

Autonomous Spheres of Leisure Activity for the Industrial Executive and Blue Collarite

by Francis P. Noe

The theory of structural autonomy was investigated from the standpoint of leisure. It was argued that leisure is a subset of autonomy which allows a certain amount of flexibility to occur within the work role. The status-roles of worker and executive were analyzed on the basis of their differential participation in leisure activities within the workplace and outside community. It was found that the scheme explaining "adaptive uses of autonomy" accurately predicted the direction that leisure would take both within the industrial organization and the outside community for both role sets. The executive possessed more leisure within his work situation and less outside while the blue collar worker enjoyed more leisure outside the work situation and less inside. This suggests a trade-off or federalist solution between control by the executive over work and control of leisure by the blue collarite.

KEYWORDS: LEISURE, INTERNAL-TO-ORGANIZATION, EXTERNAL-TO-ORGANIZATION, ROLE-AUTONOMY, TRADE-OFF, BLUE-COLLAR, EXECUTIVE, INDUSTRIAL

But since the spectators are of two kinds—the one free and educated, and the other a vulgar crowd composed of mechanics, laborers, and the like—there ought to be contests and exhibitions instituted for the relaxation of the second class. . .

Aristotle Pol. 1342^a 18-22 (BK VIII Ch. 7)

There have been a number of traditional problems about organizations on which sociologists have offered substantial comment. The problem of maintaining order and consensus ranks high in captivating the interest of those concerned about the integration of many specialized roles into a single organizational unit. This problem is especially meaningful where the society is highly specialized and differentiated. Solutions have been offered to identify the controlling or restricting mechanisms, some of which are found in procedures of organizational rank, communication, or recruitment. Many studies, however, have made the authority structure the central variant of control whereby differences in the dependency of roles within the organization fluctuate according to conditions congruent with centralized or decentralized control. Another solution for order and control has turned in the opposite direction to the possibility of structural independence. Rather than explaining how organizations control their members by creating conditions of dependency, the concept of

✪ Francis P. Noe is an assistant professor in the Sociology Department, Rosary Hill College, Buffalo, New York.

Manuscript received May 2, 1971; revised August 11, 1971.

autonomy has been proposed as an alternative, showing how members of an organization are controlled by allowing them discretion and freedom of action. To be more specific, autonomy is defined as "the absence of external constraint" (Katz, 1968: 4). More recently, autonomy has been connected with a systems approach and apparently "amounts to claiming that the system parts are, somehow, indeterminate as far as the rest of the system goes; that, to some extent at least, units within a system are unaffected by the other units; that the units enjoy a degree of interactability from the other units of the system" (Katz, 1970: 2). The extent to which autonomy influences social arrangements is subject to contingencies in the social order not yet established. Autonomy is "neither all pervasive nor totally absent" (Katz, 1965: 223). Probably, one of the outstanding contributory factors to increasing autonomy for roles, if not its emergence, is the shift that occurs within a society when it changes from a primitive to industrialized economic structure. This change from traditional to modern society is evidenced in the additional expectations and definitions which accompany roles in complex societies. The process of role differentiation takes place to the extent that the "incumbency of one role is independent of incumbency of other roles" (Banton, 1965: 30-32). "As societies advance in productive and technological sophistication, . . . independent roles become more numerous and important" (Banton, 1965: 34). Primarily, the division of labor is most affected, bringing changes to occupational roles. In a primitive society, "occupational roles provide some liberty of choice"; while in an industrial society, certain occupations are "hedged round with varied restrictions and expectations limiting their incumbents' social liberty" (Banton, 1965: 34). Increasing role differentiation pressures the traditional roles of sex and age to decline in importance as a central unifying force for an industrial society with the result that more general and independent roles begin to appear. Some independent roles are comprised of nonwork-leisure behaviors which are designated as being most fluid and differentiated for an industrial society. These roles can be "combined with almost all other roles in the social repertory" (Banton, 1965: 34). In fact, they are "highly differentiated" from the rest of the social structure. Because leisure roles are highly differentiated, it is with particular interest that they ought to be seriously considered as a dimension of structural autonomy. In general, it is suggested that independent roles are most likely to fall along a behavioral continuum between a deviant position at the marginal end, to a recreational or leisure position holding the opposite end. If any of the independent role positions become part of the repertory of another role either as a coordinated adjunct or maladapted partition, they will bring a measure of flexibility to life. Leisure roles are relatively independent which makes them more open or accessible to other roles in society. This transient characteristic of leisure roles is thereby subject to differing interpretations. In achieving autonomy, leisure roles are likely to be used extensively by some and very little by others.

Since leisure roles are relatively independent or autonomous, they are flexible enough to be enacted both within the work situation and performed outside of the work place. This freedom of movement for leisure roles is certainly desirable when examining various work and nonwork situations. In this research, this aspect of freedom is crucial in examining degrees of autonomy because it provides a baseline for comparison between different occupational roles such as

an executive or blue collar worker. These widely separated status roles might relate differently to nonwork-leisure activity both on and off the job. It is for this reason that leisure behavior is suggested as a likely possibility for investigating autonomy. Leisure parallels, almost precisely, the essential nature of autonomy in one respect for they share a quality of "flexibility" (Katz, 1968: 8; Noe, 1970: 30). Since the concept of autonomy covers more general cases of flexibility found in social organizations, leisure behaviors must be considered only a subset of autonomy. In the case of leisure or nonwork activity, the idea of residual discretionary time is quite common. This principle does not mean that "human behavior is exempt from normative controls" but rather allows for "some freedom in the choice of those activities that one will engage in and be bound by" (Moore, 1963: 35). Like leisure behaviors, autonomy is also a force that "binds people together" (Katz, 1968: 4). It permits role incumbents to adjust or adapt to varied conditions. In order to further explore this idea of integration, it might be helpful to evaluate the amount of leisure which exists within the industrial organization for the executive and worker roles. The leisure activities pursued by these roles are considered for this study the operationalized definition of autonomy. These activities are not totally exhaustive of autonomous behaviors but rather tend to narrowly define one aspect of nonwork behavior.

Hypothetical Propositions

In order to systematize the investigation of the executive and worker roles, a number of hypotheses have been offered in the past under the so-called theory of a "federalistic balance of autonomy" (Katz, 1965: 211). This theory of autonomy proposes that a balance or trade-off is reached between the top executive members within a manufacturing company and the lower blue collar worker of the organization. The balance of autonomy that is struck between these work levels "allows flexibility to both sides" (Katz, 1965: 221). This balance is accomplished by the amount of freedom which is permitted the manufacturing worker and executive both on and off the job. The distinction between internal and external autonomy is necessary for understanding the federalistic thesis. "Autonomy that is *internal* to one's organizational role refers to a sphere of autonomy regarded as an intrinsic part of the role occupant's contribution to the organization. Autonomy that is *external* to one's organizational role refers to a sphere of autonomy regarded as extraneous to one's organizational contribution (Katz, 1968: 19).

Taking first the upper level executive role, it has been hypothesized that there is "relatively great autonomy in his technological organizational role. . . . Autonomy external to his role is severely limited since his organizational responsibilities and affiliation are defined very broadly" (Katz, 1970: 7). Because his work role is a central life interest (Orzack, 1959), the distinction between work and leisure is apt to be blurred. The social boundaries separating the work and leisure role among executive types are perhaps less distinct than they might be for less prestigious work roles. There is reason to believe that "it is difficult to assess which activities are regarded as clearly external to his work role" (Katz, 1968: 52). External autonomy for the executive means having a "broad affinity for the organizational style of behavior" (Katz, 1968: 52), with fewer

prospects of freedom outside the work organization. Internal autonomy for the executive is greater because his work role is "more broadly defined." When considering leisure activities among executives, one would expect to find fewer such activities, less time spent doing them, and more internal recreational activities in the work situation.

