

Characteristics of the Work-Leisure Relations in Korea

Jo Dong-Gi

Based on the meaning of work (MOW) research and the typology of work-leisure relations developed by Wilensky and Parker, this study investigates the relationship between work-leisure orientation and the meaning of work domain variables, including work centrality, work ethic, intrinsic value, extrinsic value, and job satisfaction. The 2006 Korean Value Survey (KVS) dataset was analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance and multinomial logistic regression analysis. The results show that work-oriented respondents have larger value for work centrality variable and smaller value for work ethic than the leisure-oriented. The work-leisure relations for the work centrality and the work ethic are characterized as an 'identity/spillover' model. No significant difference was found between work-oriented and leisure-oriented respondents regarding both the intrinsic value and the extrinsic value. This implies that a 'separateness/segmentation' model properly characterizes the work-leisure relations for intrinsic and the extrinsic values. The multinomial logistic regression analysis of work-leisure relations shows that as job satisfaction increases in value, the likelihood of being leisure-oriented decreases, suggesting that a 'contrast/compensation' model be the proper characterization of the relations. The nature of the relationship between meaning of work variables and leisure orientation defies any simple generalization, and contradicts the conventional approaches that consider work and leisure to be unitary concepts and attempt to establish which of the three models best characterizes their relationship.

Keywords: extrinsic value, intrinsic value, job satisfaction, work centrality, work ethic, work-leisure orientation

Introduction

Leisure has emerged as an important issue in people's lives as the Korean soci-

ety moved into the post-industrial society. Increased material standard of living, better health, increased level of education, a declining percentage of life devoted to work, and greater personal freedom, has provided a vastly increased potential for leisure. Especially, the 'five-day workweek system' introduced in 2004 has created much real demand for leisure and related services. Furthermore, the explosive expansion of the information and communication technologies (ICT) in the last decade has greatly expanded the opportunities and means of leisure activities in Korea. As the term 'leisure society' implies, the use of free time in voluntary and pleasurable ways is an expected, and often realized, part of life in postindustrial societies (Kelly and Godbey 1992). Leisure and its use have become increasingly important to individuals' sense of self and well being, as well as a critical part of the economy (Godbey 1999).

Leisure entails the time that an individual perceives to be free from obvious and formal duties, which include a paid job or other obligatory activities. Leisure has been conceptualized and defined from a number of perspectives (such as Godbey 1999; Kelly & Godbey 1992). These different perspectives reflect historical differences in the organization of societies as well as differences in concepts and constraints upon both freedom and pleasure (Godbey 1999). Whereas the humanistic or classic approach to leisure emphasizes the concept of being human that requires freedom of action, the sociological approach is based on the view that leisure and everything else is defined in a social context by social actors who are creating their own interpreted universe of meaning (Kaplan 1975).

Work refers to any activity that produces goods or services of value to oneself or others (Rothman 1998:6). In capitalist societies, work typically refers to the production of goods and services that have monetary value for others. Work is, in short, activity that someone — employers or customers — will pay to have done. Although the link between work and pay is obvious, the term 'work' also includes activities that do not include pay (housework) or where the money is trivial and largely irrelevant (voluntary work). In such cases the idea of 'value to others' includes work for the family and such abstract ideas as altruism and service to society.

What is the relation between work and leisure? Despite the fact that a systematic and empirical investigation is required to answer this question, little empirical research has been conducted on the association between work and leisure in Korea. Perhaps the most widespread misconception found in popular discourse about work-leisure relations is that work and leisure are unitary con-

cepts. To address this issue, this study investigates systematically and empirically the characteristics of the work-leisure relations. Based on the meaning of work (MOW) research conducted by the MOW Research Team (MOW-International Research Team 1987) and the typology of work-leisure relations developed by Dubin (1958), Wilensky (1960), and Parker (1983), this study examines the relationship between work-leisure orientation and the meaning of work domain variables, such as work centrality, work ethic, intrinsic value, extrinsic value, and job satisfaction. The 2006 Korean Value Survey (KVS) dataset was analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and multinomial logistic regression analysis.

