

LEISURE AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS From modern times to postmodernity

Maria Dilma Simões Brasileiro

Federal University of Paraíba, Brazil

Abstract: The present study aims to understand the sociocultural transformations experienced in contemporary life, and the way they influence and are influenced by work, free time and leisure. At first, it introduces a discussion about paradigm changes from modernity to postmodernity. Later on, to situate this analysis about leisure, performing a brief passage in the sociocultural construction of leisure, and how these earlier historical eras influence this concept nowadays. Therefore, we point to paradigm changes from modernity to postmodernity, although we are still not able to evaluate the paths that can be taken according to these changes, since the analytical categories built to interpret them are still quite inaccurate. It is possible to affirm that human experience through new sociocultural boundaries favor the creation of new communitarianism and individualism ideologies, redefining and being redefined by work, free time and leisure.

Keywords: Leisure; work; free time; modernity; postmodernity.

Introduction

Before beginning an approach to the concept of leisure in the context of socialcultural transformations, let us focus our thoughts on the concept of postmodern society. This concept actually represents the sociocultural transformations experienced in contemporary times. It is important to put that, given the plurality of meanings and definitions used by authors to characterize these contemporary changes, the present study will not try to focus on them, but to reflect on the influence of these transformations in leisure and its manifestations.

It is worth noting that the present study will analyze not only the influences of these transformations in leisure, but also the reciprocity and influence of leisure in achieving these sociocultural transformations. Therefore, in order to understand these processes experienced in contemporary times, it is necessary to analyze the meaning and the transformations from modern to postmodern societies.

1. From modern to postmodern values

The values of rationalist productivity, the positivist concept of the world, the established truths that begin in Illustration, in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

started to collapse in the second half of the twentieth century. As explained by Lash (1994, p. 143):

the advance of individualization in the second phase of modernity also released the individuals from the collective and abstract structures such as class, nation, nuclear family and unconditional belief in science.

Modernity, defined by the destruction of old structures, by the success of rationality e by the rupture of the sacred world, that was both natural and divide, loses strength and starts to decline. In contemporary times, we are living in a modern/industrial society, focused on mass production of material goods, but also living in a post-industrial/postmodern society, centered on the production of nonmaterial resources (information, symbols, aesthetics, and values). De Masi (2000) presented that the changes experienced in societies over history is becoming shorter. Five hundred years were needed for the organization of modern society and industry; only two hundred years of industrialization were necessary to cause the advent of post-industrial society.

After the rural period and the industrial machinism, today a third period is presented: the post-industrial, able to exalt creative dimension of human activities, focusing more on culture than structure. If modernity, based in reason, was able to create the state of law and the markt, it was not able to do the same to liberty and happiness. As Touraine (2009) analyzes, the idea that progress leads to development, liberty and happiness is centered in the figure of a male western and well educated adult who defends a company, a nation and/or a society that dominates workers, women and children. However, historical facts have shown that this legal rational authority, focused on this western conception of the world and capitalism was not enough for the triumph of modernity.

In fact, to analyze this process from modernity to postmodernity is suggesting, as taught by Featherstone (2000, p.24), “a time change or rupture with modernity, which brings the appearance of a new social totality, with its distinct principles of organization”. In this context, science, technology, globalization, organizational progress, schooling and mass media were crucial elements to boost the dynamics of the new postmodern society. Eagleton (1998, p.11) explains that:

postmodernity is a way of thinking that is suspicious of classical notions of truth, reason, objectivity, the idea of universal progress, emancipation of isolated structures, major reports or definitive explanation systems.

In the same line of argument, Marín Horcajo (2003) sees postmodernity as a state of conscience that sets boundaries to dreams of greatness of modernity, represented in

scientific reason. The reason that organizes our objective understanding of the world, which gives us a desired way of life and makes us believe that its evolution will overcome social injustices.

The very concept of postmodernity, however, is not unequivocal nor is safe from valorative guidelines. This is demonstrated by the extensive debate that exists on this concept and the criticisms that are made. Thus, from our point of view, what is considered as postmodernity is also called high modernity, late modernity or hypermodernity by many authors. In fact, a range of concepts used to interpret sociocultural transformations in contemporary societies. Lyotard (1984), one of the precursors of the postmodernity concept, showed that societies enter the age of the post-industrial societies and cultures enter the postmodern age. The author points out that postmodernity is characterized by a knowledge crisis, caused by skepticism, which is related to claims of established truths in modernity.

