Suvremena psihologija 17 (2014), 2, 111-124

Izvorni znanstveni članak - UDK 159.922.8

"WHAT ARE YOU DOING?": COMPARISON OF THREE METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO STUDYING LEISURE

Petra Anić
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Rijeka
Sveučilišna avenija 4, 51000 Rijeka
panic@ffri.hr

Marko Tončić
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Rijeka
Sveučilišna avenija 4, 51000 Rijeka
mtoncic@ffri.hr

Abstract

Beside the time spent in obligatory activities we also have free time to spend in freely chosen activities. The aim of this study was to research leisure activities using different methodologies: free time activities checklist, favorite activity, and experience sampling. The participants in the checklist and favorite activity study were 769 students, while there were 121 students in the experience sampling study. Results showed significant differences in leisure activity occurrences among different methodological approaches. The favorite activities approach showed an obvious predominance of hobbies. Checklist study showed a greater frequency of reading. In the experience sampling study, electronic media activities were present above the expected levels. No differences between methods were found in outdoor activities. Finally, social activities were mentioned less often than expected as a favorite activity. The present study results suggest that for a full insight into students' leisure activities, an extensive list of everyday activities should be used, while for researching leisure in a narrower sense, from a subjective view point, several favorite activities should be studied. Finally, results have shown that the experience sampling method is a good way of researching passive activities, but may not be suitable for more engaging activities.

Key words: leisure; check-list; favorite activity; experience sampling

Ovaj rad je financiralo/sufinanciralo Sveučilište u Rijeci projektom broj 13.04.1.2.06.

This work has been fully supported by/supported in part by University of Rijeka under project number 13.04.1.2.06.

INTRODUCTION

Besides time spent in obligatory activities, like work or school, we also have free time to spend in freely chosen activities: 40-50% of time spent awake could be considered as free time or leisure (Larson & Verma, 1999). Free time activities are a large and vital part of people's lives, and are especially important because they are related to many beneficial outcomes, such as greater well-being, good mental health and healthy adjustment (Brajša-Žganec, Merkaš & Šverko, 2011; Caldwell, 2005; Casey, Ripke & Huston, 2005; Larson, 2000). Throughout the teenage years, leisure activities become increasingly more significant during young people's development, signaling the increasing role of peer groups and decreasing role of parents (Feinstein, Bynner & Duckworth, 2006).

Defining leisure

Defining free time or leisure (which are in this paper used as synonyms), observing and measuring it are demanding tasks, and for a long time have been considered a challenge to progress in the study of this field (Kleiber, Walker & Mannell, 2011).

Some authors define leisure as something that a person does when not working – activities become leisure primarily because a person is engaged in them during free time (Brightbill, 1960; Smigel, 1963). Quite an opposite description is offered by Larson and Verma (1999), who wrote that free time activities should be voluntary, intrinsically motivated, that they should demand a higher degree of self-initiative, regulation and organization than activities proposed or even imposed by others, such as work or school. If those characteristics are taken into account, perhaps activities like TV watching, that are entertaining and relaxing, but also related to high levels of boredom and apathy as well as low levels of intrinsic motivation (Massimini & Carli, 1998), cannot be considered leisure in the sense of actively spent time. In an attempt to solve this dilemma, Kleiber et al. (2011) offered a typology for defining, observing and measuring leisure, with two dimensions: type of phenomena being considered as leisure and the definitional point taken by researchers who studies leisure. Two types of phenomena are identified – objective and subjective (Ellis & Witt, 1991; Neulinger, 1974), where the objective approach sees leisure as certain types of activities, settings or time, while the subjective approach associates leisure with the occurrence of certain types of mental states, emotions, cognitions, meanings and need satisfaction. The second dimension, definitional point, refers to the fact that what is defined as leisure can be seen from the viewpoint of researcher (external) or the viewpoint of a person being studied (internal).

In this paper, the focus will be on all activities a person can do in their free time, regardless of the context and environment they occur in, the level of structure they have or how beneficial they are. Furthermore, leisure will be approached from both definitional points, external and internal.

