

RESTRICTED AND ELABORATED LEISURE CODES: THE GLOBALIZATION OF THE LEISURE EXPERIENCE

Don Dawson, University of Ottawa

Giddens (2000) argues that as a consequence of globalization ours is a “runaway world.” It is an erratic, dislocated world, one that has introduced new kinds of unpredictability, new kinds of risks, and new kinds of uncertainty. He further states that it is a mistake to treat globalization as a primarily economic phenomenon. Rather, globalization refers to a set of changes that are social, cultural and political, as well as economic. As such it affects our basic social and cultural institutions and impacts our personal lives. Globalization, according to Giddens, invades local culture such that our lives, our personalities, our identities, our emotions, our relationships are being reshaped.

It assaults the local context of life and forces people to live in a way that is more open, reflective and interdependent.

Elsewhere Giddens (1990:64) has described globalization as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away ... [and] this involves a change in the way we understand ... and experience localness.” In this sense, “localness” is not restricted to geographical locale, but includes social, cultural, political and economic local specificities. Thus, globalization has powerful economic, political, cultural and social dimensions. Four major themes regularly appear in the literature (see Smith & Smith 2000):

- de-localization and supraterritoriality;
- the spread of technological innovation and the associated growth of risk;
- the rise of multinational corporation; and
- the extent to which the move towards global free markets leads to instability.

Nevertheless, globalization must be seen as a complex and multidimensional phenomenon (Kellner & Best 1991; 1997) that articulates both progressive and regressive features. Indeed, compared to the discourses of imperialism (negative, critical) and modernization (positive, legitimizing), the discourse of globalization is on the surface neutral, yet is essentially dialectical in these regards, especially with regard to the local and global. With respect to culture Kellner (2002:5) posits that these dialectical processes result in the following:

"Global culture involves promoting life-style, consumption, products, and identities. Transnational corporations deploy advertising to penetrate local markets, to sell global products, and to overcome local resistance. Expansion of private cable and satellite systems have been aggressively promoting a commercial culture throughout the world. In a sense, culture itself is being redefined for previously local and national cultures have been forces of resistance to global forces, protecting the traditions, identities, and modes of life of specific groups and peoples. Culture has been precisely the particularizing, localizing force that distinguished societies and people from each other. Culture provided forms of local identities, practices, and modes of everyday life that could serve as a bulwark against the invasion of ideas, identities, and forms of life

extraneous to the specific local region in question. Indeed, culture is an especially complex and contested terrain today as global cultures permeate local ones and new configurations emerge that synthesize both poles, providing contradictory forces of colonization and resistance, global homogenization and new local hybrid forms and identities."

Thus there is the probability of local resistance to instances of globalization. However, as Hardt and Negri (2000) point out, globalization is a ubiquitous and amorphous force that impacts world events and local realities in virtual anonymity, obscuring concrete actors and their interests. Potential resistance is most possible, then, at an abstract level given the seemingly endless multitude of unidentifiable globalizing agents enmeshed in too numerous interdependencies. Against whom would the anti-globalization struggle be directed? Certainly imperialism and domination can be, have been and continue to be opposed, but as we have seen globalization is more than that. Ohmaie (1985), in a broad survey of North America, Europe and Japan found that differences in patterns of leisure, lifestyles, interests and preferences, and values are diminishing. Faced with such cultural globalization, there is an increasing social adaptation such that regional and national dissimilarities are gradually giving way to a more homogenized global culture.

With respect specifically to leisure, Williams (2002) reasons that globalization results in a "time-space compression" (Harvey 1996) that uproots social meanings and identities, and "dilutes traditional/local sources of identity and amplifies the quest of modern people to actively construct a sense of identity" (Williams 2002:355). He concludes that "the tendency for globalization to displace identities ... has profound impacts on the meaning and experience of place, social interaction, leisure, and over our very sense of self" (Williams 2002:355-356). People, it is argued, react against the global "homogenization" that threatens to destroy local distinctiveness by engaging in a deliberate and conscious "inward" search for authenticity. This is achievable, according to Williams (2002:359), because:

"The individual task of constructing a sense of self is very much a modern necessity and leisure offers a particularly rich context for addressing it. The relative autonomy afforded in leisure gives us moderns [sic] greater individual latitude to construct and project our identities as we want them to be. Psychological theories of self-affirmation, for example, suggest that through the course of human development, we actively strive to understand ourselves and be clearly understood by others."

Certainly others would suggest that in our leisure we as individuals are condemned, as was Sisyphus, to struggle endlessly against the boulder of globalization, ceaselessly pushing it up the hillside only to have it roll back upon us of its own weight. Rojek (1995), for example, holds that the global commodification of leisure leads to incompleteness, arbitrariness, fragmentation and indifference. Hardly the stuff of an "inward" journey of resistance and self-authentication. As well, Bauman (1993) argues that under globalization the individual must negotiate a series of "leisure options" that are (1) loosely ordered, (2) readily purchasable, (3) increasingly monetary, (4) easily detachable, and (5) utterly replaceable. These options would appear to offer little opportunity for self-affirmation and authenticity.

