not use the term 'leisure society'.

Second, the identification of the leisure society as political project and the existence of other reduced-work scenarios/projects raises the question of the collective 'project', or 'projects', of the field of leisure studies. Bramham (2006) specifically identifies the leisure society thesis as the first of four major projects which engaged the leisure studies community from the 1960s to the 2000s and this idea is broadly endorsed by the attention given to the topic by Rojek, as indicated above. In the *World Leisure Journal* debate which stimulated the preparation of the current paper and its predecessor, Aitchison (2010) effectively agreed with the proposition that the leisure society thesis had been a project but disagreed with Rojek regarding its significance and the extent of the damage it had done to the field of leisure studies. Bramham, Aitchison and others argue that the field of leisure studies has moved on to other projects since the 1970s, including the early broad social democratic consensus, environmental/outdoor recreation planning perspectives, neo-Marxist and feminist paradigms, postmodernism and various market-orientated stances (Aitchison, 2010; Bramham, 2006; Mommaas, 1997; Coalter, 1998; Veal, 2002). Some of the projects have been short-lived, while some are continuing, and they vary in terms of their spread across the leisure studies community and the degree of advocacy involved. The extent of links with the world of practice also varies, but identification with broader societal viewpoints and/or movements – such as feminism or environmentalism – is common. The question therefore arises as to why
at least some members of the leisure studies community might not identify with the shorter work-time movements identified above.

Echoing Giddens’ recommendations for a ‘rainbow coalition’ approach to the agenda of the political left, as noted above, commentators in the 1990s suggested a collaborative approach to the pursuit of reduced working hours in the formal economy. Cross (1989) stated: ‘The labor movement, which formerly dominated the short-hours cause, surely cannot be expected to find solutions without the collaboration of women’s and other groups’. Schor (1991, p. 164, 2000, 32-33) argued that a reinvigorated campaign for shorter working hours would need to involve environmental and women’s organizations as well as trade unions and consumer groups. Of the various reduced-work scenario proponents discussed above, only one refers to the leisure sector as a source of support. This is curious, given that it might be thought that the leisure studies community would have an interest in less work time and more leisure time for all.
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Table 1. Work-leisure issues: selected literature: 1980-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>D*</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type*</th>
<th>Term used</th>
<th>Key content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>The 1980s: Work, leisure and unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-86</td>
<td>Jenkins/Sherman</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure shock/revolution</td>
<td>High unemployment seen as permanent. Need for a usefulness ethic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Keane &amp; Owens</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beyond the employment society</td>
<td>Full-employment goal no longer realistic. Social democratic, conservative, neoliberal etc. approaches not valid. Gorz's socialist utopia (see table 2b) requires more detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Replacing the work ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Gappert</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure ethic</td>
<td>In 'post-affluent society', the 'new leisure ethic' will be reflected in 3 days work and 4 days play a week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Pym</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Resourcefulness ethic</td>
<td>We need a 'resourcefulness ethic' to cope with the 'threat of finite resources and the waste of industrialism'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Clemitson/Rodgers</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Life ethic</td>
<td>A life ethic: a person's main contribution to society not only through paid work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Neulinger</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure ethic</td>
<td>A leisure ethic is a necessary component of a leisure society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Contribution ethic</td>
<td>Perhaps out of the ashes of the Work Ethic.. will emerge .. a Contribution Ethic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982,2011</td>
<td>Dustin et al.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Worth ethic</td>
<td>A ‘worth ethic’ involves: respect as a birthright; freedom to grow; opportunities for choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Ritchie-Calder</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Non-work ethic</td>
<td>A non-work ethic would remove the stigma of compulsory idleness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Mobley</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Leisure ethic</td>
<td>Imperative that a 'leisure ethic' be developed to guide the leisure choices of all citizens in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Leisure ethos</td>
<td>The historically ingrained 'work ethic' must make way for a 'leisure ethos'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Martin/Mason</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Leisure ethic</td>
<td>A 'new set of values' is needed .. which recognises the changing role of work, unemployment and leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Gorz</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ethic for cooperation etc.</td>
<td>An ethic for: voluntary cooperation, self-determination, creativity and quality of our relations with each other and with nature: see below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2000  Rojek  L  UK  B  Engaged freedom  'The religious, civil and legal foundations of the work ethic need to be revised' (p. 210). See also p. 3

