

## LAZER E ÓCIO NOS DISCURSOS DE ATORES SOCIAIS DE UM PROGRAMA GOVERNAMENTAL DE ATIVIDADE FÍSICA

### LEISURE AND IDLENESS IN THE DISCOURSES OF SOCIAL ACTORS OF A GOVERNMENT PHYSICAL ACTIVITY PROGRAM

Marcos Gonçalves Maciel<sup>1</sup>, Luiz Alex Silva Saraiva<sup>2</sup>, José Clerton de Oliveira Martins<sup>3</sup>, Paulo Roberto Vieira Junior<sup>4</sup> and Liana Abrão Romera<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universidade do Estado de Minas Gerais, Ibirité, MG, Brasil.

<sup>2</sup>Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brasil.

<sup>3</sup>Universidade de Fortaleza, Fortaleza, CE, Brasil.

<sup>4</sup>Instituto Federal de Minas Gerais, Santa Luzia, MG, Brasil.

<sup>5</sup>Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, ES, Brasil.

#### RESUMO

No Brasil as propostas do lazer e do ócio apresentam perspectivas distintas. Assim sendo, o objetivo deste trabalho é analisar qual o entendimento dos atores sociais de um programa governamental de atividade física sobre o lazer e ócio. Trata de uma pesquisa qualitativa, do tipo estudo de caso. A escolha do programa e dos participantes ocorreu de forma intencional. Adotamos a entrevista em profundidade para a coleta das informações e, usamos a técnica de saturação para determinar o número de participantes. Para a interpretação dos dados nos apropriamos da técnica da análise crítica do discurso, por meio da abordagem sociocognitiva. Como principais resultados, encontramos a predominância do discurso hegemônico referente ao lazer no Brasil, notadamente, descanso, diversão e consumo; um desconhecimento a respeito do ócio. Enquanto prática social as vivências realizadas pelos alunos do programa, em sua maioria, não condizem com os pressupostos teóricos referentes ao lazer, mas se caracterizam enquanto experiências de ócio. Concluímos pelos discursos analisados que as pessoas ressignificam suas práticas de lazer, estabelecendo um paradoxo entre o que é proposto teoricamente com o que é vivenciado cotidianamente, assim como compreendem a atividade física de forma funcionalista.

**Palavras chave:** Discurso. Subjetividades. Concepções.

#### ABSTRACT

In Brazil, the proposals of leisure and idleness have different perspectives. Therefore, the objective of this work is to analyze the understanding of social actors of a government physical activity program about leisure and idleness. This was a qualitative case study. The program and participants were selected intentionally. An in-depth interview was adopted for data collection and saturation was used to determine the number of participants. For interpretation of the data, critical discourse analysis was applied using a sociocognitive approach. As main results, we found a predominance of the hegemonic discourse related to leisure in Brazil, notably rest, fun and consumerism and a lack of knowledge about idleness. Regarding social practice, the experiences of the participants in the program mostly do not match the theoretical assumptions related to leisure, but are characterized as experiences of idleness. Based on the discourses analyzed, we conclude that people re-signify their leisure practices, establishing a paradox between what is theoretically proposed and what is experienced daily, and understand physical activity from a functionalist perspective.

**Keywords:** Discourse. Subjectivities. Concepts.

#### Introduction

In the Brazilian literature, there are at least two lines of studies that involve the social phenomenon related to free time, leisure and idleness. According to Baptista<sup>1</sup>, similarities and specificities exist between these areas: the first is based on Anglo-Saxon authors and the second is under Ibero-American influence. Leisure studies in Brazil are strongly influenced by the classical theoretical perspectives proposed by the sociologists<sup>2</sup> Joffre Dumazedier and Nelson Carvalho Marcellino. These scholars see leisure as an urban-industrial phenomenon, characterized as its constituent aspects, above all, the temporal component, the classification of the fields of interests, attitude, and free choice. Even though controversies exist between these scholars and their followers with regard to some conceptual aspects about the phenomenon, such as the temporal categories that characterize it - free or spare time; the

relationship between leisure and work; idleness as a possibility of leisure, and the adoption or not of a critical perspective from a functionalist view. However, the social representation of leisure in the hypermodern society is associated mainly with rest, fun, and consumerism<sup>3</sup>.

