

Consumption of Leisure

Chapter 7.2 In *Routledge Handbook on Consumption*, edited by M. Keller, B. Halkier, M. Truninger, T. Wilska. London: Routledge.

Jennifer Smith Maguire
School of Management, University of Leicester, UK
jbs7@le.ac.uk

Introduction

This chapter examines key themes in the sociocultural study of the consumption of leisure. To begin, let us consider the relationship between these terms. Consumption and leisure are often treated synonymously: a reflection of the degree to which leisure has been shaped by commercialization and commodification (Rojek, 1985; Wearing & McDonald, 2015). This is perhaps best exemplified through sport as a genre of leisure activities. The participation in, and spectatorship and organization of sport have undergone extensive commercialization over the contemporary period (Andrews & Clift, 2015; Moor, 2007) such that we might refer to a 'sports-industrial complex' (Maguire, 2004). The close alignment of consumption and leisure might even be considered a structural feature of capitalism. As consumer spending increasingly predominates within national economies, a mentality that equates leisure with consumption ensures the reproduction of the social order (e.g. McDonald, Wearing, & Ponting, 2008).

While consumption and leisure may be overlapping processes of having and doing, there nevertheless remain leisure forms that require no, or virtually no, commercial consumption (Stebbins, 2009). Moreover, the social phenomenon of leisure predates consumer culture (Burke, 1995): to understand leisure on its own terms offers insights into the social function of the consumption of leisure beyond simply the purchase of leisure goods and services. Three themes related to leisure and consumption provide the chapter's framework. First, we consider the definition of leisure through its relationship to work. While often conceptualized as binary opposites, work and leisure are better understood as interrelated social phenomena; considerations of that interrelationship call attention to the ideological implications of leisure, its historically contingent characteristics and social function. Second, we turn to leisure's significance with regard to how individuals construct and perform identities and lifestyles. Drawing from research on sport, the section touches on notions of conspicuous leisure, serious leisure and lifestyle. Third, we examine the connection between leisure and play. The potential for leisure to afford non-instrumental fun, excitement and 'flow' experiences is examined with regard to societal and individual benefits. The chapter concludes by considering the implications for and of leisure in consumer culture.

Leisure and Work

Leisure is typically conceptualized in opposition with work. This binary often hinges on the question of time: leisure amounts to 'time other than that spent in paid employment' (Williams, 1985, p.336). This 'residual' definition of leisure (Haworth & Lewis, 2005) focuses on what goes on during the time left over from paid (and unpaid) work, and is central to

time use surveys that gather statistics about what people do within their 'free' time. For example, we know that American adults have an average of 5 hours and 5 minutes of leisure time per day (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014), which are most commonly spent watching television (2 hours and 49 minutes), socializing and communicating (38 minutes), and playing games or using the computer for leisure (27 minutes). Time use surveys in the UK have similar findings (Seddon, 2012): television watching (4 hours and 2 minutes a day on average) is the most commonly reported free time activity, followed by spending time with friends and family, and listening to music.

Research by The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) helps to put this into a global and historical perspective. The average time spent on paid work is changing: there is an overall decline in average hours worked in most countries from the 1980s until 2009 (OECD, 2009, p. 25); since 2009, with very few exceptions, the proportion of employees who work more than 50 hours per week has increased (OECD, 2015: 75). Within this global distribution of 'free time,' there remain clear national differences (2015, p. 75): for example, Turkey has the highest proportion working very long hours (over 40% working 50 or more hours per week) whereas Netherlands has the lowest (approximately .004 %). Across OECD countries, people spend an average of 15 hours per week on leisure and personal care (2015, p. 76), with main activities being personal care (of which activities sleep and eating predominate), and then leisure, which made up 22% of an average day (OECD, 2009, p. 27). Daily leisure time differs between countries, from the high end of Belgium, Germany, Finland and (highest at 27% of the day) Norway, to the low end of Japan, France, New Zealand and (lowest at 16%) Mexico (OECD, 2009, p. 27). Time use surveys are also useful for identifying inequality in the availability of leisure time, for example in relation to women whose 'second shift' of domestic work entails greater constraints on their available free time (Hochschild & Machung, 2012; see also Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003). Across the OECD countries, men spend more time in broad leisure activities than women in the majority of countries (OECD, 2009, p. 32, 2015, p. 78), with the greatest gender gaps occurring in Italy, (over 80 more minutes per day), Mexico, Poland and Korea (OECD, 2009, p. 32).

