



Cultural voraciousness – A new measure of the pace of leisure in a context of 'harriedness'

Oriel Sullivan

Oriel Sullivan
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Ben Gurion University
PO Box 653
Beer Sheva 84105, Israel
e-mail: sullivan@bgu.ac.il

Abstract

A new measure of 'voraciousness' in leisure activities is introduced as an indicator of the pace of leisure, facilitating a theoretical linkage between the literature on time pressure, busyness and harriedness in late modernity, and the literature on cultural consumption. On the methodological side it is shown that time use diaries can provide at least as good a measure of the pace of leisure as survey based measures. Respondents with a high score on the voraciousness measure ('harried' respondents) are not less likely to complete their diaries than less harried respondents. In accord with the findings from the literature on cultural omnivorousness, the most voracious groups are those with high levels of social status and human capital. However, these associations are not due to these groups having either higher income or greater quantities of available leisure time. The pace of leisure activities must therefore be due to other factors, for example, could a fast pace of out-of-home leisure participation be conceived of as a new marker of status distinction?

JEL-Codes: C42, D12, E21

Keywords: Time pressure, harriedness, leisure, busyness, time-use diaries, cultural omnivorousness

1 Introduction

Recent accounts of increasing 'busyness' in the working lives of individuals in contemporary industrialized societies (Zuzanek and Mannell, 1998; Darier, 1998; Social Research, 2005; Southerton and Tomlinson, 2005) have been echoed in the literature on leisure by the notion of increasing 'harriedness' (Zuzanek et al., 1998). In his discussion of the 'harried leisure class' Staffan Linder was one of the first to identify the change that has occurred over time in the association of work, leisure and class (Linder, 1970; Sullivan and Gershuny, 2001). At the turn of the nineteenth century, when Veblen (1994[1899]) was writing about conspicuous consumption among the rising professional classes, the distribution of leisure time was markedly different from today. As an example, we can compare the perhaps apocryphal image of the 'bankers' lunch – a long, alcoholic midday indulgence – with the image of the present-day investment banker or stockbroker, frenetically busy on several telephones for the entire day and much of the night. The current and growing association between high (earned) income and time scarcity has already been well documented (e.g., Jacobs and Gerson, 2004; Gershuny, 2000; Sullivan and Gershuny, 2004). Evidence of the working hours of better-qualified and high-income earners suggests that as qualification levels rise, so do hours of work (Robinson and Godbey, 1999; Gershuny, 2000). One solution which has been suggested for the increasing scarcity of time among certain groups is an increase in intensity of activities, at work and at leisure alike. This increase in intensity involves more activities being done simultaneously, but it may also involve shorter spells being spent on each activity, so that the sequence becomes more crowded, but also more fragmented, leading to ever heavier feelings of time pressure (e.g., Shaw, 1998; Bittman and Wajcman, 2000; Bittman, 2002; Mattingly and Bianchi, 2003). Individuals feel pressured to reduce process time in their public and their private lives, and they respond, among other things, by increasingly compressing, fragmenting, and compartmentalizing time (Southerton, 2003).

The impact of this increase in intensity of time use both in work and leisure activities is generally regarded in the literature as having a negative effect on well-being, and feelings of time pressure have long been shown to be positively associated with stress (Zuzanek and Mannell, 1998; Garhammer, 2002). Even in research which also reports a positive association between feelings of time pressure and enjoyment of life (e.g. Garhammer, 2002), a slower pace has usually been advocated as being more beneficial in terms of the quality of life (see also Darier, 1998; Grossin, 2000). Feelings of stress and harriedness are of course experienced differentially by different sub-groups of the population such as by men and women (e.g. Peters and Raaijmakers, 1998), and according to different socio-economic statuses (Garhammer, 1998; Zuzanek et al., 1998). As referred to above, the increasing association between high income and time pressure (the 'income-rich, time-poor' phenomenon) is by now well-recognized. Indeed, there is recent evidence that the feeling of time pressure and being overworked is particularly pronounced among those who in actuality may have a potentially large amount of

discretionary free time: this is the case for dual-earner couples, especially those without children. According to Goodin et al. (2005), these are the groups under the greatest "time-pressure illusion".

In this paper I introduce and describe a new measure of leisure participation which, in order to create a link to the literature on 'harriedness', takes account both of the range and the weekly frequency of participation in out-of-home leisure activities. It may be described as a measure of the 'pace' of leisure. Out-of-home leisure activities in particular are chosen because they express active leisure behaviors that take both time and money to engage in, and consequently provide a link to socio-economic and time resources which may be pertinent in the assessment of the socio-economic correlates of 'harriedness' in the late modern period.

