

NOTES ON THE CONCEPTS OF PLAY AND LEISURE

A. Giddens

Psychologists and educationalists have long been interested in play as a type of behaviour characteristic of children. Social science has taken much less notice of adult play. One reason for this is that we apparently feel slightly guilty when trying to take our non-serious activities seriously.¹ The extended leisure now available to all strata in industrial society, however, provides a weighty reason for giving such activities our serious attention. In this paper, an analysis is offered of some approaches which have been made to the study of play as a form of social behaviour, and the relationship of play to leisure is discussed.

The general conception of play

Play has been studied by two main groups of writers. A number of nineteenth century educational theorists and philosophers wrote extensively on play, particularly in terms of its relevance to the educational process. These writers produced a variety of speculative theories about the nature of play. Observations of animal play were made frequent use of, and the aetiology of play behaviour was regarded as essentially similar in animals and man. A good deal of such speculation accordingly centred around identifying the presumed biological origins of play. The second major approach to play is a more empirical one. This consists in descriptive studies of children's play undertaken by educational psychologists. The latter writers have, however, taken a certain amount of their inspiration from the earlier speculative theory.

Among both groups of writers, there has been a considerable disagreement about the essential characteristics of play as distinguished from any other type of activity. This is partly responsible for the fact that play has been subject to overlapping and complementary treatments in the literature. Writers have used as criteria of play, among other things, the following: the motivation to engage in the activity (e.g., Spencer: 'Activities that are carried on for the sake

A. Giddens

of the immediate gratifications derived, without reference to ulterior benefits');² the lack of obligation to participate in the activity (e.g., Patrick: 'Those human activities which are free and spontaneous . . . Interest in them is self-sustaining, and they are not continued under any internal or external compulsion');³ the affective components of the activity (e.g., Ruskin: 'Exertion of body or mind, made to please ourselves');⁴ the lack of articulation of the activity with other activities (e.g., Huizinga: '[Play] . . . proceeds within its own proper boundaries of time and space according to fixed rules and in an orderly manner');⁵ and the non-productive character of the activity (e.g., Caillois: 'A characteristic of play . . . is that it creates no wealth or goods').⁶

Among the criteria of play which have been offered by different writers, however, there are undoubtedly a few common strands which can be drawn out. The majority of interpretations seem to stress one fundamental characteristic of play, as differentiated from any other sort of behaviour namely, that play is activity which is by and large *non-instrumental* in character. That is, play is not linked psychologically to purposes which are external to the activity and which would dictate its character. On a social level, play is relatively 'self-contained' activity, which is not linked to consequences lying outside the performance of the activity itself. Play is essentially non-productive activity: it is distinct from economic or artistic production because of its self-contained character. It is because of these characteristics that play is usually seen as 'trivial' or 'inconsequential'; it is in the sense of being largely non-instrumental and non-productive activity, that play is not 'serious'.⁷ The consequence of the predominance of these two characteristics means that play is pleasurable to the actor, in the widest sense, and that participation in play activity is associated with some sort of need-satisfaction for the participant. Most of the other criteria which have been used to characterize play seem to derive from these three characteristics, and probably could be used to differentiate different types of play rather than to distinguish play as such.⁸

It is important to notice that, while there may be marked similarities between the play of animals and man, and between the play of diverse cultures, play does not as a concept refer merely to a specific set of behavioural forms. None of the characteristics taken as definitive of play carry the implication of specific activities, but type the behaviour largely in terms of the psychological and social context in which the activity takes place. Games, for

Notes on the Concepts of Play and Leisure

example, are not always play. For the professional sportsman, the game is not a play activity, since it takes place within a context of economic obligation which gives it a predominantly instrumental character. The adult performs an activity through economic obligation and it is called work; the child imitates the activity, and it is called play.⁹

Accepting the broad definition of play given above, a variety of adult activities can be classified as play: there is no reason to suppose that play ceases sometime in early adolescence, or to start calling it 'recreation' rather than 'play'. Childhood, both in man and the higher animals, is certainly dominated by play. The more limited importance of play in adulthood is not due to biological differences between the youthful and adult organism, but to factors external to the individual which limit the time available for play. The adult animal is perforce engaged in predominantly instrumental and adaptive activity: hunting for food, eating, sleeping and defence. In man, the social development of the individual entails his increasing involvement in a social matrix. The increasing involvement of the individual in relationships of commitment and obligation restricts play, and to some extent changes its character.