With reference to the blue collar worker, a much different pattern of leisure should be expected if the theory of autonomy has accurately predicted spheres of freedom. Following the federalistic type of solution, it is possible to hypothesize that: "The worker's technical role contains little autonomy. But in the rest of his life in the factory he has considerable autonomy. He has much autonomy external to his tasks but less internal to his existence in the factory" (Katz, 1970: 6-7). In general, the blue collar worker exhibits a stronger allegiance and more interest in matters external to his work role than the executive. For the worker, his job is not his central life interest (Dubin, 1956). The influence from his "working-class customs" apparently controls certain aspects of culture outside the factory. Participation and involvement in leisure activities outside the factory community perhaps is a likely sphere of autonomy for the worker. The internal autonomy of the worker is less extensive because of the technological requirements placed on the worker's task which in most cases curtail activity. But even in severely constrained work situations, "the activities of workers within the organization are not fully controlled" (Katz, 1968: 47). They are, however, most assuredly limited. As for the leisure activities of workers, it is likely that they will participate in recreational behaviors outside the work role, spend proportionately long periods of time in such behaviors, and participate in a wide variety of activities while having very little opportunity for engaging in such behaviors within the work situation. These predictions are contrary to those assertions made with regard to the executive role. The point has been made that "worker autonomy thus contrasts with the autonomy pattern for white-collar workers, that is, for all those who, from the lowliest clerk to the president, make up the administrative hierarchy. They have greater autonomy within their work role, but their role is more broadly defined than that of the worker" (Katz, 1968: 48). If autonomous behavior exists as explained for the executive and blue collarite, then differences in leisure behavior for each role should be noticeable in past research findings. The executive's performance in work and leisure is probably less separated than that of the worker. As a dimension of nonwork activity, leisure behaviors are discretionary and defined in this context as a form of autonomous behavior when compared to work activities. It remains, however, to be demonstrated whether differences exist in leisure both within and outside the work situation, and to what extent these differences are integrative for executive and worker roles.

Findings and Explanation

A word of caution should prefix the findings that are reported as instances of verification for the above hypotheses. The roles of executive and blue collarite are not necessarily comparable nor identical in the cases which are cited. They are sufficiently similar though certainly not perfectly matched. The executive is urban situated, male Caucasian, and employed in manufacturing establishments. The blue collarite, who also shares an urban environment, is male

Caucasian and works for manufacturing establishments. These social factors constitute a basis of comparison.

The executive's and blue collarite's styles of autonomous behavior as predicted will differ immeasurably in the amount of leisure time, kind of leisure, and use of leisure available to them. The autonomous activities of executives ought to differ from the style of leisure found among the blue collarite. Before any such analysis is undertaken, however, we must examine the preconditions which give rise to differing styles of leisure. These preconditions are part of the federalistic explanation which proposes an interchange between the executive and blue collar worker over offsetting control in work and leisure. This scheme suggests that while the executive takes charge of matters inside the industrial organization, the worker takes over some aspect of living in the community. A cultural trade-off results, whereby the executive identifies with work, and the worker associates with leisure.

Executive Role

The preconditions giving rise to the executive leisure pattern are located in his work situation. Each of these factors serves to give more value to work than other things which would lead to autonomous leisure pursuits. There are nine conditions that can affect the executive's lack of involvement in leisure. There may be others, but these seem particularly appropriate because they appear within the boundaries of leisure investigations. Taking first the fact that executives work long hours can be interpreted as "one vivid sign—an outward and discernible mark—of the extent of his labors" (Heckscher *et al.*, 1959: 12). Because an executive's work task is sometimes difficult to measure, long hours give testimony to the performance and fulfillment of his work role. Taking time out for leisure activities would mean that time would have to be found elsewhere and work time might be threatened. The opportunity to engage in discretionary time is basically accomplished by reducing work time, but factors may certainly exist which preclude any option to reduce work load. The executive role is a primary example of long hours and little discretionary time away from the career. It is correct to say that pace setting elites "have likely increased their time at work" (Wilensky, 1967: 22). Estimates of the actual workweek for the executive range well over fifty hours. Working hours at home, office, and business entertaining alone account for 55 hours (Heckscher *et al.*, 1959: 8). Other estimates of time are reported from 53 hours at a minimum to 70 hours the maximum (Denney, 1959: 47). "These men work many hours, week after week—sometimes reaching a truly startling life time total (Wilensky, 1967: 21). It is not an exaggeration to stress that the executives "complain there's just no time for any more living" (*Business Week*, 1965: 26). In fact, one survey found a lack of time to be a significant perception among 67 per cent of those who were interviewed. "As a result nearly half feel to some extent cut off from society" (Leigh, 1967: 39). This reaction is not unexpected and, though not obvious, succeeds in lending support to aristocratic notions of high culture (Kultur) at least in television viewing. "Long workweek hours rate high (fourth) as a highbrow predictor of quality of exposure" (Wilensky, 1964: 185). This finding is typical of the executive because it illustrates a preference for a higher quality of experience which is often synonymous with expensive.

Second, survey evidence reveals that when executives were asked to give their conceptions of the penalties and sacrifices associated with the achievements of top executives, the most frequently mentioned was the "lack of time for recreation and leisure" (Coates *et al.*, 1957: 219). Curtailing these activities is proper and instrumental for adapting the individual to the executive role.

Third, the increasing complexity of technological innovations placed very high demands on executive personnel. It seems that "the same machinery and industrial planning that substituted mineral power sources for the labors of men, thus freeing some of them from the long workweek, have kept the nose of the executive firmly to the grindstone" (Denney, 1959: 47). His energies are constantly needed to coordinate and substitute technology when production of efficiency wanes because of competition.

Fourth, the executive is not hired into a job but rather is employed in a career. This implies a "commitment to work, to workplace, or both" (Gusfield, 1961: 573). The evidence shows that "managerial occupations had less fluid, more fixed workplace histories than did . . . trained labor categories" (Gusfield, 1961: 573). The commitment to work is considerable for the executive, thereby organizing much of his style of life.

Fifth, the momentary reward system exercises a certain amount of influence over the actions of the executive. "Top leaders show a marked preference for income over leisure" (Wilensky, 1967: 21). "If having control of one's own work schedule and working at least 55 hours is taken as an indicator of preference for income over leisure, then most of these men have such a preference" (Wilensky, 1967: 121). The prerogative to select work over leisure is not entirely in the hands of the executive. The demands of retirement, deferred income because of education, and a protracted length of time spent in the labor market make stringent demands on a person's level of earnings. This is especially true in communities where financial support for public undertakings is required of the managerial class.

Sixth, the executive is trained to get personal fulfillment and pleasure from his work. "This is a component of the emerging self-concept encouraged during training, if not specifically dictated by it" (Orzack, 1959: 130). The socialization of the executive is channeled toward developing a self image which will define itself as centrally united to a corporate reference group—an image containing respect for the goals of hard work and efficiency.

Seventh, the executive is drawn to leisure, not so much as a legitimate cultural expression but more as a potential market for making profit. "Leisure is a growth industry" that delights many businessmen (Forbes, 1966: 114). By investing in leisure, companies have experienced complete turnabouts in corporate profits from low faltering profiles to high-growth ratios. Executives share the belief that leisure, even their own, can be turned into profit. Vacation homes, yachts, and hobbies are turned into assets. Economic gain is realized through rentals, charters, and income tax provisions which are sought in non-work hours. Many develop avocations to supplement their income in later years.