Measuring leisure

Similar to other areas of research, there are many available methods for studying leisure, but the most frequently used are surveys, with common use of leisure behavior inventories. Inventories are mostly made as a list of different activities and participants are simply asked to indicate activities in which they have participated usually accompanied with frequency and time spent during some period of time. Another method of measuring leisure is using diaries where people record activities in which they engage during a specified time period. In the last two decades, diary studies are being gradually replaced by experience sampling method – ESM (Hektner, Schmidt & Csikszentmihalyi, 2006), which is useful for researching experiences accompanying activities that researchers judge as leisure. Probably its greatest advantage is that the experiences are judged at the moment they are experienced, reducing memory bias and false recall. Also, the sampling being randomly distributed through the measuring period gives a good sample of different activities people engage in.

Classification of leisure activities

Until now there has been no dominant taxonomy of leisure activities, which represents one of the biggest problems in leisure research. Classification employed depends on the study goals and intentions of the researcher, varying from classifications based on the content of activities (e.g. Overs, Taylor, Cassel & Chernov, 1997) to those based on the relation of leisure activities to individual values or psychological needs they satisfy (e.g. Holmberg, Rosen & Holland, 1990; Tinsley & Eldredge, 1995). The simplest, and for the present research, the most relevant way of classifying leisure activities is on the basis of the nature or content of activity. A good example is Overs et al.'s (1997) classification. They classified activities into nine categories: sports, nature, art and music, organizations, education, entertainment and culture, volunteer, games, crafts and collecting. In a similar manner, Passmore and French (2001) divided activities into three categories: achievement leisure (sports, hobbies, creative and performance arts), social leisure and time out leisure (listening to music, watching TV, contemplation).

The definitional vantage point, the choice of leisure activity taxonomy and research method are narrowly tied to our understanding of leisure. Considering diversity of free time definitions, as well as different classifications of leisure activities, that inevitably lead to rather inconclusive results, we decided to use the simplest classification by the content of activity, similar to Overs et al. (1997), grouping all similar activities into the same category, and to employ three different methods of studying leisure.

The aim of this study was to research leisure activities using different methodologies. First, we gave participants a list of activities and asked them to check all the activities in which they were involved during the last week, when they were

not attending classes. Second, we asked participants to state their favorite leisure activity, giving them the opportunity to freely choose any activity they engage in and third, we sampled their daily activities. In this way we have approached this problem from both definitional vantage points described by Kleiber and colleagues (2011): internal (favorite activity) and external (free time checklist and experience sampling). Comparison of the obtained results would, hopefully, give us more reliable information about leisure activities.

METHOD

Participants

The sample included 769 students (484 females, 278 males) from the University of Rijeka who participated in the checklist and favorite activity study (mean age 20.57, with standard deviation 1.71). In the experience sampling study there were 121 students (84 females and 34 males), aged from 18 to 27 years, with mean age of 21.62 (standard deviation was 1.66). The recruitment was made during the initial month of the academic year and the participation was completely voluntary.

Instruments and procedure

Leisure activities where researched in two studies, employing three methods: free time activities checklist, favorite activity, and experience sampling.

In the first study, two methods were used: favorite activity and checklist. Participants were firstly asked to write down their favorite leisure activity. After that, a checklist of free time activities was used. Free time activities' checklist was constructed for the purposes of this research. The starting point for the development of this checklist was a list of leisure activities developed in our culture (Brdar & Lončarić, 2004) which was additionally expanded with data gathered in a preliminary study: activities that were frequently mentioned in the preliminary study were included in this study. Free time activities were conceptualized as activities a person can engage after (or before) classes. A list of 15 free time activities was presented to participants (e.g. *being with friends, watching TV, writing, painting, learning, etc.*) and they needed to choose the activities they have engaged in during the last week.