Therefore, a sense of unease is produced in the established categories and in the actions related to modernity. Featherstone (2000) says that there is still no established theory about the delineation of the sociocultural processes and institutional transformations derived from this period, “we only have the possibility to understand the concept of post modernity in a new social order and change of times” (Featherstone, 2000, p.28).

Sociocultural transformations become even more present in the late 60’s and early 70’s. The instability of the markets, mainly after the crisis of 1973, affects the capitalist production model, which begins to collapse and “launches the capitalist world in a long and deep recession that changes the relation between the State and market economies” (Brasileiro, 2012, p.82), thus influencing socioeconomic and cultural relations. This crisis puts in evidence the tax incidence on the social sector, producing a liberal reaction, privatizing the sector. In this context, they become labor relations, strengthening an economy dominated by flexible and urban labor. As a result, deep and progressive changes happen in the Welfare State. Organized civil society and individual citizens are increasingly taking center stage, and many of the claims and roles that were played by the State are taken and represented by these new social agents. In this sense, if something can be recognized in postmodernity is a fundamental change in the relationship between individual and society, since our essential condition as citizens now is compared with our situation as consumers, which demands new attitudes and organizations towards the State and market. The disbelief in major political projects and institutions also bring citizens to take a new role regarding their private life and social issues and also in their perspective and values of the world.

In fact, in the sociocultural world, the human being, which in the begging of modern society stood helpless before the interpretation of the Bible, now, in postmodern society, stands helpless before the patriarchal society and before the State.

After *Deus absconditus*, which sparked the modern belief in the power of the human species, now we have the *Societas absconditus*, which triggered the postmodern belief in the power of the individuals. (Baumann e Tester, 2002, p. 123).

In this context, the increasing disintegration of the social model in its classical form has led the search for the inner self and meaning of life. The postmodern individual, who takes leadership in socioeconomic, political and cultural matters, the individual/citizen/consumer, is also the same individual who stands out as a stranger in the world. In the words of Rago(2000, p.09):

the public man of the past now becomes a silent spectator of the present, indifferent figure, without physical, facial and emotional expression, exposed in the world of appearances. (...) In parks and squares, sunglasses reaffirm the quest for anonymity, whilst the walkman ensures not to hear anything other from the chosen sound.

Space and time in postmodernity can be built according to our individuality, to the extent that we have to choose between multiple options that life gives us, adapting and living it according to our personal situation. In other words, postmodernity is translated in a plural and individual society, in which the absolute becomes relative. Therefore, we are in a multiple and interconnected reality, and it is very difficult to account for any facet of this reality, without references between individual/social; local/global; modern/postmodern. There is no area of this social life that escapes from this reality. Intensity may vary, but the transformations observed in contemporary times cover every society, in different contexts of the world. That said, the increase of postmodern values is one of the most prominent elements of the daily life, and also a crucial factor to understand the transformations in the leisure area.

2. Leisure in the context of sociocultural transformations

The concept of leisure, as we understand and experience in contemporary times begins with modern society. As taught by Elias (1992, p.120), “according to the different structure of Greek society, the concept of leisure did not have exactly the same meaning as ours”. However, in ancient societies, it always had something equivalent to what is now called leisure, because individuals always developed parallel activities besides the survival duties, such as representation and experiencing life itself (Gaya, 1997).

For the Greeks, what currently approaches to what we call leisure was related with instruction and consisted in perform intellectual activities to enrich the spirit. It was based in the idealization of being willing and able to contemplate the supreme values of the world: truth, kindness and beauty, that meaning the wisdom above manual activities. The Greeks considered leisure not as a utilitarian way of knowledge, but a contemplative way, opposed to the occupation, especially when the latter involved any activity governed by concrete and utilitarian goals. The purpose of leisure resided in leisure itself, as there was no other reason to perform a leisure activity than the mere fact of doing it. “Only those who had leisure time were free” (Mazón, 2001, p. 54). Evidently, the leisure which the Greeks refer was only possible because the work was provided by the slaves (Russell, 2002). The democratic structure of the Greeks was delineated by a society of free citizens, in which leisure was a space for them to enjoy life. It was a state of inner peace and creative contemplation. Leisure was for free and well educated men. López de la Vieja (1998) explains that Aristotle complimented classic leisure, firmly seated in unequal conditions. To the philosopher, quoted by López de la Vieja (1998, p. 18),

the occupation of mind is superior to other activities, like military or politics. However, contemplation is not production, nor action, thus it is only possible in the absence of fatigue. Living this way requires dignified resources and also moderate use of them.