Conceptual Framework

1. The Meaning of Work

The meanings attached to work and the rewards derived from it are formed by the socio-cultural context of particular societies at specific points in time (Rothman 1998). In general, work has been found to be of relatively high importance as compared with other areas of life (England 1991). It is usually considered to be of more importance than leisure, community, and religion and was found in several studies to be ranked second only to family (Harpaz 1999; Mow-International Research Team 1987).

The meaning of work (MOW) is determined by the choices and experiences of individuals, and by the organizational and environmental context in which they work and live (MOW-International Research Team 1987). The MOW International Research Team conceptualizes the meaning of work in terms of six dimensions: work centrality, economic orientation, interpersonal relations, intrinsic orientation, entitlement norm, and obligation norm. Based on the MOW Research, and due to the limitations of the dataset, this study investigates the meaning of work with regards to work centrality, work ethic, intrinsic value, and extrinsic value.

The *work centrality* captures the importance of work in modern society. Work is one of the most basic and important activities for people in modern society, and plays a central and fundamental role in the life of individuals (Brief and Nord 1990; Mannheim 1993). High work centrality has been found to be positively related to important organizational variables, such as job satisfaction, par-

ticipation in decision making, and longer job tenure (Kanungo 1982; Dubin et al. 1975). Individuals with high work centrality seem to be more committed to their organizations and derive a purpose and contentment from their jobs (Snir and Harpaz 2002).

The *extrinsic value*, which corresponds to the economic orientation of the MOW Research, concerns with one's disposition to instrumental or extrinsic outcomes. It assumes that people work mainly for, are motivated by, and enjoy obtaining the instrumental aspects of their work context. The importance of instrumental rewards tends to vary according to their attractiveness to individuals and their ability to satisfy various needs (Lawler 1994). The important role of work with which people identify is that of providing income for sustaining life and fulfilling other important needs (MOW-International Research Team 1987). People with a high orientation to extrinsic values tend to perceive work as a main vehicle for providing income.

The concept of *intrinsic value* emphasizes individuals' needs, including their evaluation of their competence for the job and whether or not the work tasks allow them an appropriate level of self-determination. Intrinsic or expressive variables include such work-related aspects as an interesting job, variety, autonomy, and challenging work (Snir and Harpaz 2002). Such expressive work aspects were found to be important for the development of a strong job involvement among employees (Kanungo 1982).

The *work ethic* represents the work-related duties of all individuals to organizations and to society, which implies that everyone has a duty to contribute to society by working. The notion of obligations or duties derives from standards of reasoning about internalized personal responsibility and social or institutional commitment, in accordance with the Protestant work ethic (Randall and Cote 1991).

In addition to these 4 variables, some other variables in the MOW research are also important for the investigation of work-leisure relations. Especially relevant for this study is job satisfaction. The *job satisfaction* construct describes how content an individual is with his or her job (Hodson and Sullivan 2002). People's levels of job satisfaction are the result of their job tasks, the characteristics of the organization in which they work, and individual differences in needs and values.

2. Work-Leisure Relations

Several studies, notably Dubin (1958), Wilensky (1960), and Parker (1972; 1983; 1995), have tried to construct the typology of work-leisure relations. For a general description, three terms may be applied to the relations: identity, contrast, and separateness (Haworth and Veal 2004). *Identity* describes any situation where work and leisure feature similar structures, behavior, or purposes. *Contrast* means a definition of the content of one sphere as the absence or opposite of the other. *Separateness* sums up a situation of minimal contact or influence between the spheres. It will be helpful to remember these general descriptions when considering the different types of relationship between work and leisure.