In contrast, idleness studies, which are still incipient in Brazil, show some specificities regarding the ways free time is experienced. The pioneer in this area is Professor Manuel Cuenca from the Instituto de Estudios de Ocio, Spain, who has been developing theoretical-empirical models from a humanistic perspective of idleness since the end of the 1980s<sup>4</sup>. As a scholar from a Spanish-speaking country, he does not adopt the term 'lazer' (leisure), a word that does not exist in Spanish, but exclusively uses the term 'ócio' (idleness). The word 'ócio' (idleness) in the Portuguese language usually confers a negative connotation to free-time activities since it is confused with 'ociosidade' (sloth). We therefore defend in this study that the terms idleness and leisure are not synonymous since they carry different nuances and epistemological and theoretical meanings.

Defender of a humanistic idleness, Cuenca<sup>6</sup> emphasizes that, in order to understand the culture of idleness and what it transcends today, it is important that educators differentiate idleness from free time and from a mere activity. In order to discuss the issue of temporality and idleness, this author refers to the writings of De Grazia which define free time as a concrete way of estimating a given class of time, while idleness is a form of being. On the other hand, leisure is linked notably to consumerism and the practice of activities exclusively during a time free from social obligations<sup>16</sup>. Cuenca<sup>6</sup> continues arguing that it is difficult to understand current society without considering idleness as an important pillar of personal and social development.

Idleness is understood as a psychosocial human experience that involves a subjective perception characterized by satisfaction, spontaneity, and non-utilitarianism, with an end in itself<sup>5,6</sup>. The proposal of idleness is that people who experience it give a meaning to their life, thus contributing to human development<sup>7</sup>. This perspective can also involve a hybridism between the activity and the subjective qualification of the experience performed, regardless of free time, as claimed by the leisure definition. In other words, a person can understand an activity in a certain social time, for example work itself, as an experience of idleness; on the other hand, the person may be watching a movie in his/her free time without perceiving it as leisure. According to Cuenca<sup>5</sup>, these experiences do not depend on the activity itself but rather on the attitude assumed during its execution.

One activity that can be performed during free time is physical activity. Because of this temporal characteristic, a social representation exists when referring to this activity implicitly as leisure, which is not necessarily true since, beyond the temporality, according to the sociological perspective of leisure, the identification of other aspects such as freedom of choice, disinterest and subjectivity/attitude is also necessary<sup>8</sup>. The presence of these characteristics resembles the proposal of idleness studies<sup>6</sup>.

In view of these specificities, it can be concluded that not all activities performed during free time should necessarily be understood linearly as leisure. To make this affirmation, it is essential to directly ask the person involved if he/she perceives this activity as leisure. Therefore, the objective of this study is to analyze the understanding of social actors – Physical Education professionals and users – participating in a government physical activity program (GPAP) about what are leisure and idleness.

## Methods

### *Participants*

Eighteen volunteers, three Physical Education professionals and 15 users enrolled in the program, participated in the study. To ensure participant anonymity, we refer to the professionals as P1, P2 and P3. Likewise, the users were identified by a fictitious name

followed by age, for example Carlos (62). All participants signed the free informed consent form in accordance with the guidelines for studies involving humans. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Universidade do Estado de Minas Gerais (Approval No. 1.548.799).

### *Procedures*

This was a qualitative, descriptive, field study of the case type<sup>9</sup>. The place of study and the participants were selected intentionally. As a criterion for inclusion in the study, the professionals should be Physical Education graduates and should have worked in the development unit of the program for at least one year as this period would be minimally sufficient to have knowledge of the local community and to assimilate the proposal of the program. For the users, the inclusion criterion was a minimum frequency of 3 months of uninterrupted participation in the activities developed.

We adopted in-depth interviewing as the method for data collection. The interviews were previously scheduled during January 2016 and held individually in a private room of the facility where the activities were developed. The number of respondents was defined by the criterion of data saturation<sup>10</sup>. The interviews were audio recorded and subsequently transcribed-scanned to a text editor.

