

Work-Leisure Relations: Leisure Orientation and the Meaning of Work

Raphael Snir
Itzhak Harpaz
Graduate School of Business
University of Haifa

The relationship between work and leisure, with regard to various aspects of work and its meaning, was examined in two groups of people: leisure-oriented and work-oriented. Leisure-to-work spillover characterized the relations between leisure orientation and the following variables: absolute work centrality, interpersonal contacts, intrinsic orientation, obligation norm, and weekly work hours. Compensation for work by leisure characterized the relation between job satisfaction and leisure orientation. The segmentation between leisure and work hypotheses, regarding economic orientation and entitlement norm, were supported.

KEYWORDS: *Work-leisure relations, leisure orientation, meaning of work*

Introduction

Considerable research has focused on work-non-work relations in general, and on work-leisure relations in particular. Three basic models have been suggested in the literature: spillover, compensation, and segmentation. The spillover model states that the nature of one's work experiences will carry over into the non-work domain and affect attitudes and behaviors there (Wilensky, 1960). According to the compensation model, workers who experience a sense of deprivation at work will compensate in their choice of non-work activities (Wilensky, 1960). In contrast to these two models, Dubin's (1958, 1973) segmentation model claims that no relation exists between one's work and one's non-work domains; the two are lived out independently. In reviewing the empirical literature, Champoux (1981) concluded that the evidence does not allow any conclusion as to which of the models is most valid. In a more recent study by Tait, Padgett, and Baldwin (1989), the results suggest that the spillover model may be the most accurate means of characterizing the relationship between work and non-work satisfaction. However, a number of studies have found support for either the compensation model or the segmentation model (Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991). On the other hand, Kelly and Kelly (1994) found neither a complementary nor a compensatory relationship between work and either family or leisure.

Address correspondence to Raphael Snir, Graduate School of Business, University of Haifa, Haifa 31905, Israel; Email: r.snir@iname.com

Author note: This research was supported by a grant from the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), Jerusalem, and by the Israel Association for Research Funds.

The inconsistency of findings caused several authors to give up searching for general regularity in work-non-work relations, and to seek regular relations only in various subgroups of people (Champoux, 1978; Kabanoff, 1980; Shaffer, 1987).

Elizur (1991) claimed that the varying aspects of the work and non-work domains may be characterized by different patterns of relationship. Using the facet analysis approach, he distinguished and defined two basic facets, namely behavior modality (instrumental, affective, and cognitive) and social environment (work and home). He found a clear distinction between work and home regions. Further analysis revealed a compensation type of relationship between work and home in the instrumental and cognitive items, and segmentation in the affective items. The results thus contradicted the conventional approaches that consider work and non-work to be unitary concepts and attempt to establish which of the three models (spillover, compensation, or segmentation) best characterizes their relationships.

Other alternatives to the conventional approaches have focused on the direction of influence in work-non-work relations. Kohn (1990) suggested that the flow of influence might not be all one-way, and that family and leisure might have some influence on work orientation. Kirchmeyer (1992) described how family and other non-work domains can affect attitudes and behaviors at work. She argued that by active participation in non-work domains, such as family, recreation, and community, workers can increase the number of privileges enjoyed beyond work-related ones, buffer the strains of work, gain contacts and information valuable to work, and develop useful skills and perspectives for work. Cohen (1997a) found that non-work domain variables were significantly related to withdrawal cognitions. He also found that non-work domain variables affected organizational commitment (Cohen, 1997b). Overall, in reviewing the empirical literature, Watkins and Subich (1995) note the increasing accord that work is inextricably intertwined with other aspects of life.

From previous studies it may be assumed that no overall pattern exists in work-non-work relations (Champoux, 1981; Elizur, 1991). These relations, as well as the direction of influence in them, can vary among different subgroups of people and as a function of the different aspects of the two domains. The present study focuses on the relationship between work and leisure, as one of the major aspects of non-work. Since little empirical research has been conducted on the association between leisure orientation and the meaning of work, we aim to examine this phenomenon and to scrutinize it over time.

The literature lacks an empirical examination of human behavior across time in general, and work-leisure relations in particular. Methodological problems, as well as the practical complexities of such studies, mainly account for this lacuna. Nevertheless, studies focusing on work-leisure relations' phenomena over time seem to be important and are of a potential contribution. Society is not static, organizations and their environments are

constantly changing. Within this dynamic structure, the nature of the relationship between work and leisure should also be examined over time. Such an investigation has a potential to contribute to analysis and prediction of possible trends, and to better generalisations about consequences of meaning of work/leisure patterns.

Growth in Leisure Importance and Leisure Orientation

There are indications that the importance of leisure in individuals' lives is increasing. Analyzing the 1980 USA Census Data, Hunnicutt (1988) has found support to the conventional construct of a negatively inclined supply curve of labor—once a certain wage level was reached, higher wages were associated with shorter work hours. In the USA, free time increased from an average of 34 hours a week in 1965 to 40.5 hours a week in 1985 (Robinson, 1990). Calculations from some preliminary estimates in 1993-96 diary studies showed that the amount of free time was close to the 1985 figures (Robinson & Blair, 1995). Moreover, Neulinger (1976) observed that one-third of free time was reported to be experienced as leisure, demonstrating the growing impact of leisure on individuals and society. According to the results of a survey on time-use patterns of Israelis, 24% of their daily time was dedicated to leisure activities in 1991-92 (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1995). The daily unstructured leisure time (i.e., marginal leisure time, which does not include time dedicated to unpaid work, education, or religion) of Israelis was forecast to increase from an average of 5.54 hours in 1992 to 5.9 hours in 2010, and to 7.0 hours in 2025 (Interdisciplinary Center for Technological Analysis and Forecasting, 1998).

Several authors (Offe, 1984; Opaschowski, 1985; Quintanilla-Ruiz & Wilpert, 1991) claim that the increment in leisure importance signifies a decrease in work importance. Offe (1984) describes the subjective-normative influence of working as becoming more marginal in the individual's life space, as reflected in the reduction of working hours and the growing importance of leisure. The notion of the steady advance of leisure-related values at the expense of work-related values is echoed by Opaschowski (1985), who characterizes this apparent trend as a farewell to the work society. Changes, though small, in the meaning of work have been reported by Quintanilla-Ruiz and Wilpert (1991). They found a decrease in work centrality among German samples over a six-year period, with the value of work roles decreasing and the value of leisure activities increasing. In 1989, the relative importance of leisure was even higher than that of work. However, these authors argued that neither society as a whole nor individuals could completely forgo the function of work as a central mechanism of distributing goods and benefits. Work remained important in the development and maintenance of a person's identity (Quintanilla-Ruiz & Wilpert, 1991). Nevertheless, even if the role of work remains important, the role of leisure is apparently assuming significantly greater importance in most developed countries (England, 1991; Harpaz, 1999; MOW-International Research Team, 1987).