Table 1 Types of Work-Leisure Relationship

General Description	Parker	Wilensky and Dubin	Others
Identity	Extension	Spillover	Positive, congruence, isomorphism, integration
Contrast	Opposition	Compensation	Negative, dissimilar, competition, heteromorphism
Separateness	Neutrality	Segmentation	Compartmentalization

Parker (1983) introduced the terms ‘extension’, ‘proposition’ and ‘neutrality’ to describe the various types of relationship between work and leisure on the individual level.¹ The *extension* pattern consists of having leisure activities which are often similar in content to one’s working activities and of making no sharp distinction between what is considered as work and what as leisure. Wilensky (1960) conceptualized this relation as spillover model which states that the nature of one’s work experiences will carry over into the leisure activities. With the *opposition* pattern, leisure activities are deliberately unlike work and there is a sharp distinction between what is work and what is leisure. This type corresponds to Wilensky’s compensation model of work-leisure relations. According to the compensation model, workers who experience a sense of

1. Parker (1983) uses such terms as ‘fusion’, ‘polarity’, and ‘containment’ to describe the work-leisure relations on the societal level.

deprivation at work will compensate in their leisure activities (Wilensky 1960). Finally, the *neutrality* pattern consists of having leisure activities which are generally different from work but not deliberately so, and of appreciating the difference between work and leisure without always defining the one as the absence of the other. This conceptualization reflects Dubin's (1958) segmentation model which posits that no relation exists between one's work and one's leisure domains.

The characteristics of relationship between work-leisure orientation and the meaning of work are extensively investigated in the analysis, focusing on nature of work-leisure relations with regards to work centrality, work ethic, intrinsic value, extrinsic value, and job satisfaction.

Data and Method

1. Sample

The dataset used in the analysis is the 2006 wave of the Korean Value Survey (KVS), a part of the World Value Survey (WVS). The WVS is an investigation of political, social, and cultural attitudes and beliefs of people in more than 65 societies of the world. The sample was drawn via a multi-stage stratified sampling method, and the sampling error is $\pm 3.1\%$ point at 95% of confidence level. The sample of KVS 2006 consists of 1,006 respondents aged 19 or above, including 50.2% men and 48.8% women. In terms of education, 19.8% had middle school or below education, 44.1% had high school education, and 36.1% had college or higher education.

2. Measures and Method

The work-leisure orientation was measured by the following question: 'how much weight do you place on work as compared with leisure or recreation?' Respondents were asked to specify their position on the scale of 1 (it's leisure that makes life worth living, not work) to 5 ('work is what makes life worth living, not leisure'). Respondents were classified as 'leisure-oriented' (1 and 2), 'neutral' (3), or 'work-oriented' (4 and 5) according to the measure. The work centrality variable was measured by a Likert-type scale which captures the importance of work in one's life. Respondents were asked to indicate the impor-

tance of family, friend, leisure, politics, work, and religion on the scale of 1 (not important) to 4 (important). The intrinsic and the extrinsic values were measured by multiple items: five items were used for the intrinsic value including ‘a job generally respected by people’, ‘an opportunity to use initiative’, ‘a job in which you feel you can achieve’, ‘a job that is interesting’, and ‘a job that meets one’s abilities’; and four items were used for the extrinsic value including ‘good pay’, ‘not too much pressure’, ‘good job security’, and ‘good hours’. Respondents were asked to mention whether each item was important or not.

The work ethic variable was also measured by multiple items. Respondents were asked to specify how much they agree or disagree with the following 3 statements: ‘it is humiliating to receive money without having to work for it’, ‘people who don’t work turn lazy’, and ‘work is a duty towards society’. A 5-points Likert-type scale was employed for all the items. Finally, job satisfaction was computed from the following question: ‘how much are you satisfied with your current job?’ Respondents were asked to indicate the level of satisfaction with their job on the scale of 1 (dissatisfied) to 10 (satisfied). Table 2 summarizes the variables and presents data pertaining to sample characteristics, such as means, standard deviations, number of items, and range of scores of the major variables.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics of the Major Variables

Variable	Number of cases	Number of Items	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Work-leisure Orientation	1006	1	2	2.011	0.707
Work centrality	1005	1	3	3.554	0.604
Work ethic	1006	3	12	6.458	2.331
Intrinsic value	1006	5	5	3.459	1.365
Extrinsic value	1006	4	4	2.366	0.980
Job satisfaction	997	1	9	6.243	2.178

