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CHAPTER-IV

CONCEPTUALISATION OF LEISURE

The substantive concern of this chapter is on those meanings and definitions of the concept of leisure on which the sociologists often focus their attention. Although the existence and expansion of leisure has been widely commented upon there is no universal definition of the term 'leisure' (see Kenneth Roberts 1970; Clawson 1964). The difficulty of defining leisure stems from the fact that leisure has meant different things to different peoples and its obvious importance lies in the fact leisure fills our waking hours to an extent "rivalled only by income-generating activity or its equivalent" (Smith 1980:6). Inspite of this, discretionary (leisure) activity is scarcely subjected to empirical scrutiny or given the importance in theory it has in our daily lives. "Formally organised leisure activity such as, participation in associations or clubs as members, says Smith "has received far more attention even though it accounts for far less of our leisure time" (1975:9).

According to Bull (1971) "leisure time activity (which he has taken as synonymous to discretionary time activity) is the most variable and least predictable behaviour" (1971:120): The majority of adults in modern society must work for a living, and both custom and economic market forces severely limit the nature of that work. But our options when it comes to non-work activity are
infinitely more varied. The importance of leisure time activities to the average individual is clearly demonstrated in the major studies of Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) who have shown that informal social participation as a major component of free time activities is crucial to the individual's interests and attitudes at the practical level of day-to-day life.

Thus if one can explain this highly variable form of social behaviour, one may well find the conceptual tools to facilitate a comprehensive explanation of the underlying patterns behind the human leisure behaviour. Such a study is vitally needed not only to fill a glaring lacuna but to make a significant contribution to the real advancement of scientific knowledge in the field of sociology of leisure.

WHAT LEISURE IS NOT:

Hence, what is needed is not only a theoretical \textit{a priori} clarification of the term leisure and related concepts such as free-time, recreation, work etc., but also an empirical attempt at the delineation of these concepts. Since ambiguity regarding the exact definition of leisure prevails, Kenneth Roberts has attempted to overcome this problem by defining leisure negatively, in terms of what it is not. According to him leisure time can be defined as time that is 'not obligated' and leisure activities can be defined as activities that are 'non-obligatory'. He says

\ldots the diverse significances that free time possess
for different people make a definition of leisure in terms of its positive characteristics difficult. But defining leisure negatively, by differentiating it from activities pursued by virtue of their economically or socially obligatory nature, gives us a working basis from which to study the subject. (Roberts 1970:6-7).

This definition of leisure has been used as a point of departure by Kaplan (1960) and by Dumazedier (1967) in their studies of leisure. Dumazedier found that the people he interviewed, in his study conducted in France, defined leisure by differentiating it first from work, and then from other activities that were felt to be socially compulsory. Thus Roberts' negative definition of leisure does seem to possess some empirical justification.

Apart from this negative definition most sociologists have attempted to define or explain the meaning of leisure not only in terms of related concepts such as work, time, recreation etc., but also leisure as play, as problem, as mass pastime etc.

LEISURE: DIMENSIONS OF MEANING:

In order to bring out the underlying dimensions of meaning leisure has been discussed under the following categories to facilitate understanding of the major differences of meaning and definition in terms of which leisure has been discussed by sociologists:
1. Leisure vis-a-vis work.

2. Leisure as time.

3. Leisure vs. recreation.

4. Functional meaning of leisure.

5. Leisure in terms of fun.

6. Leisure as mass pastime.

7. Leisure as problem/idleness/deviance.

1. LEISURE VIS-A-VIS WORK:

One explanatory approach which has received wide attention among leisure sociologists attempts to relate leisure (non-work) activity to that portion of the social structure with which it is most often paired conceptually with work.

According to Vontobel (1946:1) "work is any conscious, purposeful activity which with satisfaction serves the material and spiritual needs of the individual and the community. Work links man to man in the common pursuits of tasks with the sole objective of earning their livelihood. Leisure as against work, is normally assumed to be 'task-free.' "In whatever way one may use leisure, it is free from the compulsions associated with work" says Anderson (1961:33) in his study on Work and Leisure.