The early theory of play

In a general way, the early theory of play can be grouped into four main types: (1) the surplus energy theory; (2) the recreation theory; (3) the recapitulation theory; and (4) the instinct-practice theory.¹⁰

The surplus energy theory is one of the oldest and simplest approaches to play. This theory regards play as the expenditure of energy which is surplus to that consumed in instrumental or adaptive activity.¹¹ According to this theory, play is 'blowing off steam'. Children have most of their wants catered for by others, and are consequently able to discharge their energies in spontaneous patterns of non-appetitive behaviour. Schiller, the German poet and philosopher, expressed the idea clearly when he defined play as 'the aimless expenditure of exuberant energy.'¹² Children and young animals, being protected and supplied with most of their needs by their parents, play most of the time. Thus, in this theory, a common biological origin is posited to explain the existence of play in animals and children. One major fault in the theory is that play tends to be regarded as 'random' behaviour, stimulated by the existence of some sort of constant reservoir of energy which must be dissipated in some

A. Giddens

way: the implication is that any sort of activity would serve to use up this quantum of energy. This theory represents a first attempt to account for the existence of play, but has no means of explaining the different forms which play may take. The theory does, however, receive some sort of support from studies of primates which appear to show the existence of 'spontaneous' tendencies towards the manipulation of the environment.¹³

The recreation theory of play was put forward by the German educationalist Lazarus, and has been endorsed by several other writers.¹⁴ According to this theory, the origins of play lie in the need for mental and physical recuperation from the stresses and strains imposed on the individual in other kinds of activity. The psychological function of play is to restore the physically and mentally fatigued individual through participation in activity which is pleasurable and relaxing.¹⁵ In one way this theory is the opposite of the notion of play as deriving from the expenditure of surplus energy: the latter theory sees play as behaviour which consumes 'left over' energy, while the recreation theory considers play to be activity through which the individual recuperates his exhausted energies. The weakness of the recreation theory is obvious enough: no indication is given of the mechanisms through which play restores, and there would appear to be many examples of play leading to mental and physical exhaustion rather than to recuperation.

The recapitulation theory is contained in the work of G. Stanley Hall.¹⁶ This theory invokes the assumption of racial inheritance: the play activities of the young are regarded as the re-enactment of past patterns of behaviour which played a part in the social development of the race. The child traces the pattern of racial development in play.¹⁷

The most influential early theory of play has been the instinct-practice (pre-exercise) theory, put forward in its most complete form by Karl Groos.¹⁸ The origins of play are regarded as instinctive; but play is seen as having its most important rôle as a part of the learning process. According to Groos, play has an essential rôle in the training of the young animal or child for adulthood. Play, in both animals and man, enables the individual to practice, in situations where the results of his activity are of no consequence, behaviour patterns which will form an essential part of his life as an adult. Through the playful imitation of adult activities, the young come to learn activities which will later be instrumental to their survival.

Notes on the Concepts of Play and Leisure

While the conception of play as deriving from instinctive sources has been abandoned, Groos' theory has been the foundation for later work which has treated play as important in socialization.

The various interpretations of play offered in the early theory are clearly not mutually exclusive. They do not offer alternative explanations of the same facts: they can rather be regarded as complementary explanations, each being applicable to some aspects or forms of play.¹⁹ The three main features of the early theory of play to which attention needs to be drawn here are the following: (1) the writers in question have been mostly concerned with speculation about the biological basis of play, and have consequently tended to stress similarities between play in animals and play in man, assuming that both spring from similar sources; (2) the other primary direction of interest has been in establishing some of the consequences of play activity for the psychological structure of the individual, and most writers have neglected the different forms which play may take, tending to regard them all as functionally equivalent for the individual; (3) play has been considered, either explicitly or by implication, both in animals and man, as specifically a childhood activity.

The study of play in childhood

A large number of empirical studies of children's play have been produced by social psychologists during the past thirty years, partly under the stimulus of the work of Groos and Hall.²⁰ The theory accompanying this work is far more limited in nature, and there has been little interest in further speculation about the biological foundations of play. Writers have rather been concerned with stressing the central rôle of play in the uniquely human process of socialization. But most writers, at least implicitly, seem to accept that there is some, albeit rather undefined, biological component in play which underlies the similarities which are to be found, as was stressed in the early theory, between the play of animals and man. On the level of human behaviour, cross-cultural similarities between the play of children are evident and striking. The ubiquitous presence of rhythm in the play of widely diverse cultures in one instance.²¹ Children in quite separate cultures develop similar rudimentary play forms apparently spontaneously and without instruction.