To investigate the relationship between work-leisure orientation and the meaning of work variables, two statistical methods were utilized in this study. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was applied to analyze the effects of work-leisure orientation for work centrality, work ethic, intrinsic value, and extrinsic value. The multinomial logistic regression analysis was employed to test the effect of job satisfaction on the work-leisure orientation. Since age is a socio-cultural and historical variable as well as a biological and psychological

one, it is likely to carry significance for the meaning of work and leisure (Freysinger 1995). Age and occupation were included as the controlling variables in the logistic regression analysis and as a covariate (age) and controlling factor (occupation) in the multivariate analysis of variance. The occupation variable was classified into three categories: white collar, blue collar, and others.

Analysis and Discussion

1. Results

Multivariate analysis of variance is used to see the main and interaction effects of categorical variables on multiple dependent interval variables (Bray and Maxwell 1985). MANOVA uses one or more categorical independents as predictors, like ANOVA, but unlike ANOVA, there is more than one dependent variable. As well as identifying whether changes in the independent variables have a significant effect on the dependent variables, the technique also seeks to identify the interactions among the independent variables and the association between dependent variables.

As is the case with most statistical analyses, before proceeding to the main results, some tests of the model assumptions should be checked first. The assumption for the multivariate approach is that the vector of the dependent variables follows a multivariate normal distribution, and the variance-covariance matrices are equal across the cells formed by the between-subjects effects. In this study, the Box's M statistic which tests the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups was found to be not significant ($F=1.165$, $p>0.05$), suggesting that the assumptions are met.

The results of multivariate analysis of variance are presented in Table 3, showing Pillai's Trace, Wilks' Lambda, and Hotelling's trace for each term in the analysis. Wilks' Lambda is commonly used for three or more dependent groups, as there are in this study and Hotelling's Trace if there are two groups.² The results of the F tests show that all effects are significant except the interac-

2. Hotelling's trace is always larger than Pillai's trace, but when the eigen-values of the test matrix are small, these two statistics will be nearly equal. This indicates that the effect probably does not contribute much to the model.

tion effect. The factor occupation and the covariate age serve as a control variable in the analysis.

Table 3 The Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Effect	Statistic	Value	F	df		Sig.	Partial η^2
				H ₀	Error		
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	0.810	1054.965	4	992.000	0.000	0.810
	Wilks' Lambda	0.190	1054.965	4	992.000	0.000	0.810
	Hotelling's Trace	4.254	1054.965	4	992.000	0.000	0.810
Work-leisure orientation	Pillai's Trace	0.022	2.755	8	1986.000	0.005	0.011
	Wilks' Lambda	0.978	2.762	8	1984.000	0.005	0.011
	Hotelling's Trace	0.022	2.768	8	1982.000	0.005	0.011
Age	Pillai's Trace	0.031	8.004	4	992.000	0.000	0.031
	Wilks' Lambda	0.969	8.004	4	992.000	0.000	0.031
	Hotelling's Trace	0.032	8.004	4	992.000	0.000	0.031
Occupation	Pillai's Trace	0.017	2.096	8	1986.000	0.033	0.008
	Wilks' Lambda	0.983	2.100	8	1984.000	0.033	0.008
	Hotelling's Trace	0.017	2.104	8	1982.000	0.032	0.008
Interaction*	Pillai's Trace	0.012	0.772	16	3980.000	0.719	0.003
	Wilks' Lambda	0.988	0.771	16	3031.248	0.720	0.003
	Hotelling's Trace	0.012	0.770	16	3962.000	0.721	0.003

* Interaction of work-leisure orientation with occupation.

The significant main effects of work-leisure orientation, age, and occupation indicate that the effects contribute to the model. By contrast, their interaction effect does not contribute to the model. However, though work-leisure orientation does contribute to the model, since the value of Pillai's trace is close to Hotelling's trace, it doesn't contribute very much. A more straightforward way to see this is to look at partial eta squared (η^2). The partial eta squared statistic reports the "practical" significance of each term, based upon the "ratio" of the variation accounted for by the effect to the sum of the variation accounted for by the effect and the variation left to error. Thus, for Table 3, work-leisure orientation accounts for 1.1% of the variability in the meaning of work variables.