Another approach that underpins population leisure statistics hinges not on time, but on an activity-based form of the work/leisure dichotomy. Leisure is constituted by activities assumed to be other than those associated with paid and unpaid work. This approach is central to cultural participation surveys such as the British 'Taking Part' survey (Davies, 2011), which has found that the most common leisure activities for adults are reading for pleasure (64%), visiting historic places (54%), going to the cinema (52%), visiting libraries (45%) and visiting museums and galleries (44%), while the most common sporting activities are indoor swimming (32%) and gym/fitness activities (22%). This approach, too, is useful in revealing inequalities in leisure participation. For example, looking at British visitors to museums and galleries in 2015/16 (Department for Culture Media & Sport, 2015): participation is clearly shaped by social class (approximately 60% of the upper socio-economic group take part, compared with 38% of the lower socio-economic group), somewhat by age (48% of 16-24 year olds, 54-56% of 25 to 74 year olds, but only 34% of those over 75), but not by gender (51 % of men, 52% of women). This approach also reveals variation in patterns of leisure expenditures. For example, British households (Key Note, 2015) increased their spending on leisure activities by nearly 15% between 2010 and 2014.

Of the £190.98 billion spent in 2014, nearly 42% was spent on restaurants, cafés and bars, and just over 21% on recreational and cultural services (within which, approximately 53% was spent on cultural services (including cinema, theatre, concerts and satellite subscriptions); 27% on games of chance (gaming and gambling, lotteries), and 20% on recreational and sporting services).

Both time- and activity-based statistics underscore the close leisure/consumption link. It is difficult to imagine any of the above activities taking place without being simultaneously linked to activity-specific purchases (such as equipment and entrance fees) or embedded within wider constellations of consumer practices and political economies (from museum gift shops to advertising revenues linked to daily television habits). Time use and participation data are useful for investigating what people do when not otherwise occupied with jobs or routines of self- and household-maintenance; but, they also highlight the shortcomings of understanding leisure strictly through an opposition to work. Practices such as updating one's Facebook profile during the workday, and checking emails while watching television with one's family remind us there is no firm boundary between work and leisure time. Similarly, many activities fall into both obligatory and discretionary use of time, such as cooking and reading. Meanwhile, research suggests a continuity of dispositions across the work/leisure divide: for example, those with jobs with higher levels of autonomy (such as professional/managerial occupations) are more likely to have an 'extension' pattern to their work-leisure relationship, meaning that work and leisure share at least some common characteristics or style, and that there is no clear demarcation experienced between the two spheres (Parker, 1976). Thus, sociologists of consumption and of leisure (amongst others) have challenged the work/leisure binary, calling attention to the continuities of activities and dispositions that fall between and across the two realms, from the home-based tele-commuting of knowledge workers (Lewis, 2003) to the workplace nap (Baxter & Kroll-Smith, 2005).

If not binary opposites, work and leisure are nevertheless interrelated: the boundary between them is historically specific, and must be understood in the context of the dominant political-economic social order (e.g. Bramham, 2002; Elias & Dunning, 1986; Parker, 1976; Rojek 1985, 1995). One approach to understanding this interrelationship is to focus on the ideological implications of leisure for the reproduction of capitalism (e.g. Baudrillard, 1998). Consider, for example, the British 'Rational Recreation' movement of the nineteenth century. Middle class reformers promoted particular forms of leisure to the urban working classes (including revised forms of established working class leisure) in an attempt to encourage orderliness, productiveness and self-improvement (Bailey, 1978). This ideological approach to leisure as a mode of social reform diffused to many societies including the United States where Henry Ford, for example, adopted principles of rational recreation alongside scientific management in his reformulation of the organization of production (Rojek, 1995). Looked at in this way, leisure may appear as an auxiliary sphere to that of occupational work, ensuring the restoration of individuals' productive and creative capacities, but also an ideological 'bread and circuses' trick played on the masses, disciplining the working classes and pacifying unrest (e.g. Ewen 1976, Rojek, 1985).