The early theory of play, including most notably the work of Groos, has had important practical ramifications, particularly in sphere of

A. Giddens

education. Educational theory had always viewed play in an unfavourable light. Play was regarded as wasteful activity, consuming time and energies which could be better devoted to work. In the new conception, play has an essential rôle in the learning process and in the wider process of cultural transmission. Most writers have come today to regard play and the play group as of paramount importance in socialization. G. H. Mead gave play a central place in his analysis. Through acting out the rôles of others in play, the child develops a conception of the social responses appropriate to these rôles, and forms the objective self which is pre-requisite to the full development of the self as subject.²² Empirical studies of play indicate that the tendency towards group play develops between the third and fourth year of childhood in our society.²³ The play group is a peer group formation composed of a voluntary association of individuals governed by a set of self-imposed rules. Piaget has provided an imposing series of studies about the way in which such rules develop, and the part they play in the development of personality. The play group is thought of as the first group through membership of which the child comes to internalize patterns of behaviour without 'autocratic' induction. The move to games with externally set rules 'mark the decline of children's games and the transition to adult play.'²⁴ The development of play activity into adolescence has been documented at length, although most studies are concerned with American society.²⁵

Play, then, has important functions in the transmission of culture and the development of personality. But psychologists have also been generally agreed in assigning other psychological functions to play. These can be categorized as (1) the *cathartic* function, and (2) the *ego-expansion* function. The cathartic function of play is given pride of place in psychoanalytic theory. According to Freud, play allows the individual to discharge states of emotional tension built up elsewhere, and permits the expression of frustrated tendencies through symbolic or representational activity.²⁶ This conception has been developed by a number of writers in the psychoanalytic tradition. Play is seen as a catharsis which not only dissipates emotional tension, but makes socially undesirable responses acceptable through the mechanisms of canalization and sublimation. The direction and form of children's play is seen as deriving partly from the need of the individual to relieve particular kinds of tension. In Erikson's words, 'a play act . . . is a complicated dynamic product of

Notes on the Concepts of Play and Leisure

'manifest' and 'latent' themes, of past experience and present task, of the need to express something and the need to suppress something, of clear representation, symbolic indirection, and radical disguise.'²⁷ The ego-expansion function of play has been well stated by Claparède: 'The function of play is to allow the child to express his ego, to display his personality, to pursue momentarily the line of his greatest interest in cases where he cannot do so through serious activities.'²⁸ Play allows the individual to express those aspects of his personality which are denied expression elsewhere. In play the creation of a sphere of irrealty where the ego is not limited by the reality principle which operates in other activity, enables the individual to attain such expression.²⁹

Psychological treatments of play, while suffering from considerable terminological confusion, show a certain amount of agreement in the general conception of play. The most important lines of consensus are: (1) Play behaviour, at least in children, springs partially from biological sources. While these sources have not been adequately defined, evidence from the study of the behaviour of animals and children indicates (a) that play develops apparently 'spontaneously', without prior instruction in both children and animals, and (b) that there are broad similarities between the play of the higher animals and the play of children. These factors indicate that there is a definite biological component in such play.

(2) Play fulfils certain psychological functions for the individual who engages in it. While a variety of notions about the nature of these functions have been put forward by the various writers, certain ideas appear again and again. The most important of these are: (a) play, or some kinds of play, may serve to dissipate personal tensions which have developed through other activity. Freud and the psychoanalytic writers embody this conception in the theory that play serves a cathartic function. But this is not so different from the original idea—which Schiller and others conceived to provide an explanation for the existence of play—that play represents the expenditure of 'surplus energy'. But while the psychoanalytic approach stresses that tensions are produced by social activities in other spheres, the latter theory sees energy as deriving from biological sources. (b) some kinds of play may serve to provide satisfactions which are denied expression in other kinds of activity. This has been set out by later writers as the ego-expansion function, but this idea is not radically different from the notion of Guts Muths and others, that play serves

A. Giddens

a recreative function. (3) Play has an essential rôle in the learning process. This view stems partly from the original work of Groos. Later writers have, however, focussed more upon specifically social learning in children.