In the second study, the experience sampling methodology (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987; Larson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1983) was employed. The experience sampling protocol was administered using the Experience sampling program (Barrett & Barrett, 2000), installed on handheld computers (PDA's Palm z22). Participants carried PDA's for seven consecutive days. The devices emitted tone signals five times a day, alarming participants to respond to questions. Signal-contingent method (Bolger, Davis & Rafaeli, 2003) was employed: the signals were randomly distributed through the day from 9 a.m. to 11 p.m. Participants were instructed to

immediately respond to a signal when it occurred by answering a series of questions presented on the PDA's screen. The time to start answering was limited to three minutes after a tone signal, and if there was no response, the program went to sleep mode until the next trial. In this way, retrospective answering was eliminated. Responses were made by clicking on the chosen answer, directly on the PDA's screen. The rating protocol included information about the location and activity at the time of signaling. The list of activities was made based on the preliminary experience sampling study in which participants wrote what they were doing each time when they were signaled. Their answers were used as a source for constructing the list used in the main study – the most frequent answers were included in the list of free time activities offered in the main study. It took about one minute to fill out the form. Altogether, participants completed 2917 valid forms.

Ratings during the time spent at the faculty and other places where classes are being held (e.g. laboratories, hospitals, etc.) were excluded from further analyses.

RESULTS

Activities offered in the free time checklist and experience sampling weren't entirely the same. The lists of activities were based on the two preliminary studies, which showed somewhat different leisure activities that participants engage in. There is a core set of activities that have shown up in our preliminary studies and that have occurrences regardless of the methodology employed. We put no boundaries on the favorite activity and allowed the participant to specify his/her favorite activity. The favorite activity was subsequently categorized by two independent raters. The agreement was quite high (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.86$). The initially differently

Table 1. Raw occurrences and by method proportions of leisure activities

	Study method		
Category	Experience sampling	Checklist	Favorite
Hobbies	89 (0.03)	730 (0.16)	256 (0.45)
Electronic	597 (0.20)	618 (0.14)	75 (0.13)
Outdoor	112 (0.04)	209 (0.05)	48 (0.08)
Reading	55 (0.02)	548 (0.12)	56 (0.10)
Social	401 (0.14)	733 (0.16)	90 (0.16)
Family	147 (0.05)	511 (0.11)	†
Studying	593 (0.20)	716 (0.16)	†
Shopping	14 (0.01)	424 (0.09)	†
Volunteering	*	64 (0.01)	†
Dancing	*	*	41 (0.07)
Sleeping	246 (0.08)	*	†
Housework	217 (0.07)	*	†
Eating, drinking	185 (0.06)	*	†
Getting ready, going somewhere	261 (0.09)	*	†

* not presented; † not mentioned; proportions are shown in parentheses

categorized activities were re-categorized in the first category that both raters agreed upon. Raw frequencies of occurrence of the categorized activities present in the study are shown in Table 1.

Hobbies (sports, drawing, painting, writing and playing an instrument), reading, socializing with friends or partner, outdoor activities that are not sports and electronic media (playing computer games, surfing the Web, watching TV, listening to music) were represented in all three studies. Time spent with family members, studying (learning, writing reports and seminars) and shopping were represented in checklist and experience sampling studies, but they did not occur as favorite activities. Finally, several activities were present in only one of the studies: volunteering in the checklist study, dancing in favorite activities and sleeping, eating and drinking, housework, and getting ready to go somewhere or going somewhere in the experience sampling.

In the checklist study, the highest frequencies of engagement can be seen for social activities, hobbies and studying, and the lowest for volunteering. Favorite activities with the highest frequency are hobbies, and with lowest dancing and outdoor activities. In the experience sampling study the highest frequency was obtained for electronic media usage and studying, while the lowest can be seen for shopping.

Only activities that were present in all three methods were chosen for further analyses. The differences in coherencies of different leisure activities between different methodological approaches were calculated with a chi square statistic. Given the heterogeneity, fuzziness and overlapping of the count categories (there are in total 4617 occurrences but only 769 participants) the count data were normalized so that the total count sums up to 769. A summary of the differences in frequency of leisure activities between the three methods are shown in Table 2.