Aristotle believed that the activities that met the characteristics of leisure were contemplation and teaching of music, through the skills of playing, reciting and composing. To the philosopher, it all contributed to form the mind, to possess the unique culture of well-educated man and to approach the virtues (Puig Rovira e Trilla, 1996). In this culture, an appreciation of the experiences that today are close to leisure as we know it was clearly seen, as well as a disdain towards the activities related to work. Analyzing the situation, Herodotus, quoted by Lafargue (1991, 67), questioned himself about the origin of these values. But Herodotus concluded that he could not affirm “whether the Greeks inherited their disdain towards work from the Egyptians, because I find the same feeling established in the Thracians, Scythians, Persians and Lydians”. Lafargue (1991, 68) said that “Greek philosophers disputed as to the origin of the ideas, but agreed when it came to hating to work”. In the same direction, Veblen (2004), when analyzing the idle classes throughout humanity history and referring to barbarian communities explained that

The distinction between prowess and ordinary work is a distinction of degrading inequality that is established between occupations. Those qualified as achievements

are worthy, honorable; the ones without the element of prowess, and especially those involving submission and slavery are unworthy, degrading and not noble (Veblen, 2004, 41).

The Greek conception of leisure as contemplation and cultivation of the spirit was not experienced in Rome, with the rise of the Roman Empire, because Rome had new connotations, which responded to other economic and political context, even though the value of leisure remained present in the upper classes. Classical Greek authors, such as Aristotle, who inaugurated a positive stance about what is now called leisure, may find some followers, such as Seneca. However, both the organization of social life and the work of other authors contributed to create a new conception of leisure in this period.

In Roman culture it is wise to distinguish leisure in the upper classes, that approached the Greek leisure, and leisure in the lower classes, associated with fun. Rome introduced the entertainment of the masses by means of comedies and treats, which was organized by the State itself. This kind of leisure, for the masses, also collaborated for their submission towards government. The feast days took almost half of the labor calendar and were designated, essentially, for fun (Montaner, 1996; Puig Roviara e Trilla, 1996; Mazón, 2001). Thus, leisure in Rome was took place in accordance to Greek principles for intellectuality, for upper classes as a way of contemplation and resting, and fun and amusement for the lower classes. As San Martín (1997) explains, the concept of leisure in Rome was well differentiated between the elite and the lower classes: for the upper classes, leiseure was meditation, rest, social life; on the other hand, for the lower classes, leiseure consisted in the amusement of the masses, *panis et circenses*, despised by the social elite. In this sense, leisure was essentially entertainment and a political instrument of domination.

With the fall of the Roman Empire, a new social organization is born: a rural society characterized by feudalism, the location and the peasant. Since Aristotle, activities promoting pleasure were already valued. However, the pleasure obtained by hedonistic elements of enthusiasm, such as the excitement produced by music, the drama and the games were suppressed. Leisure continues to be basically a time of resting and celebration, controlled by the Catholic Church and the feudal lords, which ruled people's lives and dictated conceptions and values of society. Work was related to religious activities and leisure was mixed with the religious festivities, often generating pagan festivals outside the norms of the Church.

The festivities were moments of rites and coexistence among community members. It was a society with a large number of annual festivals, as pointed by Ruiz Olabuénaga (1994, p. 1927), in medieval Spain, “the council of Calahorra established 45 ‘save parties’, which, added to the 53 Sundays, completed a calendar of cyclical celebrations of almost a hundred days” Lafargue (1991, p. 40), also refers to the holidays in the ancient times, in which “the laws of the church guaranteed 90 days of rest to the worker, 52 Sundays and 38 holidays, during which it was strictly forbidden to work. With the advance of the Middle Ages, the kind of leisure that rises is the one experienced by the upper classes. In fact, the values in this period consisted not only in absence from work, but also in the activities of war and sports, and, on another level, politics, science and religion. Leisure becomes a form of ostentation, attracting social respect, since it demonstrates wealth and, as a consequence, power (Montaner, 1996). The Greek idea of contemplation loses space during Middle Ages, even though it returns as a mental pleasure and freedom in art during Renaissance.

The gradual shift towards a more utilitarian and practical knowledge begins in the seventeenth century and unfolds in the eighteenth century, accelerated by the French Revolution and industrialization. From this period on, almost opposite values of leisure are demonstrated, something that guides the western human until today. Therefore, it presents a new idea of work as the highest expression of the human being, the confidence in himself and his omnipotence (Puig Roviara e Trilla, 1996). The development of the technique and the changes in the structure of the feudal society introduced new ways of production. Work gradually moves from the countryside to the cities. Factories become the center of work and the dynamics of everyday life is changed, both spatially and temporally. The Reformation also brings a new meaning to what was so called leisure.