### *Data analysis*

For interpretation of the data, we used critical discourse analysis as proposed by the linguist Van Dijk<sup>11,12</sup>, which applies a sociocognitive approach. This method permits to analyze the means of discursive production considering not only linguistic and grammatical aspects but also sociocultural aspects in a given context. Hence, the discourse is understood as a social practice that communicates meanings and beliefs, (re)producing and transforming social relations.

## **Results and Discussion**

Three professionals with a bachelor's degree in Physical Education participated in the study. These professionals had a mean age of  $29.6 \pm 5.5$  years, 6.3 years of higher education, and had participated in the program for a mean period of 3.6 years. Regarding the users of the program, six men and nine women with a mean age of  $51.9 \pm 11$  years were interviewed.

For comprehending the perception about leisure, we asked each professional what he/she understands about the topic. The statements demonstrate the reproduction of an academic discourse related to the predominant leisure theory in Brazil<sup>2,13</sup>, taking into account the approaches developed by Dumazedier<sup>14</sup> and Marcellino<sup>8</sup>. These approaches address leisure as a phenomenon related to modernity, which is practiced during free<sup>14</sup> or spare<sup>8</sup> time and to which the person surrenders essentially by free choice in order to participate in pleasurable activities. This sociological perspective prioritizes the dialectical relationship in the power struggle between workers and capital. The statements of the professionals express this discourse:

[...] It's something I like to do. Does the person like to do it? Is it outside his/her working hours? Outside their obligations? Let's just say that, right. It's leisure (P1).

Leisure for me is very questionable, right? There are several lines to conceptualize leisure. But I understand that leisure is an activity that the person seeks to perform out of his/her own free will, right? Without obligation to do so; often seeking to fill the idle time he/she has, right? [...] But I believe it is a voluntary pursuit by this

subject to be able to satisfy him/herself, right? And mainly seeking to fill a time of your day (P2).

For me, leisure is what you do without obligation [...] I think there are many who, when they start here at the gym in the city, they come out of a sense of obligation. But then I see it improves. They do not come out of obligation, they come because they like it. [...] There are cases of people who take care of the bedridden mother, I do not know for how many years, it is the only time of the day that they are not focused on the mother, that they come here to 'de-stress'. I'm sure it's not necessarily to do physical activity, to improve anything. It is just the time they have for leisure (P3).

In the statement of P1, the expression “[...] like ...”, “... outside working hours [...]”, “[...] outside obligations [...]”, denote some of the characteristics reported in leisure studies, such as pleasure, free time and attitude. In the understanding of P2, leisure is a polysemic term when reporting that “[...] there are several lines to conceptualize leisure [...]”. However, for this professional, leisure is linked to free choice, as perceived in the passage “[...] of his/her own free will ...” and “[...] without obligation ...”, corroborating P1. Yet, this professional also highlights leisure as a way to “fill the idle time”, i.e., to compensate for boredom. It is important to emphasize the functionalist perspective of leisure and, similarly, of physical activity. In other words, this time and activity apparently are not experienced in a disinterested manner, with an end in itself, but rather always assigning a function to it, a means to obtain some benefit from that practice.

According to P3, the freedom of choice is an aspect that characterizes leisure, as demonstrated in the passage “[...] without obligation [...]”. The professional highlights the possibility of change in a person's attitude along a given experience, as indicated in the passage “[...] but then I see it improves [...]”. No less important is to emphasize the aspect of rest or avoidance of the daily reality that leisure can provide, as perceived in the passage: “[...] it is the only time of the day that they are not focused on the mother, that they come here to 'de-stress' [...]”. This professional emphasizes aspects related to the extrinsic motivation that moves the person, which, too, is legitimate. However, this characteristic differs from the humanistic proposal of idleness, which assumes intrinsic motivation as the first step, i.e., self-satisfaction through the experiences promoted by the activity.

Analysis of the statements of these professionals permits to identify the reproduction of an academic discourse involving the attributes that characterize leisure according to the sociological perspective<sup>8,14</sup>. It was also possible to perceive that leisure can be used as a moment of escape from personal reality. However, none of the professionals reported any characteristics linked to the promotion of personal development<sup>8,14</sup>.