2 Cultural voraciousness

The proposed measure is theoretically complementary to the concept of cultural omnivorousness, familiar from the literature on cultural consumption. Omnivorousness, since its original definition by Peterson and Kern (1996), has been characterized as being based on the breadth of cultural tastes and on the way cultural capital increasingly involves an appreciation of a wide range of cultural forms including the fine arts, popular culture, and folk culture: that is, including highbrow, middlebrow, and lowbrow cultural tastes. A number of works have measured omnivorousness, mainly according to cultural tastes (particularly musical genres: Peterson and Kern, 1996; Bryson, 1997; Emmison, 2003, but also reading: Van Rees et al., 1999) or, less often, according to cultural behaviour (particularly leisure activities: Lopez Sintas and Alvarez, 2002; Holbrook et al., 2002, but also eating habits: Warde et al., 1999). Cultural omnivorousness as it is usually defined is therefore a measure of breadth in cultural tastes, but it does not measure the pace of participation in leisure activities. The proposed new measure (termed 'voraciousness' in keeping with the metaphor) combines an assessment of individual's leisure participation in respect both of the range of out-of-home leisure activities (to reflect the breath of activities) and of the frequency of participation in them (to characterize the pace of leisure participation). In this paper both time use diary and survey data are used to report on measurement issues and the socio-economic correlates of voraciousness. By focusing in this way on the pace and nature of leisure participation, it is possible to make connections between the literature on the changing pace of life and leisure in late modernity (Linder, 1970; Garhammer, 1998; Gershuny, 2000), including concepts like busyness and harriedness, and the literature on the consumption of leisure activities.

Issues of measurement

In the construction of the voraciousness measure a number of measurement issues are relevant. Although questionnaire measures of activity participation are the most familiar means of data-collection on leisure participation, time use measures are also becoming increasingly applied (e.g. Garhammer, 1998; Robinson and Godbey, 1999). However, there has been some

criticism of time-use diaries as data collection instruments in the area of free time and leisure activities. One of the most common arguments is that, while time use diaries may be able to accurately record activities which are done frequently and regularly, they may be unreliable when it comes to less frequently performed activities. There is also an ongoing debate about whether time-use diaries under-represent 'busy' respondents (see Round Table Discussion on non-response bias in time-use surveys in *Leisure & Society*, 1998).

It is therefore interesting to be able to compare the measure of voraciousness based on a time use diary source with that based on the more standard questions on leisure participation found in questionnaire-based surveys. The data set used in this paper is particularly well-suited to address these questions since it allows a comparison of diary and questionnaire measures of leisure participation constructed from a time use diary on the one hand and from survey questions on the other (both instruments delivered to the same individuals). A further advantage of the particular diary used here is that it was kept for a week rather than for a single day (the more common data-collection procedure in time use diary methodology). It therefore permits analysis of a wider and more representative range of activities, encompassing those done less frequently (e.g., once a week instead of once a day). This is a valuable feature in the analysis of leisure, particularly leisure activities outside the home (since many such activities fall into the category of less frequent activities), and goes some way towards meeting the criticism that less frequent leisure activities are likely to be under-represented in a time use diary.

3 The data

'Home OnLine' was a panel study undertaken by the Institute for Social and Economic Research at the University of Essex, England, of adult individuals in households in Britain.¹ The first wave was conducted between October and December (inclusive) of 1998, and was selected according to a qualified form of randomization, which ensures inclusion of geographically clustered areas with representation of different social strata similar to that of the population. Selection of households was random within these areas, with an overrepresentation of homes with personal computers. Counterweights were included in the dataset to reproduce the expected sample without overrepresentation of households with computers. Two methods were used to collect the data. Firstly, interviews were conducted with all adult members (aged 16 or older) of the household. In addition, interviewed respondents were provided with a week-long diary in which they were asked to record, from a list of activity categories, what they did every quarter hour on each day of that week. The activities recorded in the diary were based on (but were not identical to) the standardized categories used in the Multi-national Time Use Study (MTUS),² a cross-national archive of time use diary studies held at the Uni-

¹ The original data collection was funded by British Telecommunications plc.

² For further details of the MTUS see <http://www.timeuse.org/mtus/>.

versity of Oxford. Diaries were returned by post; in return, respondents received a gift voucher.

Sample size and response rates

The original sample comprised 1000 households, containing 2034 adult individuals. Of these, 1093 responded to the interview and completed the diary and 668 responded to the interview only, a total response rate of 87 percent. From this data set we selected a subset of respondents aged between 16 and 65 who were identified in the interview as either the head of household or the partner of the head of household. This yielded a sample of 1317 individuals and couples in households.³

Construction of diary and questionnaire-based measures of voraciousness

The first advantage of this data set is that it contains information on participation in leisure activities both from questionnaire and time use diaries, making possible a choice and a comparison of measures. Two questionnaire measures of voraciousness were derived from a question in the interview schedule asking respondents how frequently they engaged in particular leisure activities.⁴ The out-of-home leisure activities selected for the measure were: going to the cinema/concerts/the theatre; leisure group participation; eating/drinking out; watching sports; and doing sports/keeping fit/walking. The first questionnaire measure was constructed by summing the number of these activities done on 'most days', and 'at least once a week'. The second measure *also* included those activities reported as being done 'at least once a month'. Both measures had a scale of 0 (none) to 5 (all).