Perhaps for this reason Harry (1971:65) in his study on work-leisure dichotomy has categorically stated that the, "worlds of work and leisure are entirely separate." His research led to the conclusion that attitudes towards work
and leisure are "situationally specific" implying that a person in work situations does not tend to seek primary gratifications, nor does he apply criteria of efficiency in leisure situations. Thus for most people work is constricted, defined and routine; leisure in contrast is open, unrestricted and undefined.

In leisure situations one is free to choose his activities or to change them without concern to the goals. One's leisure activity need not be firm or precise, regular or measured, in the sense that work must be. According to Anderson

Modern work is pointless if it cannot be measured and predicted. On the other hand predictability in leisure activity would be balked by individual variability and volition. For example he adds, Ten persons performing the same kind of work will turn out comparable products, but the same ten may turn to different types of activity in their leisure (1961:34).

This brings us back to Harry's statement that the worlds of work and leisure are separate and is further corroborated by Miller and Swanson's (1958) 'work-leisure independence' hypothesis—one implying precision and regularity and the other spontaneity and individual variation. However, under specific situations where work and leisure activities have similar or overlapping features, there may be some transfer of attitudes or skills from former to the latter. This 'carry over or transfer' of attitudes from work to non-work situations is what Wilensky (1960) has termed the 'compensatory and spill-over
hypothesis. These hypotheses propose that non-work activity may either compensate for work deprivations or be influenced by characteristics that have spilled over from work.

According to Blum (1953:101),

Jobs requiring constant disciplined activity may lead some workers to compulsive leisure patterns of being 'busy-occupied' and 'passing-time' since attitudes acquired during work become so deeply ingrained that they are often carried into the life off the job.

Gerstl (1961) has shown in his study that for some occupations the presence of specific skills and interests influence the choice of leisure pursuits. Thus 'spill-over' occurs when styles of behaviour suitable for, or acquired in the performance of work are transferred to a non-work context. Several other writers in the area of work and leisure have reported such a transfer of skills from an occupation to a leisure context. Gerstl observed such differences in his comparisons of advertising men, professors and dentists; earlier Clarke (1956) reported data showing that skilled manual workers engage in specific hobbies.

Besides this 'spill-over' many writers have commented that leisure is a direct product of work, for the spare time and resources to enjoy it have been made available by the work or the income generating activities (e.g. Roberts 1970:123), while others have hypothesised the ways in which leisure is based upon values and interests
generated at work, and to still others leisure offers an opportunity to compensate for the frustration and monotony that work in modern industry involves (see Mills 1953; Whyte 1959; Friedmann 1961).

On the basis of the above conceptualisation of the 'work-leisure dichotomy' we may conclude that the main links between the worlds of work and leisure are those of 'structural constraints' such as:

a) resources,
b) time availability,
c) time distribution, and the like.

It also signifies the precision and measurement of work in 'time units' which in turn is measurable in 'money units'. It is this money that provides the requisite resources for making preferred leisure choices. But the use of leisure also is a distinct time-related activity. Hence we may say that the tempo of both work and leisure is 'clock (time) bound'. This statement brings us to the discussion of leisure in terms of the 'time' concept.

2. LEISURE AS TIME:

Work and leisure can best be understood in terms of the different dimensions of 'time', while the former implies the serious utilisation of time for occupations that generate income, the latter is the unserious utilisation of time in which an individual may indulge
in desired leisure pursuits. Mills has given this explanation in his study of the *White Collar Workers* where according to him leisure time means "an unserious freedom from the authoritarian seriousness of the job" (1956:236). Thus the concept of 'time' in terms of work and leisure, therefore, significantly determines the nature of activities involved.

Many sociologists have attempted to discuss human social behaviour in terms of the 'budgeting of time'. The earliest studies available in this context are those of Sorokin and Berger (1939) and Lundberg, Komarovsky and McInerny (1934) describing the life-time patterns in social behaviour and social participation in the light of "time budgets". A time budget is the observed or recorded (daily or weekly) time allocation by an individual to various activities for every period of day explains Smith, Macoulay and others (1980:10) in their study on leisure time behaviour. A comprehensive time budget study obtains data on what people do, approximately how long they do it, where, with whom, and what resources. Such a study covers the full range of activities during the twenty-four-hour time period in a day.