A second approach to the work/leisure interrelationship is to situate both phenomena within the long-term process of modernization (e.g. Elias & Dunning, 1986). The emergence

of leisure is bound up with social changes that were both preconditions for and consequences of the Industrial Revolution and its implications for the organization and experience of work—both paid, occupational work and the unpaid labour of households (Burke, 1995). Attentiveness to leisure's historical context suggests distinctions between a pre-industrial world of agrarian work interspersed with occasional festivals, and a modern world of paid labour and paid-for leisure pursuits, and between an industrial producer society dominated by work, and a post-industrial consumer society dominated by leisure. However, these shifts are long-term and never absolute. Burke (1995) identifies the emergence in the 15th century of an idea of leisure as time that should be shaped with purpose, and traces its institutionalization from the 16th century through, for example, educational discourses aimed at training children through appropriate forms of recreation and pastimes; theological-moral discourses that sought to restrict and forbid particular forms of recreation that were regarded as morally corrupting; and medical discourses attempting to evidence and promote the positive, restorative benefits of particular forms of recreation (all of which helped lay the foundations for the 19th century Rational Recreationists).

A socio-historical understanding of leisure and work is thus bound up with an understanding of the very long-term development of human society. Social relations have become increasingly interdependent, allowing for intricate divisions of labour and dense urban agglomerations, but also requiring the control of potentially disruptive emotions and urges. Leisure provides individuals with socially-approved opportunities for 'loosening their armour' in order to experience emotions otherwise excluded from public life (Elias & Dunning, 1986, p. 124-5). One can safely experience thrills or desire, for example, through the experiences of first-person shooter video games or romantic films, the public outpouring of elation at a sporting event, or the sociability of the pub or café. Elias and Dunning (1986) suggest that through the elements of sociability, motility and imagination, people are able to experience a controlled decontrolling of emotions (themes to which we will return in the final section). From this perspective, leisure is not auxiliary to work, but is the other side of the same coin: highly routinized societies resting on emotional restraint and impersonal interactions require opportunities for a counterbalancing loosening of emotional controls. Thus, leisure—and by implication, consumption—is central to human life; leisure's 'other' is not work, but non-leisure.

Leisure and Identity

Leisure is closely related to work with regard to how scholars have defined and measured it, and understood its development and social function. Leisure is also closely related to questions of identity, which has itself become an object of work in contemporary societies. Accounts of individualization draw attention to the ways in which identity has shifted over the course of modernity from a fixed set of characteristics determined by birth and ascription, to a reflexive, on-going project or performance (Bauman, 2000; Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002). Individuals, free to choose their pathways towards self-realization, are then faced with a loss of security; without fixed rules, individuals are constantly at risk of getting it wrong, and anxiety potentially attends each choice. These questions of identity converge with leisure in the concept of lifestyle: the system of practices assembled through individuals' classification of consumer goods and practices—and in turn, themselves—as

more or less legitimate or desirable (Bourdieu, 1984). Individualization is a process by which identity has become a problem, which is attended by the ascendancy of a consuming way of life and a host of countless products, experiences and therapeutic experts aimed at addressing that problem. Consumer culture thus casts leisure time as the sphere for self-work.

According to Elias and Dunning, self-work (self-fulfilment and self-expansion activities such as volunteering, private study, hobbies and self-improvement pursuits) is a major component of the spectrum of activities that make up people's spare time (1986, p. 97). While they consider this as separate from leisure in its proper sense of sociable and mimetic activities (to which we will return in the next section), we can see that the logic of self-expansion pervades much of the representation of leisure time. Self-help media present leisure as a category overwritten by the logic of self-improvement (McGee, 2005). Fitness magazines and exercise manuals exhort readers to discipline their bodies and time in order to address a panoply of risks and problems, from excess weight to inadequate self-confidence. The rewards of such self-work are typically formulated as external pleasures (e.g. looking slimmer, younger) rather than the inherent pleasure of the activity *per se* (Smith Maguire, 2008). Thus, fitness guides—like the 16th century how-to treatises on leisure (Burke, 1995)—situate leisure as functionally appropriate to a specific societal context. Readers are instructed in the obligations of leisure-time self-work and making oneself fit for a culture dominated by consumption.

This interrelationship between leisure and identity was a focus for Veblen, writing at the turn of the 20th century in *The Theory of the Leisure Class* ([1899] 1992). Veblen commented upon the 'work' of the *nouveaux riches* to display and defend their new class position. Social mobility required that the gentleman 'change his life of leisure into a more or less arduous application to the business of learning how to live a life of ostensible leisure in a becoming way' (Veblen, 1992, p. 64). Conspicuous forms of leisure—particular sports, tourism and cultural activities—served as tools in status competition and identity construction. Golf, for example, involves specific skills, equipment, accessories and deportment that explicitly signal an ability to eschew instrumental manual labour and budgetary concerns (Veblen, 1992, p. 76). While participation in golf has arguably democratized since Veblen's time, the sport nevertheless continues to operate in the reproduction of power hierarchies and group identities, as research on the South African context suggests (Cock, 2008).