The diary measure of voraciousness was based on time use diary information, and was designed to be as compatible as possible with the questionnaire measures. Respondents to the diary recorded their participation in different leisure activities throughout the week in quarter-hour slots. The diary measure simply counted the number of *different* out-of-home leisure activities done in the diary week, giving a range from 0 (none) to 4 (all). The out-of-home leisure activities selected for the diary measure were: going to concerts/the cinema; walking; eating/drinking out; and doing sports.⁵ Like the questionnaire measures it was therefore a measure both of the *range* (since it involves counting how many different activities are participated in) and of the *frequency* (since in order to be recorded during a specific week an activity has to be done on average at least weekly) of participation in different out-of-home leisure activities.

³ A randomly selected sample of one adult individual per household was also constructed, and all analyses were performed for both these samples. The results for the individual sample were identical to those for the sample of individual and couple households; given the greater numbers in the latter, only those results are presented.

⁴ The response categories were: most days; at least once a week; at least once a month; several times a year; once a year or less; never/almost never.

⁵ The diary's leisure categories were not precisely comparable with the questionnaire's leisure categories.

4 Diary/questionnaire measures comparison

The first step was to compare the time-use and questionnaire measures of voraciousness from the Home OnLine data. In particular, it is important to examine the basis for the criticisms of time use diary data as a source for information on less frequent leisure activities. In Table 1, the first questionnaire measure of voraciousness is based on the number of different out-of-home activities reported from the survey as being done at least once a week. The second questionnaire measure also contains those activities that are reported on the survey question as being done "at least once a month". On average one-quarter of these activities will appear in a weekly diary. Assuming that the diary gives an accurate record of activity participation we would therefore expect the diary estimate to have a higher distribution and mean than the first questionnaire measure, but a lower distribution and mean than the second questionnaire measure. Since both the distribution and mean of the diary measure sit squarely between those of the two questionnaire measures, we can conclude that time use diaries are indeed effective in measuring leisure participation, even for activities done monthly.

Table 1
Distributions and means of the time use diary and questionnaire measures of voraciousness: Britain 1998

Number of different out-of-home leisure activities/week	Questionnaire measure (1)		Weekly diary measure		Questionnaire measure (2)	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
None	135	(19.7)	103	(15.0)	57	(8.3)
One	304	(44.2)	232	(33.7)	179	(26.0)
Two	186	(27.1)	227	(32.9)	247	(35.8)
Three	60	(8.7)	102	(14.8)	150	(21.8)
Four	2	(0.3)	24	(3.5)	49	(7.1)
Five	1	(0.1)	-	-	7	(1.0)
N=100%	688 ⁺		688 ⁺		688 ⁺	
Mean	1.26		1.58		1.96	
Correlation coefficient (Spearman's rho) with weekly diary measure	.363				.350	

⁺ The analyses are based on a sample of 1317 respondents. However, the N in this analysis is a result of the sample weighting which corrects for both the original over-sampling of households with a personal computer and for differential patterns of non-response.

Source: Home OnLine, Britain, 1998 (first wave).

In assessing the overall efficacy of the measures based on the diaries and the questionnaires it is reasonable to conclude that the time-use diary instrument (recorded over a week of activi-

ties) may be the more accurate in recording the true range of different weekly activities, since in the diary activities were recorded simultaneously (or nearly simultaneously) with their actual performance, while in the questionnaire respondents were asked to recall the frequency with which they participated in particular activities. It has been shown that diary estimates of time spent in different activities, where people record their participation in those activities with at least some degree of contemporaneity (i.e., in their diaries), differ from estimates based upon responses to retrospective questions. It can safely be assumed that diary estimates are in fact the more accurate, since they do not involve the same problems of retrospective recall or respondents' estimations of their 'usual' behavior (see Juster, 1985; Robinson, 1985; Kalfs, 1993). In addition, general under-reporting of activities in surveys by comparison to time-use diary data has been commented on before in the methodological literature on time use diaries: see Dow and Juster, 1985. And indeed, comparison of the measures reported here suggested under-reporting by women to the survey question about the number of different leisure activities (see Table 3 and associated discussion below).

The conclusion that time use diaries record as many different leisure activities as more conventional questionnaire instruments still leaves open the question of differential diary completion by busy and less busy respondents. In other words, whether busy respondents are less likely to complete their diaries leading to an underestimation of the extent of harriedness (or, in this case, voraciousness in leisure) calculated from diary data (see Round Table Discussion in *Leisure and Society*, 1998). In order to address this issue, it is necessary to distinguish between respondents who completed a diary with those who responded only to the survey questionnaire.

Table 2 shows that when the distribution and means of the voraciousness measures are recalculated comparing those people who responded to the survey questionnaire only with all those who filled in a diary, the distributions are extremely similar (weighting this time only for over-representation of those with personal computers in the sample). So it seems that there is very little difference in the reporting of voraciousness (or the *pace* of consumption of leisure) between the diary and survey questionnaire respondents (compare results from Table 1 – shown in brackets).