In this new reality, new values are created. Philosophical leisure is no longer a way of living, based on slavery and against devaluation of work. Since then, each individual must seek the ways of surviving through work. English Puritanism in the sixteenth century, supported by the Calvinist doctrines gives an ethical and religious value to work, defending leisure as a lack of work. In this period, with the Reformation values, work is synonymous with dignity. Life becomes submitted to rationality and to values in which leisure was not included. Leisure was unproductive and had perverse effects, since it stimulated values that were not compatible with the work. Everything related to leisure was condemned. The imperative was to work. In this context, the main role of leisure was to rest and restore the energy to work more. We entered modernity and modern values of leisure.

3. Leisure, modernity and its values

In England, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – and later in the American colonies – inactivity was the worst of vices, meaning the lack of effort and, without it, one could not achieve salvation in the afterlife (Montaner, 1996). As a consequence of these new ideas and new social conditions, the pace of work of the individuals become harder and harder. The work journey was never less than 12 hours and it reached 16 hours often. Until the Industrial Revolution, the meaning of the relation between work and leisure was not evident. In other words, before Industrial Revolution there was no explicit confrontation between work hours and free time/leisure, but only a relation of continuous and mutual balance. People's lives had a unitary character, and were not less harsh and painful than the early modern times, but quite the opposite (Puig Rovira e Trilla, 1996). This labor paradigm shift was analyzed by Lafargue (1991), in the year of 1883. In the words of the author:

The capitalist moral, pitiful parody of Christian moral casts a curse on the worker's flesh: his ideal is to reduce the producer's needs to a minimum, suppress his joys and passions and condemn him to the role of a machine that works without a rest (Lafargue, 1991, p. 09).

At the beginning of the industrial revolution, social reality was the incessant work of the people, aligned with leisure of an idle class (Veblen, 2004). The bourgeoisie, as highest exponents of moral effort, dedicated their lives to business and instructive kinds of leisure, as a way of ostentation. The classical meaning of philosophical leisure was no longer so fashionable. Therefore, leisure was no longer used in a philosophical way to find the meaning of life, but to distinguish themselves from the others by means of a specific lifestyle. So, as in previous periods, the idle class, privileged, which cultivated the pleasures of leisure always existed, but based on slavery and peasants and, during modernity, the workers.

The puritan ideology that had been deeply incorporated by the bourgeoisie, was clearly understood during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The French Revolution produced the last transformations, establishing work and modern leisure. But it is with the consolidation of capitalism that the modern sense of work, free time and leisure is built. With this consolidation, modern society itself is also established, with the idea that leisure is no longer the Greek ideal, but it also lacks the gratuitous character. In modern industrial world, moral values of the concept of leisure are synonymous with laziness and unproductive. Work “would be a brake to noble passions of men” (Lafargue, 1991, p. 24).

In this context, the classical concept of leisure, in service of freedom and pursuit of excellence by a privileged minority set the tone of leisure in antiquity. Historically, we associate what today we understand as leisure to Greek *skolé* that always existed in different forms, while the concept of free time is a consequence of industrial development (Cuenca Cabeza, 2000). Since then, bourgeois leisure is set as time earned from the work performed. However, as Lafargue (1991, p.39) warns,

the leisure announced by the pagan poet never came: blind, perverse and homicidal passion work transforms the liberating machine in instruments of slavery of free men: their productivity impoverishes them.

The author thinks that the blindness of the worker towards his work, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the period in which Lafargue writes “The Right To Be Lazy”, strengthens social wealth, but impoverishes the individuals, and by getting poorer, they had more reasons to keep working and be miserable. As for the bourgeois, Lafargue points that, in order to perform the condition of non-producer and overconsumer, the bourgeois had to violate his modern taste, “to lose his laborious habits of two centuries ago and to give himself up to unbounded luxury, spicy indigestibles and syphilitic debauches” (Lafargue, 1991, p.43). In the analysis of the bourgeoisie of the nineteenth century, Lafargue still adds that once settled down into absolute laziness and demoralized by enforced enjoyment, the capitalist class in spite of the injury involved in its new kind of life, adapted itself to it.