The studies by Szalai (1972), Chopin (1974) and Robins (1977) give a comprehensive mapping of the human social activities highlighting the 'time use patterns'. On the basis of these studies Szalai and others have been able to abstract some fairly regular daily, weekly, monthly and seasonal activity patterns. According to Parker (1971)
and De Grazia (1962) the importance of these studies lie in the fact that they identify those categories in which all human activities or ways of spending time could be classified. Parker goes on to say that this reduction of time budget categories is useful as a means of elucidating the major differences among 'work or work-related' activities, 'socially compelled' activities (obligatory) and 'discretionary' (leisure) activities. He has discussed these activities in terms of the following five 'time budget' categories.

1) Work, working time, Solid time and Subsistence time - Activities in this category include all those likely to lead to remuneration.

2) Work-related time, Work obligations - Apart from actual working time, most people have to spend time travelling to and from work, getting ready for work. Also included here are work-related reading, learning/meetings. The key element in this category is that these activities are not directly remunerative but are necessary in order to maintain or enhance remuneration from activities in the first category.
iii) **Existence time, meeting physiological needs** – This category covers the minimum time we all must spend sleeping, eating, washing etc.

iv) **Non-work obligations, Semi-leisure** – Parker quotes Dumazedier in defining semi-leisure as “activities which, from the point of view of the individual, arise in the first place from leisure, but which represent in different degrees the character of obligations" (1971:35). Such obligations include looking after home, pets, gardens, shopping and so on. The differentiation between a non-work obligation and a leisure activity depends on the individual’s attitudes towards activity.

v) **Leisure, Free time, Spare time, Uncommitted time, Discretionary time, Choosing time** – All these phrases describe some aspect of what is meant by leisure or discretionary time. The essence of leisure activities is the ‘freedom of choice’ They take place during time we can use as we choose or please.

It is this fifth category which is the central focus of this research highlighting the leisure time activities of college students. The emphasis will be on the pattern of time use that one might in everyday speech call ‘inaction’
(e.g. sitting, thinking), non movement (e.g. watching movies, television), passive receptivity (e.g. listening to radio, music) that describes the range of leisure activity pattern different from a somewhat similar concept namely 'recreation'.

3. **LEISURE VS RECREATION:**

The terms 'leisure' and 'recreation' though often used interchangeably in America and Britain conceptually have different meanings. Most writers on recreation, even when using the terms synonymously, 'leisure and recreation' in the same sentence, usually agree that leisure is 'free time' and recreation concerns the 'uses made of such time'. According to Senters (1971) recreation and leisure are not synonymous. To him leisure implies a 'temporal dimension' - the time free from the more formal and obligatory demands of work whereas recreation refers to a 'behavioural dimension' i.e. engaging in mental or physical activity for its own sake. "Engaging in an activity for its own sake" refers to the value intrinsic in any activity as perceived by the participant. Such an activity, according to Anderson, "is not consciously performed for the sake of any reward beyond itself, to which we give ourselves in leisure time" (1961:43). In other terms an individual engages in recreational activity because of inner desire not because of outer compulsions. Recreation as compared to leisure thus implies, according to Butler (1949:8) "any form of leisure
time experience or activity in which the individual engages from choice because of enjoyment and satisfaction which it brings directly to him.

Nash (1953) in his study on the Philosophy of Recreation and Leisure has attempted to explain the difference between leisure and recreation activities that tend to comprise the discretionary time budget of individuals. That both the concepts are related to the time factor is obvious but while recreation involves active participation in the activity, leisure oscillates between active to passive participation. Nash says that in recreation one must play the game, not merely look on, while others play (leisure). Activities such as rocking chair, sitting before the TV, listening to radio, watching sports, getting second hand thrills from movies, dances and dramas—all imply passive participation in the activities which he terms as leisure. In contrast recreation means 'staying in the game' (1953:175) which therefore, entails facilities that require organisation and administration. Public facilities such as playgrounds, clubs, swimming pools, museums, libraries staffed with instructors are meant to provide recreation facilities to the members. It is therefore, associated with programme for using leisure time, and provides guidance in the use of leisure time in socially approved activities.