However, how do the processes of cultural resistance, negotiation and hybridization take place in leisure? One means of examining the dialectics of the local and the global is by way of Basil Bernstein's (1971) sociolinguistic theory of "restricted" and "elaborated" language codes. According to Bernstein (1971:76), "Forms of spoken language in the process of their learning initiate, generalize and reinforce special types of relationships with the environment and thus create for the individual particular forms of significance." Hence, the code a person uses symbolizes their social identity. In Bernstein's theory there are two types of language codes, the restricted code and the elaborated code. The restricted code is suited for situations where there is a great deal of shared and taken-for-granted knowledge amongst a group of speakers. "It [the restricted code] is economical and rich, conveying a vast amount of meaning in a few words, each of which has a complex set of connotations" (Atherton 2002). When using a restricted code, people rely upon shared background knowledge and understandings between those included in their group. Restricted codes are used amongst family and friends in close social settings such as leisure. The elaborated code on the other hand is used in circumstances wherein everything needs to be spelled out so that people can understand what is being said. Little, if any, prior or shared understanding or knowledge is assumed. The elaborated code is of necessity complete and detailed. Thus, the restricted code is "implicit" while the elaborated code is "explicit." "Clearly," says Bernstein (1971:135), "one code is not better than another; each possesses its own aesthetic, its own possibilities."

Bernstein's research in the 1960s and 1970s indicated that people who were more mobile geographically, socially and culturally found use for both the restricted and elaborated codes. Restricted code could be used in local contexts featuring close interpersonal relationships while elaborated code would be employed in communicating with "outsiders" from the wider society. To Bernstein, language is much more than grammar and vocabulary; it shapes the essential characteristics of culture and enables the formation and expression of cultural identity. The way in "which speech codes are realized is a function of the culture acting through social relationships in specific contexts" (Bernstein 1971:173-174). Many theorists would further assert that all perceptions of the everyday world involve codes. Jameson (1972:152), a contemporary of Bernstein, argued that "all perceptual systems are already languages in their own right." Hence, in everyday linguistic exchanges people act out their social world, affirm their roles and share systems of values and knowledge (Halliday (1978). From this standpoint, one can readily imagine restricted and elaborated leisure codes, codes that would apply to different social settings and contexts. Indeed, Chandler (2001) allows that in a broad sense all linguistics codes are social codes. If we are to propose restricted and elaborated leisure codes, let us review their possible characteristics (see Table 1).

TABLE 1 - Elaborated and Restricted Leisure Codes	
Elaborated code	Restricted code
Universalistic	Particularistic
Articulated symbols	Condensed symbols
Explicitness	Implicitness
Rational	Metaphorical

Context free	Context dependent
Individualized roles	Communalized roles
Social distance	Social intimacy

Adapted from Grillo 1989:183.

As can be deduced from Table 1, a restricted leisure code would be used in decidedly localized, closed leisure settings, whereas leisure contexts that are highly globalized will necessarily utilize an elaborated code. Consequently, it can be argued that globalized leisure emphasizes elaborated codes and is a more consciously articulated and less spontaneous form of culture. Restricted codes are in the main subconsciously applied, but when the global collides with the local, its penetration focuses attention as the spontaneous restricted codes no longer work, bringing social relations to conscious elaboration. Winsa (2000:197) reminds us that, “In everyday speech we use the words ‘heart’ and ‘spirit’ when people are passionate and emotional in their speech, whereas the analytical and ‘objectified’ approach is seen as the language of the ‘mind’.” Restricted codes, used within localized groups, are spontaneously and subconsciously understood and embedded with emotions. A restricted leisure code, then, is by definition without intrusion or involvement of consciousness, and “for that reason it is the voice of the heart” (Winsa 2000:197).

Conversely, an elaborated leisure code, by its very nature is itself a “filter” of conscious awareness (Winsa 2000:197) that governs the production and comprehension of globalized leisure interactions and experiences. Thus, globalized leisure is predominantly a planned and conscious experience that necessitates a high degree of self- and other-monitoring. The experience of leisure under globalization, therefore, is increasingly elaborated, formalized, objectified and bereft of spirit. Any struggle to oppose these ubiquitous and omnipresent social and cultural transmutations will surely prove daunting.

ABSTRACTS
of Papers Presented at the
Eleventh Canadian Congress on Leisure Research
May 17 – 20, 2005
Hosted by
Department of Recreation and Tourism Management
Malaspina University-College
Nanaimo, B.C.
Abstracts compiled and edited by
Tom Delamere, Carleigh Randall, David Robinson
CCLR-11 Programme Committee
Tom Delamere
Dan McDonald
Carleigh Randall
Rick Rollins
and
David Robinson



Copyright © 2005 Canadian Association for Leisure Studies
ISBN 1-896886-01-9



Appropriate Use of Documents: Documents may be downloaded or printed (single copy only). Please note that this document is copyrighted and CREDIT MUST BE PROVIDED to the originator of the document when you quote from it. You must not sell the document or make a profit from reproducing it. You must not copy, extract, summarize or distribute downloaded documents outside of your own organization in a manner which competes with or substitutes for the distribution of the database by the Lifestyle Information Network (LIN). <http://www.lin.ca>