This increase in leisure importance, whether or not it is at the expense of work, is perhaps an indication of the need to research leisure orientation more systematically. Burdge (1961) defined leisure orientation as the attitude of an individual or a group of individuals to leisure. Studies have addressed this topic (e.g., Beatty, Jeon, & Albaum, 1994; Dattilo, Dattilo, Samdahl, & Kleiber, 1994; van Delden, 1971; Spreitzer & Snyder, 1987; Weiner & Hunt, 1983) and some related topics, such as leisure motivation (e.g., Manfreda, Driver, & Tarrant, 1996) and leisure ethic (e.g., Hirschfeld & Feild, 2000). For instance, Weiner and Hunt (1983) found that students were positively oriented toward work as well as leisure. Dattilo et al., (1994) found that self-esteem is differently correlated with different aspects of leisure orientation among low income overweight women.

However, unlike most studies concerning leisure orientation, the present study has high external validity, since it is based on two representative samples of the (Israeli) labor force. Furthermore, the fact that data was gathered from the first sample in 1981 and from the second sample in 1993, through the Meaning of Work project (MOW—International Research Team, 1987), enables an examination of stability or change over time, concerning the association between leisure orientation and the meaning of work.

Leisure participation has a beneficial effect on satisfaction, psychological well-being, and health (Coleman, 1993; Coleman & Iso-Ahola, 1993). Among the psychological aspects listed by many scholars as conducive to these positive outcomes is the opportunity for skill utilization, self-expression and self-actualization, need gratification, freedom of choice, and an avenue to develop one's sense of competence (Melamed, Meir, & Samson, 1995).

Since both leisure and work occupy a major part of a person's life, first it is important to comprehend the meaning of work concept as a framework for examining its relation with leisure.

Meaning of Work: Theoretical Model and Conceptualization

Despite the relatively recent interest in this topic, a well-articulated theory of the meaning of work (MOW) has not yet been developed. The pioneering classic project of the Meaning of Work International Research Team resulted only in a heuristic model based on the conception that the meaning of work is determined by the choices and experiences of individuals, and by the organizational and environmental context in which they work and live (MOW—International Research Team, 1987). The conceptualization presented here is based on the MOW research project, carried out comparatively in eight countries (Belgium, Britain, Japan, Netherlands, USA, West-Germany, former Yugoslavia and Israel). It portrays the meaning of work in terms of six major notions or dimensions: work centrality, economic orientation, interpersonal relations, intrinsic orientation, entitlement norm, and obligation norm. The core concept addressed by each dimension is described below (for the empirical process leading to the extraction of these six variables, see Method).

Work Centrality

Work is one of the most basic and important activities for people in modern society. The assertion that work plays a central and fundamental role in the life of individuals has been supported empirically in most industrialized countries (Brief & Nord, 1990; England & Misumi, 1986; Mannheim, 1993). Studies by Dubin and others (Dubin, Champoux, & Porter, 1975; Dubin, Hedley, & Taveggia, 1976) were helpful in developing this concept, which refers to the degree of general importance that working has in one's life at any given time (MOW—International Research Team, 1987).

There are two major theoretical components of the work centrality construct, each with specific properties. The first, absolute work centrality, involves a belief or value orientation toward work as a life role. The second, relative work centrality, involves a decision orientation about preferred life spheres for behavior. The relative work importance component parallels Dubin's (1956) central life interests and Barker's (1968) theory of behavioral settings. In general, work has been found to be of relatively high importance as compared with other areas of life (England, 1991; Quintanilla-Ruiz & Wilpert, 1991). It is usually considered to be of more importance than leisure, community, and religion and was found in several studies to be ranked second only to family (Harding & Hikspoors, 1995; Harpaz, 1999; MOW—International Research Team, 1987). High work centrality has been found to be positively related to important organizational variables, such as job satisfaction, participation in decision making (Kanungo, 1982), and longer job tenure (Dubin et al., 1975). Individuals with high work centrality seem to be more committed to their organizations and derive a purpose and contentment from their jobs. Hence, it is conceivable that a sudden acquisition of a large sum of money or wealth would not prompt these individuals to relinquish their jobs.

Economic Orientation

This sphere stems from one's disposition to instrumental or extrinsic work outcomes. It assumes that people work mainly for, are motivated by, and enjoy obtaining the instrumental aspects of their work context. The importance of instrumental rewards tends to vary according to their attractiveness to individuals and their ability to satisfy various needs (Lawler, 1994). In the Meaning of Work project, in the six countries where this question was posed, income was the most dominant valued work outcome, preceding various expressive and other aspects (MOW—International Research Team, 1987). In Israel, income was selected as the most important work outcome by more than 30 percent of the sample representing the labor force in the 1980s, and by 43 percent in the 1990s (Harpaz, 1999).

There are a number of contentions and findings claiming that contrary to common belief, intrinsic or expressive needs are not the only important aspect of work for people, and that instrumental variables are important as well (Dubin et al., 1975; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1992). It was disclosed that

the most important role of work with which people identify is that of providing income for sustaining life and fulfilling other important needs (England & Harpaz, 1990; MOW—International Research Team, 1987). Accordingly, it seems that people with an acute inclination to instrumental or economic values perceive work as a main vehicle for providing income.

Interpersonal Relations

Humans are social beings and interaction among them is essential for their mental health (McAdams, 1988). The importance of interpersonal relations among people, for their well being and subsistence, has been extensively discussed by various scholars (Battle, 1990; Kulik, Mahler, & Moore, 1996; Wright, 1984). The need for affiliation, and specifically the desire for friendly and close interpersonal relationships, is part of most need theories (McClelland, 1985). In their classic typology of the meanings and functions of work that seem to incorporate the findings of most of the research, Kaplan and Tausky (1974) emphasize the prominence of "satisfying interpersonal experiences," and point out that satisfaction stems from affiliations established at work (Kaplan & Tausky, 1974). The influence of social relations at work was also demonstrated by the results attained by the MOW project's outcomes (England, 1991; MOW—International Research Team, 1987).

Intrinsic Orientation

This concept emphasizes individuals' needs, including their evaluation of their competence for the job and whether or not the work task allows them an appropriate level of self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 1985). It is generally agreed that intrinsic or expressive variables include work aspects such as an interesting job, variety, autonomy, challenging work, and so on. Such expressive work aspects were found to be important for the development of a strong job involvement among employees (Kanungo, 1982; Vroom, 1962). Several scholars define or equate job involvement or components of it with work centrality or with the view of work as a central life interest (Lodahl & Keiner, 1965; Pinder, 1998).

Interesting work was the most dominant work goal for a representative sample of the labor force in seven countries. This finding was consistent internationally, across different managerial and organizational hierarchies, as well as demographic variables (MOW—International Research Team, 1987). Intrinsic orientation emerged as the strongest predictor of work centrality in Germany, Israel, Japan, and the United States, prompting the researchers to argue that intrinsic orientation seems to be a universal phenomenon (Harpaz & Fu, 1997).

Entitlement and Obligation: Societal Norms Regarding Work

Based on Triandis's (1972) work on subjective culture, a set of normative assumptions were developed about what one should expect from work and

working (opportunities or entitlements) and what one should expect to contribute through working (obligations). The *entitlement norm* represents the underlying rights of individuals and the work-related responsibilities of society and organizations to all individuals (i.e., all members of society are entitled to have work if they so desire). These notions of entitlements or rights derive from standards or reasoning about property rights and the psychological contract as applied to the work setting. The *obligation norm* represents the work duties of all individuals to organizations and to society (i.e., everyone has a duty to contribute to society by working). The notion of obligations or duties derives from standards of reasoning about internalized personal responsibility and social or institutional commitment, in accordance with the Protestant work ethic (Randall & Cote, 1991). In the Meaning of Work study, an evaluative rather than a descriptive meaning of norms was utilized. That is, norms indicate what should be, rather than what is; they involve general expectations about appropriate behavior concerning working (MOW—International Research Team, 1987). Moreover, it appears that if a society generally holds positive norms and attitudes towards work, work is central and highly cherished; in such a society, it would be considered a deviation from the norm to stay away from the work force, or not actively to seek employment.