A professional recreationist, according to Anderson, aims to extend his recreation facilities to all ages and
classes of people, whatever be their individual leisure preferences (1961:49). Leisure as such is free from such expressive objectives. Its 'function' is mainly to enable people to find enjoyment, amusement and self-fulfilment by participating in discretionary activities during their free time.

4. **FUNCTIONAL MEANING OF LEISURE:**

Dumazedier (1967:54) has defined leisure in terms of its three functions namely:

a) relaxation,

b) diversion, and

c) development of personality

He adds that their claims on an individual's time tend to be in that order. When leisure is preceded by work and fatigue then relaxation must have priority. Diversion may be any activity that is either planned or incidentally experienced that provides amusement. For instance, work unconnected with job, performed during free time may be a diversion. Normally, according to Dumazedier diversion is thought of as leisure activity that often does not serve any practical purpose, leisure time used for the development of personality may also be diverting. For example, reading, engaging in play or arts.

On the basis of above description of the three elements as the functional basis of leisure, Dumazedier defines leisure as follows:
Leisure is activity to which the individual may freely devote himself outside the needs and obligations of his occupation, his family and society for his relaxation, diversion and personal development (1967:55).*

These three functions—relaxation, diversion and development—are not always distinguishable and all three may be present in a single activity. Dumazedier says that "Personal development is a wider concept than 'self-improvement' which helps an individual to acquire self-discipline and poise, understanding and even social orientation" (1959:375). It implies developing those qualities by which one is identified as a good neighbour, friend, family member; it also includes work and study during leisure to advance oneself through education and training.

Huizinga (1950), the Dutch scholar in his philosophical study of play, *Homo Ludens*, observed its importance in the development of personality. He studied the concept of play as seen in sport, in games and in fantasy activity in the area where leisure behaviour most intimately involves the personality. He recognised that different kinds of play serve different leisure needs of the individuals. Thus

*Original quotation Dumazedier with Friedmann & Morin in Encyclopaedia Francaise T.XIV 56.6.
Huizinga's definition of play as a leisure time activity is functional. He says,

"Play is an activity carried on within certain limits of time, space and meaning in a defined situation, according to freely-accepted rules. The mood of play is relieving, and is accompanied by feelings of elation and eagerness and leads to pleasure and relaxation" (1950:20).

While Huizinga mentions the time and space elements in play, it is not in terms of 'work-leisure' time complex in which leisure competes with work and non-work obligations for space on the clock. Although he did not relate play with work, he did relate it to the wider interests of life and art.

To Mitchell and Mason (1948) the term play involves attitude of mind as well as action. Play is activity enjoyed by the performer and into which he enters with freedom and spontaneity. On the other hand play and art according to Dewey (1922) are much alike. Both are moral necessities in caring for the "margin that exists between the total stock of impulses that demand outlet and the amount expended in regular action. They keep the balance which work cannot indefinitely maintain" Dewey (1922:160). In this sense, play and art find expression when the individual has a surplus of time and energy, above that needed for his work.

Vontobel (1946:83-84) identifies leisure with art, with qualities of refinement, holding it to be unique because it is often associated with spiritual and artistic
values. Moreover she associates leisure with aristocratic refinement, quiet dignity and graciousness. This is the meaning of leisure that she found in her study of German Protestantism. It concerns attitudes and behaviour in the use of leisure.

Play and art is thus one way of using leisure says Anderson (1961:46) but often amusement implies an opposite way, for instance, he says, one participates in play, but for amusement he may watch others play. He may engage in some pastime alone for his amusement eg. reading, playing, singing or promoting a hobby. When he buys a ticket to visit a movie he may also pay an 'amusement tax'. Too often commercial pastimes are identified as activities for they are functional in providing amusement and fun to the participants.

Coming back to Dumazedier's definition of leisure we find that he distinguishes between leisure time and time given to obligations. Leisure functions are wedged in between one's occupation and his other obligations: Leisure in terms of time, according to him, is opportunity and freedom. Freedom is linked to choice and choice is opportunity for indulging in those activities that provide amusement and fun.