Eighth, the executive is drawn to a set of social values which often conflict with the preferences of workers for mass entertainment. The desire and inclination among labor for "more free time" and "less productive work" challenge "the basic values of the business culture" (Underwood, 1964: 205-6). Leisure

is not productively used according to a business executive who associates a "lack of strong moral convictions and leisure that we have not yet learned how to use" (McNair, 1959: 335-6). Business executives are called to the right use of leisure where they "can develop the strength of character and vision to defend the spiritual values of our democracy, and thus preserve the freedom of man. And the road to thus—the only road to it—is through self education" (Chapman, 1962: 46). These values have a tendency to wean executives away from the idle life.

Ninth, the problems in dealing with employee recreation programs both on and off the job lead to increased manager involvement, which is not in the best interests of managerial personnel. In one particular survey, "executives . . . took special pains to point out that more time off creates problems for management" (Geyer, 1965: 61). Production problems are created by not having sufficient talent to do a job because of "time off." Work scheduling is another hurdle faced by management in order to give employees "opportunities for creative leisure" (Blakelock, 1959-60: 464). Besides these time and place problems, executives are likely to get involved in the legal ramifications of employee-supported recreation programs.* Knowledge of the last is essential for the executive if he intends to form "corporate policies aimed at providing leisure facilities and services to employees" (Denney, 1959: 52). Leisure considerations have even become part of the decision making process involving "plant location" (Denney, 1959: 52). There is reason to believe that although these are additional burdens that executives must contend with, they also provide desirable consequences in saved "income" (Cunningham, 1967: 177) and reduced "absenteeism" (Denney, 1959: 52). While tangible benefits do result from an executive taking interest in the employee's preference for leisure, for the most part the worker's interests conflict with the executive's own basic career goals and aspirations. But paradoxically, they cause him more work and problems which his training has taught him to accept. Under these conditions which have been briefly enumerated in the above, it is highly unlikely that executives would engage in autonomous leisure activities that are external to his work role. At the same time, he would probably be more likely to organize his work situation by incorporating more autonomous leisure activities within the performance of his work duties. In order to further explore this subject, a systematic review of data both internal and external to the industrial organization has been arranged for the executive role.

External autonomy has reference to those activities occurring outside of the executive's work situation. Table 1 summarizes information about the amount and kind of leisure activities pursued by executives. These studies were reviewed because they contained specific reference to an executive's participation in leisure activities. First, the executive spends relatively little time engaged in such activities. Second, the differences between executive and blue collar† lei-

* At last count, 25,000 firms are spending more than one billion dollars annually on employee recreation programs (White, 1963: 39). Many companies have faced litigation proceedings involving employee injuries as a result of company-sponsored programs.

† Consult Table 3 for additional differences between an executive and blue collar use of leisure.

sure is evidenced by the amount and not the kind of activity sought. The executive has a tendency to emphasize certain leisure activities which provide either economic or professional gain. It appears highly unlikely that the executive will "follow the lead of the working class by" inertia and acquire more leisure in the future (Heckscher *et al.*, 1959: 156). This prediction is particularly significant as witnessed in the amount of time and style of participation that has occurred in the past. Prior to the depression years and even before the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1939 that reduced the workweek for workers, the executive was already receiving 14 per cent less time for leisure. A number of studies have claimed that the amount of leisure time available to the executive outside his work role is used "as leverage in work" (Seligman, 1965: 354). It helped to insure "promotion" and "enhance one's status" (Coates *et al.*, 1957: 201; Seligman, 1965: 354). Because of these career benefits, participation in civic and professional activities are more sought after by the executive in his free time (Coates *et al.*, 1957: 205; Orzack, 1959), although they may not be "entirely voluntary" (Coates *et al.*, 1957: 213). An interesting corollary to these findings is found in the positive relationship between close friends in the same or related work and "autonomy"* (Parker, 1964: 216). Furthermore, it was hypothesized that the "extent to which a person makes close friends of work colleagues is proportionate to the degree that work encroaches on his leisure time" (Parker, 1964: 217-8). This relationship was also supported and tends to confirm the friendship or clique-like patterns among executives who feel their work encroaches on leisure. It also helps explain the fact that executives take their leisure with "other executives" (Coates *et al.*, 1957: 216). The remaining kinds of leisure engaged in by the executive entail financial matters constituting either capital expenditures or monetary profits. The leisure activities of vacationing by yachting, extensive touring, and retreat home ownership are peculiar to the executive.

It's been said that an executive carries into his leisure activities a sense of status belonging to his work role. "There are many reflections of this but surely one of the most interesting is the passion for ownership" (Denney, 1959: 54). The economic motive is pervasive for many, especially in the acquisition of property in foreign lands such as villas, chateaus, castles, retreats, or Caribbean condominiums. The economic consequences are attractive when realized through "a fast appreciating asset," the moderate tax structure of many foreign countries, and the lack of taxes on income, inheritance, and property (*Business Week*, 1969: 121). Yachting is another popular kind of leisure ownership which combines profit with pleasure. Although the "boating boys" are blue collar workers, they are far from being yachtsmen with an annual number in Lloyd's Register. From purely an economic point of view, if 50 per cent of a yacht's calendar is recorded in the log as business, tax allowances are permitted. The option of putting a yacht up for a charter when not in use by the owner is an even better way of writing off expenses (R. L., 1969: 35). There are semi-economic motives which also lure executives to purchase yachts. These definitely complement the executive's work role by providing "a sense of

* Autonomy defined as discretion in decision making about work centered activities.

TABLE 1
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AUTONOMOUS NONWORK ACTIVITIES EXTERNAL TO THE INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION AND THE MALE EXECUTIVE ROLE

NAME AND TYPE OF STUDY	METHODOLOGICAL NOTE	KIND OF ACTIVITIES	AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION	EXECUTIVE ROLE COMPARISON OVER AMOUNT AND KIND OF PARTICIPATION	SIMILARITIES OR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WORKER AND EXECUTIVE OVER KIND OF PARTICIPATION
"The Amount and Uses of Leisure" by Lundberg, Komarovsky & McNerny Sample survey using diaries. 1934	"a pioneer survey" with considerable variability among samples and methods. pp. 371-378	Visiting, reading, entertainment, sports, radio, motoring and clubs. pp. 99-100	4.3 hours per day average. p. 99	Participants in all stated activities. Highest percent in visiting and reading. p. 100	(1) the blue collar worker participates about 48 minutes more per day than executives-14% more time. p. 99 (2) no difference in preference between worker and executive
"Mass Society and Mass Culture: Interdependence or Independence" by Harold Wilensky	"an empirical approach" with much detail and a concerted effort to be "specific" pp. 181-183	Emphasizes the efforts of occupational groups to be selective in their use of newspapers, periodicals and television. p. 191	N.A.	N.A.	"5% of the executives and engineers are exposed to quality mass media taken from magazines, books, newspapers and T.V. whereas 1% of the middle mass (lower middle & upper working classes). Clearly a minority in each group. The differences are not great between groups. pp. 191-194
"Probability samples of six professional and middle mass groups" using "detached interviews" 1964					