Sociological approaches to play

Sociological treatments of play have proceeded without much regard for either the general conception of play used by the philosophers and psychologists, or for their conclusions. One approach to the study of play in sociology has taken an extremely wide view of play. In this view, play has been regarded not only as a type of social behaviour, but as a set of characteristics which can be found in greater or less degree in nearly all activity. 'Ludic' characteristics are attributed to a wide variety of activities which would not themselves be included as examples of play. Kroeber, for example, links the 'play impulse' directly to social and technological invention. The 'play impulse', which appears here to represent a reappearance of the 'surplus energy' concept, is held to explain an important sector of technological advance. Human behaviour never consists in mere adaptation to the exigencies of a particular environment, but always involves the manipulation of the environment over and above that which is required to survive it. Playful manipulation of the environment precedes the realization of utility: any type of inventive modification of the environment involves something over and above mere adaptation to it. Thus, according to Kroeber, play impulses in man 'motivate great areas of human behaviour and important achievements of culture . . . games and sports . . . the influence of curiosity, of desire for variety of mental restlessness, in the arts, sciences and fashions.'³⁰ Huizinga puts forward a similar view, regarding play both as a type of behaviour, and as a characteristic or set of characteristics attaching to other types of behaviour. According to Huizinga, many kinds of human activity have a 'play-element' in them. He points out that in every language he studied there exists one word for work, and a different word for play; but he goes on to indicate that all sorts of human activities, such as scientific investigation, war, litigation, and many other kinds of activity which we would normally call 'work', have some play-element in them. Rationality and formalization, entailing the standardization of behaviour within precise limits, mean a diminution of the 'play-element' in behaviour. Modern industrial society, which

Notes on the Concepts of Play and Leisure

is marked by the increasing rationalization of activity in many spheres of social life, has lost many of the ludic characteristics distinguishing previous ages.³¹

The main objection to this kind of approach is that it is too diffuse. What Kroeber and Huizinga demonstrate is basically that very few human activities consist in the direct and simple adaptation to the exigencies of external circumstances. (Panic might be one of the few human examples of such behaviour). In most human activity there is some kind of assimilation to the ego³² over and above adaptation to externally set demands. But this helps little to understand different kinds of social behaviour. This view of play sets the net so wide that it confuses more than it clarifies.

The main approach to the study of play in sociology has been in terms of a polar contrast with work. Here play falls within the general category of the sociology of leisure.³³ This field of sociology has suffered in two ways: (1) leisure has been implicitly seen as a relatively minor or 'trivial' sector of social life. Leisure activity has been in general regarded as merely ancillary to those systems of economy, power and prestige which have been taken in sociology as crucial to the explication of social behaviour; (2) there has been conceptual confusion and ambiguity in the use of the key terms 'leisure', 'play' and 'recreation'. These three are often used interchangeably. Some writers use 'play' as synonymous with 'leisure'; others limit the term to refer only to leisure activities which bring pleasure to the individual.³⁴ A large number of writers do not employ the term 'play', however: in their usage, play is an activity of children, which gives way to 'recreation' sometime during adolescence.³⁵ Some writers regard play as a particular type of leisure activity, but seem uncertain about how play differs from other leisure activities.³⁶

Using the criteria which have been taken above as definitive of play, a clearer formulation of the relationship of play to leisure can be arrived at. In industrial society, where sharp divisions are often made between work and activities outside of work, play certainly belongs to leisure. Basic to the definition of work is that it consists in (a) instrumental activity, undertaken (b) within a framework of direct or indirect economic obligation. However, a large number of leisure activities also have strong instrumental characteristics. Very often these take the form of an obligation or duty to perform a particular activity. The frequent use of the terms 'free' time or 'spare' time as synonyms for leisure suggests that such time is free of social

A. Giddens

or economic obligation. But much leisure is neither 'free' time, nor 'spare' time: various sorts of obligation and commitment extend far into leisure time. In many kinds of leisure activity there exists a fairly well-defined system of obligation or reciprocity which in part determines the use of leisure. Such is the case, for example, with the widespread activity of 'visiting' relatives among certain strata of the population. In other cases there are structured forms of obligation to participate in particular activities because of their association with social status in the group. An example might be church-going in certain middle-class groups. Another common form of leisure activity is overtly utilitarian activity which has strong instrumental characteristics. A good deal of leisure, for example, is spent in such activities as helping around the house, painting and decorating, mowing the lawn and so on.³⁷