Finally, some additional variables were examined in the MOW study to provide information on a number of other aspects of the work situation and work-related attitudes (MOW—International Research Team, 1987). Two of these variables are especially relevant for the present research topic: weekly work hours and job satisfaction.

Leisure Orientation and the Meaning of Work

Based on the notion that there is no overall pattern in work-non-work relations (Champoux, 1981; Elizur, 1991), this section examines the relationship between work and leisure, as one of the major aspects of non-work, in two different groups of people (the leisure-oriented and the work-oriented) concerning various aspects of work and its meaning. A comparison between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people does not necessarily imply that the two groups are totally distinct. Operationalizations of multiple roles have begun to take into account the quality of the role rather than merely role occupancy (McBride, 1990). Furthermore, even the two domains, work and leisure, are not utterly differentiated. Primeau (1996) demonstrated how distinctions between work and leisure are culturally bound and perpetuated the assumption that they are dichotomous experiences.

Building on the available scant literature, a set of hypotheses was developed and tested in the present study:

Absolute Work Centrality

We did not find studies that attempted directly to examine the relationship between leisure orientation and absolute work centrality. Using data

from 349 employed individuals, Hirschfeld and Feild (2000) found negative correlation between leisure ethic and work centrality. There is also reference in the literature to the relationship between relative work importance and absolute work importance. According to Harpaz (1990), relative work importance and absolute work importance do have some conceptual similarities. Both include properties of involvement; both have relational properties (the relational property in absolute work importance is the work in relation to self, while in relative work importance it is work in relation to other life aspects); and both are concerned with a person's identification with working in general. Based on these conceptual similarities, we predicted:

H1:

Leisure will spill over into work. Valuing leisure more than work will reduce absolute work importance; that is, the absolute work importance of leisure-oriented people will be lower than that of work-oriented people.

Economic Orientation

We did not find studies focusing specifically on the relation between leisure orientation and economic (work) orientation. However, there are indications in the literature on the importance of economic reasons for working. Money plays an important role in the life of most people (Lawler, 1971). Economic reasons for working are as important as ever, and to that extent work remains central in people's lives (Haywood, Kew, Bramham, Spink, Capenerhurst, & Henry, 1989). Even if work is defined as a means to some other end, like leisure, generating income still constitutes one of the basic reasons for employment. Based on these claims, we expected:

H2:

In accordance with the segmentation model, there will be no difference between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people regarding economic (work) orientation.

Interpersonal Relations

Tinsley, Hinson, Tinsley, and Holt (1993) examined the attributes characteristic of common and memorable leisure experiences and work experiences. The most apparent differences were found between work experiences and the two categories of leisure experiences. Leisure experiences were found to involve attributes such as companionship and enjoyment, while work experiences involved attributes such as fulfillment, accomplishment, responsibility, and extrinsic rewards.

Blickle, Goenner, and Heider (1998) examined the relationship among vocational orientations, values, and motives in a sample of young German workers. Leisure orientation was correlated with affiliation motives. Work also fulfills social functions, by providing opportunities for meeting new people and developing friendships (Donald & Havighurst, 1959; Steers & Porter, 1975; Warr, 1981). Establishing and maintaining interpersonal relations take on particular importance when the type of work requires group efforts. How-

ever, we assumed that leisure-oriented people, as an outcome of their personal inclination, had a stronger need to use friendship opportunities at the workplace than work-oriented people. Hence, we expected:

H3:

There will be a leisure-to-work spillover: leisure-oriented people will attribute more importance to interpersonal relations at work than will work-oriented people.

Intrinsic Orientation

From a psychological perspective, leisure has been associated with perceived freedom, intrinsic motivation, and non-instrumentality (Neulinger, 1976). Leisure is seen as intrinsically motivated and as an end in itself, rather than as a means to an end. This definition dates from the ancient Greeks, who spoke of *schol'e* (leisure) as a contemplative activity pursued for its own sake (de Grazia, 1962). Dumazedier (1974) described leisure as disinterested (having no utilitarian purpose) and hedonistic. Several studies substantiated the presence of intrinsic satisfaction in subjective leisure across many activity contexts (Iso-Ahola, 1979; Kelly, 1978). Unger and Kernan (1983) found that intrinsic satisfaction is one of the most important determinants of subjective leisure present across a variety of situational contexts. Weissinger and Bandalos (1995) defined Intrinsic Leisure Motivation Disposition as a tendency to seek intrinsic rewards in leisure behavior. They assumed that the strength of this tendency would differ across individuals, but would remain relatively stable within individuals. Hence we expected:

H4:

Leisure-oriented people tend to prefer leisure, rather than work, as a valued domain for obtaining intrinsic rewards. Hence, a leisure-to-work spillover will take place, and the intrinsic (work) orientation of leisure-oriented people will be weaker than that of work-oriented people.

Entitlement Norm

Israeli workers have experienced greater job insecurity in the last two decades, since the Histadrut (General Federation of Labor) has lost much of its power. According to Zusman (1995), as the trend toward a market economy has grown stronger, the trade union has come to be perceived as a negative force, harming the flexibility of the labor market. Thus, the Histadrut's influence on the determination of salaries has been significantly reduced, and largely replaced by personal contracts as a means of setting salaries and working conditions (Shirom, 1995). The employment conditions of about 50 percent of Israeli wage earners are now settled through personal contract (Zusman, 1995). Greater job insecurity is not a unique Israeli phenomenon. For example, American workers have also experienced it during the last decade (Aronowitz & Di Fazio, 1994; Moore, 1996). We assumed that because of this feeling of occupational insecurity, the entitlement norm (i.e. the notion that a job should be provided to every individual who desires to

work) was held by most Israeli workers, whether or not they were leisure-oriented or work-oriented. Hence:

H5:

In keeping with the segmentation model, there will be no difference between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people regarding the entitlement norm.

Obligation Norm

The obligation norm is the normative belief that all individuals have a duty to contribute to society through work (MOW-International Research Team, 1987). Leisure is often described as "free", that is, something one perceives as voluntary, without coercion or obligation (Dumazedier, 1974; Ennis, 1968; Huizinga, 1950; Stephenson, 1967). This property of leisure, like intrinsic satisfaction, derives from the Aristotelian definition of leisure: freedom from the necessity to work (de Grazia, 1962). The concept of freedom has been central to philosophical approaches to leisure since Aristotle (Goodale & Goodbey, 1988; Kelly, 1992). Several authors have asserted that perceived freedom is the single precondition of subjective leisure (Bregha, 1980; Kaplan, 1975; Neulinger, 1976). Unger and Kernan (1983) found perceived freedom to be one of three determinants of subjective leisure present across a variety of situational contexts. Hence,

H6:

The need for freedom is likely to spill over into the work domain for leisure-oriented people, whose obligation norm will be weaker than that of work-oriented people.