TABLE 1—Continued

NAME AND TYPE OF STUDY	METHODOLOGICAL NOTE	KIND OF ACTIVITIES	AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION	EXECUTIVE ROLE COMPARISON OVER AMOUNT AND KIND OF PARTICIPATION	SIMILARITIES OR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WORKER AND EXECUTIVE OVER KIND OF PARTICIPATION
<p>(3) Free time which does come to the executive group seems less the result of their own deliberate choice or resolve than the gradual spread of a pattern set from below. They will be following the lead of the working class by inertia.</p> <p>p. 156</p>					
<p>"A Look at Executive Vacations" by DeVer Sholes</p> <p>A survey of Chicago executives by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry</p> <p>1960</p>	N.A.	<p>When, where and how do executives spend their vacations.</p> <p>p. 50</p>	<p>Average time spent is 3-4 weeks for 66% of executives.</p> <p>p. 51</p> <p>The average expenditure for all executives amounted to 1,140 dollars.</p> <p>p. 50</p>	N.A.	<p>(1) The most popular vacation activity was sightseeing, hunting and fishing, sports, and loafing.</p> <p>p. 50</p> <p>(2) 1% of all executives last year (1959) took their vacations during a plant shut-down period. While 25-30% of manu-</p>

TABLE 1—Continued

“Vacations for Executives” by Mitchell Meyer	facturing workers took theirs during plant shutdowns.	p. 51	N.A.
A selected survey of business organizations.	1967	p. 51	N.A.
Samples surveyed were drawn on the basis of listed NYSE securities for manufacturing firms. Unclear about who was interviewed and vague about sampling procedures and techniques used.	p. 49	p. 50	p. 50
A survey into the vacation allowances for executives.	p. 50	p. 51	p. 51
Average vacation period 3–4 weeks.	p. 50	p. 48	p. 48
Yet 36% (56) of the 156 companies set the maximum for any executive group higher than that for other white collar employees in the company, but 41% (23) of the 56 companies have relatively small maximums for white col-	p. 48	p. 48	p. 48

TABLE 1—Continued

NAME AND TYPE OF STUDY	METHODOLOGICAL NOTE	KIND OF ACTIVITIES	AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION	EXECUTIVE ROLE COMPARISON OVER AMOUNT AND KIND OF PARTICIPATION	SIMILARITIES OR DIF- FERENCES BETWEEN WORKER AND EXECU- TIVE OVER KIND OF PARTICIPATION
				lar employees, i.e., only 2 or 3 weeks. p. 50	
				(4) Manufacturing companies have ex- clusive vacation pro- grams for top and key executives which ac- count for only 24% (56) of all 226 manu- facturing companies. pp. 49-50	

achievement" (*Business Week*, 1965: 24), a symbol of authority (R. L., 1969: 35), and "promotion" to higher offices (Dalton, 1951: 233). Both yachting and retreat homes are primarily in use during the executive's voluntary vacation. The majority of executives follow the same vacation pattern as the blue collar worker, except that their's is not based on seniority or length of service. The evidence is not entirely clear whether executives possess the same amount of vacation time or more than blue collarites; but in any case, there is no indication that they possess less. In addition, executives don't "spare the bank balance on a vacation" (DeVer Sholes, 1960: 50), for they prefer to patronize first class accommodations. Most vacation by traveling or staying in far-off retreats which provide social and psychological distance between themselves and their work. Executives "escape" from "competition" (Warner *et al.*, 1959: 41) and "escape" to make new friends (*Business Week*, 1965: 24). These escapes demonstrate the powerful influence of the work role over their life style and the effort it must take in order to experience autonomy. As the data indicate, the executive has few options to exercise in acquiring leisure outside his work situation. Those activities preferred by him will serve to reinforce the values of the work situation, promote his career, or dramatically separate him from his work through vacationing. The executive's work role controls his autonomous leisure opportunities in the external community both in number and frequency.

Internal Autonomy has reference to those activities occurring inside the executive's work situation. There is much less evidence available in the research literature on this point as seen in Table 2. The picture that emerges from the data locates about a third of an executive's role performance in sanctioned leisure activities. Business entertaining, traveling, and luncheons occupy a substantial part of the executive's daily work routine. He is almost "constantly pre-occupied and concerned about his burdens" (Heckscher, 1959: 6). One obvious result is that work invades his "residual discretionary" time to such an extent that work and leisure cannot be "distinguished" (Moore, 1963: 29; Berger, 1962: 29). In a formal speech given by an executive before a student-faculty group, shock was registered by the audience over the executive's "total commitment" to an "eighty-hour week, in which one really never separates his work and leisure" (Underwood, 1964: 190). This negative reaction is to be expected from the audience but unlike them, the executive is apparently willing to trade off some of the comforts of mass leisure for wealth and status. Contrary to public belief, the executive finds much satisfaction and pleasure in his role. "He finds himself combining work, sociability and leisure" (Denney, 1959: 54). "For him, there is no great difference between working at the office and being at home" (Heckscher, 1959: 10). As one executive expressed it, "I don't know whether I am working or fishing." While this personal opinion may be somewhat exaggerated, it expresses the idea of flexibility and autonomy which the executive has over his work but still no less than those comments which claim that "working can get to be a by-product of having a good time or my real fun is actually doing a job and finishing it" (Heckscher, 1959: 7). There are also concrete ways in which the executive's work takes on leisure forms. While the executive is dealing with serious material interests, his work "sometimes develops play forms as a secondary characteristic. A sporting element is sometimes introduced into commercial competition . . . when the drive among executives

TABLE 2
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AUTONOMOUS NONWORK ACTIVITIES INTERNAL TO THE INDUSTRIAL
ORGANIZATION AND THE MALE EXECUTIVE ROLE

NAME AND TYPE OF STUDY	METHODOLOGICAL	KIND OF ACTIVITIES	AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION	EXECUTIVE ROLE COMPARISON OVER AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION	WORKER AND EXECU- TIVE ROLE COMPARISON OVER KIND OF PARTICIPATION
"The Executive Unleashed" by Andrew Leigh	Executives selected by age and technical capabilities. p. 33	House guests other than relatives. p. 39	The majority invite once every 7 weeks. 25% invite about every 18 days. p. 39	The American execu- tive is happy to spend part of his spare time at home wineing & dining business as- sociates. By contrast, the British equiva- lent shuns such rat race tactics. p. 39	N.A.
A selected survey of executives was taken. 1967					
"Executive Leisure" by Hertscher & de Grazia	"A random selection" of executives polled about leisure activities. Descriptive data with little methodological comment. p. 7	(1) at home doing business paper work (2) business enter- tainment at home (3) traveling between office and home (4) business travel (5) outside home business—social functions	Average hrs. per week. (1) 6.8 (2) 2.6 (3) 5.3 (4) 6.6 (5) 2.8	The executive works on the average of 42.7 hours a week in the office but also works at leisure as part of his occupa- tional role another 24.1 hours. p. 10	N.A.
A sample of Harvard Business Review readers and execu- tives listed in a national directory (Poor's Register) polled through a questionnaire. 1959					
"Drinking Habits of the Executive" re- ported by Industrial	The information was gathered during health examinations	Alcoholic consump- tion. p. 14	1-2 drinks per day for 50% of the 8,233 executives interviewed;	Despite the wide- spread popularity of business drinking, more they make, the	More executives drink than nonexecutives. The