There is a significant difference in leisure activity occurrences among different methodological approaches ($\chi^2(8, N = 769) = 92.50$, $p < 0.01$). Hobbies were reported less than expected in checklist and experience sampling study and more than expected as favorite activities. The situation was opposite for activities including electronic media: they were stated less often as favorite activity, but occurred more often than expected in the experience sampling study. No differences between methods were found in the reports of outdoor activities. For reading, it can be seen

Table 2. Normalized frequencies of leisure activities obtained in three methods

	Experience sampling	Checklist	Favorite
Hobbies	4 (*-3.53*)	92 (*-2.96*)	174 (*4.36*)
Electronic	27 (*4.64*)	78 (*0.67*)	51 (*-2.51*)
Outdoor	5 (*0.16*)	26 (*-0.67*)	33 (*0.61*)
Reading	2 (*-2.11*)	69 (*2.60*)	38 (*-1.76*)
Social	18 (*1.58*)	92 (*1.42*)	61 (*-2.05*)

Standardized residuals are shown in parentheses

that participants reported it more often than expected in the checklist study, but less often in the experience sampling study. Finally, social activities were mentioned less often than expected as favorite activity.

The favorite activities approach showed an obvious predominance of hobbies, which are mentioned in a much lesser extent in the checklist, and are practically unmentioned in the experience sampling research. Checklist study showed a greater perceived frequency of reading and a lesser frequency of hobbies. In a week-long sampling period, electronic media occurrences are present highly above the expected rate, while hobbies and reading are reported less than expected.

DISCUSSION

In this paper, free time activities were approached in three ways, in an attempt to gather more detailed information on students' leisure time and to gain insight into methodological differences between them. Free time activities checklist allowed us to get a broader picture of what students do in their free time and how they think they spend their free time. Activities students engaged in are sampled using experience sampling methodology during one typical week. This enabled us to gather more detailed and ecologically valid information about how students spend free time. The favorite activity measure was also used, because it was assumed that some of the activities people engage in during free time are not so freely chosen. As an example we can take studying: individuals did choose it independently, but the sense of responsibility toward their parents who are financing their studies might play a role in that choice. However, the favorite activity should really be freely chosen by the person, therefore it can be considered as an activity that people themselves perceive as leisure. By getting information about what activities are favorite activities, and comparing them with the lists of activities we offered participants to choose from, we were able to capture both definitional points (Kleiber et al., 2011) – external and internal.

First of all, there is a group of method specific activities. For example, sleeping, housework, eating and preparing were present only in experience sampling study. They may not be strictly free time activities but they do occupy a significant proportion of the sampled activities (almost 0.30). Dancing was mentioned as a favorite activity in a number of cases. Categorizing it as a hobby or as a social activity would have changed the favorite activities' frequency distribution (emphasizing hobbies even more or raising the perception of social activities as favorite activities). We decided to put it in a category of its own mainly because it can be perceived in both ways (as a hobby or social activity; Passmore & French, 2001). Finally, volunteering was included in the list of activities in the checklist study, based on preliminary study findings. Its occurrence was small but stable across both the preliminary and the main study.

Another group of activities occurred using both checklist and experience sampling study. Shopping, studying and socializing with family members are present in both of them, with marginally different occurrences. None of the above emerged as a favorite activity. Studying is an important, as well as one of the most time consuming activities in student life: they study approximately 23 hours per week, spending more time only in social activities (Anić, 2012). We actually did expect that studying will not be perceived as a favorite activity, probably because students see it as their duty imposed by others, something that needs to be done, something they do not enjoy. Our expectations were confirmed: it is a common way of spending free time, but it is not amongst their favorite leisure activities. As for time spent with family members, a well-known fact is that during adolescence time spent with family decreases and time spent with peers' increases (e.g. Zeijl, Du Bois-Reymond & Te Poel, 2001). The present study results showed that students spend time with their families, but this activity is not amongst their favorite activities, which goes along with the finding that from adolescence onwards people are more oriented toward their peers and friends than toward their primary family. Our data do not allow us to comment why this is not amongst favorite activities, but if we assume that this is passively spent time (e.g. resting, watching TV together…), the result is not that surprising. Favorite leisure activities are probably activities in which people are more active, which they enjoy and are interested in, and it looks like spending time with family members, possibly in a rather passive way, in this period of life is not a source of enjoyment or interest. Finally, over 400 participants stated that they engaged in shopping during the previous week, but it was not mentioned as a favorite activity. Furthermore, the experience sampling study results showed a lower occurrence of shopping. Besides the need to purchase some specific merchandise (e.g. groceries, clothes, etc.), there are many different motives for shopping, like personal (e.g. role playing, diversion from daily routine, self-gratification, etc.) or social (e.g. communication with people that share our interests, peer group attraction) (Tauber, 1972). In the present study, we did not ask students for their motives for shopping, but since this was not a favorite activity, it is reasonable to assume that they mainly shop just to buy things they need. The other components of shopping just might not be that pronounced, but they might come to the fore if we asked them to choose several activities they enjoy and perceive as favorite. Compared to other activities, shopping might just not be attractive enough to become a favorite activity, but it could be amongst activities people enjoy, especially women (Campbell, 1997).