Weekly Work Hours

Work involvement may include behavioral elements, such as the amount of time spent participating in work activities (Harpaz, 1990). Quintanilla-Ruiz and Wilpert (1991) found a decrease in work centrality and an increase in leisure importance among German samples over a six-year period. They claimed that this may coincide with a real reduction in hours worked during this period. Persons high in the commitment component of intrinsic leisure motivation tended to value leisure behaviors and feel dedicated to ensuring leisure in their lives (Weissinger & Bandalos, 1995). Accordingly, we expected to find differences between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people in regard to the amount of time spent participating in work activities. Leisure was expected to spill over into work in the following manner:

H7:

Leisure-oriented people will tend to work fewer hours per week than work-oriented people.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a function of the discrepancy between what is desired in a job and what is actually experienced, as a standard of comparison (Rice,

McFarlin, & Bennett, 1989). Work centrality has been found to be positively related to job satisfaction (Kanungo, 1982). Alternative causal models have been developed, relating work centrality and job satisfaction to antecedents and outcomes. While all models proved acceptable, the strongest model posited job satisfaction as an antecedent rather than an outcome of work centrality (Mannheim, Baruch, & Tal, 1997). Spreitzer and Snyder (1987) found that leisure involvement could serve as a partial compensation for deficits in job satisfaction. Based on these findings, we expected:

H8:

There will be compensation for work by leisure. Therefore, as job satisfaction increases in value, the likelihood of being leisure-oriented will decrease.

Method

Samples

Data were collected through the Meaning of Work project initially conducted by this study's second author, in 1981, and then again in 1993.

The 1981 Sample

In 1981, a questionnaire probing the Meaning of Work was completed by a representative sample of the Israeli labor force, consisting of 973 respondents. The sample was drawn from 10 socioeconomic strata as defined by the Central Bureau of Statistics, using an ecological method. Eight strata represented the urban areas, covering 95% of the Israel's citizens; while the remaining two strata represented the rural settlements, according to Israel's population distribution. This resulted in stepwise random selection according to random household identification, random choice among those who fell within prescribed categories, and random quota sampling according to the specifications of the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics.

Specifically, 35% of the sample was drawn from the four largest cities in Israel (Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa, and Beer Sheva), 35% from "old" cities (founded before the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948), 13% from "new" cities (founded after 1948), 6% from old urban settlements (towns administered by a local municipality), 7% from new urban settlements, 1.5% from old rural settlements, and 2.5% from new rural settlements. The stratification of the sample ensured a high level of representation and decreased sampling error.

Each city was divided into sub-districts, and within each district streets were randomly selected according to their representation; and only in the range of the sampling error, so its population was organized in a less heterogeneous stratum. The sampling unit was the family living in an apartment or a house. In each street interviewers went to the first house, then from house to house, entering every apartment until they completed the number of interviews allocated to that street. (Thus, a systematic bias of the sample was prevented; i.e. it eliminated the tendency of interviewers to enter only

the lower floors, as most Israelis tend to live in apartment houses). Individuals were interviewed in their homes by professional interviewers from a national survey agency, according to the University of Michigan's "Kish Method" (Kish, 1967). Namely, the interviewer was asked to compile a list of all people, aged 18 and above, who permanently live in the same household. After the first interviewee was chosen, the interviewer proceeded to interview every third person on the list. This system ensures that two principles are taken into consideration: first, a proper representation of families with respect to their size, which eliminates over-representation of small families or under-representation of large families. The second principle—a lack of bias according to the availability of family members to the interview. Women, housewives, mothers of young children, and people over 65 tend to spend more time at home. Drawing up lists of family members and interviewing every third person prevented systematic bias of this kind.

Finally, an average interview lasted about 25 minutes, and about 87% of all individuals approached for interviewing agreed to participate. Comparisons with regard to census data showed a high degree of representation (MOW—International Research Team, 1987).

The sample population comprised 57.4% men and 42.6% women, with a mean age of 39.4 years. Regarding educational level, 19.1% had primary school education, 46.1% had a secondary school education, 18.5% had some college or vocational/technical education, and 16.3% had a university degree.

The 1993 Sample

Data on a new representative sample of the labor force were collected in 1993. The same procedures as those of the 1981 study for sampling and interviewing were followed in the 1993 study. Specifically, respondents were selected by various random methods and were interviewed individually in their homes by professional interviewers from a national survey agency. The questionnaire contained the same items used in the 1981 sample, an average interview again lasted about 25 minutes, and 84% of all individuals asked to be interviewed agreed to participate in the study. Likewise, comparisons with census data of the *Statistical Abstracts of Israel* (1995) showed a high degree of representation.

The 1993 sample population consisted of 942 respondents, including 57.9% men and 42.1% women, mean age 38.2 years. In education, 6.9% had primary education, 50.3% had secondary education, 21.9% had some college or vocational/technical education, and 20.9% had a university degree.

Measures

The Meaning of Work Dimensions

Below is a description of the five meaning of work domains and their measurement scales, followed by a description of the procedure for the ex-

traction and development of the six dimensions used in the present study. These five domains were employed in the 1981 Israeli data collection, as a part of the MOW study (MOW—International Research Team, 1987). For maintenance of uniformity for replication and comparability, they were also used in the 1993 Israeli data collection.

The Meaning of Work is an original and pioneering cross-national project initiated in the late 1970s by a group of researchers from eight countries. A model consisting of five domains was jointly formulated and empirically tested in each country. These domains include work centrality, societal norms regarding work, work goals, valued work outcomes, and work-role identification (MOW-International Research Team, 1987). Each of these domains was designed uniquely to capture the multidimensionality and richness embodied in attitudes to work and work values. A short description of the domains follows.

Centrality of work. Two measures of work centrality were used. The first was a Likert-type scale measure of absolute work centrality, indicating the importance of work from 1 (low) to 7 (high). The second was a measure of relative work centrality, which had respondents assign up to a total of 100 points to the following areas of their lives: leisure, community, work, religion, and family.

Valued work outcomes. Respondents were asked to assign up to a total of 100 points to the following six outcomes provided by work: status and prestige, income, time absorption, interesting contacts, service to society, and interest and satisfaction.

Work-role identification. To examine how people define and identify work in terms of various roles, respondents were asked to rank six work roles according to their importance: task, company, product/service, co-workers, occupation, and money.

Importance of work goals. Respondents were asked to rank eleven goals or aspects of their work life in order of their importance: opportunity to learn, interpersonal relations, promotion, work hours, variety, interesting work, job security, match between job and abilities, pay, working conditions, and autonomy.

Societal norms regarding work. Respondents were asked to evaluate a set of statements about work, in terms of what one should expect from work, or entitlements (i.e., "If a worker's skills become outdated, his/her employer should be responsible for retraining"), and what one should contribute through working, or obligations (i.e., "It is the duty of every able-bodied citizen to contribute to society by working"). Respondents rated each of ten normative statements from 1 (disagree) to 4 (agree).