Since partial eta squared is very small for work-leisure orientation, it does not contribute very much to the model. In this case, however, it is enough for the multivariate tests to show that work-leisure orientation is significant, which means that the effect of at least one of work-leisure orientation is different from

Table 4 Test of Between-Subjects Effect for Work-Leisure Orientation

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial η^2
Work-Leisure Orientation	Work centrality	4.654	2	2.327	6.540	0.002	0.013
	Work ethic	48.480	2	24.240	4.702	0.009	0.009
	Intrinsic value	4.795	2	2.398	1.287	0.277	0.003
	Extrinsic value	0.302	2	0.151	0.156	0.855	0.000

Table 5 Contrasts Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Work-leisure orientation Contrast (Reference category: neutral)		Dependent Variable			
		Work centrality	Work ethic	Intrinsic value	Extrinsic value
Leisure-oriented vs. Neutral	Contrast Estimate	-0.081	-0.126	-0.101	-0.044
	Standard Error	0.061	0.230	0.138	0.100
	Significance	0.184	0.584	0.467	0.656
Work-oriented vs. Neutral	Contrast Estimate	0.102	-0.530	0.089	-0.043
	Standard Error	0.049	0.188	0.113	0.081
	Significance Sig.	0.039	0.005	0.431	0.598

the others. The contrast results presented in Table 5 will show us where the differences are.

Simple contrasts using the last level of work-leisure orientation as the reference category were specified for the analysis. Thus, the first contrast compares the first level to the last level; that is, the effect of 'leisure-oriented' to the effect of 'neutral'. The results show that no contrast estimates for the dependent variables are significant ($p > 0.05$). The second contrast compares 'work-oriented' to 'neutral' category and the contrast estimates show that, on average, work-oriented respondents have larger value for work centrality variable and have smaller value for work ethic than neutral respondents ($p < 0.05$). The contrast estimates for both intrinsic and extrinsic work values are not significant.

The logistic regression analysis was used to investigate the effect of job satisfaction on work-leisure orientation. The multinomial logistic regression is a form of regression which is used when the dependent variable has more than two classes. The likelihood ratio test of the model against the null model in which all the parameter coefficients are zero was found to be significant ($\chi^2 = 41.215, p < 0.05$).

Table 6 The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Work-leisure Orientation

Work-leisure orientation*		B	Standard Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Leisure-oriented	Intercept	0.455	0.450	1.022	1	0.312	
	Job satisfaction	0.051	0.042	1.464	1	0.226	1.053
	Age	-0.018	0.008	4.842	1	0.028	0.982
	Occupation**						
	White collar	-0.167	0.247	0.458	1	0.498	0.846
Blue collar	-0.181	0.233	0.606	1	0.436	0.834	
Work-oriented	Intercept	-0.686	0.398	2.972	1	0.085	
	Job satisfaction	0.114	0.036	9.853	1	0.002	1.121
	Age	0.014	0.007	4.053	1	0.044	1.014
	Occupation**						
	White collar	0.119	0.205	0.338	1	0.561	1.126
Blue collar	0.170	0.194	0.762	1	0.383	1.185	

* Reference category is 'neutral'.

** Reference category is 'others'.

The parameter estimates table (Table 6) summarizes the effect of each predictor. The Wald statistic, the ratio of the coefficient to its standard error, squared, indicates that the effect of job satisfaction on leisure orientation is not significant. For the work orientation, job satisfaction has a positive effect, meaning that respondents with a higher job satisfaction have a higher likelihood of being work-oriented. Exp (B) of job satisfaction for work orientation is 1.121, and this means that a unit increase in job satisfaction will increase odds of work orientation by a factor of $e^{0.114}=1.121$ controlling for age and occupation.