Van den Broek and Breedveld also include a measure of the 'diversity' of the leisure repertoire calculated from both diary and questionnaire information in a report of time use in the Netherlands from the Dutch series of time use surveys between 1985-2000 (Van den Broek and Breedveld, 2004). Their time use measure (which included PC usage) was calculated from the weekly diary activities, while the questionnaire measure (which included both PC and internet usage) was calculated from questions about which leisure activities were participated in. Analyses of these measures are presented only at the population level, and they show an overall decline in diversity from 1985-2000 over the time diary week, but an increase in the reported *annual* repertoire of activities. No discussion of differential response is included and no break-downs are given for different groups of the population, but the authors suggest that this divergence over time in the time use and questionnaire measures may signal a move from

a more involved participation in leisure activities in the earlier period towards a "passer-by" status in the later, characterized by greater annual diversity in the leisure repertoire but a more restricted range of weekly activities.

Table 2
Comparison of diary and questionnaire respondents on measure of voraciousness:
Britain 1998 (Table 1 results shown in brackets)

	Questionnaire measure 1: (weighted for PC ⁺ only)		Diary measure: (weighted for PC ⁺ only)		Questionnaire measure 2: (weighted for PC ⁺ only)	
0	16.9	(19.7)	16.4	(15.0)	7.7	(8.3)
1	48.5	(44.2)	33.7	(33.7)	28.1	(26.0)
2	26.9	(27.1)	32.3	(32.9)	37.0	(35.8)
3	6.3	(8.7)	14.4	(14.8)	20.3	(21.8)
4	1.4	(0.3)	3.3	(3.5)	6.8	(7.1)
5	0.0	(0.1)			.1	(1.0)
Mean	1.27	(1.26)	1.55	(1.58)	1.91	(1.96)
N =100%	425 (questionnaire only respondents)		653 (all diary respondents)		425 (questionnaire only respondents)	

⁺ PC = personal computer
 Source: Home OnLine, Britain, 1998 (first wave).

Diary/questionnaire measures: gender difference

Despite the overall similarity of the diary and survey measures of voraciousness, and in support of the documented contention that questionnaire-derived measures may lead to under-reporting by comparison with diary-derived measures, there is a suggestion of differential reporting by sex between the diary and questionnaire measures of voraciousness from the Home OnLine data (see Table 3). While there is no difference evident in voraciousness recorded for the week between men and women from the time-use diary information (this being true both in the simple T-test and in the multiple analyses of variance controlling for social status and family structure shown in Tables 4 and 5), there is a statistically significant difference by sex for the first questionnaire measure (which remains statistically significant in multiple analysis of variance when controlling for measures of social status and family structure), with men reporting on average a greater number of different out-of-home leisure activities participated in per week. In addition, there is a difference in the same direction which is just over the conventional limit of statistical significance for the second questionnaire measure (P=.07). It is not clear to what extent these differences can be attributed to differential reporting by men and women in response to questionnaire items on the usual frequency of different

leisure activities; if we *are* seeing an example of differential reporting, then it is interesting to speculate why men might be more inclined to over-report, or women to under-report, the frequency with which they participate in different out-of-home leisure activities. If we accept the diary measure as the more accurate (since it does not rely on retrospective recall of activity participation) the implication is that men and women may be reporting their leisure activity information differentially in the survey questions on leisure; with women under-reporting their participation in out-of-home leisure activities. We can only speculate on the reasons for this – but one possible explanation that accords with the literature is that women feel more under pressure from work and family responsibilities and therefore do not recall their leisure activities so well, perhaps because of a stronger overall sense of harriedness.

Table 3
Means of diary and questionnaire measures of voraciousness by sex: Britain 1998

		Mean	Std. Error	N ⁺
Diary measure	Male	1.61	.0572	296
	Female	1.56	.0533	391
Questionnaire measure (1)	Male	1.36**	.0527	296
	Female	1.19	.0439	391
Questionnaire measure (2)	Male	2.05*	.0647	296
	Female	1.90	.0538	391

+ Although the weighted data is used here, the differences by gender are not an effect of sample weighting since the same phenomenon is evident when using the unweighted data.

** Difference statistically significant at P=.013; * Significance level P=.07

Source: Home OnLine, Britain, 1998 (first wave).

Performance of measures of voraciousness: substantive findings

It remains to show how the measure of voraciousness performs in relation to standard socio-economic variables. In other words, what is the relationship between the voraciousness in leisure participation and measures of social status, or human capital? For the reasons given above, in which various advantages of using time use diary information as opposed to retrospective recall questions are outlined, the measure of voraciousness based on time use diaries was used in the following analyses.