c. The truth about working hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980, 1988</td>
<td>Hunnicutt</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Work without end</td>
<td>Work time in USA did not fall significantly in the post-World War II period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Schor</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Overworked American</td>
<td>Work time in USA had not fallen in post-WWII period. Americans devoted to 'getting and spending.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Basso</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Modern times, ancient hours</td>
<td>Disputes the thesis that working hours have fallen, and will continue to fall, under capitalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Robinson/Godbey</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Time use</td>
<td>Based on time-use surveys, claim that leisure time in USA is increasing – a fact hidden by labour force data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Aronowitz/DiFazio</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Jobless future</td>
<td>Reduced labour requirements in industrial society, but leisure not discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Rifkin</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>The end of work</td>
<td>Effects of reduction in labour requirements not clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999, 2002</td>
<td>Bowring</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Post-work society</td>
<td>Continuation of work-centred society is an untenable proposition ... we are on the threshold of a post-work society (1999). Post-Fordist conditions, for creative workers, breaks the nexus between labour time and the production of value (2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Zuzanek</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Time-pressure &amp; stress</td>
<td>Canadian data indicates work time increasing, but leisure time is not decreasing, but subjective feelings of time-pressure are increasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>Work time has not increased in UK, but other factors cause a sense of time pressure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Discipline: C campaign; Cn consultant; E economist; F futurist; H historian; J journalist; L leisure specialist; P political scientist/politician; R religious: theologian/priest etc. S sociologist; Sc scientist; TU trade unionist

** Type: B book; BC book chapter; J journal article; LJ leisure journal article; J(nr) non-refereed journal; R report; W website.
### Table 2. Leisure society and reduced-work futures literature, 1980-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>D*</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type**</th>
<th>Term used</th>
<th>References to LS sources</th>
<th>Key content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Leisure society/reduced work theses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A The current leisure society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Ryken</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Age of leisure</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>'Our own century is surely the age of leisure'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Linhart</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Austria/Jap</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Japan is moving towards a leisure society, ie. one with current Western working hours/ holidays etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Dumazedier</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>We live in a leisure society but the leisure civilisation has still to be created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Leisure society rather than a leisured society characterises contemporary UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ravenscroft/Gilchrist</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Working soc. of leisure</td>
<td>Dumazedier, Veblen</td>
<td>'The emergent working society of leisure' exists in some areas of UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Leisure society as evolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>'.. the breakthroughs of technology are bringing it [LS] very close'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Watts</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Age of leisure</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>'Prophets of an age of leisure' state that 'Britain and other 'developed' societies are moving into a new leisure age'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Haworth</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Leisure-orientated society</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>'the leisure society, which (it is supposed) will certainly be ushered in by automation, and in some measure is already upon us'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Henley Centre</td>
<td>Cn</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>J(nr)</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>'We are moving inexorably from the era of the leisure classes .. to the era of the leisured society' (Darton, 1986).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Westland</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Leisure-orientated society</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>A leisure-oriented society has implications for education and basis of social status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Stebbins</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Leisure age</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Information Age is on the verge of giving birth to the Leisure Age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/08</td>
<td>Molitor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>J(nr)</td>
<td>Leisure era</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Leisure era will arrive in USA in 2015, when leisure time will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exceed work time.

While an evolutionary leisure society was assumed in early writings (1981), a later book (1990) was a political manifesto for achieving of a leisure society.

Leisure society is an emancipated society, but will not arise automatically under capitalism. 'Education for leisure' is required to achieve fundamental changes.

We live in a leisure society: the leisure civilisation has still to be created and requires significant educational and cultural reforms.

Response to increasing efficiency and reduced labour requirements in the formal economy: an increased role for the household-based ‘self-service’ activity.

Leisure society is not viable (see section c below). In future conditions of reduced work time people would engage in 'Ownwork'.

‘It would be more socialist to reduce the extent to which we all have to labour, releasing our time and energy to explore other kinds of activity’ (p. 234)

Permanent structural reduction in demand for labour in advanced economies must be planned for, with a variety of reforms.

Campaign founded in 1988 by the Women for Economic Justice, seeks to challenge America’s ‘workaholic culture, and public and workplace policies’.

America’s unsustainable culture of ‘work and spend’ should be countered by a ‘new politics of consumption’, including reduced working hours.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989, 1994</td>
<td>Gorz</td>
<td>S France</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Society of free time</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Aznar</td>
<td>S France</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Eco-system</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Aronowitz &amp; DiFazio</td>
<td>S USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Post-work society</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>L Canada</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Post-materialist society</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Henderson et al.</td>
<td>L USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>‘Wanderground’ scenario</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Hayden</td>
<td>P Canada</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Work time reduction</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>S Germany</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Multi-activity society with ‘civil labour’</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Bryson</td>
<td>S USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Feminist 'uchronia'</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>New Economics Foundation</td>
<td>E UK</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>21-hour work-week</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Analytical/ambivalent/definitional

1980 | Kando | L USA | B | Leisure society | None | The economic conditions exist for a leisure society in USA, but it is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Age of leisure</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Ryken</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Age of leisure</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Veal</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>Ecology Party, Porritt, Roberts, Kahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Henley Centre</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>J(nr)</td>
<td>Leisured society</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Vattimo</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Tribe</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>Dumazedier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Godbey</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Spracklen</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>Rojek, Smigel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Veal</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c. Critics of the leisure society thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Civilization of leisure</td>
<td>Dumazedier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Ecology Party</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leisure age</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'post-service society ... could be a golden age of leisure and personal development', but paid work hours of less than 20 per week likely to be unviable.