This fact reflects the influence of the existing discourse in terms of the understanding of leisure in contemporary society, linking it mainly to the functions of consumerism and fun<sup>15</sup>. According to the approach proposed by Van Dijk<sup>11</sup>, discourses can receive different influences from hegemonic groups, for example from the teaching systems and media, to create a context that favors their reproduction. More specifically, the construction of social memory - understood as a body of knowledge elaborated by a knowledge area, as in the case of Physical Education – passes mainly through theoretical knowledge that is transmitted during academic and/or continuing education.

In the following statements, we perceive the ideological reproduction regarding the functionalist perspective of both leisure and physical activity, which can influence the concept adopted by professionals:

(Question): Do you believe that the City Gym Program-BH provides leisure or physical activity? “I think the gym has moments. It has the moment of promotion, the moment of prevention, the moment of leisure; so it has its moments. Yes... our initial proposal is exercise three times a week, that time. [...] Do we have moments of leisure? We do. When I take a class, for example, and I’m going to take it for a walk. [...] So, I see that the gym embraces everything according to the moments; this cannot be confused. You could say it like this: Ah, I’m going to the gym, I’m going to my class, Monday, 7 o’clock in the morning, my pleasure? No. It’s not my pleasure. I’m there to do my physical activity, my exercise. Ah, today is Tuesday, the people scheduled a walk, is it leisure? Yes”. [...] (P1).

(Question): Do you understand these activities that your users do as leisure? “Look for some it might be; as a professional not. I do not see it as leisure; perhaps because they always come for the prevention of illness or injury I cannot fully conclude this way; maybe I have to work this out because in fact for some it is, right? In my point of view, leisure should be looser, you know? So you do not work the activity for them as leisure? No”. (P2).

The reports of P1 and P2 confirm the previous understanding that, in order to have leisure, the person requires free time, which contrasts with the experience of the activities offered by the GPAP. However, the physical activities developed in the program are essentially understood as health promoting. The pragmatism of the professionals regarding the “impossibility” of promoting leisure in the classes is evident, even if there is a pleasant environment that indicates satisfaction, among other attributes concerning leisure that can be observed in these moments.

With respect to the users’ understanding of leisure, we identified the reproduction of the same discourse. However, this discourse is acquired in the form of cultural knowledge, or common sense, as indicated in the statements:

“[...] it is to meet people, to take a walk, to travel, to enjoy time with other people, right!” João (44).

“[...] the leisure of the family, going out, [...] going to a club, for example”. Carlos (62).

By considering this type of knowledge, Van Dijk<sup>11</sup> suggests that the discourse arises when social interactions are carried out based on collectively shared beliefs, knowledge, norms, and values, i.e., by social representations. According to this author, these representations are “categorized” and permit experiences to be understood in a communicative situation. Thus, it is through these daily representations presented by the discourses, such as conversations, the news and books, that one acquires knowledge of the world and socially shared attitudes<sup>11</sup>. This dynamic creates a broad framework whereby groups and power-holders are able to affect the social discourse.

In the specific case of the users, in an unanimous manner, the social representation of leisure is also linked to rest and fun, reproducing the media appeal when associating leisure with free time, especially during weekends, holidays and/or vacations<sup>13</sup>. These periods are traditionally used by people to take walks or travel, as well as to have fun while looking for spaces and/or leisure facilities that allow times of relaxation and “escape” from everyday problems.

The participants João (44) and Carlos (62) highlight the social, tourist and fun components attributed to leisure, possibly reproducing a media discourse that is sold by contemporary society. These characteristics emphasize the consumerist aspects that permeate this understanding of leisure<sup>5,16,17</sup>.

Analyzing the professionals’ and users’ understanding of leisure, we identified a

difference in the aspects that permeate their respective discourses. The reproduction of a hegemonic discourse constructed, for example, during academic education is observed in the first group. Van Dijk<sup>11</sup> calls this type of discourse part of the specific knowledge of a social class that aims to create, propagate, and defend its ideologies. On the other hand, the users' discourse represents a common sense knowledge associated with consumerism and fun, which is widely exploited by the mass media when selling the idea of leisure.