2. Discussion

The results of the multivariate analysis of variance for work-leisure relations showed that work-oriented respondents had larger value for work centrality variable than the leisure-oriented. For the work ethic variable, the results revealed that work-oriented individuals had smaller value than the leisure-oriented. There was no significant difference revealed between work-oriented and leisure-oriented respondents regarding both the intrinsic and the extrinsic values. The multinomial logistic regression analysis of work-leisure orientation showed that the likelihood of being leisure-oriented would decrease as job satisfaction increased

in value.

Let's try to interpret these results in terms of the three types of work-leisure relations (i.e. identity/spillover, contrast/compensation, and separateness/segmentation) discussed in the previous section. Firstly, the relationship between work-leisure orientation and work centrality can be characterized as an 'identity/spillover' model. The work importance of leisure-oriented people was found to be lower than that of work-oriented people. As the 'identity/spillover' model posits, leisure spills over into work. Valuing leisure more than work reduces work centrality. Secondly, the relation of the work ethic to work-leisure orientation also seems to be an 'identity/spillover' model. The norm of work as an obligation was found to be stronger for the leisure-oriented respondents than the work-oriented.

Thirdly, the relationships of work-leisure orientation to both the intrinsic and the extrinsic values are characterized as a 'separateness/segmentation' model. In accordance with the segmentation model, there was no difference between leisure-oriented and work-oriented people regarding both values. However, since leisure can be seen as intrinsically motivated and as an end itself, rather than as a means to an end, the relationship between the work-leisure orientation and the intrinsic value may be conceptualized as an 'identity' or a 'spillover' model. Some studies (e.g. Snir and Harpaz 2002) have found that leisure-oriented people tended to prefer leisure, rather than work, as a valued domain for obtaining intrinsic rewards. But the results of this study are not consistent with this reasoning. A more elaborated analysis will be needed to identify whether such difference is caused by the socio-cultural factors or not.

Finally, the relation of job satisfaction with work-leisure orientation is characterized as a 'contrast' or 'compensation' model. The 'contrast/compensation' model posits that workers who experience a sense of deprivation at work compensate in their leisure activities. Job satisfaction is a function of the discrepancy between what is desired in a job and what is actually experienced, as a standard of comparison. In line with the model, the likelihood of being leisure-oriented decreases as job satisfaction increases in value. That is, there is compensation for work by leisure.

Summary and Conclusion

The central premise of the sociology of work is that work-related domains shape

the basic institutional frameworks that influence almost all other parts of people's lives. This is especially so in an economy where labor is organized through markets. In modern market-based societies labor is not just a material imperative; it has also been an idealized activity that guides moral judgments. For instance, the work ethic has been a prized cultural possession of the middle classes. Until the twentieth century, leisure, conceptualized as work's opposite, was deemed sinful by some, a luxury by others. Vast social and cultural changes have occurred in the twentieth century with respect to work and leisure, greatly transforming the work-leisure relations.

Based on the meaning of work research conducted by the MOW Research Team and the typology of work-leisure relations developed by Dubin, Wilensky, and Parker, this study investigated the relationship between work-leisure orientation and the meaning of work domain variables, such as work centrality, work ethic, intrinsic value, extrinsic value, and job satisfaction. To summarize the major findings of this study, the results of the multivariate analysis of variance for work-leisure relations showed that work-oriented respondents had larger value for work centrality variable and smaller value for work ethic than the leisure-oriented. The work-leisure relations for the work centrality and work ethic are characterized as an 'identity/spillover' model. There was no significant difference revealed between work-oriented and leisure-oriented respondents regarding both the intrinsic and the extrinsic values. This implies that a 'separateness/segmentation' model will properly characterize the work-leisure relations for the intrinsic and the extrinsic values. The multinomial logistic regression analysis showed that the likelihood of being leisure-oriented would decrease as job satisfaction increased in value, suggesting that the 'contrast/compensation' model be the proper characterization of the relations. The nature of the relationship between meaning of work variables and leisure orientation defies any simple generalization, and the results contradict the conventional approaches that consider work and leisure to be unitary concepts and attempt to establish which of the three models best characterizes their relationship.