Since Veblen's time, the concern with performing social identities via leisure and lifestyle choices has expanded beyond the *nouveaux riches*. This is reflected in research on the significance of participation in physical activities and sport subcultures for individuals' identities. Particularly useful in this regard is Stebbins' notion of 'serious leisure' for activities that are 'sufficiently substantial, interesting, and fulfilling for the participant to find a (leisure) career there acquiring and expressing a combination of its special skills, knowledge, and experience' (2009, p. 14). Six qualities characterise serious leisure and link leisure to identity: the possibility of following a relatively structured career within the pursuit; the need to persevere in the face of challenges; the need to invest personal effort in acquiring specialized skills and knowledge; the possibility of enjoying such durable benefits as self-actualization, a sense of belonging and self-gratification; the shared expression of a distinct ethos or values by the community of participants; and a strong sense of

identification with and through the chosen pursuit for participants (Stebbins, 2009, p. 17-19).

Given those common characteristics, serious leisure pursuits often take the form of subcultures or social worlds with distinctive sets of norms and beliefs, through which participants potentially gain a meaningful sense of identity and belonging. Consider, for example, various forms of 'serious sport tourism' (Green & Jones, 2005, p. 176-78) such as diving or golfing holidays, or travel for triathlon and adventure racing events. The additional investment of time and effort in travel in order to undertake the activity affords participants enhanced identity benefits, such as the chance to interact with subcultural peers, conspicuously display their identity, and mark milestones within their career. Similarly, the positioning of skateboarding and kite-surfing as 'alternative' reinforces identity: participants tend to share a common currency of attitudes and styles of behaviour and dress, and 'describe their activities as "lifestyles" rather than as "sports"' (Wheaton, 2010, p. 1059). As an extreme, high-involvement serious leisure participants may exhibit characteristics of addiction, as research on young Korean players of Massively Multiplayer Online Games (MMOG) suggests (Seok & DaCosta, 2014).

Just as leisure has been shaped by commercialization and individualization, so too is the experience of lifestyle sports inflected by these two processes. Research on lifestyle sports identifies a potential conflict between a counter-cultural ethos and the co-option that accompanies the corporate-driven expansion of these activities (Stranger, 2010; Wheaton, 2010). Commercialization—in the form of the increasing prominence of media and mega events, such as ESPN's X Games, and the mainstreaming of once-marginal brands—poses a seeming threat to the self-actualization of lifestyle sport participants, whose authenticity is assumed to rest on a juxtaposition with mainstream sport. However, interpretive research highlights that there is no inherent, authentic identity reserved for subcultural insiders, that notions of authenticity are used to police subcultural boundaries, and that commercial processes and goods are as central as distinctive styles of participation in the lived identities of participants (Donnelly, 2006; Stranger, 2010). For serious lifestyle sport participants, leisure is clearly a sphere for undertaking the considerable effort of self work, and of consuming in a style appropriate to one's identity.

Leisure and Play

The ideal of leisure as fun and pleasurable is largely implicit within the work reviewed thus far, such as in the case of a work/leisure dichotomy juxtaposing the drudgery of work with the pleasure of play. Yet, as we have seen, such a dichotomy is flawed: work and leisure are co-constituted and intertwined phenomena (Burke, 1995; Elias & Dunning, 1986), and they overlap in their dispositions and structures, as with the case of serious leisure (Stebbins, 2009). Rather than regard the association with fun and play as a result of leisure's ideological implications (or as merely a preserve of children), studies of leisure and consumption suggest that the play element of leisure is fundamental to human experience. This idea lies at the heart of *homo ludens*, Huizinga's (1970) conceptualization of an ideal type of human existence for which free, spontaneous, non-instrumental play (as opposed to work) is fundamental to self-development (Rojek, 2000). Put more broadly, leisure and play can only be understood through attention to the interdependencies between society and emotions (Maguire, 2011).