After exploring the perspective of leisure, we also asked the participants what they understand about idleness. The group of professionals related idleness to sloth, thus reproducing a common discourse:

“[...] Not that idleness is bad, sometimes it is good! I am in the mood to be idle, I am tired, anyway, but there are hours, moments, let's say like this!” (P1).

“[...] idleness itself is that time, the time of not working [...], so if you think like this, the time they are here - referring to the users - it is not the time of their work, right! A time for being idle, let's say, I think that's it” (P2).

“[...] 90% of the people are referred because they stay idle at home! So, they come exactly because of the social interaction [...] several diseases appear due to idleness!” (P3).

These statements refer to at least two observations. The professionals graduated in 2008, 2010 and 2011. However, they did not recall possible discussions of the contents regarding the classical Greek approach to idleness proposed particularly by Aristotle, which is widely disseminated across different knowledge areas in the academic environment. The curricula of Physical Education courses usually contain disciplines such as the History of Physical Education and/or Fundamentals of Leisure, which discuss or should address the principles that guided the Greek society, which adopted idleness as a means of forming the citizen, using for example physical activity, music, poetry, among other activities. Contemplative idleness disseminated in ancient Greece could be understood as a state of creative enjoyment, of peace, a condition for wisdom<sup>17,18</sup>. Hence, aspects related to contemplative experiences, different ways of life, cultural manifestations, values, and senses have permeated idleness since that time.

We also noted a lack of knowledge about the humanistic proposal of idleness<sup>6</sup>. Although Cuenca began his investigations at the end of the 1980s, in Brazil, the echo of his works is still recent. The poor visibility of this perspective in the Brazilian academic environment is therefore understandable. However, we may cite the studies of some Ibero-American authors who discuss this perspective<sup>1,5,6,7,16,19,20,21</sup>.

According to Cuenca<sup>5</sup>, humanistic idleness transcends the temporal perspective, doing nothing and performing a set of activities. However, it is based above all on the subjectivity of those who experience it, on satisfaction, and on intrinsic motivation. Thus, humanistic idleness is linked to aspects of value, to non-utilitarianism, and to the complexity of the activities promoted in their experience that lead to human development.

Another analysis that can be performed regarding the discourse of the respondents concerns the misleading meaning with which idleness is normally associated, i.e., sloth. The word idleness in Brazil involves negative values due to religious influence and the capitalista ideology characterizing modernity that attributed a new connotation to it<sup>15</sup>. This fact infers the idea of a valuation of work and condemnation to non-work, to unproductivity. Thus, idleness loses its sense of contributing to human formation, with a pejorative aspect being attributed to it, as the “father of all addictions”, linking it directly to laziness.

When the users of the program were asked what they understand about idleness, they unanimously answered that they had never heard about it. This fact shows that even at the

level of common sense, at least among the participants, there is complete lack of knowledge about the topic, as if in the capitalist society it is not appropriate to talk about something that refers to “unproductivity”.

When the users were asked what they do as leisure in their daily life, the answers denote a different experience to their understanding of the topic, “[...] it is the routine life really [...]”, “[...] leaving home, getting another focus, I like to chat, that is getting distracted [...]”, “[...] playing video games [...]”. The statements associate leisure with “simple tasks” of life, such as the family relationship, satisfaction, leaving the house to “chitchat with friends”, altruism, without the need to spend money in the detriment of consumerism and fun, as demonstrated by the following answers:

“In everyday life, it is the routine life really, taking care of things” Mário (60).

“[...] going to church, working, helping people; that is leisure for me. [...]; going to a meeting, praying [...], leaving home, getting another focus, I like to chat, that is getting distracted [...]” Regina (60).

“In my day to day life, we usually play video games, that Xbox dance, we even laugh. And movies, right?” Paula (38).