This study examined the work-leisure relations only in terms of the three theoretical models. Thus the findings of this study are not full explanations for changing work-leisure relations. Further research may require that some of the details be changed or qualified. For instance, the work-leisure relations can reflect changes in the composition and character of the work force, which in turn are related to the rise of a service-based, "post-industrial" society, as the transformations underlying the rise of a white-collar, service-based and knowledge-

intensive economy in the past several decades influenced heavily on the work-leisure relations. Furthermore, as mentioned in the introduction, the meanings attached to work are formed by the socio-cultural context of particular societies at specific points in time. By adopting a comparative approach utilizing cross-national or longitudinal data, the nature of the work-leisure relations can be analyzed in more depth.

References

- Bray, J. H., and S. E. Maxwell. 1985. *Multivariate Analysis of Variance*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Brief, A., and W. Nord. 1990. "Work and meaning: Definitions and interpretations." in A. Brief and W. Nord, eds., *The Meaning of Occupational Work*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Critcher, C., P. Bramham, and A. Tomlinson, eds. 1995. *Sociology of Leisure*. New York: Spon Press.
- Dubin, R. 1958. *The World of Work: Industrial Society and Human Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dubin, R, J. E. Champoux, and L. W. Porter. 1975. "Central life interests and organizational commitment of blue collar and clerical workers." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 20:411-21.
- England, G. W. 1991. "The meaning of working in the USA: Recent changes." *European Work and Organizational Psychologist* 1:111-24.
- Freysinger, V J. 1995. "The dialectics of leisure and development for women and men in midlife: An interpretive study." *Journal of Leisure Research* 27(1): 61-84.
- Godbey, G. C. 1999. *Leisure in Your Life: An Exploration*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Hall, R.H. 1986. *The Dimensions of Work*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Harpaz, I. 1999. "The transformation of work values in Israel." *Monthly Labor Review* 122:46-50.
- Haworth, John T. and A. J. Veal, eds. 2004. *Work and Leisure*. New York: Routledge.
- Hodson, Randy, and Teresa A. Sullivan. 2002. *The Social Organization of Work* (3rd Edition). Wadsworth.
- Kanungo, R. N. 1982. *Work alienation*. New York: Praeger.

- Kaplan, M. 1975. *Leisure: Theory and Policy*. Springfield, IL: C. C. Thomas.
- Kelly, J. R., and G. C. Godbey. 1992. *Sociology of Leisure*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Manheim, B. 1993. "Gender and the effects of demographics status and work values on work centrality." *Work and Occupations* 20:3-22.
- MOW-International Research Team. 1987. *The Meaning of Work: An International View*. London: Academic Press.
- Olson, C. L. 1974. "Comparative robustness of six tests in multivariate analysis of variance." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 69(348): 894-908.
- Parker, Stanley. 1972. *The Future of Work and Leisure*. London: Paladin.
- Parker, Stanley. 1983. *Leisure and Work*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Parker, Stanley. 1995. "Toward a theory of work and leisure." in Critcher, C., P. Bramham, and A. Tomlinson, eds. *Sociology of Leisure*. New York: Spon Press.
- Randall, D. M. and J. A. Cote. 1991. "Interrelationships of Work Commitment Constructs." *Work and Occupations* 18(2): 194-211.
- Rothman, Robert A. 1998. *Working: Sociological Perspectives* (2nd Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Snir, Raphael, and Itzhak Harpaz. 2002. "Work-leisure relations: Leisure orientation and the meaning of work." *Journal of Leisure Research* 2nd Quarter.
- Veal, A. J. 2004. "Looking back: perspectives on the leisure-work relationship." in John T. Haworth and A. J. Veal, eds. *Work and Leisure*. New York: Routledge.
- Wilensky, H. L. 1960. "Work, careers and social integration." *International Social Science Journal* 12(4): 543-60.

Jo Dong-Gi is Assistant Professor of sociology at Dongguk University. His areas of expertise include the information society studies, work and occupation, social class, and quantitative research methods. He is currently involved in the studies of the social capital formation on the cyberspace, the subjective aspects of middle class, and deviant behaviors on the Internet.