This model of society extends to the west, especially after the nineteenth century, when work becomes the center of life. The religious belief system also contributed, by means of the protestant ethic, to a work ethic (Gil, 1998). When work is separated from the rest of people’s activities, and the dichotomy between work time and free time is suggested, we are faced with an exclusive phenomenon of the modern/industrial societies, which produces the time division and the implicit relationship between work, free time and leisure. In this context, one of the most important changes in the beginning of the industrial period up the present has been perception and interpretation of time. According to Ruiz Olabuénaga (1994, p. 1921),

time lost its sacred nature to become profane. Sacred time is cyclical and recurrent, where the beginning coincides with the end and rests on the myth of the eternal return. Sacred time is not experienced alone or in private, but in public and community.

Still based in Ruiz Olabuénaga (1994), sacred time is from everyone to everyone and it is independent from the individual subject. It is a time to be lived together, not to be

fractionated or private. In the words of the author, modern times are profane times, which work by the sum successive segments, with the main characteristic of being longitudinal. Longitudinal time is individual and private, becoming a flexible, variable and fractionated time. The transition from cyclical to linear time implies, according to Ruiz Olabuénaga (1994), a change from the sun to the watch and from seasons to a schedule. The longitudinal and private character of time in modernity, among other reasons, marked the relationship between work hours, free time and leisure. If it is important in modern times to be productive and free time is unproductive, it is only justified if it is related to work.

Each society has its time construction. Modern time is, above all, a time measured in hours, minutes and seconds. Within this dynamic time, free time in modernity is a waste of time and work is synonymous with life and source of wealth. As pointed by Russell (2002, 32), “modern men thinks that any activity should be performed in favor of other things, never of the activity itself”. To the author, “we do not have time to acquire other mental skills other than the ones that help us in the things that are considered important” (Russell, 2002, 39). With these values, it is not surprising that Protestantism has suppressed the cults of saints, also suppressing feast days that were dedicated to them, thus converting in productive days (Lafargue, 1991; Montaner, 1996; Russell, 2002). In this sense, time in modern/industrial society, as social time, is considered as objective, measured and quantified. Leisure, as a perspective of human experience, in this reality, is accused of failing to give real meaning to life, since it is guided by the principle of nature against culture, passion against reason (Fortuna, 1995).

The anxiety of new production in the beginning of the capitalist model also led to the application of severe conditions of exploitation towards the workers. As the working class became aware of their social situation and gathering in organizations, creating trade unions, they start to claim for better work conditions. The objectives of the debates were basically reduction of the work journey and higher wages, which became the premises to enjoy the free time (Montaner, 1996). But even with the reduction of work hours, especially because it is associated with part of the pleasure in life, leisure is still devalorized because it is given a negative connotation, in the scale of values in modern society. The fact of having free time, however, did not imply in experiencing leisure (Elias, 1992; Leif, 1992; Cuenca Cabeza, 2000).

Leisure time, which we identified within the free time, is a part of time that is dedicated to activities of free choice, because of its pleasant feeling and does not involve remuneration. Leisure is only effective in a real willingness to oneself, related to

performing something other than the professional occupation, with or without others around you, and the one experiencing it is highly motivated by it (Leif, 1992). In this modern concept of leisure, leisure time is a set of events that fulfill a complementary function to work, thus being experiences inside the social context. However, in the words of Elias (1992, p. 149), “the special characteristics of the leisure activities can only be understood if considered not only in relation to employment, but also in relation to numerous non-leisure activities performed during free time”. This happens because leisure, which was previously seen as a limited social phenomenon, regarding the amount of people that could afford it and its social importance, becomes to be seen, after the consolidation of modern/industrial societies as a mass phenomenon. “The development of contemporary industrialized societies, created the structural conditions that led to an explosion of leisure and activities that support it” (Del Pino Artacho *et al.*, 2001, p.14).

Since the establishment of the Welfare State, civil society e other organized sectors of society gradually took center stage demanding leisure, not only free time, as a right for all. The State itself, while implementing public policies, has focused its plans and interventions in leisure activities for the population. As Cuenca Cabeza (2000, p.30), explains “some say that leisure has taken the place that religion once had in the past and, when we analyze data referred to time, it seems that the increase of leisure time is reducing the time dedicated to religious practices.”.

Analyzing leisure in a more conceptual perspective, nowadays the authors do not agree on the subject of what we can consider as leisure. In fact, for a contemporary definition of leisure, we have to incorporate complex aspects of human dimension and, as a consequence, of contemporary societies. The current period of paradigm crisis, uncertainty and contradictions of the modern/postmodern social reality contributes to this current context of leisure. We consider leisure as subjective experiences, materialized in physical and sports activities, tourism, arts and recreation. It is a time for oneself, with a relatively high degree of individual election, inside a social context. Individuals who participate in these practices show their emotions as a way of being and perceiving life, within socially approved disarray. However, to think of a definition of leisure within the contemporary context is complex and risky, since feelings, experiences and well opposed realities are present both in leisure and work activities. Reaching the summit of a mountain, signing a new contract are experiences that stimulate antagonistic feelings such as fear, insecurity, pleasure and satisfaction. These are inseparable feelings, which generate a complex process in daily life, involving the world of leisure and work.