Mid-century 'predictions were naively optimistic about the quantity of leisure in the modern world', but evidence on leisure time availability is mixed.

Leisure society idea no longer fashionable but, compared with our forebears, contemporary society could be called a leisure society, as could Kahn's future 'quaternary activity'-dominated society (Kahn, Brown and Martel, 1977: 23).

1986 views of a leisure society (see above) changed in the 1990s.

The pre-requisite for the achievement of the EU goal of becoming a 'knowledge society' is the development of a 'leisure society' or 'thinking society'.

Economic conditions exist for the development of a leisure society, but social and political values/attitudes prevent it.

A society of leisure will not necessarily resolve future work/leisure problems, but retired people offer a demonstration of living without work.

Possible to imagine an amoral or immoral leisure society, via the examples of science fiction/fantasy literature.

References to the leisure society in the literature involve numerous myths and misconceptions.

A 'civilization of leisure' is incompatible with the 'iron cage' of 'Taylorized' work.

Leisure is not a viable alternative to work.

Materialist future implied by LS is environmentally unsustainable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author/Region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Civilisation of leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted falls in working hours have not materialised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The freedom implied by leisure is incompatible with the reality of capitalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure society idea exists in a social vacuum. Current 'new leisure class lifestyle' enjoyed only by sections of the middle classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Haworth</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Leisure-orientated soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure society is not viable because only work can provided meaning/purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Porritt</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In capitalist society, leisure society = a society with high unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Clarke/Critcher</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proponents of the leisure society idea are opportunistic. The emancipatory and idyllic idea of the leisure society is undermined by leisure's association with the 'devil's work', ie. drunkenness, illicit sexuality, crime, etc. Economic support for a non-working population is problematical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure society is not viable because: 1. people would find idleness unacceptable; 2. the employed would resent supporting the majority in idleness. 'Ownwork' solution - see section b. above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-2010</td>
<td>Rojek</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure society associated with invalid post-industrial theory. Furthermore, trends towards reduced working hours were thwarted by the economic crises in the 1970s and '80s, then by globalisation. Class, race and gender inequality and Third World poverty are ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Seabrook</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure society is equated with mass unemployment and associated poverty. A non-materialist lifestyle is offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988,2000</td>
<td>Gershuny</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In LS visions such as Kahn's 'we slide.. towards leisure as escape from responsibilities, a reversion to an infantile state in which we just don't have to work' (p. 61).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Handy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |               |         |                |        | 'The idea of a 'leisure society' with whole blocks of people with nothing to do except enjoy themselves, is to me a vision of hell not
of heaven'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Free-time/leisure society</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>'leisure and play are unthinkable without work (or anyway without social activity)'. The idea of 'civil labour' is presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Bramham</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>LJ/B</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>Kerr et al.</td>
<td>The fundamental flaw in visions of a future leisure society was that they were articulated at the precise moment when economic forces were historically moving in a new and different direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Paramio/Zofio</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Civilisation of leisure</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>'End of work' and 'leisure society' theses are undermined by Spanish data, which show labour force trends towards long hours, casualisation and low wages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Aitchison</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>Rojek, Roberts, Veal</td>
<td>Leisure society idea is anachronistic due to the advent of long working hours and high unemployment, and more relevant leisure-related theses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Dieser</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Leisure society</td>
<td>Aitchison</td>
<td>The leisure society thesis is equated with the conceptualisation of leisure as 'freedom, free time and freedom of choice' and dismissed on that basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Table 1 ** See Table 1..