The identification of the distinction between what users understand as leisure and what they experience in everyday life reinforces the media-reproduced idea of leisure, emphasizing it as consumerism. However, the activities reported exhibit the attributes of experiences of idleness, such as enjoyment, sociability, relaxation, break, among others<sup>19,21,22</sup>. Considering this perspective, the activities reported by the participants in the program meet some of the attributes listed to characterize them as experiences of idleness<sup>21</sup>, including:

1) perception of freedom; 2) intrinsic motivation or meaning (autotelism); 3) enjoyment or positive affective states; 4) human development; 5) sociability or interpersonal encounter; 6) rest or relaxation; 7) break or evasion; 8) challenge; 9) psychological implication; 10) self-expression, and, finally, 11) the introspective states: the encounter with yourself, with nature or with beauty (esthetic appreciation).

Subjectivity brings people closer to idleness since it comprises intentionality in the way of being human and being in the world according to the circumstances involved<sup>20</sup>. Idleness therefore refers to a desirable situation, which enables the spirit of curiosity and interest, functioning as a catalyst between behavior and the action experienced. In addition, idleness as an activity centered on subjectivity and personal daily life does not present itself in a linear or causal way, but is dynamically and complexly interwoven with other social phenomena, regardless of social times<sup>6</sup>. Thus, idleness is distinguished from mere entertainment or fun - although these are completely licit in their experiences - by the degree of positive involvement, i.e., the effort, commitment, and constancy with which a person engages in an activity<sup>20</sup>.

To identify how these perceptions occur, Van Dijk<sup>12</sup> claims that the representations are stored in the long-term memory, establishing individually and collectively assumed mental models. These models refer to events that are considered relevant and that are schematically categorized in our mind, such as leisure and idleness. The perceptions occur because these mental models represent not only personal beliefs but, above all, the subjective variations in social representations - knowledge, attitudes and ideologies - especially linked by social groups and organizations, establishing parameters of a discourse<sup>11,12</sup>.

Another relevant element for this discussion is the association or not of physical activity with leisure. We asked the participants what motivated them to practice physical activity. Among the different statements we can cite:

“To reduce the tiredness and pain to get things done” Maria (68).

“Ah. It was the problem with my back; I started walking, I didn’t like walking” Regina (60).

“I like, health, health too” Marta (41).

“The doctor asked to regularize my health” Vanda (66).

The responses were unanimous regarding extrinsic factors and primarily point to the health factor as the main reason for adherence to this activity. We noted the influence of the biomedical discourse as a predominant factor for the execution of the activities which, too, is legitimate. Thus, most users reported health as an extrinsic reason rather than intrinsic motivation based, for example, on self-satisfaction and self-realization, to perform physical activity.

Only four users reported that they understood this activity as leisure. If these activities are carried out in free time, freely chosen, and are satisfactory according to the users’ perception, we ask: why is there this very low association with leisure activity? Maciel and Soares<sup>23</sup>, who performed a discursive analysis of the proposal of this program modality, reported the presence of a biomedical discourse reflected as a social representation by emphatically stating “physical activity as health”. This discourse is also reproduced by healthcare professionals, the media, and the “healthcare industry”, which comprises the food, clothes, and sports equipment sectors<sup>24</sup>. In this respect, we identified a strong influence of this discourse to the detriment of the experience of this activity as a type of leisure, satisfaction, having a moment for yourself, or according to the characteristics of humanistic idleness.

In the contemporary functionalist society, restrictions still appear to exist in assuming that “time is wasted” with doing nothing and with the non-utilitarianism of social practices, as spending time in physical activity as a means to obtain health benefits may be more convenient and seems to be socially more acceptable than saying it is done simply for self-realization and self-satisfaction.

The distinction made by the participants regarding the motivations that lead them to perform physical activity and to understand it as a time of leisure may be related to the mental models constructed, as well as to personal and sociocultural aspects. According to Chaves<sup>25</sup>, the personal perceptions related to subjectivity arise “[...] from the activity of the individual, the agent and self-creator of self, and occurs in the individual’s cultural context of social relations and that these relations produced by individuals depend on historical-cultural practices developed by society”. Hence, the interrelationships that exist between the person and society describe how the sociocultural aspects historically constructed by man involve him. Nonetheless, culture influences the person and/or collectivities regarding their ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. However, individual activity within this society may induce the appropriation, reformulation and reconstruction of the understanding of cultural phenomena. From this activity, the human being then constructs his subjectivity that is influenced by cultural practices, which he himself maintains, transforms, or discards.