TABLE 2—Continued

Marketing Staff	conducted by the	20% 3–4 drinks; 22% never drink.	80% of the executives don't believe that a nonalcoholic lunch puts them at a busi- ness disadvantage.	more likely it is that they drink. But the heaviest drinkers are not executives and the heaviest drinkers (six or more a day) are most likely to be found in an income bracket under \$10,000.
A survey of New York area business- men by Life Exten- sion Institute.	p. 14	p. 14	p. 90	p. 90
1969				

for the highest sales record, the biggest selection, the greatest speed and power, and so on, goes beyond utilitarian considerations" (Underwood, 1964: 198-9). During the daily work routine, informal group experiences are solidified through "luncheon group" meetings or other "informal approaches to decision making" (Gardner, 1946: 6; Denney, 1959: 59). The amount of personal recreation and flexibility in the executive's role shows signs of having numerous alternatives for relaxation and fun. The autonomy of leisure is assimilated into his work activities in such a way that it becomes very difficult to separate the two. While the data is not very extensive, it seems that the available evidence points to limited choices of professional and vocational activities outside the work role. Inside the work role, a highly developed set of informal relations are permitted, such as "golf, or playing cards together, or joining the same social clubs" (Gardner, 1946: 6). One general impression gained from the data indicates that the social boundaries between the home, club, and workplace are not distinct. The results, in part, reveal discretion and flexibility in the exercise of work and leisure. The autonomy of leisure for the executive upon leaving his work role is more restricted in the number and kinds of activity open to him, these being governed by the values and norms that are part of his work role. At this stage in the investigation of autonomy, the federalist thesis has accurately predicted the direction of leisure. If one is willing to accept our premise that leisure is a subset of autonomy, then the evidence on executive leisure surely lends support to the federalist thesis.

Worker Role

The preconditions giving rise to the worker's leisure pattern are located in his work situation. Each of these factors gives less value to work while increasing emphasis is directed toward things external to his "job." The blue collarite's work role is "instrumental" in providing access to leisure amusements. "The primary meaning of work is as a means to an end, or ends, external to the work situation; that is, work is regarded as a means of acquiring the income necessary to support a valued way of life of which work itself is not an integral part" (Goldthorpe, *et al.*, 1968: 38-39). "In other words, a privatised social life and an instrumental orientation to work may in this way be seen as mutually supportive aspects of a particular life-style" (Goldthorpe, *et al.*, 1968: 175). The conditions of employment contribute to the increased accessibility of nonwork activities which are highly valued by the worker. There are no less than six conditions and undoubtedly many more that could be abstracted from the literature. Most references were chosen because they referred to problems affecting the work role but at the same time indicated that solutions could be found in nonwork activities, though not always involving leisure. Once again, taking first the time available to the blue collarite outside of his work task, the findings show, as of 1960, that most workers enjoy a 40-hour week. The depression years of the 1930's gave rise to serious discussion on the reduction of the workweek. In 1934, the Black Bill for a 30-hour week passed in the United States Senate by a comfortable majority, but it wasn't until 1939 that the Fair Labor Standards Act provided a provision for limiting the workweek to 40 hours. When comparing the leisure time of workers at all levels of status, the blue collarite spends less time per week and possesses a lifetime average below

that of the professional white collar worker, even though the latter works seven years less on the average. "Recent years have witnessed a gradual increase in leisure time through reductions in the standard workweek and in hours actually worked" (Henle, 1962: 252). There are two exceptions to this trend, however. First, there are those workers who have "second fronts" or "moonlight." "It appears that a rate in excess of five percent is *intrinsic* to modern society" (Wilensky, 1963: 120). It also involves those workers who have negotiated contracts for a shorter workweek and anticipate the necessity of overtime at higher hourly rates. As an overall assessment, however, the workweek has been reduced. When comparing the years between 1940-1960, "perhaps the most significant development was that more than half the total gain in paid leisure resulted from increased vacation and holiday time" (Henle, 1962: 257).

Another aspect that is essential for understanding work-time as it relates to the worker is scheduling. For the most part the industrial worker is "a clock-driven occupational type" (Moore, 1963: 29). When compared to the executive, he has less discretion over his work-time but fewer hours and more time for the potential use of leisure. It has been found, for example, that "men who define work as scheduled or paid activity tend to believe they would feel the same or better if they weren't working" (Weiss, *et al.*, 1960: 150). Definitions of work as scheduled or paid activity are, in fact, most frequent "among laborers and factory workers" (Weiss, *et al.*, 1960: 145). Still another variation of the time theme finds different patterns of leisure activity among shift and non-shift workers. Work scheduling, along with the normally scheduled leisure activity, enters into determining a worker's choice of nonwork activity. Just as the schedule of the workplace contains opportunities for autonomy, so, too, are leisure activities affected by a schedule. These activities can range from "those that can be performed only at unique times . . . ; through those that can be done in a fairly wide range of times, like visiting friends; to those that can be done almost anytime, like reading, listening to records, or working in a home workshop" (Blakelock, 1959-60: 452). It was discovered that shift workers with dubious work schedules tended to participate less in inflexible nonwork activities, such as attending clubs and organizations. On the other hand, executives who are not nine-to-five employees can arrange their daily work schedules to include such possibilities. Fourth, the central life interest of the worker is not anchored in his work. "For almost three out of every four industrial workers studied, work and the workplace are not central life interests" (Dubin, 1956: 131). The worker apparently finds his outside interests more important and satisfying than his work. Work is not his place for acquiring and fulfilling "his intimate human relationships, and for his feelings of enjoyment, happiness, and worth" (Dubin, 1956: 140). Part of his satisfaction is derived from the kinds of leisure and recreation which have been molded by the working class for their consumption. Needless to say, most of the activities do not qualify as high (Kultur); yet though they may be (Kitsch), they remain the culture of the worker regardless of what class was responsible for their diffusion.

Closely related to the problem of central life interest is the question of valueless work. In this respect, the remaining points to be considered are of special interest. It has been assumed that "the splitting up of skilled trades

and the regimentation of tasks often leave the worker with a sense of unfulfillment and dissatisfaction" (Dumazedier, 1960: 72). The accumulative changes in automated technology, greater bureaucratization of labor, and the increasing movement of professionalism combine to pressure the worker into more restricted work situations. From this lack of freedom arises the need for compensation hopefully achieved through personally creative and productive forms of leisure. It is worth noting, however, that educational and cultural programs for the worker have experienced dismal defeat. Recreation programs have also experienced defeat whenever labor or management have attempted to more than indirectly organize the workers' leisure (Bok *et al.*, 1970: 369). The apocalyptic rhetoric of a labor spokesman seems quite out of place against the worker's record. It reads: "Labor is seeking in the period of its new leisure to cultivate the various facets of its personality so that it may develop the whole man" (Miller, 1933: 466). The fact is that "dull work is most often accompanied by dull leisure" (Dumazedier, 1967: 72-3). "The constrictive use of leisure is likely to depend in considerable measure on the constructive definition of jobs" (Moore, 1963: 38). It shouldn't be surprising to anyone that a worker will deliberately restrict his external activities to either complement the mechanization of labor or rebel by excess in leisure (Katz, 1965: 223). Both responses are expressions of autonomous leisure behavior controlled by the worker's culture to offset the dominance of industrialization.

Sixth, the relatively large size of industrial complexes contributes to an atmosphere of insensitive control over the highly specialized functions of workers. While toiling within large organizations at jobs, the workers are permitted "little autonomy or sense of personal responsibility" (Weiss *et al.*, 1960: 145). Although the concept of "alienation" is fraught with Hegelian moralizing, it is suitable in this context for interpreting these worker remarks: "I am not what I do: do not judge me by what I do for a living"; and then one turns to nonworking life for values and identity. As such, Berger (1962: 34) concludes that "alienation would seem almost complete." In a brief review of the above conditions, it seems likely that the worker would spend more time engaging in autonomous activities external to his work situation. As argued before, one segment of legitimate autonomous activity is available through leisure. With regard to the exercise of autonomy within the work situation, fewer leisure activities would be expected. To pursue this line of reasoning, data are provided on both internal and external aspects of leisure for the worker.