*** In a number of publications, Rojek cites numerous sources which he associates with the leisure society thesis. They include Kaplan, Dumazedier, Neulinger, who can be so associated, and Dower, Kerr et al., Touraine, and Bell, Schor, along with Aronowitz and Di Fazio who cannot.
† Clarke and Critcher (1985, 1-2) refer to a Neulinger source, but not to one in which he actually uses the term 'leisure society'. They further link a number of authors to the leisure society idea (p. 182), but erroneously.
Table 3. Definitions of a leisure society: summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Author/date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 'historical inversion'</td>
<td>Kaplan (1960, p. 3)</td>
<td>Leisure time ≥ 50% of day-time (USA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcuse (1962, p. vii)</td>
<td>Possibility of ‘working time becoming marginal, and free time becoming full time’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henley Centre (Darton, 1986, p. 7)</td>
<td>Leisure time &gt; paid work time (F/T working males, UK).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dumazedier (1989, p. 144)</td>
<td>'Free time now exceeds work time'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molitor (2000, 2008a, 2008b)</td>
<td>Leisure time ≥ 50% of life time (USA, 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neulingher (1981, pp. 243-44)</td>
<td>Leisure society citizens required to undertake 'necessary jobs for a certain number of hours per week, during a relatively small number of years'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corijn (1987, p. 272)</td>
<td>Paid work is 'minimal'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veal (1987, p. 1)</td>
<td>Paid working hours significantly less than those of our forebears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: zero paid work</td>
<td>Handy (1989, p. 166)</td>
<td>'Whole blocks of people with nothing to do except enjoy themselves'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Godbey (1997, p. 198)</td>
<td>Retiree lifestyle as indicator of life with zero paid work time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources</td>
<td>Neulingher (1981a, pp. 243-44)</td>
<td>Citizens guaranteed minimum subsistence income, health services and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corijn (1987, p. 272)</td>
<td>Full access to consumption/ infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry (1999, p. 283)</td>
<td>'Access to leisure resources increasingly available across the social spectrum'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Author(s) and Page(s)</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer expenditure</strong></td>
<td>Neulinger (1981, p. 147)</td>
<td>Tourism is 'second ranking retail expenditure' (USA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryken (1986, p. 82)</td>
<td>$262 billion pa spent on leisure (USA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social significance of</td>
<td>Roberts (1970, pp. 101-2)</td>
<td>Leisure is a significant source of individual identity and a significant institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leisure</td>
<td>Corijn (1987, p. 272)</td>
<td>Leisure is an 'essential' part of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry (1999, p. 283)</td>
<td>Leisure is a source of 'meaning and sense of identity to many '.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dieser (2010)</td>
<td>The leisure society thesis is equated with the conceptualisation of leisure as 'freedom, free time and freedom of choice'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Dumazedier (1974, p. 213)</td>
<td>The leisure civilization (as opposed to the leisure society) is a political project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average hours worked in employment, per week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females in workforce</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Females in workforce</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Unemployment rates, USA, UK and G7 countries, 1971-2010

Source: OECD via: http://stats.oecd.org

* G7 = Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, UK, USA
Notes

1 ‘Paid working hours’ or ‘paid work’ is used here to refer to all work undertaken in employment, as distinct from from unpaid domestic or voluntary work. This is different from the practice in some labour force literature where the term ‘paid work’ or ‘paid hours’ is used in contrast to ‘worked hours’, the latter excluding paid holiday time.

2. As with the 1960s and ‘70s, the literature of the later period includes numerous passing or secondary references to the leisure society and related ideas. Typically they simply refer to the likely advent of a leisure society or to the fact that other writers, invariably unnamed, have such expectations, or they use the term in the title only. Examples identified are: Vickerman (1980), UK; Jahoda (1981) USA; Humphrey (1983),USA; Richards (1983),UK; Lichtenberger (1984), Austria; Leighfield (1987), UK; Smith and Theberge (1987),USA; Headey (1988), Australia; Rowe (1993), Australia; Zeldin (1995), UK; Leheny (1997), USA/Jap.; Edginton and Chen (2008), USA.

3 NB. In the second half of Table 1, p. 209, in Leisure Society I, a superfluous heading ‘Leisure society already here’ was included in error: all seven authors on this page are in fact leisure society critics.

4 The Society for the Reduction of Human Labor now appears to be inactive but details for a contact person, Benjamin Hunnicutt, are provided on the website of the Shorter Work-Time Group (nd);

5. The reference in the text was to Marcuse’s *Eros and Civilization* (1963), but the bibliographical reference is to the original, 1956, British edition. The latter does not contain any mention of an ‘historic inversion’ but the Preface to the 1962 Vintage paperback edition refers to the theoretical possibility of the ‘reversal of the relation between free time and working time’ and of ‘working time becoming marginal and free time becoming full time’ (p. vii). The link between Marcuse and ‘historic inversion’ was repeated a few years later, without a bibliographic reference, by a colleague of Dumazedier, Geneviève Poujol (1993: 36), and her remarks were, in turn, quoted by Dine (1999: 173). In the same volume, Bhodan Jung (1993: 201) said of Poland during its 1980s economic crisis: ‘For the average Pole it was a time of Dumazedier’s ‘historic inversion’, when daily discretionary time (270 minutes per day) became greater than time spent on work (235 minutes per day). ... In this sense the crisis has, in a perverse way, brought Poland one step closer to a poorer brand of a ‘new leisure society’’. The figures given by Jung suggest that the amount of time is averaged over the whole week and the whole adult population.

6 In more recent references to Kerr et al., Rojek (2010: 31) does not refer to them as post-industrial theorists and notes that their comments on leisure were ‘en passant’ but still insists on the debatable observation that they were of ‘foundational significance in the evolution of the leisure society thesis’.