4. In pursuit of a new understanding of leisure

Work in contemporary context is not only related to the job one has, but especially with the quality of it, the feelings that are experienced, and the perception that is given. Leisure no longer has boundaries as limited as work. An individual can be satisfied in leisure activities as well as in non-leisure activities. In this sense, leisure and work are comprehended as concepts built from individual experiences and meanings, generated in collective contexts, within a logic of pleasure and personal fulfillment.

Analyzing the current relation between work and leisure, both are structured from two perspectives: one that clearly differentiates work from leisure, within a modern vision of society and other establishing interconnection between leisure and work, which is situated in the postmodern values. In this second perspective is a revaluation of leisure experiences. In this understanding, the work will not disappear, nor will we live the civilization of leisure - in fact, the development of leisure is bringing other forms of work - but leisure is occupying a space in people's lives, which throughout history was only experienced by the elites. Without losing its importance, work is losing its exclusive characteristic. (De Masi, 2000; Cuenca Cabeza, 1999).

The contemporary work is complex, multidimensional and multifactorial, as are the post-modern societies. This complexity at work and in daily life creates a strong interconnection between work and leisure. According to Cuenca Cabeza (2000), many jobs are losing the concept of work journey, due to the imprecision of boundaries between work hours and free time. In this context, the work not only wins new contours, but especially begins to change the meaning and the value it had at other times. As stressed Valls (2000), the contemporary time is a continuum, filled with various activities of work and leisure, without transition, similar to how it was before the industrialization process, but for radically different reasons. The new formats of work not only modify and are modified by free time and leisure, but also by the way time is structured in current routine.

In the postmodern concept of work, we have seen several people performing their tasks with passion and fulfillment. The jobs that require creativity, observation, reflection and communication are the ones that provide more pleasure. With these new features work also discuss new relations between human development and technique, which is the same as thinking about the relationship between leisure and work, because "the ways of production, distribution and consumption of creative content require changes of business models and forms of work, including new abilities and infrastructure" (Reis, 2012, p. 47). Leisure and work are presented as creative dimensions, with strong

influences on life dimensions as a whole. That happens because in the postmodern perspective there is a mutual influence between professional time and free time, and, as a consequence, leisure time. As pointed by De Masi (2000), a industry worker fills his free time by going to the movies, doing something different than his work activities. But an advertiser, a sociologist, a psychologist or an economist goes to the movies, it is hard to tell where the fun begins and work is done, since their creative activity dissipates any possible barrier between study, work and free time. Also, this relationship should also be understood in the reverse way.

In this perspective, contemporary time is a time of transition between material/mechanical/modern work and immaterial, creative, postmodern work/leisure. The process of creative work/leisure yet is little spread among the population, especially in developing countries or underdeveloped countries. One of the reasons for the lack of dissemination of these new work/leisure values can be found in the educational process, since education is one of the essential factors for building new values. As already discussed elsewhere (Brasileiro, 2012), education is a prerequisite for human development, especially when related to the paradigm shift from modern to postmodern. However, it is necessary to note that when we refer to education, we are not referring to the instrumental education, which values the teaching of technique for their reproduction, but education that has its central axis in human values.

Just like the work socializing process was made through education, it will also be necessary regarding leisure, so people can stimulate their creativity, which will be experienced in their moments of leisure/time. Russell (2002), in 1935, considered that the leisure experiences are products of civilization and education. According to this author, "a man who throughout his life worked long hours will feel bored if he suddenly becomes idle" (Russell, 2002, p. 30). This happens because the educational process in modern times only prepared people, with the exception of the elite, for work. Russell also explains that, in spite of the idle class enjoy advantages that were not based on justice, it is impossible to deny its contribution for what is called civilization, because it was this class that cultivated art, discovered science, invented philosophy and improved social relations. To the author, without the idle class, humanity never have emerged from barbarism.

However, Russell also emphasizes that these people who have made a difference in the idle class were a minority, because they were different from thousands of landowners and merchants, who did not think beyond their daily experiences. Nowadays, however, it is necessary to think about quality educational processes for all, involving the discovery of creative values. The categories time, space, competition, solidarity,

ecosystem, quality of work, are restructuring and, in this context, the activities with purely economic values are giving way to more hedonistic values and new communitarianism, and education has a lot to build on these new values.