5. **Leisure in terms of fun**

Wolfenstein (1951:15) has discussed leisure in terms of the concept of 'fun'. According to her there is emerging a new attitude towards leisure which she
designates "fun-morality." The attitude of "fun morality" is an inborn compulsion which drives people to participate in activities 'to have fun'. They must not be mere stay-at-homes, but must join in the life about them for the sake of having 'fun' and for having fun, Wolfenstein says, that they must cultivate a capacity for fun.

The emergence of "fun morality" as a leisure value implies an attitude of interest towards the commercially available amusements so long as they provide fun. These in turn, determine the pattern of leisure interests in a society. Emergence of "fun morality" according to Inkeles and Smith (1974) has replaced an earlier achievement-oriented ethic characterising industrial societies, instead, expressive leisure activities have gained significant preference in the present day social setup. According to Dumazedier (1967:61)

Having fun itself tends to become an obligation in the leisure society. Work no longer provides complete satisfaction to a man, he needs thrills and excitement just to let out the strain of work. For this, he may either use his leisure meaningfully or just drift in leisure pursuits without any purpose.

But what is significant is that either way he manages to have 'fun'. In this context the role of commercial entertainments is specially significant for they provide amusement and fun to individuals during their leisure time at the 'mass' level.

6. Leisure as Mass Pastime:

Some sociologists, on the basis of observed
developments in the leisure habits of the population during the 20th century have drawn conclusions about the overall impact that the emergence of leisure industries catering for the mass market have made upon the manner in which the public spends its free time. According to Jeffries (1980) mass media serves as a socialising agent and determines the development of media behaviour in a society. In their summary of media socialisation research Mcleod and O'Keefe (1972) have identified content or criterion of behaviour in terms of the media use. They have also described media preference and media participation in terms of frequency units such as number of hours spent watching TV, listening to radio or reading print media. Since products of commercial amusement vary widely in their cultural quality, it signifies the changing patterns of media preferences by individuals during their leisure time. Anderson (1961:117) attributes this to the "diverse offerings of the amusement industries" that appeal to a large number of patrons and brings them profits. "Leisure has thus become commercialised" says Durant (1933:22), "to such an extent that it has become a major mode of entertainment for people who engage in mass pastimes, provided they have money to pay." According to Nash (1953) mass participation in leisure industries have created a society of spectators who passively accept forms of recreation and amusement that are handed down to them. It has resulted in people passively watching or listening
to entertainment that has been mass produced for their easy consumption. People spend their leisure time listening to music rather than playing it, sit silently to see movies, watch sports without playing themselves. They do not play game, their thrills come from seeing experts perform, thus watching life from the sidelines. Spending their leisure as passive spectators has dulled people's leisure interests and made them inert and lazy.

This growing tendency of people to avoid activity and join crowds as spectators is devastating, according to Nash. He describes this 'devitality' as a social sickness which he calls 'Spectatoritis' (1953:64). Spectatoritis lulls people into spending their leisure doing things from which they derive vicarious pleasures.

Durant (1938) has also viewed commercialisation of leisure in terms of its passive values, for it offers endless devices to an idle person. In this context both Nash and Durant tend to discuss commercialisation of leisure in terms of its 'pathological' aspects rather than its purely entertainment value.

VII. LEISURE AS PROBLEM:

Some sociologists have defined leisure in terms of its pathological aspects. While Sussman (1956) describes leisure as inducing 'idleness'; Asher Tropp (1959) highlighting the pathological aspects of leisure in his study of British Society regards leisure as a 'problem'.
According to Pieper (1952:52) compared with the exclusive ideal of work as activity, leisure implies an attitude of "non-activity". Pieper's "attitude of non-activity" practised beyond the needs for rest is what Sussman (1956:11) has called 'idleness'. Idleness is not synonymous with leisure says Anderson (1961:49), but is 'the avoidance of work'. He, however, clarifies that idleness should not be mistaken for 'unemployment'. 'Idleness' according to him is individual, a voluntary matter, whereas, 'unemployment' is a social and economic condition and is seldom voluntary. One may enjoy 'idleness' for brief periods, but not 'unemployment'. Leisure as free time is 'positive'; unemployment is 'negative'. this latter is linked with deprivation or lack of resources for economic sustenance as well as amusement in leisure. Such a situation breeds tension and may lead to 'deviance'!