All these activities are predominantly instrumental in character, and are often marked by the presence of some structured obligation to participate in them. The instrumental character of these activities separates them from another type of leisure activity which falls into the general category of play as defined above. Such activity is predominantly non-instrumental in character. Activities which are usually classed as 'recreational'—hobbies, games and sports, and the various forms of vicarious 'amusement', for example—generally fall into this category. Games are a primary play form, although games are not always play. The game depends upon the temporary acceptance by the players of a set of rules which 'cut off' the activity within the games from events in the 'real' world. Games often are played in a special physical locale—the pitch, the course, the card-table—which emphasises the social and psychological separation of such play from behaviour which is integrated with reality. But, as Simmel points out, all play has definite links with reality, however 'detached' it may be in other respects.³⁸ No form of play is completely isolated from the 'real' world; all play involves an equilibrium between input from the 'real' external context of the activity, and the output expended by the player. When this equilibrium is disturbed through the infusion of reality—when, for example, the activity becomes linked closely to instrumental ends lying outside the activity itself, its character as play is lost. When a game of golf becomes primarily a means of creating business opportunities, it largely loses its play character. In this case, behaviour in the game is invested with consequences of considerable import outside of the game itself; the activity is directly

Notes on the Concepts of Play and Leisure

enmeshed in the social system of 'real' life. Play as a type of leisure activity, then, entails the temporary creation of a sphere of irreality, which is derived in games from what Goffman calls the 'rules of irrelevance'.³⁹ Play is sometimes identified with physically active behaviour; but vicarious 'participation' in the events on stage or screen may fulfil the essential characteristics of play; these involve the temporary abandonment of the 'real' world and the vicarious entry into a world of representation and symbolism. There is, of course, no clear borderline between instrumental leisure and play. Play is never completely 'cut off' from the 'real' world, and all leisure shows some instrumental characteristics.

Stringent divisions between work and leisure are mostly characteristic of modern industrial society. In industrial work, where a discrete work environment exists separated from the home, and where labour is evaluated in temporal terms, the social cleavage of time into work and leisure is common. In societies where the sphere of work is not clearly delineated, socially or psychologically, it is probably more appropriate to speak only of a continuum between work and play. Play takes its characteristics largely from the organization of work in a society. As Margaret Mead puts it, the survival of any society depends upon its meeting a number of prerequisites: one of these is a generalized social need to establish some kind of pattern of work and extra-work activity, 'which in most societies becomes transformed also into the way in which work—activity that is purposeful and directed towards ends that lie outside the activity—and play—activity which is self-rewarding—are alternated.'⁴⁰ Some societies are characterized by a periodic rhythm between what Riesman calls 'heavy' work and 'heavy' play.⁴¹ The work structure of other societies is organised around the continual performance of light tasks rather than the periodic performance of heavy labour. The distinctions between work and leisure which apply in modern society do not easily cover such an organization of work. In Bali, according to Mead, there is no word for 'tired', only a word meaning something like 'too tired', which is used after relatively uncommon instances of hard labour; among the Arapesh, on the other hand, work is organized in a definite periodic fashion. Ceremonial play organized on a communal basis is usually most important in those societies which do not have very precise work-leisure divisions.⁴²

The study of leisure in modern society is one of the neglected fields of sociology. The analysis of some sociological problems of

A. Giddens

leisure did receive some attention in the 1930's—but most writers were concerned with leisure as a moral 'problem', rather than with the objective study of leisure as an area of social behaviour.⁴³ The best sociological study of leisure, however, is still that by Lundberg *et al*, which appeared in 1936.⁴⁴ A number of fairly recent publications bear witness to an upsurge of interest in the sociology of leisure.⁴⁵ But, in the two major symposia on leisure, many of the contributions are from non-academic sources,⁴⁶ and the study of leisure still remains very much a field dominated by the *litterateur*. There are, however, strong indications that the sociological analysis of leisure will come more from out of the shadow of the sociology of work. The decreasing length of the average working week, the increase in the average span of life, and the existence of a fixed retirement age, have all contributed to the development of protracted leisure for the mass of the population. But not until fairly recently have sociologists begun to attack this problem, and try to establish what are the objective consequences of extended leisure for the working population.

The lack of adequate conceptualization in this field is a consequence of this comparative neglect. Even more than in most areas of sociology, terminology has been adopted en bloc from everyday language. The term 'leisure' itself has been used in a variety of different meanings. Thus Piper writes: 'Leisure, it must be clearly understood, is a mental and spiritual attitude—it is not simply the result of external factors, it is not the inevitable result of spare time, a holiday, weekend, or a vacation.'⁴⁷ The term is held to imply, however vaguely, the necessary existence of a body of qualities tending towards 'refreshment, diversion, or personal enrichment.'⁴⁸ It is difficult with this sort of definition to get some measure of objectivity in determining just what activities constitute leisure, and which do not. Such definitions usually involve evaluative criteria of 'useful' activity which relate to the 'proper' use of leisure, and may mask a sort of intellectual priggishness which condemns some activities and condones others.⁴⁹ Classifications of leisure behaviour are usually formulated into simple formal categories—such as 'art', 'reading', or 'the Cinema'. Many investigations of leisure are only gross statistical surveys of relative participation in particular kinds of leisure activities. These studies of leisure still proceed largely in the form of social survey investigations, and produce only the most superficial of information about leisure behaviour. One reason for this, of course, is that there has