Play features within established typologies of leisure. Stebbins, for example, contrasts serious leisure with 'casual leisure': 'immediately intrinsically rewarding, relatively short-lived pleasurable activity requiring little or no special training to enjoy it' (2009, p. 22), such as playing games, relaxing or socializing, and forms of active and passive entertainment. Elias and Dunning (1986: 97-8), on the other hand, reserve the term leisure expressly for those spare time activities that are sociable and/or mimetic. Mimetic play activities arouse emotions such as fear, desire, laughter, disgust, and transpose them onto a new (leisure) form, thus blunting their sting and making them socially-acceptable to experience (1986: 124). In this way, leisure offers a controlled de-controlling of the emotions, as with the pleasure of being 'hunted' within predation-themed video games (Bertozzi, 2014). Formality and routines are not the opposite of play and pleasure but can, in fact, facilitate the loosening of emotional restraints—e.g. the formal socializing of a wedding compared with that of meeting up at the pub; the highly organized format of playing in a football match or being part of a fan group compared with the informal organization of dancing.

The above accounts suggest that the degree of skill, regulation and routinization of the activity is significant to participants' experience of play, and its potential benefits. This dovetails with the work of Csikszentmihalyi (1992), who identifies an experience of 'flow' in various pursuits, including sport, art and music: a deeply meaningful sense of engagement and participation that is completely absorbing. Participants lose track of time, a sense of themselves as separate from the task, and an orientation towards external ends to which the activity might be directed. Being 'in the flow' or 'in the zone' affords a sense of pleasure and happiness, and is associated with a clear sense of purpose, intense concentration and a sense of control (both in relation to risk, and in relation to one's autonomy in choosing to do the activity for its own sake). Comparing across various studies, Csikszentmihalyi suggests that what enables flow experiences is the alignment of a participant's skills and competencies with the challenges of the task; being over-challenged or under-challenged is unlikely to result in a flow experience (1992, p. 74).

Various studies of sport participation identify dimensions of flow. For example, skateboarders' experience of pleasure is closely linked to the autonomous, self-directed and intrinsic aspects of the activity: being able to set their own challenges appropriate to their skill level, and persist in skill improvement on their own terms, is closely linked to feelings of pride and satisfaction (Seifert & Hedderson, 2010; see also Beal, 1996). Similarly, the potential for 'thrills' is a key motivational factor for participants in sports such as kayaking and ice climbing (Stebbins, 2005) and many other lifestyle sports that combine specialized skills, identities and risk.

It is important to remember that flow, play and pleasure are not limited to leisure participation 'on the field of play,' but extend to spectatorship. This is perhaps most obvious in the case of fans—individuals whose identities are explicitly linked to their appreciation of and involvement in a particular phenomenon. Research on football fans in Belgium, France and Spain finds fandom to be both sociable and mimetic, creating the potential for subcultural identity through shared routines and rituals such as team scarves and paraphernalia, songs and chants, and the sacred place of the stadium (Derbaix & Decrop, 2011). Music fans similarly derive pleasure and identity through their leisure. Research on the fans of the band Phish suggests musical improvisation offers the thrill of risk (for the

musicians) and discovery (for the fans), while flow might be found through the immediacy of dancing and being carried away by the music (Blau, 2010). While meaningful leisure can certainly extend to 'casual' spectatorship, the degree of pleasure and emotional release is likely to hinge on the relative presence of one or more of the elements of sociability (e.g. watching alone or with others), motility (e.g. standing vs. dancing) and imagination (e.g. the proximity or distance between the leisure experience and everyday life) within the experience of spectating. Hence, those with a deeper sense of engagement and investment in leisure activities are more likely to experience the emotional release associated with flow or other forms of catharsis—be that the devoted opera enthusiast, transported in imagination while listening alone to a recording of a performance, or the passionate rugby fan, face painted in team colours and crying in despair alongside fellow supporters at the loss of their team. These potentialities for engaged spectatorship, sociability and mimesis are now being extended through digital and social media, such as online video gaming 'clans' (Jansz & Tanis, 2007) or online Turkish football fan sites (McManus, 2013).

Taken together, research from the sociology of consumption, leisure and sport suggests that the potential for flow, play and pleasure is located at the intersection of freedom and constraint. Leisure is not 'free' but is freeing *because* it is embedded within routines and rules. Leisure potentially offers both a tension release for humans embedded in societies built on emotional restraint, and a form of 'exciting significance' (Maguire 2011, p. 921) through which self-actualization and identity are achieved and performed. This potential rests on the structures (rules, regulations, conventions, norms) within which the activity sits, the relative alignment between skills, competencies and challenges, and the degree of autonomy and intrinsic motivation underlying participation.