Merton (1957) in the discussion of his theory of anomie claimed that when discrepancy exists between the goals that society urges its members to aspire towards and the means that society makes available for legitimately pursuing those goals some sort of deviant behaviour is bound to result. Crime, gambling, drinking, sexual delinquency are all deviant behaviour patterns. If crime and delinquency is to be explained in terms of anomie theory it is in leisure goals and the means to achieve them that the relevant discrepancy is reflected in society's value system.
In their free time Downes (1966) found that the young people he studied possessed an urge to experience excitement and to engage in a variety of pursuits that cost money. If money and excitement could not be obtained legitimately the young people would resort to deviant methods of obtaining those satisfactions from their leisure that they considered to be important. Downes in his enquiry into the origins of crime was forced to take into account attitudes and values based upon leisure in order to determine the relationship between leisure and deviance.

To the young people themselves the activities to which they devoted their free time were not a problem at all. The only problem was the likely reactions that could be forthcoming from other sections of society. The wider society did define their behaviour as deviant, delinquent and problematic. The research conducted by Downes offers one example of leisure posing a 'latent and unacknowledged social problem'.

The crux of the problem faced by the boys whom Downes studied, was that although they were not consciously aware of it, they were unable to realise the values around which they wished their leisure to be organised.

Other studies have confirmed that many young people possess no clear goals or values to guide their leisure activities. Jephcott's (1967) research amongst young people revealed that many of the adolescents she studied had difficulty in filling their free time. Miller's (1963)
research has also endorsed the view that young people have difficulty in devising a wide enough range of interesting activities to prevent their leisure being dominated by 'boredom'.

Some of those who have devised ways to use leisure by indulging in pursuits to develop their personalities do manage to avoid boredom but most others do not know what to do with their free time -- they have not internalized an alternative set of norms in terms of which to structure their own free time. There is every indication that this situation is typical for young people in contemporary society. A fully satisfying leisure is impossible because young people possess no determinate standards and values to satisfy. In this sense their leisure constitutes a social problem although it may rarely be recognized as such.

It, therefore, needs careful investigation in a bid to clarify 'what it is about leisure that presents a problem?'; and 'how best it could be overcome?'.

PRESENT STUDY:

In the foregoing discussion an attempt has been made to highlight the diverse meanings and definitions that have been used by different sociologists to explain the concept of leisure.

Against this background the present study attempts to understand and analyze the whole range of leisure activities and leisure attitudes of college students of Delhi University. Before turning to the descriptive details,
in keeping with the content of this chapter, the study also attempts to explore the meaning of leisure as the students understood it.

The respondents were specifically asked what they understood by term leisure with reference to any one of the four alternatives provided viz. leisure is free time, unobligated time, time to do as you please or an escape from routine of work/study along with a provision for any other response which to them implied leisure. Their responses are given in Table 5. In our analysis the term 'free time' implies the time when the students are relatively free from all kinds of duties which demand/or require their attention during the normal routine of their daily lives. This is the time which they can devote to the pursuit of those activities which they prefer or towards which they feel inclined. Leisure as 'unobligated time' implies freedom from the obligatory demands of the society, be it in relation to his family, relatives, or college studies, when a student generally feels free to follow his own preferences in the utilisation of his 'unobligatory time' without any external social pressure. 'Do as you please' refers to a state of affairs when a student has total freedom to select the activities in which he wishes to participate during his free time. It is the opposite of that dimension of time when lack of freedom or societal restraints prevent him to do what pleases him most. This time is thus indicative of absolute freedom and discretion exercised by the students
FIGURE 1
MEANING OF LEISURE BY STUDENTS

- **DO AS YOU PLEASE (39.0%)**
- **FREE TIME (21.6%)**
- **ESCAPE FROM ROUTINE OF WORK (30.7%)**
- **UNOBLIGATED TIME (8.7%)**
in the choice of those activities that provides them with maximum of fun and enjoyment. The term 'escape from routine of work/study' is indicative of the inherent demands of the routinized activity of study which at times spell boredom for the students' community. This term therefore refers to the students' desire to escape from the boredom of the routine demands of work as well as the college academic schedule and enjoy the free time so generated.