We defend the thesis that physical activities should be promoted beyond functionalist aspects, considering especially the subjectivities that can be built in this relationship. For this purpose, developing these activities through the proposal of experiences of idleness could be an important contribution to achieving this goal. According to Martins<sup>26</sup>, a person in convening the “[...] experiences of idleness as a value and systematic practice promotes the

development of his/her autonomy, increasing self-esteem and also being able to obtain satisfaction and relaxation". Thus, while performing activities based initially on functionalist aspects, people can modify their perceptions along this process through pedagogical actions and/or spontaneously, assuming them as experiences of idleness by incorporating some of their attributes in order to give a meaning to the activity; even if they are everyday activities, they become significant<sup>7</sup>.

## **Conclusions**

The adoption of the sociocognitive proposal for the interpretation of the discourses of the social actors involved in this study permitted to unveil nuances of the representations assumed by the participants. However, the selection of this approach has limitations due to the methodological choices adopted. In addition, the lack of studies in the literature addressing similar objectives and employing the analysis method used here restricted the discussion in this study.

The discursive analysis allowed to identify the reproduction of the predominant proposal of leisure studies in Brazil on the part of professionals, notably attributes related to free time, pleasure, rest, and fun. This position might be influenced by the mental model of academic education that delineates the specific representations of a knowledge area, in this study, Physical Education, which assumes a leading role in the topic of leisure in Brazil.

With respect to idleness, the professionals did not report historical aspects of the topic nor of the classical Greek perspective or the recent proposal presented by the authors who conduct studies based on the humanistic perspective of idleness. In addition, we identified that these professionals still exhibit a mental model linked to the pejorative aspect of idleness, i.e., sloth, unproductivity. On the other hand, the users exhibit a mental model associating leisure with rest, fun and consumerism, reproducing a capitalist ideology, and, as common sense, refer to some of the principles reported in leisure studies in Brazil. However, according to their discourses, they do not know the meaning of idleness.

Possibly, the hegemonic discourse of leisure may have influenced the adoption of this mental model, either by the social relations established with the professionals of the program investigated or by the media that sell the idea of leisure. However, the data demonstrated a paradox regarding the theoretical perspective of the sociological area of leisure. In practice, the users perform activities of leisure related to daily life and not necessarily linked to a time free from social obligations and from consumerism.

This fact allows us to reflect on the idealization of the leisure phenomenon in contemporary society. However, when we analyzed the discourses we identified that people re-signify their activities, giving them peculiar meanings and potentiating and qualifying the "simple tasks of life", such as those performed in everyday life, and thus characterizing these activities in a manner similar to the proposal of experiences of idleness.

Another relevant factor identified in the analysis of the data was the discourse attributed to physical activity. In a society characterized by functionalism, this type of social phenomenon is promoted, for example, as a "tool" or "strategy" to achieve a "greater social purpose", such as occupying free time, avoiding boredom, preventing disease and/or health promotion, factors moving the healthcare industry. On the other hand, the assumption of the perspective of physical activity as an experience of idleness links it notoriously to promoting feelings of self-realization, self-satisfaction, and human development. Although these aspects are defended, they are still "taboos" that need to be overcome in the contemporary productivist society.