Leisure and Consumer Culture

In light of the above discussion, what insights does leisure research offer to our understanding of consumer culture? Existing research suggests diminishing prospects for play in consumer culture. Pervasive rationalization and commercialization (Rojek, 1985) constrain the potential experience, and ideal conceptualization of leisure, as suggested by critiques of the 'McDonaldization' (Ritzer, 2000) and 'Disneyization' (Bryman, 2004) of society. Furthermore, in a consumer society, self-work is presented as an obligation. Pleasure is instrumentalized, both as a means of motivating individuals to partake in leisure activities, and as part of the wider reproduction of service economies, consumer cultures and neo-liberal social orders that rely on self-managing, responsible individuals (Rose, 1999). The logic of self-investment potentially transforms even banal, routine care activities into vehicles for self-expression and status-positioning, and thus opportunities for profit. Leisure as a time of doing nothing, of idleness, is a refusal of the obligation of productivity (Dumazedier, 1974); but, this radical potential is reserved for the very wealthy (for whom it is sanctioned), or tolerated only in the very poor (with the unemployed expected to actively engage in re-skilling). For the majority, leisure must be a time for the 'production of *value*—distinctive value, status value, prestige value' (Baudrillard, 1998, p. 157).

Yet, there is also reason to be affirmed in the persistence of the playful—and possibly radical—dimensions of leisure. Indeed, play, spontaneous fun and non-instrumental pleasure remain at the core of the myth of leisure in consumer culture, and of a view of

human life as an on-going 'unstable tension-equilibrium between...impersonal intellectual activity and...pleasurable excitation' of emotion (Elias & Dunning, 1986, p. 120). Beyond the social function of leisure as an antidote to the rationalization and emotional restraints of everyday life, there is also the possibility for leisure to disrupt the social order. As Turner (1988) suggests, it is in the seemingly harmless, innocent danger of fun that leisure and ludic culture have the chance to critique the social order. Consider, for example, the 'Red Hat Society' (RHS), a leisure group for mid-life and elderly women (Stalp, Radina, & Lynch, 2008). The RHS members use notions of fun and play as a shield for challenging cultural stereotypes, including the traditional view of women's leisure as secondary to that of men's (Henderson, Hodges, & Kivel, 2002), and of older women as invisible both in public space and in the sexualized, male gaze (Calasanti & Slevin, 2001). Through extravagant outfits (red hats; flamboyant purple outfits), campy performances (hyper-feminine tea parties; shopping excursions) and deviant behaviour (loud laughter; look-at-me outfits), RHS members assert themselves within public leisure places, challenging their assumed absence from such spaces and practices (Stalp et al., 2008).

Conclusion

Let us conclude by considering the state of knowledge vis-à-vis consumer culture and leisure, and identify future directions for research. Signs of a maturing coalescence of research on consumption and on leisure (in general, and oriented around a specific leisure field, such as sport) include recent monographs (Dixon, 2013; Stebbins, 2009) and entries in compendiums of consumption (e.g. Andrews & Clift, 2015; Wearing & McDonald, 2015; this entry). From population surveys, to ethnographic interview-based studies, to textual studies, we can identify a wealth of existing research that has sought to locate and critically unpack the meaning, significance and consequences of leisure forms through a diverse range of epistemological and methodological positions. Such work makes clear that context matters: the lived experience, political economy and cultural norms of leisure times, practices and ideals cannot be understood without reference to the specific societal and historical context of the participants, institutions and practices. Such contextuality has been confirmed through the growing range of studies that look beyond Western settings, traditional leisure forms and typical leisure participants. However, amidst the expansion of our knowledge of the specific, we should not lose sight of the 'big picture' through, for example, cross-cultural, longitudinal and archival research that is able to widen our lens to appreciate the on-going development of dominant, emergent and residual leisure forms (Williams, 1977).

This review thus suggests some emerging directions for future studies of leisure and consumption. First: there remain pressing questions with regard to the unequal distribution of resources (economic and temporal resources, but also cultural tastes and preferences) through which individuals take up consumption and leisure options. Especially for the understudied, rapidly growing and precarious middle classes of emerging economies, leisure inequalities must be traced along various lines (including gender, sexuality, race/ethnicity, age, class, physical disability). Second: insights from the sociology of consumption regarding the rise of an 'omnivorous' taste regime (Warde, Wright & Gayo-Cal, 2007) beg questions of how changing notions of legitimate and illegitimate culture manifest in leisure domains. Such questions are especially pertinent for sport, which—in addition to an internal

stratification that positions some sports as more socially-esteemed than others—has its own awkward positioning as less legitimate vis-à-vis other ‘cultural’ leisure activities such as art and music.