Coming back to the students' responses given in Table 5 (see figure 1) we find that a majority of students regard leisure as the time in which they can 'do as they please'. This suggests the operation of the element of freedom of choice in students' preferences regarding their leisure pursuits. To many, leisure also provided an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning of leisure</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Free time</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unobligated time</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do as you please</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Escape from routine of work/study</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opportunity to escape from the daily routine of life, be it work or study. Hence we may say that students regard leisure as the time in which they are free to do what pleases them and it also provides them refuge from the routine demands of life as well as work.

An analysis of the data, in this context, on the basis of sex, Type of college, year and course of study and host/lers and day scholars was undertaken in order to understand the variations, if any, in terms of the meaning of leisure to the students.

By comparing the responses of the male and female students (Table 6) we find that leisure as the time to 'do as you please' rates highest with both the sexes though

**TABLE 6**

Sex-wise response regarding the meaning of leisure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure means</th>
<th>Male N=282</th>
<th>Female N=203</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(figs in percentage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Free time</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unobligated time</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do as you please</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Escape from routine of work/study.</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 6.92 \quad \text{p} \leq 0.05 \quad \text{df} = 3 \]

their responses were not found to be statistically significant. On the other hand a far greater percentage
of females than males regard leisure as an 'escape from routine of work/study.' This may be attributed to the differences that are found to exist in the amount of leisure time that the sexes enjoy. Household duties, supervised and controlled upbringing of the females delimit their range of leisure opportunities than males. Hence the spells of free time that they have are conceived by them in terms of the opportunity in which they can escape from the routinized demands of the work/study activities. We also find that more males than females regard leisure as free time. Males who have greater freedom to exercise choice in the selection of their leisure activities also enjoy more flexibility and greater mobility than the females, regarding the operation of parental authority. This leaves them far more time to indulge in the pursuit of discretionary activities than the females. That is why perhaps more males than females identify leisure with free time. Leisure as 'unobligated time' rated lowest with both the sexes showing no significant difference in their response.

By comparing data on the type of college (Table-7), year of study (Table-8), course of study (Table-9) and hostlers/day scholars (Table-10) we again find leisure as implying the time to 'do as you please' as the most common response followed by 'escape from routine of work/study; 'free time' and 'unobligated time' in that order.

The data on the type of college (Table-7) reveals a difference in the response of purely male college students who regard leisure as free time than the purely female
college students or coeducational college students. In the same way we find a difference in response regarding the 'escape from routine of work/study' where we find more PFC and CEC students opting for this meaning of leisure than the PMC students. These two responses are a clear reflection of the sex-wise influence on the students response regarding the meaning of leisure. Since colleges are based on sex-wise composition, the similarity in responses becomes easy to understand. The response regarding leisure as the time in which the students 'do as they please' continues to be topmost, in contrast leisure as 'unobligated time' is the least preferred meaning of leisure. Both these responses were not found to be significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure means:</th>
<th>PMC N=159</th>
<th>CEC N=171</th>
<th>PFC N=155</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Free time</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unobligated time</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do as you please</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Escape from routine of work/study</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 100.0 100.0 100.0

\[ x^2 = 6.53 \quad P \leq 0.05 \quad df = 6 \]

The data on the year of study (Table-9) reveals a
difference in response between the 1st year students who regard leisure as the time to 'do as you please' as compared to the IIInd and IIIrd year students. The reason for this could be that the 1st year students, fresh from the disciplined life of the school tend to regard the relative freedom of the college as an opportunity in which they are free to choose the activities that please them the most, and which perhaps they could not freely pursue in school. After the initial taste of freedom they tend to settle in the college routinized schedule and this perhaps affects the percentage of those who continue to regard leisure as the time in which to 'do as you please' in the IIInd and IIIrd year of college. Closely following this are those who regard it as free time. None of these responses registered any marked variation in percentage. However, we do find a significant variation in the response regarding leisure as 'unobligated time' in which the response of IIInd year students was found to be double than the 1st and IIIrd year students. Perhaps this is a reflection of the relative ease with which the second year students tend to regard the obligatory demands of the academic schedule in the college milieu: In the 1st and IIIrd year the students depict the academic seriousness in the initial and terminal phase of the college life—one fresh from school and the other to make good grades in exams—hence we find far fewer 1st and IIIrd year students regard leisure as unobligated time than the IIInd year students. On the whole none of the responses was found to be statistically significant.
TABLE-8