Firstly, multiple analyses of variance (Table 4) demonstrate statistically significant differences in the measure of voraciousness by highest qualification level, social status of job and

type of newspaper read while holding constant the effects of sex and of family structure.⁶ There are strong positive associations evident between the diary measure of voraciousness and these variables (all relationships statistically significant at the $P=.003$ level or above), even when controlling for the effects of family structure and of sex. In other words, those in the highest status or human capital groups report the greatest number of different out-of-home leisure activities per week, when holding constant the effects of family structure and sex. These findings confirm that the measure of voraciousness used here shows similar characteristics to some of the behaviorally based measures of omnivorousness reported in the literature on cultural omnivorousness (e.g., López Sintas and Garcia Álvarez, 2002). This connection is clear in the association reported in the literature between high levels of status and human capital with cultural omnivorousness, and the same association with voraciousness reported in this paper. However, voraciousness (a measure of the *pace* of leisure) should be conceptually distinguished from the meaning of omnivorousness as it was originally conceived, namely as a measure of the *breadth of cultural tastes*.

In addition, with regard to the family structure variable, adults living alone are the most voraciousness (i.e. participate in the greatest number of different out-of-home leisure activities). Among those in couples, young couples (aged under 36) without children participated in the highest number of different out-of-home leisure activities (i.e. were the most voracious) and those with children aged under 12 in the household participated in the lowest number. These results accord with findings on leisure participation more generally, in which those under greater pressure of time are less involved in active leisure. They also correspond again with findings from the literature on omnivorousness, in which it is younger people without families who in general display the widest range of cultural participation (e.g. Warde et al., 1999; Van Eijck, 2001; López Sintas and Garcia Álvarez, 2002). The effect of sex in the analysis was not statistically significant.

Finally, in order to connect to the literature on harriedness, time and money are brought into the equation. It could be hypothesized, for example, that the pace of participation in out-of-home leisure activities was primarily a function of time or of money. The observed association between high levels of social status/human capital and voraciousness may simply be the outcome of the fact that people with high levels of social status have more money to spend on leisure, or more time for it. The first of these propositions (that people with higher levels of social status have in general more money) is almost certainly true; the second (that they have more time) is more doubtful, considering the increasingly reported association between high levels of employment income and long hours of work (e.g., Sullivan and Gershuny, 2004). However, both propositions could be tested through these data, to see whether the observed

⁶ The measure of family structure was based on life-cycle stages, including aspects of age and the presence and age of dependent children in the household. The categories are: living alone, aged under 36; living with spouse, aged under 36 with no dependent children; living with spouse, over age 36 with no dependent children; living with spouse, dependent children aged under 12 in the house; living with spouse, dependent children aged 12 or more in the house; other.

associations between high levels of social status/human capital and voraciousness can be attributed to time, or to money.

Table 4
Multiple analysis of variance models showing effect of social status and cultural capital variables on the measure of voraciousness: Britain 1998

	Model 1: Social status of job	Model 2: Highest qualifi- cation level	Model 3: Type of news- paper read
<i>Social status of job</i> (employees only)	P = .003 beta = .170		
Predicted means (adjusted):			
Management	1.79		
Intermediate	1.78		
Small employer/low supervi- sor	1.55		
Semi/unskilled routine	1.37		
<i>Highest qualification level</i>		P = .001 beta = .160	
Predicted means (adjusted):			
Degree, nursing		1.83	
A-level, higher vocational		1.61	
GCSE, lower vocational		1.59	
None		1.37	
<i>Type of newspaper read</i>			P = .000 beta = .180
Predicted means (adjusted):			
Quality			1.98
Medium			1.70
Tabloid			1.39
None			1.51
<i>Family structure</i>	P = .005	P = .013	P = .000
<i>Sex</i>	not significant	not significant	not significant
Model R ²	.07	.06	.06
N ⁺	466	687	687

+ The analyses are based on a sample of 1317 respondents. However, the N in this analysis is a result of the sample weighting which corrects for both the original over-sampling of households with a personal computer and for differential patterns of non-response.

Source: Home OnLine, Britain, 1998 (first wave).

A second set of multivariate models was designed to test these suggestions (see Table 5). In fact, the relationship of voraciousness with all three independent variables (social status of job, level of highest qualification, and type of newspaper read) is in general seen to remain highly statistically significant even when controlling for the effects of time and income as covariates in analysis (Table 5). In other words, those with the highest levels of social status/human capital report on average the highest number of different out-of-home leisure activities even when holding constant available leisure time, and income. The only cases where this was not so were for the models in which net monthly pay was the covariate, and highest qualification level and type of newspaper read were the independent variables. However, in these cases, two arguments support the overall conclusion. First, the predicted means for these models, adjusted for the control variables, showed a relationship with voraciousness in the expected direction. That is, higher levels of social status and human capital were associated with a higher mean number of different out-of-home leisure activities in a clear monotonic sequence. Second, in identical analyses performed with the questionnaire-derived dependent variable measure of voraciousness, the direction of the predicted means was exactly the same, but, because of the larger sample numbers for this variable (due to non-response on the time-use diary), these variables were statistically significant at $P = .015$ and $.000$ respectively.