Third: the dialogue between the study of consumption, leisure studies, and leisure-related sub-disciplines (among them the sociology of sport and of gaming) remains underdeveloped. Digital and social media have created possibilities for new forms and modes of cultural exchange, social community, identity, obligation, creativity, control and co-production; these have yet to be fully assessed in terms of their implications for the reproduction and transformation of dominant, emergent and residual consumption practices. Fourth and finally: historically-oriented examinations of leisure highlight the intersection of individual and social structures, and should be a call to take a wide view of the ‘institutional field’ (Zukin & Smith Maguire, 2004) within which specific consumption practices sit. As Warde argues (2014, p. 295), studies of consumption generally neglect the normalisation of practices and ‘pay little attention to the creation of norms, standards and institutions which produce shared understandings and common procedures.’ Yet, this is a strength within studies of leisure that foreground the historical contingency and social construction of routines and of their significance for the enactment and experience of emotions, identities and group bonds.

References

- Andrews, D.L., & Clift, B.C. (2015). Consumption and sport. In: D.T. Cook & M.J. Ryan (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell encyclopedia of consumption and consumer studies* (pp. 191-195). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bailey, P. (1978) *Leisure and class in Victorian England: Rational recreation and the contest for control, 1830-1885*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The consumer society: Myths and structures*. London: Sage.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Baxter, V., & Kroll-Smith, K. (2005). Normalizing the workplace nap: Blurring the boundaries between public and private space and time. *Current Sociology*, 53(1), 33-55.
- Beal, B. (1996). Alternative masculinity and its effects on gender relations in the subculture of skate-boarding. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 19, 204–220.
- Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002). *Individualization: Institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. London: Sage.
- Bertozi, E. (2014). The feeling of being hunted: Pleasures and potentialities of predation play. *Games and Culture*, 9(6), 429-441.
- Blau, J.A. (2010). A phan on Phish: Live improvised music in five performative commitments. *Cultural Studies <-> Critical Methodologies*, 10(4), 307-319.
- Bramham, P. (2002). Rojek, the sociological imagination and leisure. *Leisure Studies*, 21, 221-234.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *The Disneyization of society*. London: Sage.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2014). Leisure and sports activities. *American Time Use Survey*. <http://www.bls.gov/TUS/CHARTS/LEISURE.HTM> [Accessed January 2016].
- Burke, P. (1995). The invention of leisure in early modern Europe. *Past and Present*, 146, 136-150.

- Calasanti, T., & Slevin, K.F. (2001). *Gender, social inequality, and aging*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Cock, J. (2008). Caddies and 'cronies': Golf and changing patterns of exclusion and inclusion in post-apartheid South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 39(2), 183-200.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1992). *Flow: The psychology of happiness*. London: Ryder.
- Davies, J. (2011). *Mapping leisure: Visualising the landscape of cultural and sporting participation: An analysis of the Taking Part Survey*. English Heritage. <https://content.historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/research/mapping-leisure-rep-jul11.pdf> [Accessed January 2016].
- Department for Culture Media & Sport. (2015). *Taking Part 2015/16 Quarter 2. Statistical Release*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/taking-part-201516-quarter-2-statistical-release> [Accessed January 2016].
- Derbaix, C., & Decrop, A. (2011). Colours and scarves: An ethnographic account of football fans and their paraphernalia. *Leisure Studies*, 30(3), 271-291.
- Dixon, K. (2013). *Consuming football in late modern life*. London: Routledge.
- Donnelly, M. (2006). Studying extreme sports: Beyond core participants. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 30(2), 219-224.
- Dumazedier, J. (1974). *Sociology of leisure*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Elias, N., & Dunning, E. (1986). *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ewen, S. (1976). *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Green, B.C., & Jones, I. (2005). Serious leisure, social identity and sport tourism. *Sport in Society*, 8(2), 164-181.
- Haworth, J., & Lewis, S. (2005). Work, leisure and well-being. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 33(1), 67-79.
- Henderson, K.A., Hodges, S., & Kivel, B.D. (2002). Context and dialogue in research on women and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(3), 253-271.
- Hochschild, A., & Machung, A. (2012). *The second shift: Working families and the revolution at home* (rev. ed.). London: Penguin
- Huizinga, J. (1970). *Homo Ludens: A study of the play element in culture*. London: Temple Smith.
- Jansz, J., & Tanis, M. (2007). Appeal of playing online first person shooter games. *CyberPsychology and Behaviour*, 10(1), 133-136.
- Key Note. (2015). *Trends in leisure activities*. Key Note Limited.
- Lewis, S. (2003). The integration of paid work and the rest of life. Is post-industrial work the new leisure? *Leisure Studies*, 22(4), 343-355.
- Maguire, J. (2004). Challenging the sports-industrial complex: Human sciences, advocacy and service. *European Physical Education Review*, 10(3), 299-322.
- Maguire, J.A. (2011). Welcome to the pleasure dome?: Emotions, leisure and society. *Sport in Society*, 14(7/8), 913-926.
- Mattingly, M., & Bianchi, S.M. (2003). Gender differences in the quantity and quality of free time: The U.S. experience. *Social Forces*, 81(3), 999-1031.
- McDonald, M., Wearing, S., & Ponting, J. (2008). Narcissism and neoliberalism: Work, leisure and alienation in an era of consumption. *Loisir et Société/Society and Leisure*, 30(1), 489-510.