The scores of the 39 questions measuring the five MOW domains described above were subjected to a principal component factor analysis. Factors with Eigen values exceeding 1.0 were rotated to simple structure by the varimax procedure. Factor loadings with an absolute value greater than or equal to .40 were used to define and interpret the factors (MOW-International Research Team, 1987). The analysis resulted in six major work-

related indices, which were found operationally to define and represent the MOW domains. To examine the stability of the structure of these scales (or indices) between 1981 and 1993, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted by the LISREL method (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1981). Our structural model hypothesized that each of the indices would maintain its stability concerning the items that composed it. The analysis showed that the measurement model was solid, all the indicators loaded at least moderate to high on the latent constructs or dimensions that they represented, consistently over the two time periods ($\chi^2 = 790.98$, $df = 578$; Goodness of Fit Index = .75; Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index = .71, Root Mean Square Residual = .10). Hence, the variables were good indicators of the meaning of work indices across time. The same six indices (constructs) in the structural model emerged at both time periods and, with the exception of the intrinsic orientation toward work dimension, all constructs remained stable. The latter dimension was composed of five indicators in the original 1981 factor analysis, while in 1993 only three indicators loaded on this construct. The indicators of job-abilities match and autonomy were not significant and therefore were dropped from the model. Other than this minor change in the structure of the meaning of work over time, the model indicated that the meaning of work constructs were well linked.

These dimensions and the items composing them were as follows:

Work centrality. (a) absolute centrality of work; (b) relative centrality of work.

Economic orientation. (a) importance of pay; (b) role of money; (c) good pay.

Interpersonal relations. (a) interesting contacts; (b) type of people; (c) good interpersonal relations.

Intrinsic orientation. (a) satisfying work; (b) variety; (c) interesting work; (d) job-abilities match; (e) autonomy.

Entitlement norm. (a) retraining responsibility; (b) ask for suggestions; (c) meaningful work; (d) entitled to a job.

Obligation norm. (a) contribution to society; (b) save for future; (c) value any work.

The major dependent variables analyzed in this study were absolute work centrality, economic orientation, interpersonal relations, intrinsic orientation, entitlement norm, and obligation norm. The relative work centrality measure was used to construct the leisure orientation variable, as described below.

Leisure Orientation

Employed individuals were classified either as leisure-oriented or work-oriented according to their scores on the relative work centrality measure, which required respondents to assign up to a total of 100 points to the following areas of their lives: leisure, community, work, religion, and family. Using relative importance score to establish leisure orientation is based on

the assumption that values are essentially a hierarchical preference structure (Locke, 1976; Rokeach, 1973).

The classification was carried out in the following manner: first, the relative leisure importance score and the relative work importance score were transformed into z scores (within the sample—1981 or 1993—to which the individual belonged). Next, individuals with a higher relative leisure-importance score than their relative work-importance score, and a relative leisure-importance z score equal to or higher than 1, were classified as leisure-oriented. Individuals with a higher relative work-importance score than their relative leisure-importance score, and a relative work-importance z score equal to or higher than 1, were classified as work-oriented. In the 1981 sample, the average relative leisure-importance score was 17.93 ($SD = 15.67$), and the average relative work-importance score was 27.77 ($SD = 18.73$). In the 1993 sample, the average relative leisure-importance score was 20.02 ($SD = 16.64$), and the average relative work-importance score was 31.16 ($SD = 18.52$).

From both the 1981 sample and the 1993 sample, 217 individuals were classified as leisure-oriented and 381 individuals were classified as work-oriented. Table 1 presents the distributions of sex, educational level, age, marital status, and type of work among leisure-oriented versus work-oriented people.

Weekly Work Hours

Weekly work hours were measured by the question: "On the average, how many hours a week do you work (including overtime)?"

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was computed from the following two questions:

Q1: "If you were to start all over again, would you again choose your occupation or would you choose a different one?" (1) A different occupation. (2) The same occupation.

Q2: "Would you recommend your occupation to your children for their work?" (1) No. (2) Yes.

The scale was calculated in the following way: Job satisfaction = $Q1 + Q2 - 1$.

Statistical Analysis

To examine the relation between job satisfaction and leisure orientation, logistic regression analysis was used. Hypotheses regarding absolute work centrality, economic orientation, interpersonal relations, intrinsic orientation, entitlement norm, obligation norm, and weekly work hours were examined via multivariate analyses of variance. Each MANOVA included two independent variables: leisure orientation and the year of labor force sampling.

TABLE 1
Distribution of Demographic Variables Among Leisure-Oriented People Versus Work-Oriented People

Variables	Leisure-Oriented People			Work-Oriented People		
	1981 Sample (<i>n</i> = 104)	1993 Sample (<i>n</i> 113)	Both Samples (<i>n</i> = 217)	1981 Sample (<i>n</i> = 169)	1993 Sample (<i>n</i> = 212)	Both Samples (<i>n</i> = 381)
<i>Sex (%)</i>						
Male	53.9	71.4	63.1	70.4	68.7	69.5
Female	46.1	28.6	36.9	29.6	31.3	30.5
<i>Education (%)</i>						
Elementary school	6.9	4.5	5.6	16.8	8.0	11.9
High school	63.7	64.3	64.0	55.7	43.4	48.8
Some college and college degree	29.4	31.2	30.4	37.5	48.6	39.3
<i>Age (years)</i>						
Mean	34.0	33.1	33.6	40.5	38.7	39.5
SD	12.5	11.8	12.1	13.0	12.3	12.6
<i>Marital status (%)</i>						
Married and/or living with a partner in a joint household	55.4	50.4	52.8	82.1	71.8	76.4
<i>Type of Work (%)</i>						
Professional and management	25.6	40.8	33.7	23.9	45.7	33.6
Clerical and services	53.3	41.7	47.2	50.0	40.9	44.7
Production and agriculture	21.1	17.5	19.2	26.1	13.4	18.8

Age is not only a biological and psychological variable but also a socio-cultural and historical one, and it is likely to carry significance for the meaning of leisure (Freyinger, 1995). It was used as a control variable in the logistic regression analysis and as a covariate in the multivariate analyses of variance.

Generally, investigations of sex issues in leisure behavior and experiences have established differences between the leisure of man and women (Dattilo, Dattilo, Samdahl, & Kleiber, 1994; Primeau, 1996). In the present study, however, neither sex nor educational level were included in the inferential statistical analyses since their inclusion had no impact on the pattern

of similarities and/or differences between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people.

In order to find out whether the similarities and/or differences between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people are relatively stable across time, labor-force sampling year was used as a control variable in the logistic regression analysis regarding job satisfaction. Similarly, the multivariate analyses of variance included interaction of leisure orientation by labor force sampling year.

Results

Data pertaining to sample characteristics, such as means, standard deviations, number of items, and range of scores among research variables, are presented in Table 2.

Since the labor force demographic composition did not change significantly from 1981 to 1993 (Harpaz, 1999), neither chance nor sample composition changes can be effectively argued as major challenges to the "realness" of the observed similarities or differences between the 1981 and the 1993 samples.

TABLE 2
Research Variables and Relevant Statistics for the Two Representative Samples of the Israeli Labor Force, 1981 and 1993^a

Variables	1981 Sample		1993 Sample		Number of Items	Range of Scores
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Absolute work importance	5.53	1.32	5.43	1.21	1	1-7
Economic orientation	3.81	1.41	4.62	1.41	3	1-7
Interpersonal relations	3.32	0.95	3.10	0.98	3	1-7
Intrinsic orientation	3.68	0.87	3.68	0.86	5	1-7
Entitlement norm	5.68	0.90	5.50	0.91	4	1-7
Obligation norm	5.23	1.07	5.00	1.08	3	1-7
Job satisfaction	4.83	1.57	3.64	2.52	2	1-7
Weekly work hours	40.68	13.29	43.75	13.19	1	—

^a Variables were constructed from questions based on different scale values, and their items were transformed into a 1-7 scale.