Year of study vs meaning of leisure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure is</th>
<th>1st year N=193</th>
<th>IIInd yr. N=90</th>
<th>IIIrd yr. N=202</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Free time</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unobligated time</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do as you please</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Escape from routine of</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work/study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figs. in percentage)

\[ x^2 = 6.79 \quad \text{P} \leq 0.05 \quad df = 6 \]

When we compare the responses of Pass course and Honours students (Table-9) we find once again highest preference for 'do as you please' meaning of leisure by both the Pass as well as Honours students though percentage-wise former's response was higher than the latter it was not found to be statistically significant. However the percentage difference could be attributed to the comparative lesser academic pressure on the Pass than the Honours students. That is why perhaps we find that more Honours than the Pass students have registered their responses regarding leisure as an 'escape from the routine of work/study because Honours students have to attend more lectures per week than the Pass students. No difference
in response was observed regarding leisure as 'free time' or 'unobligated time' between the Pass and Honours students. On the whole none of the responses were found to be statistically significant.

**TABLE-9**

Course of study vs meaning of leisure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure is</th>
<th>Pass N=158</th>
<th>Honours N=327</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Free time</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unobligated time</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do as you please</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Escape from routine of work/study</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(figs. in percentage)


\[ X^2 = 3.61 \quad p < .05 \quad df = 3 \]

The data on hostlers and day scholars also followed the same pattern (see Table-10) as in the case of variables discussed above with maximum preference for 'do as you please' meaning of leisure followed by the others. None of the responses were found to be significant.
TABLE 10

Responses of hostlers/day scholars regarding meaning of leisure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure is</th>
<th>Hostlers N=71</th>
<th>Day scholars N=414</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(figs. in %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Free time</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unobligated time</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do as you please</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Escape from routine</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of work/study                |
| Total:                      | 100.0         | 100.0              |

\[ \chi^2 = 2.08 \quad \text{p} \leq .05 \quad df = 3 \]

On the basis of the data presented above regarding the meaning of leisure as understood by the students we may generalise that far from considering leisure purely in terms of 'free time,' leisure signifies to a majority of college students the time to 'do as one pleases' implying thereby the option of 'freedom of choice' to indulge in activities of their own inclinations and interests. This meaning of leisure was found to be highly preferred by the students irrespective of the influence of any of the variables discussed above. In addition to this leisure to some, also stands for an 'escape from the routine of work/study' which are obligatory in nature.
To the students, participating in activities of one's own choice implies a freedom or escape from the routine of studies that are the bases of the college education system. In contrast 'freedom of choice' or discretion constitutes the central theme of leisure for the students, where rules, roles and obligations of the primary social institutions tend to lose their significance; how far the students successfully utilise their leisure, however, depends upon the range of choices available to them and their ability to make effective and significant choices. What is significant, however, is that the students do conceive of leisure in terms of the time in which they can indulge in activities of their own choice in their search for pleasure which Wolfenstein (1951) has designated as "fun morality."

In leisure, students indulge in activities for the sake of having fun. Phrases such as "that interests me" or "for fun's sake", etc., which the students use freely, appear to signify the prime conditions of leisure activities where contentment is sought and where the students are not compelled to be tied to a particular leisure activity by any moral, material, social or legal obligations as is the case with attending, say, lectures etc.

However, there are those leisure activities that are extracurricular in nature and carry an inherent element of compulsion and where freedom of choice tends to be restricted. A descriptive analysis of these activities
forms the central theme of the next chapter in our scheme where an attempt has been made to present a comparative account of the students' participation in the college sponsored activities.