Method specific activities should not be excluded in future studies, because people do engage in them. Some of them, like sleeping or housework, cannot be considered as leisure in the narrow sense (e.g. Larson & Verma, 1999), while others, like studying, are probably not subjectively perceived as leisure (e.g. Iso-Ahola, 1999; Neulinger, 1974). The predominance of those activities in everyday life suggests keeping them in future studies. People do engage in them, probably for a significant portion of their free time, and excluding them would result in an incomplete picture of how they spend their free time.

Comparison of frequency of activities obtained by the three methods revealed some interesting results. Hobbies, including sports and various artistic activities, were reported more than expected as the favorite activity. However, engagement in those types of activities was reported less than expected in the checklist study, and especially in the experience sampling study. There are two possible reasons for that. It might be that hobbies are evaluated with greater importance than other activities while in fact they do not occur that often. The other is related to the experience sampling method: students may have not responded to the signals while they were in the middle of training, music rehearsal or some similar activity because they did not hear the signal, or they did not want to stop what they were doing (or perhaps they weren't even allowed by their trainers or instructors). This suggests that experience sampling study may not be a good way to study more active and intense experiences that should not be interrupted.

The situation was opposite for the usage of electronic media: students report it less often as a favorite activity, but more often than expected in the experience sampling study. The difference between checklist and experience sampling study results could be a consequence of a wrong perception of time usage. Distorted perception of time, or time loss, is reported by high and low frequency computer and video games players (Wood & Griffiths, 2007; Wood, Griffiths & Parke, 2007). Students might think that they watch TV or play computer games less than they actually do, losing the sense of time spent in front of the TV or computer. Furthermore, based on the findings that people tend to over-report engagement in physical activities that they find socially desirable (Adams et al., 2005), the under-reporting of watching TV and playing computer games could be also a reflection of social desirability. Students say that they watch TV and play computer less than they do, because they perceive those activities as less socially desirable and want to show themselves in a better light. Watching TV is a passive way of spending free time, in which enjoyment is shown to be lower than the average enjoyment for other activities (Robinson & Godbey, 1999), and is often associated with boredom and apathy (Massimini & Carli, 1998). According to Larson and Verma (1999), it is just a way to "kill" time when we have nothing else to do, without any of the qualities that free time activities are supposed to have and therefore it is not perceived as a favorite activity. This is confirmed in its low occurrence as a favorite activity obtained in the present study.

Reading is reported more often in the checklist study and less often than expected in the experience sampling study. Also, it is not often reported as their favorite activity. Why do students read so much if they don't like it? Perhaps the explanation given for TV watching can be applied here – this is a rather passive way of spending free time, often with low challenges and activation, which make it less likely to be a favorite activity. The opposite results of checklist and experience sampling study can be explained in several ways. It is possible that students give socially desirable answers, similar to the findings on physical exercise, that we have already mentioned (Adams et al., 2005), saying that they read more than they actually do.

Furthermore, it might be that they have a distorted perception of how much they read. Finally, it is possible that in the experience sampling study we did not capture them reading because that activity occurred outside the sampled period (i.e. before 9 a.m. and/or after 11 p.m.). Even though experience sampling is a good way of studying unstructured activities like reading, watching TV, etc., perhaps in future studies the daily time range should be extended and the number of signals increased. In this way it would be possible to gather more information that would allow us to form a better picture of free time use.