- McGee, M. (2005). *Self-Help, Inc.: Makeover Culture in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McManus, J. (2013). Been there, done that, bought the t-shirt: Besiktas fans and the commodification of football in Turkey. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 45(1), 3-24.
- Moor, L. (2007). Sport and commodification: A reflection on key concepts. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 31(2), 128-142.
- OECD. (2009). *Society at a glance*. OECD iLibrary.
- OECD. (2015). *How's life? 2015. Measuring well-being*. OECD iLibrary.
- Parker, S. (1976). *The sociology of leisure*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Ritzer, G. (2013). *The McDonaldization of society*. (20th anniversary ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Rojek, C. (1985). *Capitalism & leisure theory*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Rojek, C. (1995). *Decentring leisure: Rethinking leisure theory*. London: Sage.
- Rojek, C. (2000). *Leisure and culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seddon, C. (2012). *Measuring national well-being: What we do, 2012*. Office of National Statistics. http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171766_258996.pdf [Accessed January 2016].
- Seifert, T., & Hedderson, C. (2010). Intrinsic motivation and flow in skateboarding: An ethnographic study. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 11, 277-292.
- Seok, S., & DaCosta, B. (2014). Distinguishing addiction from high engagement: An investigation into the social lives of adolescent and young adult massively multiplayer online game players. *Games and Culture*, 9(4), 227-254.
- Smith Maguire, J. (2008). *Fit for consumption: Sociology and the business of fitness*. London: Routledge.
- Stalp, M.C., Radina, M.E., & Lynch, A. (2008). "We do it cuz it's fun": Gendered fun and leisure for midlife women through Red Hat Society membership. *Sociological Perspectives*, 51(2), 325-348.
- Stebbins, R. (2005). *Challenging mountain nature: Risk, motive, and lifestyle in three hobbyist sports*. Calgary: Detselig.
- Stebbins, R. (2009). *Leisure and consumption: Common ground/separate worlds*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stranger, M. (2010). Surface and substructure: Beneath surfing's commodified surface. *Sport in Society*, 13(7/8), 1117-34.
- Turner, V. (1988). *The anthropology of performance*. New York: PAJ.
- Veblen, T. (1992). *The theory of the leisure class: An economic study of institutions*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Warde, A., Wright, D., & Gayo-Cal, M. (2007). Understanding cultural omnivorousness: Or, the myth of the cultural omnivore. *Cultural Sociology*, 1(2), 143-164.
- Warde, A. (2014). After taste: Culture, consumption and theories of practice. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 14(3), 279-303.
- Wearing, S.L., & McDonald, M. (2015). Leisure and consumption. In: D.T. Cook & M.J. Ryan (Eds.) *The Wiley Blackwell encyclopedia of consumption and consumer studies* (pp. 381-383). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wheaton, B. (2010). Introducing the consumption and representation of lifestyle sports. *Sport in Society*, 13(7/8), 1057-1081.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Williams, R. (1983). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zukin, S., & Smith Maguire, J. (2004). Consumers and consumption. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 173-197.