Breaking the boundaries between leisure and work takes us to all these reflections and makes us believe that the experiences and conceptions of leisure are gradually becoming a factor that emphasizes the quality of the experience instead of the type of activity performed. Leisure experiences in postmodern societies seem to be more determined by subjective than objective factors, that used to rule the experiences of leisure in modern times. This does not mean that we are in a process of dissociation between the system and the people, a dissociation of the collective world to a world full of subjectivity, but human and social experiences performed in new ways, which favor the emergence of new types of individualism and communitarianism.

The concepts of free time and leisure bring, therefore, values and behaviors of predominantly modern values. The dependence relationships of leisure over work, or the dimensions of life to the working world, are still the result of a perspective of values of modern society, which in its genesis is based on values and beliefs accepted by the bourgeois ideal (Gaya, 1997). As Lafargue (1991, 59) points, referring to the nineteenth century, “it is necessary do defend work and not impose it”. In the twenty-first century, we argue that it is necessary to defend work and leisure, as dimensions of daily life, and not impose them. Paraphrasing Kumar (1997, p. 17), there seems to be something in the experiences of contemporary modern societies that, “in a persistent way, causes not only the ‘sense of finish’, but also new beginnings”. And in these new beginnings we must defend our perspectives to understand the relations between leisure, free time and work hours.

Conclusion

In contemporary times, leisure moves within modern and postmodern logic, in a scale of values that goes from leisure to recover from the fatigue caused by work, passing through consumerist demonstrations, until experiences of human development, with relative autonomy in relation to labor, market and social pressures. Therefore, to say that leisure is a concept that is materialized within a set of practices that are inserted in the logic of pleasure, personal fulfillment, and/or free time for oneself, that are experiences opposed to work or part of social practices associated with consumption is to simplify a complex and broad concept, that cannot be understood with a superficial reading, as often happens nowadays.

By the economic and sociocultural transformations experienced in current time and reflected in leisure experiences, perhaps we are not yet able to give a modern interpretation, to our modern mentality, about this social phenomenon. It is a time with new realities and settings, its interpretation requires new categories and also new language, for which we have yet not developed a theoretical frame. However, we can affirm that profound changes are being made in the work environment, as well as in free time and leisure, changes that are beginning to unfold, breaking barriers, and creating new paradigms in this relationship. The fact that we reflect about unconventional issues such as leisure and free time, building a dialogue between individual and society, interacting with each other in leisure space and time, is leading us to the appearance of new values. In addition to that, new readings and perspectives of leisure do not represent harmony and consensus around this concept, because overcoming perspectives always leads to new ambivalent and multidirectional perspectives.

References

- BAUMANN, Z. & TESTER, K. (2002): *La ambivalencia de la modernidad y otras conversaciones*. Original: Conversations with Zygmunt Bauman (2001). Translation: Albert Roca Álvarez. Barcelona. Piadós.
- BRASILEIRO, M. D. S. (2012): Desenvolvimento e turismo: para além do paradigma econômico. In: BRASILEIRO, M. D. S.; MEDINA, J. C. C.; CORIOLANO, L. N.: *Turismo, cultura e desenvolvimento*. Campina Grande. EDUEPB, p. 75-98.
- CUENCA CABEZA, M. (2000): *Ocio Humanista*. Bilbao. Universidad de Deusto.
- DE MASI, D. (1999): *A emoção é a regra*. Original: L'emozione e la regola (1989). Tradução: Elia Ferreira Edel. 4ª ed. Rio de Janeiro. José Olympio Editorial.
- DE MASI, D. (2000): *O futuro do trabalho*. Original: Il futuro del lavoro (1999). Tradução: Yadyr A. Figueiredo. 4ª ed. Rio de Janeiro. José Olympio Editorial.
- DEL PINO ARTACHO, J.; DUASO AGUADO, A.; MARTÍNEZ, C. (2001): *Prácticas de ocio, cambio cultural y nuevas tecnologías en la juventud española de fin de siglo*. Madrid. Centro de Investigación Sociológica.
- EAGLETON, T. (1998): *As ilusões do pós-modernismo*. Original: The Ilusions of Postmodernism (1996). Translation: Elisabeth Barbosa. Rio de Janeiro. Jorge Zahar.
- ELIAS, N. (1992): *A busca da excitação*. Original: The Quest for Excitement (1985). Translation: Maria Manuela Almeida e Silva. Lisboa. Difusão Editorial.
- FEATHERSTONE, M. (2000): *Cultura de consumo y posmodernismo*. Original: Consumer Culture and Postmodernism (1991). Translation: Eduardo Sinnott. Buenos Aires. Amorrortu editores.
- FORTUNA, C. (1995): Sociologia e práticas de lazer. IN: *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*. Nº 43, p. 5-10.