The conclusion is that those with high levels of social status and human capital have less time for leisure but still engage in a greater number of different out-of-home leisure activities per week. We can assume that what characterizes these groups in general is shorter periods of leisure, which are also more diverse in terms of the range of different out-of-home activities participated in. This conclusion is supported by a further refinement of the analysis in which the total amount of time spent *only* on the same four out-of-home leisure activities used to calculate the measure of voraciousness was entered as a covariate into the same multiple analysis of variance. In this analysis, which assessed the mean of the voraciousness measure while holding constant the total amount of time spent in these four activities, the effects of social status of job, highest qualification level, and type of newspaper read still remained statistically significant. The implication is that the higher levels of voraciousness for those with higher levels of social status and human capital is independent of the total amount of time spent on these activities, and therefore that the pace of leisure (at least for active, out-of-home leisure activities) is indeed faster for these sub-groups of the population. Further analyses and theoretical discussion may be found in Sullivan and Katz-Gerro (2007).

Table 5
Multiple analysis of variance models showing effect of social status variables on voraciousness, controlling for measures of time and money: Britain 1998

	Covariate= net monthly income (employees only)	Covariate= hours worked per week (employees only)	Covariate= total leisure time
Social status of job	P = .004 beta = .220	P = .000 beta = .200	P = .000 beta = .200
Predicted means (adjusted):			
Management	1.78	1.81	1.83
Intermediate	1.86	1.77	1.74
Small employer/low supervisor	1.62	1.57	1.55
Semi/unskilled routine	1.28	1.30	1.33
Family structure	P = .001 beta = .260	P = .002 beta = .200	ns
Sex	ns	ns	ns
Covariate	ns	ns	P=.000
Model R ²	.11	.08	.12
Highest qualification level	ns (beta = .130)	P = .033 beta = .140	P = .000 beta = .200
Predicted means (adjusted):			
Degree, nursing qualification	1.82	1.85	1.89
A-level, higher vocational	1.64	1.64	1.65
GCSE, lower vocational	1.55	1.58	1.59
None	1.48	1.44	1.30
Family structure	P = .008 beta = .230	P = .02 beta = .17	ns
Sex	ns	ns	ns
Covariate	ns	ns	P = .000
Model R ²	.07	.06	.09
Type of newspaper read	ns (beta = .120)	P = .000 beta = .200	P = .000 beta = .170
Predicted means (adjusted):			
Quality	1.82	2.06	1.98
Medium	1.73	1.70	1.68
Tabloid	1.48	1.39	1.38
None	1.60	1.60	1.54
Family structure	P = .004 beta = .240	P = .004 beta = .190	P = .001 beta = .170
Sex	ns	ns	ns
Covariate	ns	ns	P = .000
Model R ²	.07	.08	.09

Source: Home OnLine, Britain, 1998 (first wave).

5 Discussion and conclusion

The new measure of voraciousness in leisure proves to be a useful discriminator between sub-groups of the population relating to social status and human capital. In analysis it shows similar characteristics to cultural omnivorousness, in that groups of higher social status are more voracious in their leisure consumption. However, since voraciousness is a measure of the pace and diversity of leisure (rather than of the breadth of tastes) it permits a theoretical linkage to the literature on time pressure, busyness and harriedness in late modernity. The data also permitted a comparison of the measure of voraciousness based on time use diaries with equivalent measures based on responses to a questionnaire survey, and it was shown that time use diaries can provide at least as good a measure of the pace of leisure as survey based measures. Therefore in the area of leisure as well as in the area of paid employment (see Juster et al., 2003) there is support for the idea that time use diaries perform similarly to survey data in the recording of activities. It seems that respondents with a high score on the voraciousness measure (and therefore with a high pace of leisure activities – the 'harried' respondents) are not less likely to complete their diaries than less harried respondents, supporting the idea that harriedness in leisure participation does not negatively influence diary response (see Round Table Discussion, 1998). There are also certain advantages to data collected from time use diaries because of the contemporaneousness of the recording of activities, as opposed to reliance on retrospective recall. Relatedly, there is an indication that, in accord with previously documented under-reporting in survey data compared to time use diaries (Dow and Juster, 1985), women may under-report their leisure participation in survey questionnaires. It may be this phenomenon can be attributed to the greater sense of time-pressuredness that women experience compared to men (e.g. Peters and Raaijmakers, 1998; Southerton, 2003), and that we are seeing here an effect of ex-post-facto perceptions of leisure time reflected in responses to retrospective recall questions.

The substantive results indicate that, in accord with the findings from the literature on cultural omnivorousness, the most voracious groups are those with high levels of social status and human capital. However, it was shown that these associations are not due to these groups having either higher income (which on average they do) or greater quantities of available leisure time (which, at least in modern industrialized economies, they do not). It seems that the voraciousness of groups with high social status and human capital must therefore be explained by other factors.