Hypothesis 1 concerning absolute work centrality (leisure-to-work spillover), Hypothesis 2 concerning economic orientation (segmentation), and Hypothesis 3 concerning interpersonal relations (leisure-to-work spillover) were examined via MANOVA. No significant multivariate effect for the interaction of leisure orientation by labor force sampling year was found. The analysis revealed a significant multivariate effect for leisure orientation (Wilks' lambda = 0.921, $F(3,552) = 15.66$, $p < 0.001$). The results of the univariate F tests for the main effect of leisure orientation are presented in Table 3 (see analysis 1).

Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 were supported, as shown respectively in the following findings. H1: the absolute work centrality of leisure-oriented individuals was found to be lower than that of work-oriented individuals. H2: there was no significant difference revealed between leisure-oriented and work-oriented individuals regarding economic orientation. H3: the leisure-

TABLE 3
Results of F Tests for the Main Effect of Leisure Orientation in Three Separate Multivariate Analyses of Variance, with Age as a Covariate

Dependent Variables	F	df	Leisure-Oriented People			Work-Oriented People		
			Mean ^a	SD	Mean ^b	Mean ^a	SD	Mean ^b
Analysis 1								
Absolute work centrality	41.83***	1,554	5.05	1.46	5.06	5.82	1.15	5.81
Economic orientation	1.37	1,554	4.44	1.43	4.40	4.26	1.42	4.26
Interpersonal relations	4.44	1,554	3.29	1.03	3.28	3.06	1.03	3.08
			($n = 199$)			($n = 360$)		
Analysis 2								
Intrinsic orientation	11.72**	1,584	3.50	0.92	3.51	3.78	0.86	3.77
Entitlement norm	1.59	1,584	5.49	0.92	5.49	5.57	0.97	5.59
Obligation norm	5.27*	1,584	4.91	1.12	4.94	5.20	1.09	5.17
			($n = 214$)			($n = 375$)		
Analysis 3								
Weekly work hours	12.32***	1,562	43.54	13.48	43.07	47.23	13.80	47.40
			($n = 205$)			($n = 362$)		

^aObserved mean; ^bAdjusted mean.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

oriented attributed more importance to interpersonal relations at work than did work-oriented individuals.

Hypothesis 4 concerning intrinsic orientation (leisure-to-work spillover), Hypothesis 5 concerning entitlement norm (segmentation), and Hypothesis 6 concerning obligation norm (leisure-to-work spillover) were examined via MANOVA. No significant multivariate effect for the interaction of leisure orientation by labor force sampling year was found. The analysis revealed a significant multivariate effect for leisure orientation (Wilks' lambda = 0.969, $F(3,582) = 6.13$, $p < 0.001$). The results of the univariate F tests for the main effect of leisure orientation are presented in Table 3 (see analysis 2). Hypotheses 4, 5 and 6 were supported, as shown respectively in the following findings. H4: the intrinsic orientation of leisure-oriented individuals was found to be weaker than that of work-oriented individuals. H5: no significant difference was revealed between the two groups regarding the entitlement norm. H6: the obligation norm of leisure-oriented individuals was found to be weaker than that of work-oriented individuals.

Hypothesis 7 concerning weekly work hours (leisure-to-work spillover) was examined via MANOVA. No significant effect for the interaction of leisure orientation by labor force sampling year was found. The analysis revealed a significant effect for leisure orientation. The results of the F test for the main effect of leisure orientation are presented in Table 3 (see analysis 3). Hypothesis 7 was supported, as shown in the following finding. H7: leisure-oriented individuals were found to work fewer hours per week than work-oriented individuals.

Hypothesis 8 concerning the relation between job satisfaction and leisure orientation (compensation for work by leisure) was examined via logistic regression analysis. The predictor variables were age, labor force sampling year, and job satisfaction. The results of the logistic regression analysis predicting leisure orientation are presented in Table 4.

The additional contribution of job satisfaction to the prediction of leisure orientation (beyond the contributions of age and labor force sampling

TABLE 4
Results of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Leisure Orientation

Predictor Variables	Block X^2	df	Model X^2	df	b	SE	Wald	df
(n = 556)								
Block 1	29.39***	2	29.39***	2				
Age					-0.04	0.01	26.20***	1
Labor force sampling year					-0.11	0.18	0.35	1
Block 2	8.07**	1	37.45***	3				
Job satisfaction					-0.12	0.04	7.88**	1

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

year) is significant. As job satisfaction increased in value, the likelihood of being leisure-oriented decreased.

In all of the analyses described above, the similarities or differences between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people remained stable across time.

Discussion

The present study is one of the few on the subject of work-leisure relations based on representative samples of the Israeli labor force. It is also one of the few studies dealing specifically with the topic of leisure orientation. In the USA, free time has increased considerably (Robinson, 1990). Similarly, Quintanilla-Ruiz and Wilpert (1991) found a decrease in weekly work hours among German samples over a six-year period. Mulgan and Wilkinson (1995) cite survey research in Britain which indicated that over 70 percent of people working more than 40 hours per week wanted to work less. Although work is still highly important, the role of leisure seems to assume significantly greater importance (England, 1991; Harpaz, 1999; MOW-International Research Team, 1987).

In view of the increasing importance of leisure, the findings of this study are timely. According to Haywood et al. (1989), early research of work-leisure relations examined the ways in which work may spill over into leisure, or the capacity of leisure to compensate for the shortcomings of work. In either case, leisure was seen as subordinate to work and reflected the conception of the work ethic. In the current study, we have presented and examined a less work-biased set of hypotheses.

The prediction that there is no general regularity in the relations between work and leisure, as one of the major aspects of non-work, was supported. Work-non-work relations can vary among different subgroups of people (Champoux, 1978; Kabanoff, 1980; Shaffer, 1987) and as a function of the different aspects of the two domains (Elizur, 1991). Moreover, the direction of influence on these relations can vary as well (Kohn, 1990). Leisure-to-work spillover was shown to characterize the relations between leisure orientation and the following variables: absolute work centrality, interpersonal relations, intrinsic orientation, obligation norm, and weekly work hours. These findings support Kirchmeyer's (1992) conclusion that for a true understanding of an individual at work, not only should that person's work life be considered but also his/her life away from work. However, this support is somewhat limited, since only the differences between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people concerning absolute work centrality and weekly work hours can be regarded as substantive, and not just statistically significant.

Spreitzer and Snyder's (1987) claim that leisure involvement can serve as a partial compensation for deficits in job satisfaction, is supported by the finding that compensation for work by leisure characterized the relation between job satisfaction and leisure orientation.

The segmentation between leisure and work hypotheses regarding economic orientation and the entitlement norm were supported. Economic

reasons for working, as well as the need for occupational security, have remained important during the last two decades, regardless of one's leisure or work orientation. Indeed, work in the sense of paid employment is still found to be central (Haywood et al., 1989).