Notes on the Concepts of Play and Leisure

been very little attempt to construct a sociological theory of leisure. Sociologically penetrating analyses of leisure behaviour are generally only produced as an incidental aspect of investigations fundamentally devoted to other problems.⁵⁰ Statistical surveys of the extent of cinema-going, reading, outdoor sports, etc., in the national population tell us nothing about the functional significance of such activities for different groups. To obtain sociological generalizations about leisure, the leisure styles of specific social groups—such as class groups, or community groups—must be analysed in terms of the 'total life situation' of such groups.⁵¹

Realization that a good deal of leisure in modern society is taken up in predominantly instrumental activity, is important for the formulation of social policy concerned with the 'problem' of leisure. Extended leisure does *not*, by and large, in modern society entail the development of a 'vacuum' of 'free' time. A great amount of the leisure now available to the population is occupied in instrumental leisure.⁵² Moreover, in much of the moralistic literature on leisure, norms and ideals of leisure behaviour are interpreted almost wholly in terms of the personal standards of the individual writers, rather than in terms of objects relating to the actual needs of groups in common structural situations. One reason, in fact, for the prominence given to the 'problem' of leisure may be that we have only the experience of leisured elites upon which to base suppositions about the leisure needs of groups in modern industrial society. On the practical level of formulating policy for leisure, and of 'educating for leisure', one of the crucial pre-requisites is the systematic investigation of the interrelationships between work, leisure, and play.

Adult play is not psychologically identical with the play of children, since its character is determined partly by its juxtaposition with work. As Erikson points out, while children's play, at least in infancy, is directly connected with the increasing mastery of reality, for the adult, play is a 'periodical stepping out from those forms of defined limitation which are his reality.'⁵³ In the latter case, the individual 'must do something which he has chosen to do without being compelled by urgent interests or impelled by strong passion; he must feel entertained and free from any fear or hope of serious consequences. He is on vacation from reality—or, as is most commonly emphasised, he *does not work*. It is this opposition to work which gives play a number of connotations.'⁵⁴ The 'stepping aside' from reality is the most important and intriguing characteristic of play.⁵⁵

A. Giddens

It is undeniable that the character of the play of a group will depend partly upon needs created, or left unfulfilled, in other spheres of social life—particularly in work. Dubin and others have explored some ways in which the importance which a group attaches to play as a 'life interest' relates to the character of the work situation.⁵⁶

But it seems likely that the two major psychological functions of play in children are applicable to adult play: (a) the cathartic function: play often appears to enable the individual to dissipate personal tension accumulated in other spheres of activity. Catharsis cannot explain as much as in children's play the particular form the play activity takes, but forms of play such as competitive sports may serve to canalize aggression in socially acceptable directions. (b) the ego-expansion function: among some groups in modern society, it seems to be a major psychological function of play to provide satisfactions of achievement and self-realization which are frustrated elsewhere.⁵⁷ The development of the ego-expansion characteristics which play might offer is one of the main features of most programmatic approaches which have been made to leisure as a 'social problem' in modern society.⁵⁸ Insofar as play fulfils either of these psychological functions, it follows that the general social function of play is also a 'cathartic' one. But play takes in a wide category of behaviour, and it is almost as meaningless to attribute specified social functions to play in general, as it would be to ascribe such functions to work in general.

Conclusion.

Moral value is commonly attached to different types of play, and may be attached to play as a whole.⁵⁹ Cohen has shown how conceptions of the status and utility of play have shifted since the Middle Ages.⁶⁰ Riesman, Wolfenstein and others have drawn attention to changes in the ideology of work and leisure which have been taking place in the United States.⁶¹ The developments which have given rise to extended leisure for virtually all groups in the population, have also brought about considerable ideological ambiguity between values which are oriented towards stressing the value of work and those which emphasize the potential satisfactions of play. People in those occupations—the professions, for example—where the division between work and leisure is not stringently defined, may be in an indeterminate position between values oriented towards work and others directed towards play. Values which have stressed the central

Notes on the Concepts of Play and Leisure

importance of work in life have, of course, gone hand in hand with a comparative lack of interest in the analysis of leisure in general. But the ever-decreasing length of the average working day suggests that problems of leisure will increasingly come into the forefront of both theoretical and practical interest.⁶²

University of Leicester.