The last difference was observed for social activities: participants favored them less than expected. It is interesting that they generally do not perceive socializing as a favorite activity, even though since adolescence, peers should be amongst the most important people in their lives (e.g. Steinberg, 1990). Students spend a lot of time socializing, but those activities are quite different in the level of challenge, motivation, activation, etc., which possibly make them less likely to be seen as favorite on the whole. We have researched socializing in general, without paying attention to the specific social activities participants engage in. Perhaps they do enjoy and favor some specific activity with their friends or partners, like going to a movie, a concert, etc., but the general category of socializing might be too universal to be perceived as favorite. A recommendation for future studies is to divide this category into several smaller categories to capture possible differences.

To conclude, sampling of activities showed that most young peoples' daily activities can be classified as what Passmore and French (2001) call social or entertainment leisure, while favorite activities are mainly in the domain called achievement leisure.

General comparison of the three methods

Information about leisure can be collected in many different ways, from direct observation to retrospective recalls of periods lasting up to several years or even a lifetime. However, like other retrospective methods, even 24-hour recall involves selecting the correct time period for recall, recalling the relevant events and aggregation of the recalled in appropriate format (Wheeler & Reis, 1991), making reports difficult and often of questionable accuracy. The downsides of retrospective methods are well documented in the research done by Engle and Lumpkin (1992), who found that without cognitive enhancement, college students fail to report 54% of the activities that objective observers saw them do during the two-hour period on the previous day. Even with short time periods between the event and report, the reliability of retrospective reports depends on the properties of the acts, base rates, desirability, gender as well as other factors (e.g. Fahrenberg, Brügner, Foerster & Käppler, 1999; Gosling, John, Kraik & Robins, 1998). Researchers need to choose between methods of data collection that give individual's subjective opinion of time

use and methods that assess the individual's actual time use. This decision should be based on the research questions researchers try to answer (Klumb & Perrez, 2004).

The present study results suggest that for a full picture of students' free time activities, more extensive lists of everyday activities should be used, in order to minimize the chance of omitting something. A construction of the list that would capture all possible activities is practically impossible to do. A better option, perhaps, is to ask participants to write down all activities they were engaged in during the specified time period. However, in that case they would probably leave something out, as shown in the study of Engle and Lumpin (1992). It looks like the best choice is to use a list of activities with instructions to participants that they add activities if needed. When analyzing frequencies of those data, we always need to keep in mind problems associated with retrospective recall.

Next, if a study aims to research leisure in the narrower sense, from a subjective viewpoint, participants could be asked to state several, not just one, activities in which they engage during free time, which they enjoy and consider as their favorite activities. This would provide data about concrete activities perceived by participants as leisure, without limiting it to only one favorite activity.

As for the experience sampling method, we have seen that it is a good way of researching activities that are more passive, like watching TV or reading, but may not be suitable for more engaging activities, like hobbies, especially sports and playing music. Signaling in the time of such activity could be more prone to lack of response consequently lowering the recorded activity occurrences. The density and period of activity sampling almost surely plays a role. Our study sampled activities approximately every 3 hours, missing activities in between. The sampling period of one week may not be representative of our subjects' lives in general, while checklist studies most probably are. For those "active" activities, the checklist or the favorite activity approaches are possibly much better. Another option is to use classical diary studies, or *The Day Reconstruction Method* (Kahneman, Krueger, Schkade, Schwarz & Stone, 2004), which are not interruptive, but, on the other hand, are still subject to errors tied to retrospective recalls, which should be taken into account.

There's a lot of room for improvement of the methods used in our study. First, we concentrated only on one favorite activity and it would be better to broaden this at least on several activities, giving participants more choice and also providing results that are more comparable to those of the checklist and experience sampling study. Second, we used a list of activities in the experience sampling study based on the results of a preliminary study. The usage of open questions would have expanded the possibilities and the accuracy of activity monitoring, but because of the cumbersome input process and feedback from preliminary study, we opted for a representative list to choose from avoiding additional strain to the participants.