External Autonomy has reference to those activities occurring outside the blue collarite's work situation. Table 3, and to some extent Table 1, summarize this information. Some salient features of the data are readily apparent from Table 3. First, the range of variety among leisure activities engaged in by the worker is substantially larger in comparison to those of the executive. Second, friendship relationships within their leisure are based on contacts outside their work. In the case of the executive, the converse is, of course, true. Third, the evidence points in the direction of the worker spending more time in leisure activities than the executive. While the information in the research literature is not that plentiful, two basic themes about a worker's

Autonomous Spheres of Leisure Activity

239

TABLE 3
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AUTONOMOUS NONWORK ACTIVITIES EXTERNAL TO THE INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION AND THE MALE BLUE COLLAR WORK ROLE

NAME AND TYPE OF STUDY	METHODOLOGICAL NOTE	KIND OF ACTIVITIES	AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION	WORK ROLE COMPARISON OVER AMOUNT AND KIND OF PARTICIPATION	WORK AND EXECUTIVE ROLE COMPARISON OVER KIND OF PARTICIPATION
"Automation and Leisure" by Wm. A. Faunce	A study of a group of workers about how they <i>might</i> use increased leisure if it were available	(1) work around the house (2) spend time with family (3) travel (4) spectator sports (5) fishing and hunting (6) hobbies	(1) 96.8 (2) 76.8 (3) 53.6 (4) 48.8 (5) 42.4 (6) 25.6 percent of workers (125) listing activities which are preferred more than 25% of the time.	Leisure which need not be used as recuperative time may be spent by the industrial worker in more active participation in family activities pp. 94-95	N.A.
A list of reported responses from a group of automobile workers 1959					
"The Uneven Distribution of Leisure: the Impact of Economic Growth on Free Time" by Harold Wilensky	Interviews done in 1960. Selection criteria applies to all who were white, male members of labor force married now or in the past. p. 114	Measures amount of long hours at least 55 per week spent by various work groups.	14% (304) for older worker and 24% (54) for younger worker. Where workers have control over schedule, this drops to 9% for older worker and 2% for younger. p. 118	For the most part, blue collar workers do not work long hours, but there are variations within this group because of age and level of skill.	Professionals, executives, officials, and proprietors have long workweeks, year-round employment. Their longer vacations and shorter worklives (delayed entry and often earlier retirement) do not offset this edge in working hours. p. 113
Probability samples of six professional and middle groups using detailed interviews. 1961					
"The Use of Leisure and its Relation to	A randomly selected sample of workers	Commercialized and craftsmanship	those devoting most of their leisure time to	N.A.	Participation in commercialized and craft-

TABLE 3—Continued

NAME AND TYPE OF STUDY	METHODOLOGICAL NOTE	KIND OF ACTIVITIES	AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION	WORK ROLE COMPARISON OVER AMOUNT AND KIND OF PARTICIPATION	WORK AND EXECUTIVE ROLE COMPARISON OVER KIND OF PARTICIPATION
Levels of Occupational Prestige" by Alfred Clarke	from each occupational level. Selection of respondents confined to urban, adult males.	activities. pp. 210-211	such activities. pp. 210-211		manSHIP types of leisure activity are inversely related to occupational prestige levels. pp. 210-211
A sample survey of occupational prestige levels obtained through questionnaires.	pp. 206-207				
"Industrial Workers Worlds: A Study of the Central Life Interests of Industrial Workers" by Robert Dubin	A sample of industrial workers interviewed within three industrial firms. Clearly an urban setting. pp. 133-134	Informal group relationships—"those involving small talk, leisure time behavior, friendship, inter-actions, and affectional attachments." p. 135	Those expressing a verbal preference for association. Primary human relations take place only in situations where social experience is valued by the individual. p. 137	Only .09% of the industrial workers in the sample prefer the informal group life that is centered in the job; 9 out of 10 of those studied clearly indicated they preferred informal human associations and contacts were found in the community among friends and with family.	N.A.
A sample survey of industrial workers' central life interests obtained through a questionnaire. 1956	Limits research to discussion on "Caucasian male blue collarite and his depend-	(1) mass media (2) sports (3) hobbies (4) visiting	(1) T.V.—makes very heavy use of the medium p. 188	Blue collarites choose leisure pursuits that have the power to affirm acquired wis-	In contrast to white collar, blue collar men stand out in the slightly greater emphasis they
<i>Blue Collar Life</i> by Arthur Shostak					
Secondary analysis of					

TABLE 3—Continued

blue collar life. 1969	ents, basically a group of 21 million.” p. VII	(5) outdoor activities (6) games (7) ‘fraternal’ organi- zations pp. 188–206	Radio—long a blue collar favorite p. 205 Reading—avid news- paper, pocketbook, homecraft and work- shop publications. p. 193–196 (2) Blue collarites en- gage in a wide range of athletic endeavors p. 202 Spectator sports draw large numbers of blue collarites. p. 199 Auto sport is the big- gest play toy of them all. p. 197 (3) Home workshop and repair activities are very extensive. p. 198 (4) Family ties, visiting done on basis of sex and friendly neighbor- hood tavern. pp. 190–191 (5) Certain outdoor activities have appeal— fishing, hunting camp-	dom rather than pro- vide any confronta- tion with novel and possibly taxing matters. They choose leisure pursuits that have an ability to massage rather than for any message the medium might contain. They also use their leisure as a source of relief from strain. A re- sponse to the ener- gizing character of much of their work ... leisure helps resonate the general blue collar culture. p. 208	place on home, work- shop, and repair activi- ties and the much greater emphasis they place on fishing, hunt- ing, observing sports, and picnicking. p. 188
---------------------------	--	---	--	---	---

TABLE 3—Continued

NAME AND TYPE OF STUDY	METHODOLOGICAL NOTE	KIND OF ACTIVITIES	AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION	WORK ROLE COM- PARISON OVER AMOUNT AND KIND OF PARTICIPATION		WORK AND EXECUTIVE ROLE COMPARISON OVER KIND OF PARTICIPATION
			ing, and gardening. (6) Gambling and bet- ting or chance games. p. 204 (7) Ethnic societies, church and veterans' groups, "social" organizations.			
						p. 199

leisure are still readily detectable. Both themes are part of the compensation formula which argues that corrective rewards are to be given for necessary but unliked work. These themes of *reinforcement* and *escape* regularly appear as explanations for workers' leisure. With respect to the reinforcement argument, there is reason to believe that blue collar workers indulge in only those leisure activities which complement and *reinforce* their cultures (Shostak, 1969: 187-210). They select and participate in leisure pursuits that fit into their life styles. Consequently, "blue collarites choose leisure pursuits that have the power to affirm acquired wisdom rather than provide any confrontation with novel and possible taxing matters" (Shostak, 1969: 208). These kinds of activities are compatible with the educational and cultural backgrounds of most blue collarites. Most of the activities listed in Table 3 are capable of being handled by a worker without placing unnecessary strain upon his educational background. Just as the executive reaches an accord over the use of leisure in his life, the worker is equally acculturated into his community to do the same. Taking up the second theme—escape, we find that "the technological society leads the worker to bouts of drink, gambling, stockcar races, and horror movies. All this is an escape from modern work, intended to help one forget the factory or the frustration that comes from no work at all" (Seligman, 1965: 359). Independence and freedom within society can be achieved by the worker through escape, not in a deviant sense, but through rest, recuperation and relaxation. "Through leisure the gate to freedom is opened and man can escape . . . , not as a result of any violent effort to escape, but as in ecstasy" (Pieper, 1952: 344). In taking social distance from the work situation, the blue collarite can either rest, which "relieves fatigue and makes good the physical or nervous deterioration," or seek entertainment which "serves chiefly to provide relief from the boredom of monotonous and repetitive daily occupations" (Dumazedier, 1960: 526).