## References

1. Baptista MM. (2016). Estudos de ócio e leisure studies: O atual debate filosófico, político e cultural. RBEL 2016;3(1):20-30.
2. Bertini VMR. O pensamento de Joffre Dumazedier e de Nelson Carvalho Marcellino: algumas convergências e diferenças no campo do Lazer. Licere 2005;8(1):111-125.
3. Pinheiro KF, Rhoden I, Martins JCO. A experiência do ócio na sociedade Hipermoderna. Revista Mal-Estar e Subjetividade 2010;10(4):1131-1146.
4. Romera L. Entrevista com professor Manuel Cuenca del Instituto de Estudios de Ocio de la Universidad de Deusto. Licere 2016;19(2):429-441.
5. Cuenca MC. O ócio autotético. Revista do Centro de Pesquisa e Formação 2016;(2):10-29.
6. Cuenca MC. Ócio humanista: Dimension y manifestiones del ócio. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto; 2000.
7. Francileudo FA, Martins JCO. Sentido do tempo, sentido do ócio, sentidos para o viver. Coimbra: Gracio Editor; 2016.
8. Marcellino NC. Lazer e educação. Campinas: Papirus; 1987.
9. Creswell JW. Projeto de pesquisa: métodos qualitativo, quantitativo e misto. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed; 2010.
10. Strauss A, Corbin J. Pesquisa qualitativa: Técnicas e procedimentos para o desenvolvimento de teoria fundamentada. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed; 2008.
11. Van Dijk T. Discurso e contexto: Uma abordagem sociocognitiva. São Paulo: Contexto. 2012.
12. Van Dijk T. Ideology and discourse A multidisciplinary introduction. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University; 2004.
13. Gomes CL. Lazer: Necessidade humana e dimensão da cultura. RBEL 2014;1(1):3-20.
14. Dumazedier J. Sociologia empírica do lazer. São Paulo: Perspectiva; 1973.
15. Aquino CAB, Martins JCO. Ócio, lazer e tempo livre na sociedade do consumo e do trabalho. Rev Mal-Estar e Subjetividade 2007;7(2):479-500.
16. Martins JCO. Lazer, tempo livre e ócio na cidade contemporânea. Revista Interdisciplinar de Ciências Sociais e Humanas 2013;1(5):131-147.
17. Marinho, A, Pimentel, GGA. Dos clássicos aos contemporâneos: Revendo e conhecendo importantes categorias referentes às teorias do lazer. In: Pimentel GGA. Teorias do lazer. Maringá: Eduem; 2010.
18. Marcassa L. Ócio. In: GOMES CL, editor. Dicionário crítico do lazer. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica; 2004, p. 126-133.
19. Cuenca. Aproximación multidisciplinar a los estudios de ocio. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto; 2006.
20. Monteagudo MJ, Cuenca J, Bayón F, Kleiber DA. Ócio ao longo da vida: As pontencialidades dos itinerários de ócio para a promoção do desenvolvimento humano. Revista Lusófona de Estudos Culturais 2013;1(2):156-173.
21. Rhoden I. O ócio como experiência subjetiva: contribuições da psicologia do ócio - Revista Mal-Estar e Subjetividade 2009;9(4):1233-1250.
22. Rhoden I. A experiência do ócio construtivo e a qualidade de vida. Textual 2005;1(6):10-21.
23. Maciel MG, Soares LA. Análise discurso do programa academia da cidade de Belo Horizonte/MG. Licere 2016;19(1):203-232.
24. Maciel MG. A efetividade das experiências de ócio em um programa governamental de atividade física. [Tese de doutorado em Estudos do Lazer]. Belo Horizonte: Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Programa de Pós-Graduação Interdisciplinar em Estudos do Lazer; 2016.
25. Chaves AM. O fenômeno psicológico como objeto de estudo transdisciplinar. Psicol Refl Crít 2000;13(1):159-165. Doi: 10.1590/S0102-79722000000100016.
26. Martins JCO. Ócio e promoção da saúde. Rev Bras Promoç Saúde 2015;28(3): 297-300.

**Acknowledgements:** To Fundação de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais for the doctoral fellowship granted to Marcos G. Maciel (FAPEMIG – PCRH 90402/14)

### ORCID of the authors:

Marcos Gonçalves Maciel: 0000-0002-8357-491x  
 José Clerton De Oliveira Martins: 0000-0002-8229-0915  
 Paulo Roberto Vieira Junior: 0000-0001-8456-9779  
 Liana Abrão Romera: 0000-0001-7501-670x  
 Luiz Alex Silva Saraiva: 0000-0003-4809-2744

Received on Jan, 20, 2018.

Reviewed on Jun, 22, 2018.

Accepted on Jul, 25, 2018.

---

**Author address:** Marcos Gonçalves Maciel. Av. São Paulo, nº 3.996, Vila Rosário. Ibitaré/MG - CEP: 32400-000. E-mail: marcos.maciel@uemg.br