The twentieth century saw the increasing importance of non-traditional dimensions of status and self-identity; among them patterns of cultural consumption. Following Bourdieu, the sociological literature has increasingly emphasized the importance of consumption in the late modern period in shaping the contours of social locations and social relations (Bourdieu, 1984; Featherstone, 1995; Slater, 1997), and its significance for individual self-identity (for example, Bauman, 1987; Friedman, 1994; Gabriel and Lang 1995). The literature on the conditions of late modernity suggests an increase in individual reflexivity, particularly among the

groups referred to here, which includes an increasing desire for a diversity of experiences (Giddens, 1991; Beck et al., 1994). From the literature on time pressure and stress in western societies Garhammer (1998, 2002) refers to the desire not to miss anything, to experience everything as quickly as possible, as a consequence of the 'social acceleration' (Rosa, 2003) of late modern society. Robinson and Godbey also refer to ever-increasing feelings of time pressure among managerial and professional groups in the USA as arising primarily through an increasing emphasis on the 'consumption of experiences': doing more, doing them more quickly, and doing more simultaneously (Robinson and Godbey, 1999).

Voraciousness in leisure might also be conceived of as a new marker of status distinction. It has been suggested, for example, that busyness in employment may be regarded as a "badge of honour" by the new "superordinate working class" (Gershuny, 2005). It might also be hypothesized that voraciousness may be seen in the same way. According to this hypothesis, the 'tasting' of many different out-of-home leisure activities with a fast turnover would imply a kind of "multi-cultural capital" (Bryson, 1997) of leisure. Of course it may not prove possible to distinguish completely between these possible explanations since in reality the meanings of consumption are multiple, shifting and overlapping (Douglas and Isherwood 1996). In the end, since it is known that busyness, harriedness and time pressure in general are related positively to stress (Zuzanek and Mannell, 1998; Garhammer, 2002), the implication is that the quality of life is likely to be adversely affected for those at the higher end of the social status scale not just by their longer hours on average of employment (Robinson and Godbey, 1999; Gershuny, 2000), but also by their (self-chosen) pace of leisure participation in the free time that they do have available.

In respect of future research, it will be important to draw out the possible theoretical links between voraciousness, busyness in general and processes of social distinction. In addition, while it has been shown that voraciousness shares many of the same relationships with aspects of human, economic, and cultural capital reported from the literature on cultural omnivorousness, it is also important to show how omnivorousness and voraciousness are themselves related. It is possible to conceive, for example, of consumers with a wide range of musical tastes (cultural omnivores) who only attend concerts in their out-of-home leisure, and who are therefore not voracious leisure consumers. Unfortunately, the Home OnLine data are not suited for constructing a measure of omnivorousness, since they contain no direct information on cultural tastes. Indeed, large-scale data including a combination of time-use data with details about cultural tastes, or highly specific information about cultural activities, are extremely rare, if not non-existent.

References

- Bauman, Z. (1987), *Legislators and interpreters: On modernity, postmodernity and intellectuals*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Beck, U., Giddens, A. and S. Lasch (1994), *Reflexive modernization*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

- Bittman, M. (2002), Social participation and family welfare: The money and time costs in leisure in Australia, in: *Social Policy and Administration*, Vol. 36, No. 4, 408-425.
- Bittman, M. and J. Wajcman (2000), The rush hour: The character of leisure time and gender equity, in: *Social Forces*, Vol. 79, No. 1, 165-189.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984), *Distinction: A Social Critique on the Judgment of Taste*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Bryson, B. (1996), Anything but heavy metal: Symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes, in: *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 61, 884-99.
- Bryson, B. (1997), What about the univores? Musical dislikes and group-based identity construction among Americans with low levels of education, in: *Poetics*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 141-156.
- Darier, E. (1998), Time to be lazy: Work, the environment and modern subjectivities, in: *Time & Society*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 193-208.
- Douglas, M. and B. Isherwood (1996), (2nd edition), *The world of goods*, 2nd ed., Routledge, London.
- Dow, G.K. and F.T. Juster (1985), Goods, time and well-being: The joint dependence problem, in: Juster, F.T. and F.P. Stafford (eds.), *Time, goods and well-being*, University of Michigan Survey Research Center, Michigan.
- Emmison, M. (2003), Social class and cultural mobility: Reconfiguring the cultural omnivore thesis, in: *Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 39, No. 3, 211-230.
- Featherstone, M. (1995), *Undoing culture: Globalization, postmodernism and identity*, Sage, London.
- Friedman, J. (ed.) (1994), *Consumption and identity*, Routledge, London.
- Gabriel, Y. and T. Lang (1995), *The unmanageable consumer: Contemporary consumption and its fragmentations*, Sage, London.
- Garhammer, M. (1998), Time-use, time-pressure and leisure-consumption in European societies: Old and new social inequalities in well-being in Germany, UK, Spain and Sweden, Paper presented to the XIV World Congress of Sociology, 'Social Knowledge: Heritage, Challenges, Prospects', Montreal, July 26th - August 1st.
- Garhammer, M. (2002), Pace of life and enjoyment of life, in: *Journal of Happiness Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 3, 217-256.
- Gershuny, J. (2000), Changing times: Work and leisure in postindustrial society, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gershuny, J. (2005), Busyness as the badge of honour for the new superordinate working class, in: *Social Research*, Vol. 72, No. 2, 287-314.
- Giddens, A. (1991), *Modernity and self identity*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Goodin, R.E., Rice J.M., Bittman, M. and P. Saunders (2005), The time-pressure illusion: Discretionary time vs free time, in: *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 73, 43-70.
- Grossin, W. (2000), The benefits of slowness, in: *Social Science Information/Information Sur Les Sciences Sociales*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 219-232.
- Holbrook, M.B., Weiss, M.J. and J. Habich (2002), Disentangling effacement, omnivore, and distinction effects on the consumption of cultural activities: An illustration, in: *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 345.
- Jacobs, J.A. and K. Gerson (2004), *The time divide: Work, family, and gender inequality*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.
- Juster, F.T. (1985), The validity and quality of time use estimates obtained from recall diaries, in: Juster, F.T. and F.P. Stafford (eds.), *Time, goods and well-being*, University of Michigan Survey Research Center, Michigan.
- Juster, F.T., Ono, H. and F.P. Stafford (2003), An assessment of alternative measures of time use, in: *Sociological Methodology*, Vol. 33, 19-54.
- Kalfs, N. (1993), *Hour by hour: Effects of the data collection mode in time use research*, Nederlands Instituut voor Maatschappij en Markt-Onderzoek, Amsterdam.
- Linder, S. (1970), *The harried leisure class*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- López Sintas, J. and E.G. Álvarez (2002), Omnivores show up again: The segmentation of cultural consumers in Spanish social space, in: *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 18, No. 3, 353-368.