¹ See Riesman's comments, in D. Riesman: 'Some observations on changes in leisure attitudes', *Individualism Reconsidered*, Glencoe, 1954, p. 202.

² H. Spencer: *The Principles of Psychology*, Vol. 2, London, 1872, p. 632.

³ G. T. W. Patrick: *The Psychology of Relaxation*, New York, 1916, p. 13.

⁴ Ruskin, quoted in E. D. Mitchell and B. S. Mason: *The Theory of Play*, New York, 1934, p. 86.

⁵ J. Huizinga: *Homo Ludens. A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*, London, 1949, p. 13.

⁶ R. Caillois: *Man, Play and Games*, Glencoe, 1961, p. 5.

⁷ See Huizinga: *op. cit.* p. 5ff.

⁸ E. S. Robinson: 'Play', *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*.

⁹ T. Woody: *Life and Education in Early Societies*, New York, 1949, p. 20.

¹⁰ See Mitchell and Mason: *op. cit.*; J. N. Dasgupta: 'Psychological theories of play and their influence upon educational theory and practice', unpub. M.A. thesis, University of London, 1949, pp. 16-37; H. C. Lehman and P. A. Witty: *The Psychology of Play Activities*, New York, 1927, pp. 7-27.

¹¹ Spencer: *op. cit.*, pp. 627-632.

¹² F. Schiller: *Essays, Aesthetical and Philosophical*, London, 1875, p. 112.

¹³ See W. Köhler: *The Mentality of Apes*, London, 1925, pp. 71ff.

¹⁴ M. Lazarus: *Über die Reize des Spiels*, Berlin, 1883.

¹⁵ Patrick discusses play in terms of relaxation. Patrick: *op. cit.*

¹⁶ G. S. Hall: *Adolescence, its Psychology*, 2 vols., London, 1905.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 1., p. 202.

¹⁸ K. Groos: *The Play of Animals*, London, 1898.

¹⁹ See Robinson *loc. cit.*, pp. 160-161.

²⁰ Some of these are summarized in S. N. Britt and S. Q. Janus: 'Toward a social psychology of human play', *J. Soc. Psych.*, 1941, Vol. 13.

²¹ J. S. Slotkin: *Social Anthropology*, New York, 1950, pp. 278-282. Also in E. Hurlock: 'Experimental investigations of childhood play', *Psych. Bull.*, 31, 1943. See also Köhler's description of apes' 'dances'. Köhler, *op. cit.*, pp. 326-329.

A. Giddens

²² G. H. Mead: *Mind, Self and Society*, Chicago, 1934, pp. 152-164. Typical schemes of the development of play in the child are given in: L. J. Stone and J. Church: *Childhood and Adolescence*, New York, 1957, pp. 150-159; G. P. Stone: 'Appearance and self', A. M. Rose (ed.): *Human Behaviour and Social Processes*, Boston, 1962, pp. 86-118; and E. H. Erikson: 'Clinical studies in Childhood play', R. G. Barker, J. S. Kounin and H. F. Wright: *Child Behaviour and Development*, New York, 1943.

²³ A. Gesell and F. Ilg: *The Child from Five to Ten*, New York, 1946, pp. 359-373; also, R. Helanko: *Theoretical Aspects of Play and Socialization*, Turku, 1958, pp. 22-31.

²⁴ J. Piaget: *Play, Dreams and Imitation in Childhood*, New York, 1951, p. 168.

²⁵ See, for example, A. Gesell, F. L. Ilg and L. B. Ames: *Youth. The Years from Ten to Sixteen*, London, 1956.

²⁶ S. Freud: *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, London, 1922. The cathartic function of play is elaborated by Menninger. See K. Menninger: *Love Against Hate*, New York, 1949, pp. 167-188.

²⁷ E. H. Erikson: *loc. cit.*, p. 326.

²⁸ E. Claparède: *Psychology of the Child*, Quoted, Piaget: *op. cit.*, pp. 158-159.

²⁹ The cathartic and ego-expansive properties of play have resulted in the use of play as a therapeutic medium. See Erikson, *loc. cit.*, for example; or M. Klein: 'The psychoanalytic play technique: its history and significance', M. Klein, P. Heinmann, and R. E. Money-Kyrle (eds.): *New Directions in Psycho-analysis*, London, 1955, pp. 3-22.