REFERENCES

Adams, S.A., Matthews, C.E., Ebbeling, C.B., Moore, C.G., Cunningham, J.E., Fulton, J., Herbert, J.R. (2005). The effect of social desirability and social approval on self-reports of physical activity. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 161*, 389-398, doi: 10.1093/aje/kwi054

Anić, P. (2012). *Kako priti do sreče: Življenski cilji adolescentov in aktivnosti v prostem času* [How to find happiness: Adolescents' life goals and free time activities]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Barrett, D.J., Barrett, L.F. (2000). *The Experience-Sampling Program (ESP). Retrieved from* http:// www2.bc.edu/~barretli/esp/

Bolger, N., Davis, A., Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary studies: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 579-616. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145030

Brajša-Žganec, A., Merkaš, M., Šverko, I. (2011). Quality of Life and Leisure Activities: How do Leisure Activities Contribute to Subjective Well-Being? *Social Indicators Research, 102*, 81-91. doi: 10.1007/s11205-010-9724-2

Brdar, I., Lončarić, D. (2004). Suočavanje s akademskim stresom I aktivnosti u slobodnom vremenu učenika. *Društvena istraživanja*, *74*, 967-988.

Brightbill, C.K. (1960). *The challenge of leisure*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Caldwell, L.L. (2005). Leisure and health: Why is leisure therapeutic? *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling. 33*, 7-26.

Campbell, C. (1997). Shopping, pleasure and the sex war. In: P.Falk, C. Campbell, (Eds.), *The shopping experience* (166-176). London: Sage Publications.

Casey, D.M., Ripke, M.N., Huston, A.C. (2005). Activity participation and the well-being of children and adolescents in the context of the welfare reform. In: J.L. Mahoney, R.W. Larson, J.S. Eccles (Eds.), *Organized activities as contexts of development* (65-84). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Csikszenmihalyi, M., Larson, R. (1987). Validity and reliability of the Experience-Sampling Method. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 175*, 526-536.

Ellis, G.D., Witt, P.A. (1991). Conceptualization and measurement of leisure: Making the abstract concrete. In T.L. Goodale, P.A. Witt (Eds.), *Recreation and leisure: Issues in an era of change* (377-395). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.

Engle, P.L., Lumpkin, J.B. (1992). How accurate are time-use reports? Effects of cognitive enhancement and cultural differences on recall accuracy? *Applied Cognitive Psychology 6*, 141-159.

Fahrenberg, J., Brügner, G., Foerster, F., Käppler, Ch. (1999). Ambulatory assessment of diurnal changes with a handheld computer: Mood, attention and morningness-eveningness. *Personality and Individual Differences 26*, 641-656.

Feinstein, L., Bynner, J., Duckworth, K. (2006). Young People's Leisure Contexts and their Relation to Adult Outcomes. *Journal of Youth Studies, 9*, 305-327. doi: 10.1080/13676260600805663

Gosling, S. D., John, O.P., Craik, K.H., Robins, R.W. (1998). Do people know how they behave? Self-reported act frequencies compared with on-line coding by observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 74*, 1337–1349.

Hektner, J.M., Schmidt, J.A., Csikszentmihalyi, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Experience Sampling Method: Measuring the Quality of Everyday Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Holmberg, K., Rosen, D., Holland, J.L. (1990). *The Leisure Activities Finder*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1999). Motivational foundations of leisure. In E.L. Jackson, T.L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (35–51). State College, PA: Venture.

Kahneman, D., Krueger, A.B., Schkade, D.A., Schwarz, N., Stone, A.A. (2004). A Survey Method for Characterizing Daily Life Experience: The Day Reconstruction Method. *Science, 306*, 1776-1780.

Kleiber, D. A., Walker, G. J., & Mannell, R. C. (2011). *A social psychology of leisure (2nd ed.)*. State College, PA: Venture.

Klumb, P.L., Perrez, M. (2004). Why time-sampling studies can enrich work–leisure research. *Social Indicators Research, 67*, 1-10.

Larson, R.*W.* (*2000*). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American Psychologist, 55*, 170-183.

Larson, R., Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1983). The experience sampling method. *New Directions for Methodology of Social and Behavioral Science*, *15*, 41-56.