Given the range of leisure activities in most communities, the worker who seeks such autonomy is more than likely to find sufficient outlets readily competing for his attention and money. As indicated in Table 3, the commercialization of leisure is positively related to the lower occupational prestige groups. By way of concluding this section, it seems quite clear that there is greater involvement and use, if not control, of leisure demands in today's society by the blue collar workers. As the federalist thesis predicts, this outcome is to be expected.

Internal Autonomy has reference to those nonwork activities which occur within the work situation. As with the executive, reliable empirical data for the worker is not so plentiful. However, those studies which are available adequately document the area, and at least provide evidence measuring the direct effect of technological systems upon certain opportunities for leisure. The information represented in Table 4, while containing only two studies, is more than sufficient because of its wide-ranging nature. In particular, the Meissner (1969) research is most appropriate because of the large number of industrial cases that were reviewed. But his research problem is even more significant because it is related to the issue of autonomy. His problem defines "the chances men have while at work and, particularly, the restraints or limitations which the technology of the workplace imposes on these choices. . . .

TABLE 4
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AUTONOMOUS NONWORK ACTIVITIES INTERNAL TO THE INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION AND THE MALE BLUE COLLAR WORK ROLE

NAME AND TYPE OF STUDY	METHODOLOGICAL NOTE	KIND OF ACTIVITIES	AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION	WORK ROLE COMPARISON OVER AMOUNT AND KIND OF PARTICIPATION	WORKER AND EXECUTIVE ROLE COMPARISON OVER KIND OF PARTICIPATION
<i>Technology and the Worker</i> by Martin Meissner	This book attempts to combine two orientations. The effects technology have on work performance and what workers do together at work when they are not working. p. XIII	(1) Nontechnical behavior involved in a repeated sense of alimentary and conversational rituals. Regularized peach time, banana time, fish time, coke time, and coffee or lunch time are predictably introduced by one of the men every day, through behaviors followed by the corresponding conduct on the part of others. p. 184	(1) Hand work was the only work form which contained aspects of nontechnical influence. p. 179	(1) One report on hand work contains many observations on such things as where and with whom to take coffee breaks, what to contribute to money collections, and what part to play in games. p. 182	N.A.
A detailed and systematic review of case studies about industrial workers. 1969		(2) The range of permitted communication, kidding, story telling, and joking like the above activities is affected by technological restraints. p. 230	(2) Heavy hauling and automation workers converse about nontechnical factors. Negative for machine line and intermittent for hand work. p. 230	(2) For heavy hauling and automated tasks, a variety of stories, unrelated to work, are told for the entertainment of one's fellows. p. 210	

Autonomous Spheres of Leisure Activity

245

TABLE 4—Continued

<i>Alienation and Freedom</i> by Robert Blauner	The present study brings together empirical evidence from a variety of sources. p. 11	Nonwork leisure activity which accrues to the chemical operator while on the job. p. 156	the work of the chemical operator consists of long periods of relative inactivity. . . . p. 136	N.A.
A secondary analysis of data on the industrial workers. 1964			There are a number of ways in which chemical workers deal with this problem of on-the-job leisure. The most important use of time is probably conversation and joking with fellow workers. . . . the most popular topics of conversation are politics, outside leisure interests and books and magazines they have read. p. 156	

We also mean the rules . . . for making the design work and for attaining planned ends" (Meissner, 1969: 15). He systematically analyzes industrial case studies on the basis of restraint which a particular kind of technology imposes on its users. He also analyzes those conditions of technology under which one is likely to find aspects of nontechnological behavior and permitted communication. The results are presented in Table 4. As expected, given the federalistic thesis, leisure activities of a behavioral and verbal type for the worker are all but absent in the industrial organization. Hand work was the only technological system which contained play forms of activity. Heavy hauling and automated technologies were the only work systems which permitted nontechnological communication. Most of the conversations, at least for the chemical workers, revolved about politics or leisure interests outside of work. At still another level of internal autonomy, there may be fewer technological considerations but more social pressures for considering institutional problems of leisure at work. "There will . . . be talk of things generally thought to be of less import and less related to what are claimed to be the main concern of labor and management such as . . . sports and parties etc." (Hughes, 1946: 111). Some French and American companies have gone so far as to make "puttering workshops available to their employees at the very place of work" (Dumazedier, 1967: 81). Sports, parties, and workshops at work are rare occurrences in most industrial situations. The latitude and freedom which the worker possesses in the work situation by comparison to the executive is minimal when judged on the basis of leisure. In general, the federalistic thesis as it relates to the autonomy of leisure once again seems to be borne out by the data.

Conclusion

The integration of the blue collarite and executive into the industrial organization is partly achieved by their differential use of autonomy. One sphere of autonomous nonwork behavior is leisure. Because of the rules and restraints controlling the activities of the blue collarite in his workplace, few cases were found which permitted autonomous-leisure activity. To compensate for this loss of freedom, the blue collarite receives control over the kinds of leisure found in the community. The record of the blue collarite's consumption of leisure activities is larger and more diversified than that of the executive in the community. The executive who is part of the recognized authority structure of the industrial organization is not restricted or limited to just the workplace in carrying out his tasks. In fact, he moves freely between home, club, and factory doing business and mixing it with leisure. From the evidence gathered thus far, it looks as though the executive has more autonomy inside his career role than the blue collarite. Yet, while the executive finds freedom and flexibility in leisure within the work role, he is conversely limited by the leisure alternatives available to him in the outside world. The blue collarite has limited leisure alternatives within the workplace, but he has the controlling edge over his leisure outside his workplace. A trade-off or balance is struck between the worker and executive roles. The executive is integrated into his career status by not engaging in outside leisure activities. The worker is integrated into his job status by being free to organize the outside leisure

activities of the community. "The blue collarite, in sum, remains responsible for his own leisure record. . . ." There is "recognition of the complementarity between the worker's leisure record and total way of life" (Shostak, 1969: 207). The executive does not totally accept the worker's leisured style of life but shares in it, particularly as it affects his vacation schedule. Likewise, the worker does not accept the executive's corporate style of life but shares in it, insofar as it provides benefits such as "free time" and "wages" instrumental for acquiring leisure.

In appraising the federalistic thesis as it applies to the autonomy of leisure, we would have to conclude that the evidence lends support to this position. A single exception has been noted in the data; but even here, it is difficult to accurately judge because of the scantiness of information. The claim has been made that "workers have considerable autonomy within the confines of the organization" (Katz, 1968: 47). It has been argued that this autonomy arises out of allowing the worker to bring his culture to the workplace. This furthers the integration of the blue collarite into the work situation by providing a smooth transition between the community and factory. It has also been reported that the manual worker can adopt to his workplace "by the invention of all sorts of factory games and status play" (Berger, 1962: 33). This has been confirmed, but for only hand workers, not all blue collarites. This proposition contained in the federalist thesis, like the other hypotheses, must be subjected to greater empirical control and testing in the future. Social organizations other than the industrial, along with their status roles, must also be viewed within the autonomous leisure model.