- GAYA, A. (1997): Lazer e trabalho: os limites ideológicos de uma relação de subserviência. IN: COSTA, L. (editor): *Meio Ambiente e desporto: uma perspectiva internacional*. Porto. Universidade do Porto, p. 145-153.
- GIL, F. (1998): El papel del ocio: entre la discriminación y la liberación. IN: GIL, F. (coord.): *Para comprender el ocio*. Navarra. Ed. Verbo Divino, p. 33-51.
- LAFARQUE, P. (1991): *O direito a preguiça*. Original: *Le Droit a la Paresse* (1883). Translation: Antônio José Massano. 3ª ed. Lisboa. Ed. Teorema.
- LASH, S. (1997): La reflexividad y sus dobles: estructura, estética, comunidad. IN: BECK, U., GIDDENS, A. e LASH, S.: *Modernización reflexiva – política, tradición y estética en el orden social moderno*. Original: *Reflexive, Modernization, Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics* (1994). Translation: Jesus Alborés. Madrid. Alianza.
- LEIF, J. (1992): *Tiempo libre y tiempo para uno mismo*. Madrid. Narcea Ed.
- LÓPEZ DE LA VIEJA, M. T. (1998): Ocio y punto de vista moral. IN: GIL, Fernando (coord.): *Para comprender el ocio*. Navarra. Ed. Verbo Divino, p. 13-31.
- MARTÍN HORCAJO, M. (2003): El deporte en las sociedades postmodernas. IN: MOSQUERA, M. J. e GAMBAU, V.: *Deporte y Postmodernidad: VII Congreso de la AEISAD*. Madrid. Esteban Sanz, p. 25-45.
- MAZÓN, T. (2001): *Sociología del Turismo*. Madrid. Ed. Centro de Estudios Ramón Areces.
- MONTANER, J. (1996): *Psicosociología del turismo*. Madrid. Síntesis.
- PUIG ROVIRA, J. & TRILLA, J. (1996): *La pedagogía del ocio*. Barcelona. Editorial Laertes.
- RAGO, M. (2000): O cassino americano, ou reflexiones sobre o lazer em tempos pós-modernos. IN: BRUHNS, H. T. e GUTIERREZ, L. G. (orgs): *O corpo e o lúdico: ciclo de debates lazer e motricidade*. Campinas. FEF- UNICAMP, p. 05-18.
- REIS, A. C. F. (2012): *Cidades Criativas*. São Paulo. SESI-SP Editora.
- RUIZ OLABUENAGA, J. I. (1994): Ocio y estilos de vida. In: M. JUÁREZ (ed.): *V Informe sociológico sobre la situación social en España*. Madrid. Fundación Foessa.
- RUSSELL, B. (2002): *O elogio ao ócio*. Original: *In Praise of Idleness* (1935). Translation: Pedro Jorgensen Júnior. 4ª ed. Rio de Janeiro. Sextante.
- SAN MARTÍN, J. E. (1997): *Psicosociología del ocio y el turismo*. Granada. ALJIBE.
- TOURAINÉ, A. (2009): *Crítica da Modernidade*. Original: *Critique de la modernité* (1990). Translation: Elia Ferreira Edel. 9ª ed. Petrópolis. Vozes.
- VALLS, J-F. (2000): *Gestión de empresas de turismo y ocio*. Barcelona. ESADE.
- VEBLEN, T. (2004): *Teoría de la clase ociosa*. Original: *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899). Translation: Carlos Mellizo. Madrid. Alianza editorial.

Dilma Brasileiro has a degree in Physical Education from the Federal University of Paraíba (UFPB) / Brazil. She is a Master of Science in Sport Recreation and Leisure, University of Porto / Portugal. She has an European Doctorate in Sociology, Faculty of Political Sciences and Sociology (University of Granada / Spain), with internship at the University of Montpellier 1/França. She has done a Postdoc at the Department of Sociology and Business Law (University of Bologna / Italy). She is a full professor in UFPB and teaches in the Physical Education and Tourism courses (UEPB-UFCG), as well as in the Graduate Program in Regional Development. She leads the Laboratory for the Study of Leisure, Sport, Tourism and Society (LAESTUS / UFPB / CNPq).
dsbrasileiro@gmail.com