- Mattingly, M. and S. Bianchi (2003), Gender differences in the quantity and quality of free time: The U.S. experience, in: *Social Forces*, Vol. 81, No. 3, 999-1030.
- Moses, B. (2000), *The good news about careers: How you'll be working in the next decade*, Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer, California.
- Peters, P. and S. Raaijmakers (1998), Time crunch and the perception of control over time from a gendered perspective: The Dutch case, in: *Loisir Et Societe/Society and Leisure*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 417-433.
- Peterson, R.A. and R.M. Kern (1996), Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore, in: *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 61, 900-907.
- Robinson, J.P. (1985), The validity and reliability of diaries versus alternative time use measures, in: Juster, F.T. and F.P. Stafford (eds.), *Time, goods and well-being*, University of Michigan Survey Research Center, Michigan.
- Robinson, J.P. and G. Godbey (1999), *Time for life: the surprising ways Americans use their time*, 2nd ed., Penn State University Press, Philadelphia.
- Rosa, H. (2003), Social acceleration: Ethical and political consequences of adeshynchronized high-speed society, in: *Constellations*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 3-33.
- Round Table Discussion (1998), Non-response bias in time-use surveys, in: *Leisure and Society*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 48-582.
- Shaw, J. (1998), Feeling a list coming on: Gender and the pace of life, in: *Time and Society*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 383-396.
- Slater, D. (1997), *Consumer culture and modernity*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Social Research (2005), Special issue on busyness, in: *Social Research*, Vol. 72, 2.
- Southerton, D. (2003), Squeezing time: Allocating practices, coordinating networks and scheduling society, in: *Time & Society*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 5-25.
- Southerton, D. and M. Tomlinson (2005), Pressed for time-the differential impacts of a 'time squeeze', in: *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 53, No. 2, 215-239.
- Sullivan, O. and J. Gershuny (2001), Cross-national changes in time-use: Some sociological (hi)stories re-examined, in: *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 52, No. 4, 331-347.
- Sullivan, O. and J. Gershuny (2004), Inconspicuous consumption: Work-rich, time-poor in the liberal market economy, in: *Journal of Consumer Culture*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 79-100.
- Sullivan, O. and Katz-Gerro, T. (2007), The omnivorousness thesis revisited: Voracious cultural consumers, in: *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 123-137.
- Van den Broek, A. and K. Breedveld (eds.) (2004), *Trends in time: The use and organization of time in the Netherlands, 1975-2000*, Social and Cultural Planning Office, The Hague.
- Van Eijck, K. and B. Bargeman (2001), Social differentiation in musical taste patterns, in: *Social Forces*, Vol. 79, 1163-1184.
- Van Rees, K., Vermunt, J. and M. Verboord (1999), Cultural classifications under discussion: Latent class analysis of highbrow and lowbrow reading, in: *Poetics*, Vol. 26, 349-365.
- Veblen, T. (1994 [1899]), *The theory of the leisure class*, Penguin, New York.
- Warde, A., Martens, L. and W. Olsen (1999), Consumption and the problem of variety: cultural omnivorousness, social distinction and dining out, in: *Sociology*, Vol. 33, 105-127.
- Zuzanek, J., Beckers, T. and P. Peters (1998), The 'harried leisure class' revisited: Dutch and Canadian trends in the use of time from the 1970s to the 1990s, in: *Leisure Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1-19.
- Zuzanek, J. and R. Mannell (1998), Life-cycle squeeze, time pressure, daily stress, and leisure participation: A Canadian perspective, in: *Loisir Et Societe/Society and Leisure*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 513-544.