References

- Banton, Michael. 1965. *Roles an Introduction to the Study of Social Relations*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berger, Bennet M. 1962. The sociology of leisure: some suggestions. *Work and Leisure*. Edited by Erwin O. Smigel. New Haven: College and University Press: 21-37.
- Blakelock, Edwin. 1959. A new look at the new leisure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 60: 4:446-447.
- Blauner, Robert. 1964. *Alienation and Freedom*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bok, Derek C. and Dunlop, John T. 1970. *Labor and the American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Business Week. 1965. The double life pays off. (July): 13:23-26.
- . 1969. Executives rush to exotic retreats. (March): 8:119-121.
- Chapman, Gilbert. 1962. Needed thinkers in business. *Dun's Review and Modern Industry*. 79 (Feb.): 44-46.
- Clarke, Alfred C. 1956. Leisure and occupational prestige. *Mass Leisure*, ed. by Eric Larrabee and Rolf Meyersohn. 205-214, Glencoe: Free Press.
- Coates, Charles H. and Pellegrin, Roland. 1957. Executives and supervisors: informal factors in differential bureaucratic promotion. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2 (Apr.): 217-220.
- Cunningham, Bob. 1967. The pleasure prinzip—a growing personnel problem and opportunity. *Personnel Journal*. 46 (March): 177-178.
- Dalton, Melville. 1951. Informal factors in career achievement. *Organizational Careers: A Sourcebook for Theory*, ed. Burney G. Glaser. 230-235. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Denney, Reuel. 1959. The leisure society. *Harvard Business Review*. 37 (May-June): 46-60.

- DeVer, Sholes. 1960. Having a wonderful time. *Management Review*. 49 (June): 50-52.
- Dill, William R. 1957. Environment as an influence on managerial autonomy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2:409-442.
- Dubin, Robert. 1956. Industrial workers' world: a study of the "central life interests" of industrial workers. *Social Problems*. 3 (Jan.): 131-142.
- Dumazedier, J. 1960. Current problems of the sociology of leisure. *International Social Science Journal*. 12 (Oct.): 522-531.
- . 1967. *Toward a Society of Leisure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Faunce, William A. 1959. Automation and leisure. *Work and Leisure*, ed. Erwin O. Smigel. 85-96. New Haven: College and University Press.
- Forbes. 1966. Leisure—the leisure industry faces a basic problem: who can predict how people will decide to spend their space time. 97 (Jan.): 114.
- Gardner, Burheigh G. 1946. The factory as a social system. *Industry and Society*, ed. William Foote Whyte. New York: McGraw-Hill. 4-20.
- Geyer-McAllister, Andrew. 1965. Vacations and holidays: more time off with pay. *Management Review*. (May): 59-61.
- Goldthorpe, John H., et al. 1968. *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gusfield, Joseph. 1961. Occupational roles and forms of enterprise. *American Journal of Sociology*. 66 (May): 571-580.
- Heckscher, August and de Grazia Sebastian. 1959. Executive leisure. *Harvard Business Review*. (Jul.-Aug.): 6-156.
- Henle, Peter. 1962. Recent growth of paid leisure for U. S. workers. *Monthly Labor Review*. 85 (Mar.): 249-257.
- . 1962. Recent growth of paid leisure for U. S. workers. *Work and Leisure*, ed. Erwin O. Smigel, pp. 182-200. New Haven: University Press.
- Hughes, Everett Cherrington. 1946. Race relations in industry. *Industry and Society*, ed. William Foote Whyte. 107-122. New York: McGraw Hill.
- . 1958. *Men and Their Work*. New York: The Free Press.
- Industrial Marketing*. 1969. Drinking habits of the executive: study shows when, what, how many. (Jan.): 13-14.
- Katz, Fred E. 1965. Explaining informal work groups in complex organizations: the case for autonomy in structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 10 (Sept.): 204-223.
- . 1968. *Autonomy and Organization*. New York: Random House.
- . 1970. Autonomy and theory construction. *American Sociological Association*. Presented at the 1970 ASA meeting. 1-9.
- Leigh, Andrew. 1967. The executive unleashed. *Business Management*. 97 (Aug.): 32-39.
- Lundberg, G. A., Komarovsky, M., and McInerney, M. A. 1969. *Leisure A Suburban Study*. New York: Agathon Press, Inc.
- McNair, Malcolm P. 1959. A dissenting voice on human relations in industry. *Industrial Man: Businessmen and Business Organizations*, ed. W. Lloyd Warner and Norman H. Martin. 323-340. New York: Harper Brothers.
- Meissner, Martin. 1969. *Technology and the Worker*. San Francisco: Chandler Publications Co.
- Meyer, M. 1967. Vacations for executives. *Conference Board Record*. 4: 10 (Oct.): 48-51.
- Miller, Spencer. 1933. Labor and the challenge of the new leisure. *Harvard Business Review*. 462-467.
- Moore, Wilbert E. 1963. *Man, Time, and Society*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Noe, Francis P. 1970. A comparative typology of leisure in nonindustrialized society. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 2 (Winter): 30-41.
- Orzack, Louis H. 1959. Work as a "central life interest" of professionals. *Social Problems*. 7 (Fall): 125-132.

Autonomous Spheres of Leisure Activity

249

- Parker, S. R. 1964. Type of work, friendship patterns, and leisure. *Human Relations*. 17:215-219.
- Pieper, J. 1958. Leisure as contemplation. *Mass Leisure*, ed. Eric Larrabee & Rolf Meyersohn. 340-345. Glencoe: Free Press.
- R. L. 1969. The nautical captains of industry. *Dun's Review*. (Aug.): 30-35.
- Seligman, Ben B. 1965. On work, alienation, and leisure. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*. 24 (Oct.): 337-360.
- Shostak, Arthur B. 1969. *Blue Collar Life*. New York: Random House.
- Underwood, Kenneth. 1964. On the pinnacles of power—the business executive. *The Human Shape of Work*, ed. Peter L. Berger. 181-210. New York: The Macmillan Co.
- Warner, Lloyd W., and Abogglen, James C. 1959. Case histories of two “unsuccessful” men. *Industrial Man, Businessmen and Business Organizations*, ed. Warner & Norman H. Martin. New York: Harper Brothers.
- , and Martin, Norman H. 1959. *Industrial Man, Businessmen and Business Organizations*. New York: Harper Brothers.
- Weiss, Robert, & Kahn, Robert L. 1960. Definitions of work and occupations. *Social Problems*. 8 (Fall): 142-151.
- Wilensky, Harold L. 1956. Security and alternative career possibilities in other organizations. In *Organizational Careers: A Sourcebook for Theory*, ed. Barney G. Glaser. 402-404. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- . 1961. The uneven distribution of leisure: the impact of economic growth on “free time.” *Work and Leisure*, ed. Erwin O. Smigel. 107-137. New Haven: College and University Press.
- . 1963. The moonlighter. *Industrial Relations*. 3 (Oct.): 105-124.
- . 1964. Mass society and mass culture: interdependence or independence? *American Sociological Review*. 29 (Apr.): 173-197.
- . 1967. Impact of change on work and leisure. *Monthly Labor Review*. 90 (Sept.): 21-22.
- White, F. X. 1963. As you were saying—new emphasis on recreation in employee relations. *Personnel Journal*. 42 (Jan.): 38-40.