³⁰ A. L. Kroeber: *Anthropology*, New York, 1948, p. 29.

³¹ Huizinga: *op. cit.* For Huizinga, an activity has a certain play-character insofar as it contains agonistic elements. Thus war may have a definite play quality.

³² Piaget's phrase. See Piaget: *op. cit.*, pp. 147-150.

³³ See, for example, N. Anderson: *Work and Leisure*, London, 1961, p. 130 ff.

³⁴ E.g., M. Wolfenstein: 'The emergence of fun morality', *J. of Social Issues*, 7, 1951, pp. 3-16.

³⁵ As in Stone and Church: *op. cit.*

³⁶ For example, Anderson: *op. cit.*, pp. 44-46.

³⁷ See J. Dumazedier: 'Tendances de la sociologie du loisir', paper given at the Fourth World Congress of Sociology, Stresa, 1959.

³⁸ G. Simmel: *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, Glencoe, p. 41.

³⁹ E. Goffman: *Encounters. Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*, Indianapolis, 1961, p. 19. A discussion of the relationship between games and play can be found in: G. Bateson: 'The message "this is play"', *Transactions of the Second Conference on Group Processes*, Princeton, 1955, p. 199ff; and in F. Redl: 'The impact of game ingredients on children's play behaviour', *Transactions of the Fourth Conference on Group Processes*, Princeton, 1957, pp. 33-81.

⁴⁰ M. Mead: *Male and Female*, London, 1949, p. 163.

Notes on the Concepts of Play and Leisure

⁴¹ Riesman: 'Some observations on changes in leisure attitudes', *loc. cit.*, p. 216.

⁴² M. Mead: *op. cit.*, pp. 165-169.

⁴³ See, for example, C. O. Burns: *Leisure in the Modern World*, New York, 1932; or J. B. Nash: *Spectatoritis*, New York, 1932. A comprehensive bibliography on leisure is provided in E. Larrabee and R. Meyersohn (eds.): *Mass Leisure*, Glencoe, 1958.

⁴⁴ G. Lundberg, A. MacInerny and M. Komorovsky: *Leisure. A Suburban Study*, New York, 1936.

⁴⁵ For example, Larrabee and Meyersohn: *op. cit.*; Anderson: *op. cit.*, Kaplan: *op. cit.*; and B. Rosenberg and D. M. White (eds.): *Mass Culture*, Glencoe, 1959.

⁴⁶ See Larrabee and Meyersohn: *op. cit.*

⁴⁷ J. Pieper: 'Leisure as contemplation', in E. Larrabee and R. Meyersohn: *op. cit.*, p. 342.

⁴⁸ The phrase is from a UNESCO study, quoted in R. Meyersohn: 'Americans off duty', W. T. Donohue (ed.): *Free Time: Challenge to Later Maturity*, Ann Arbor, 1958, preface, p. ix.

⁴⁹ For a discussion of this point, see W. C. Sutherland: 'A philosophy of leisure', *Recreation in the Age of Automation*, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1957, p. 1-4. I use 'leisure' in this paper in a residual fashion, to denote that sphere of life not occupied in working, travelling to work or sleeping.

⁵⁰ As in R. S. Lynd and H. M. Lynd: *Middletown*, New York, 1929.

⁵¹ See R. C. White: 'Social class differences in the uses of leisure', *A.J.S.*, 1955, 61, pp. 145-50.

⁵² See Dumazedier: 'Réalités du loisir et idéologies', *Esprit*, New Series, 1959.

⁵³ E. H. Erikson: *Childhood and Society*, London, 1953, p. 186.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

⁵⁵ See, for example, the interesting article by Goffman: *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 17-81.

⁵⁶ R. Dubin: 'Industrial workers' worlds', in A. M. Rose: *op. cit.*, pp. 247-266.

⁵⁷ Anderson: *op. cit.*, pp. 205-258.

⁵⁸ In, for example, C. O. Burns, *op. cit.*

⁵⁹ J. S. Slotkin: *op. cit.*, pp. 278-282.

⁶⁰ J. Cohen: 'The ideas of work and play', *B.J.S.*, 1953, pp. 312-322.

⁶¹ Wolfenstein: *loc. cit.*; Riesman: 'Some observations on changes in leisure attitudes', *loc. cit.*

⁶² cf. J. Vial: 'Pour une sociologie des loisirs', *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie*, vol. 13, 1952, pp. 61-77.

This document is a scanned copy of a printed document. No warranty is given about the accuracy of the copy. Users should refer to the original published version of the material.