The similarities or differences between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people regarding the meaning of work have remained stable across labor force sampling time (1981 and 1993). That the labor force demographic composition did not change significantly from 1981 to 1993 (Harpaz, 1999) lends further support to the study's findings.

Knowledge about stability or changes over time concerning societal value patterns may provide vital information on what is important to individuals, and thus may portray a picture of what they aspire for at a given moment. In the work place this may be related to what are their work goals, what motivates them, and to the importance of a certain reward system, as well as, leisure activities away from work. If organizations are realizing that the value system is relatively stable, it has clear implications regarding various policies concerning continuing to provide outcomes which match the prevailing value system. In contrast, if organizations are realizing that the structure of the work force's value system has shifted, it may thus help them match their plans and policies accordingly.

The use of cross-sectional, correlational data, drawn from two representative samples of the Israeli labor force, does not allow us to make causal inferences concerning the various hypothesized relationships. However, the design of this study using dependent/predicted variables is appropriate because work and non-work are expected to be reciprocally related (Watkins & Subich, 1995). Causal inferences regarding work-leisure relations will be made possible through longitudinal design studies.

From an organizational point of view, the differentiation between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people is, in itself, simplistic. The level of similarities or differences between the two groups depends on the various aspects of work and its meaning. They are not shown to differ in respect of economic orientation and entitlement norm. However, leisure-oriented people show lower levels of absolute work centrality, intrinsic work orientation, obligation norm, and work commitment (in terms of working hours) than work-oriented people; they also attribute greater importance than their work-oriented counterparts to interpersonal relations at work.

There are implications of the study's findings for human resource management concerning employees placement, non-standard forms of employment, and flexible benefits programs. It seems that leisure-oriented people are more suited to positions that provide opportunities for interacting with other people at work and are not very demanding from the aspect of time investment.

Boje (1996) claimed that the growth in non-standard employment and changes in work time patterns are related to the growing demand for higher flexibility in the firms' planning of the production process as well as in the workers' handling of their everyday life. Thus, non-standard forms of em-

ployment such as flexible working hours, part-time, reduced weekly working hours, and a four-day workweek might be beneficial both for leisure-oriented workers and their employers.

Flexible benefits programs allow employees to pick and choose from among a multitude of benefits options. Therefore, these programs tend to meet the needs of today's more diverse workforce. By enabling leisure-oriented employees to choose organizational rewards that match their needs, such as extended vacation time and subsidized recreation, their work motivation and organizational commitment might be increased.

Generally, leisure aspects should receive increased attention in future research in order to clarify the differential effects of leisure and work domains on employees' attitudes and behaviors.

References

- Aronowitz, S., & Di Fazio, W. (1994). *The jobless future: Sci-tec and the dogma of work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Barker, R. (1968). *Ecological psychology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Battle, J. (1990). *Self esteem: The new revolution*. Edmonton, Canada: James Battle.
- Beatty, S. E., Jeon, J. O., & Albaum, G. (1994). A cross-national study of leisure activities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25, 409-422.
- Blickle, G., Goenner, S., & Heider, J. (1998). Berufsorientierungen von Auszubildenden in gewerblich-technischen Berufen. *Zeitschrift Arbeits und Organisationspsychologie*, 42(2), 95-99.
- Boje, T. P. (1996). Gender, work time and flexible employment: The case of Denmark. *Time and Society*, 5(3), 341-361.
- Bregha, F. J. (1980). Leisure and freedom re-examined. In T. L. Goodale & P. A. Witt (Eds.), *Recreation and leisure: Issues in an era of change* (pp. 30-37). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Brief, A., & Nord, W. (1990). Work and meaning: Definitions and interpretations. In A. Brief & W. Nord (Eds.), *The meaning of occupational work*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Burdge, R. (1961). *The development of a leisure orientation scale*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (1995). *Time use patterns in Israel. Additional findings of the time budgeting survey 1991/2*. Publication 1029. Jerusalem: Central Bureau of Statistics (Hebrew).
- Champoux, J. E. (1978). Perceptions of work and non-work: A reexamination of the compensatory and spillover models. *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, 5, 402-422.
- Champoux, J. E. (1981). A sociological perspective on work involvement. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 30, 65-86.
- Cohen, A. (1997a). Non-work influences on withdrawal cognitions: An empirical examination of an overlooked issue. *Human relations*, 50(12), 1511-1536.
- Cohen, A. (1997b). Personal and organizational responses to work-non-work interface as related to organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27(12), 1085-1114.
- Coleman, D. (1993). Leisure based social support, leisure dispositions and health. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25, 350-361.
- Coleman, D., & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1993). Leisure and health: The role of social support and self-determination. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25, 111-128.
- Dattilo, J., Dattilo, A. M., Samdahl, D. M., & Kleiber, D. A. (1994). Leisure orientations and self-esteem in women with low incomes who are overweight. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(1), 23-38.

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- de Grazia, S. (1962). *Of time, work and leisure*. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund.
- Donald, M., & Havighurst, R. (1959). The meaning of leisure. *Social Forces*, 37, 357-360.
- Dubin, R. (1956). Industrial worker's worlds: A study of the "central life interest" of industrial workers. *Social Problems*, 3, 131-142.
- Dubin, R. (1958). *The world of work: Industrial society and human relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dubin, R. (1973). Work and non-work: Institutional perspectives. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Work and non-work in the year 2001*. Monterey, Calif: Brooks/Cole.
- Dubin, R., Champoux, J. E., & Porter, L. W. (1975). Central life interests and organizational commitment of blue collar and clerical workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 411-421.
- Dubin, R., Hedley, R. A., & Taveggia, T. C. (1976). Attachment to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of work, organization and society* (pp. 281-341). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Dumazedier, J. (1974). *Sociology of leisure*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Elizur, D. (1991). Work and non-work relations: The conical structure of work and home life relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 313-322.
- England, G. W. (1991). The meaning of working in the USA: Recent changes. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 1, 111-124.
- England, G. W., & Harpaz, I. (1990). How working is defined: National contexts and demographic and organizational role influences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 253-266.
- England, G. W., & Misumi, J. (1986). Work centrality in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 17, 399-416.
- Ennis, P. H. (1968). The definition and measurement of leisure. In E. B. Sheldon & W. E. Moore (Eds.), *Indicators of social change: Concepts and measurements* (pp. 525-572). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Freyinger, V. J. (1995). The dialectics of leisure and development for women and men in mid-life: An interpretive study. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27(1), 61-84.
- Goodale, T., & Goodbey, G. (1988). *The evolution of leisure*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Harding, S. H., & Hikspoors, F. J. (1995). New work values: In theory and in practice. *International Social Science Journal*, 47, 441-55.
- Harpaz, I. (1990). *The meaning of work in Israel: Its nature and consequences*. New York: Praeger.
- Harpaz, I. (1999). The transformation of work values in Israel. *Monthly Labor Review*, 122, 46-50.
- Harpaz, I., & Fu, X. (1997). Work centrality in Germany, Israel, Japan, and the United States. *Cross Cultural Research*, 31, 171-200.
- Haywood, L., Kew, F., Bramham, P., Spink, J., Capenerhurst, J., & Henry, I. (1989). *Understanding leisure*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hirschfeld, R. R., & Feild, H. S. (2000). Work centrality and work alienation: Distinct aspects of a general commitment to work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 789-800.
- Huizinga, J. (1950). *Homo ludens*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hunnicut, B. K. (1988). Work, leisure and labor supply: An analysis of the 1980 U.S. census data. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 18, 31-55.
- Interdisciplinary Center for Technological Analysis and Forecasting. (1998). *Leisure in Israel: Trends for the next millenium*. Tel Aviv: Interdisciplinary Center for Technological Analysis and Forecasting at Tel Aviv University (Hebrew).
- Iso-Ahola, S. (1979). Basic dimensions of definitions of leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 11(1), 28-39.
- Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1985). *LISREL VI: Analysis of linear structural Relationships by maximum likelihood, instrumental variables, and least squares*. Uppsala: University of Uppsala.