Larson, R.W., Verma, S. (1999). How children and adolescents spend time across the world: Work, play and developmental opportunities. *Psychological Bulletin, 125,* 701-736. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.701

Massimini., F., Carli, M. (1998). The systematic assessment of flow in daily experience. In M. Csikszentmihalyi, I. Csikszentmihalyi (Eds.), *Optimal Experience* (266-287). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neulinger, J. (1974). *The psychology of leisure: Research approaches to the study of leisure*. Springfield. IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Overs, R.P., Taylor, S., Cassell, E., Chernov, M. (1977). *Avocational counseling for the elderly.* Sussex: Avocational Counseling Research.

Passmore, A.E., French, D. (2001). Development and administration of a measure to assess adolescents' participation in leisure activities. *Adolescence*, *36*, 67-75.

Robinson, J.P., Godbey, G. (1999). *Time for life: The surprising ways Americans use their time*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Smigel, E.O. (Ed.) (1963). *Work and leisure: A contemporary social problem*. New Heaven: College & University Press.

Steinberg, L. (1990). Autonomy, conflict, and harmony in the family relationship. In S.S. Feldman, G.R. Elliott (Eds.), At the threshold: The developing adolescent (255-276). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Tauber, E.M. (1972). Why do people shop? *The Journal of Marketing*, *36,* 46-49.

Tinsley, H.E.A., Eldredge, B.D. (1995). Psychological benefits of leisure participation: A taxonomy of leisure activities based on their need-gratifying properties. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 123-132.

Wheeler, L., Reis, H.T. (1991). Self-recording of everyday life events: Origins, types and issues. *Journal of Personality, 59*, 339-354.

Wood, R.T.A., Griffiths, M.D. (2007). Time loss whilst playing video games: Is there a relationship to addictive behaviours? *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 5*, 141-149.

Wood, R.T.A., Griffiths, M.D., Parke, A. (2007). Experiences of time loss among videogame players: An empirical study. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 10*, 38-44.

Zeijl, E., Du Bois-Reymond, M., Te Poel. Y. (2001). Young Adolescents' Leisure Patterns. *Society and Leisure*, *24*, 379-402.

"ŠTO RADIŠ?": USPOREDBA TRI METODOLOŠKA PRISTUPA ISTRAŽIVANJU SLOBODNOG VREMENA

Sažetak

Osim vremena koje provodimo u obveznim aktivnostima, preostaje nam i slobodno vrijeme tijekom kojega biramo aktivnosti. Cilj ovog istraživanja bio je istražiti aktivnosti u slobodno vrijeme putem različitih metoda: popisa aktivnosti u slobodno vrijeme, omiljene aktivnosti te uzorkovanjem iskustava; 769 studenata je sudjelovalo u istraživanjima putem popisa slobodnih aktivnosti i omiljene aktivnosti, dok je u metodi uzorkovanja iskustava sudjelovao 121 student. Rezultati su pokazali značajnu razliku u frekvencijama aktivnosti u slobodno vrijeme dobivenih različitim metodološkim pristupima. Hobiji dominiraju kod omiljenih aktivnosti, dok se čitanje pokazalo čestom aktivnošću u istraživanju putem popisa slobodnih aktivnosti. Kod uzorkovanja iskustava kao česta aktivnost pojavljuju se aktivnosti vezane uz elektroničke medije. U aktivnostima na otvorenom nije pronađena razlika između podataka dobivenih različitim metodama. Naposljetku, studenti društvene aktivnosti navode kao omiljenu aktivnost rjeđe od očekivanog. Rezultati upućuju na to da je za potpuni uvid u slobodne aktivnosti potrebno koristiti opširan popis svakodnevnih aktivnosti, dok je za proučavanje slobodnih aktivnosti u subjektivnom smislu uputno ispitati nekoliko omiljenih aktivnosti. Također, pokazalo se da je uzorkovanje iskustava pogodnije za istraživanje pasivnijih aktivnosti nego za aktivnosti koje traže veći angažman i predanost.

Ključne riječi: slobodno vrijeme; popis aktivnosti; omiljena aktivnost; uzorkovanje iskustava

Primljeno: 01. 04. 2014.