- Kabanoff, B. (1980). Work and non-work: A review of models, methods and findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 60-77.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). *Work alienation*. New York: Praeger.
- Kanungo, R. N., & Mendonca, M. (1992). *Compensation: Effective reward management*. Toronto: Butterworths.
- Kaplan, H. R., & Tausky, C. (1974). The meaning of work among the hard-core unemployed. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 17, 185-198.
- Kaplan, M. (1975). *Leisure: Theory and policy*. New York: Wiley.
- Kelly, J. R. (1978). A revised paradigm of leisure choices. *Leisure Sciences*, 1(4), 345-363.
- Kelly, J. R. (1992). Leisure. In E. Borgatta (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of sociology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Kelly, J. R., & Kelly, J. R. (1994). Multiple dimensions of meaning in the domains of work, family, and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(3), 251-274.
- Kirchmeyer, C. (1992). Nonwork participation and work attitudes: A test of scarcity vs. expansion models of personal resources. *Human Relations*, 45, 775-795.
- Kish, L. (1967). *Survey Sampling*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kohn, M. (1990). Unresolved issues in work/personality. In K. Erikson & S. Vallas (Eds.), *The nature of work*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kulik, J. A., Mahler, H. I. M., & Moore, P. J. (1996). Social comparison and affiliation under threat: Effects on recovery from major surgery. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 967-979.
- Lawler, E. E. (1971). *Pay and organizational effectiveness: A psychological view*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lawler, E. E. (1994). *Motivation in work organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lodahl, T. M., & Keiner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 23-33.
- Manfredo, M. J., Driver, B. L., & Tarrant, M. A. (1996). Measuring leisure motivation: A meta-analysis of the Recreation Experience Preference Scales. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(3), 188-213.
- Mannheim, B. (1993). Gender and the effects of demographics status and work values on work centrality. *Work and Occupations*, 20, 3-22.
- Mannheim, B., Baruch, Y., & Tal, J. (1997). Alternative models for antecedents and outcomes of work centrality and job satisfaction of hi-tech personnel. *Human Relations*, 50(12), 1537-1562.
- McAdams, D. P. (1988). Personal needs and personal relationships. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 7-22). Chichester, England: Wiley.
- McBride, A. B. (1990). Mental health effects of women's multiple roles. *American Psychologist*, 45, 381-384.
- McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation*. New York: Scott Freeman.
- Melamed, S., Meir, E. I., & Samson, A. (1995). The benefits of personality-leisure congruence: Evidence and implications. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27(1), 25-40.
- Moore T. S. (1996). *The disposable workforce: Worker displacement and employment instability in America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- MOW-International Research Team. (1987). *The Meaning of work: An international view*. London: Academic Press.
- Mulgan, G., & Wilkinson, H. (1995). Well-being and time. *Demos*, 5, 2-11.
- Neulinger, J. (1976). *The psychology of leisure*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

- Offe, C. (1984). "Arbeitsgesellschaft." *Strukturprobleme und zukunftsprospektiven*. Frankfurt/M: Campus.
- Opaschowski, H. W. (1985). Die neue freizeitarbeitsethik. In R. Altwater & M. Baethke (Eds.), *Arbeit 2000*. Hamburg: Verlag zum Studium der Arbeiterbewegung.
- Pinder, C. C. (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Primeau, L. A. (1996). Work and leisure: Transcending the dichotomy. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 50(7), 569-577.
- Quintanilla-Ruiz, S. A., & Wilpert, B. (1991). Are work meanings changing? *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 1, 91-109.
- Rain, J. S., Lane, I. M., & Steiner, D. D. (1991). A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: Review and future considerations. *Human Relations*, 44, 287-307.
- Randall, M. D., & Cote, J. A. (1991). Interrelationships of work commitment constructs. *Work and Occupation*, 18, 194-212.
- Rice, R. W., McFarlin, D. B., & Bennett, D. E. (1989). Standards of comparison and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 591-598.
- Robinson, J. P. (1990). The leisure pie (use of leisure time). *American Demographics*, 12, 39.
- Robinson, J. P., & Blair, J. (1995). *The national macroenvironmental activity pattern survey (preliminary report)*. Washington, D.C.: Environmental Protection Agency.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Shaffer, G. S. (1987). Patterns of work and non-work satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 115-124.
- Shirom, A. (1995). Changing the Histadrut 1994: Possible implications for the labor relations system in the public sector. *Riv'on Le Kalkala*, 42(1), 36-64 (Hebrew).
- Spreitzer, E., & Snyder, E. E. (1987). Educational-occupational fit and leisure orientation as related to life satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 19(2), 149-158.
- Statistical Abstracts of Israel*. (1995). Jerusalem: Government Publications.
- Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1975). *Motivation and work behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stephenson, W. (1967). *The play theory of mass communication*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tait, M., Padgett, M. Y., & Baldwin, T. T. (1989). Job and life satisfaction: A reevaluation of the strength of the relationship and gender as a function of the date of the study. *Journal of Psychology*, 74, 502-507.
- Tinsley, H. E. A., Hinson, J. A., Tinsley, D. J., & Holt, M. S. (1993). Attributes of leisure and work experiences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 40(4), 447-455.
- Triandis, H. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: Wiley.
- Unger, L. S., & Kernan, J. B. (1983). On the meaning of leisure: An investigation of some determinants of the subjective experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 381-392.
- van Delden, M. H. (1971). Orientation about work and leisure. *Mens-en-Onderneming*, 25(6), 360-371. (this is written with a small v in the text)
- Vroom, V. H. (1962). Industrial social psychology. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (2nd ed.), 5, 196-268.
- Warr, P. B. (1981). Psychological aspects of employment and unemployment. *Psychological Medicine*, 12, 7-11.
- Watkins, C. E., & Subich, L. M. (1995). Annual review, 1992-1994: Career development, reciprocal work/non-work interaction, and women's workforce participation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47, 109-163.
- Weiner, A. I., & Hunt, S. L. (1983). Work and leisure orientations among university students: Implications for college and university counselors. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 61(9), 537-542.

-
- Weissinger, E., & Bandalos, D. L. (1995). Development, reliability and validity of a scale to measure intrinsic motivation in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27(4), 379-400.
- Wilensky, H. L. (1960). Work, careers and social integration. *International Social Science Journal*, 12, 543-560.
- Wright, P. H. (1984). Self-referent motivation and the intrinsic quality of friendship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 1, 115-130.
- Zusman, T. (1995). From collective agreements to personal contracts: Pay, labor relations and the His. *Riv'on Le-Kalkala*, 42(1), 1-35 (Hebrew).