

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH AND KNOWLEDGE

ISSN-2213-1356

www.ijirk.com

Definition, Concepts and Research about Leisure Time

George F. Zarotis*

Faculty of Human Sciences, University of the Aegean, Rhodes, Greece

Walter Tokarski

German Sport University, Cologne

***Corresponding Author**

Abstract

Since the importance between work and leisure has shifted and at the same time prosperity has increased, the value of leisure time has been increasingly appreciated. Leisure time has become a characteristic feature of the quality of life of societies with a high level of development, and is particularly regarded as a measure of personal freedom, participation in social life and the well-being of the citizens living in it. Leisure time not only includes entertainment, recreation and a break from work, but also education, political and social action as well as health orientation. The ultimate goal of this research is to approach the definition, concepts and science of leisure time. The method adopted for the study was a review of the relevant literature. In the light of the present study, it is evident that, as regards the definition of leisure time, it's concept until today has not been unambiguously defined. It is clear that leisure time unites temporal and emotional elements of action and is constituted differently in every society, in which free time segments and subjective voluntary actions can be chosen, and leisure time does not exist in tandem and independently of the social reality, but is an important component of modern society. Therefore, leisure time as a constituent element of society constantly determines the social life and the pattern of human thinking and perception. Social developments increasingly perceive work and leisure as activities that, in contrast to the past, have a new relationship with each other. In view of current social developments, as well as in relation to the European market and the widespread changes in eastern and middle Europe, and in view of the expected developments in the field of leisure time, the possibilities for predicting or estimating trends in the field of scientific methodology have so far been insufficiently developed. Similar techniques, e.g. in the form of special analysis procedures (time series analysis) or scenario techniques, so far have been used in exceptional cases. The development of appropriate specialized tools or the unbiased acceptance and adaptation of appropriate methods by neighbouring

scientific disciplines is essentially still at a preliminary stage, as regards the field of leisure time science, and is a specific task for the coming years.

Key Words: *Definitions & concepts about leisure time, Leisure time Science*

INTRODUCTION

Leisure time has become a characteristic feature of the quality of life of societies with a high level of development, and is particularly regarded as a measure of personal freedom, participation in social life and the well-being of the citizens living in it. Leisure time not only includes entertainment, recreation and a break from work, but also education, political and social action as well as health orientation. Correspondingly, the concept of leisure time today is less univocal: Leisure time is what anyone understands with this term. It can be anything. Work and leisure are no longer strictly separated areas of life: work can become leisure and leisure can become work. The subjective appreciation of leisure time, the time budget available, and the investment of people in leisure time have increased significantly over the last 50 years. At the same time the leisure infrastructure is constantly being built. The basis for these events is that, despite the financial crises, working hours are becoming less and incomes are constantly increasing. Leisure time has changed from being a time solely for rest and consumption, like it was in 1950s up to 70s, to a time dedicated to experience and enjoyment. The consequence of this is the constant search for new impulses, challenges and the creation of intellectual demands. Today's leisure time is the domain where people want to develop their lifestyles and the organization dimensions of their daily life, as well as to find self-fulfilment. Thus, leisure time is no longer solely the time that remains after work, but an independent and central part of life. The consequence of this evolution is that in advanced societies a differentiated leisure time system has been developed (Freericks & Brinkmann, 2015). The important elements of a leisure time system are the existence of a general right to leisure time, the extensive inclusion of society members in the performance of the individual areas of the leisure time system (culture, sports, media, tourism, entertainment) from a leisure time policy of any kind, the existence of a fairly large leisure time market with public and private service providers, the acceptance of leisure time from the occupational and working fields as well as the introduction of leisure time science with the potential for education, initial and recurrent training in this professional field, and field of work, and the creation of corresponding leisure time professions. In addition to the ideas of the determinants, which, like the so-called 'negative definitions of leisure', emphasize the importance of work in leisure time, to date propositions for explaining the relationship between work and leisure have always played a role in the discussion about leisure time science. The most well-known propositions are the decompression proposition (leisure is the domain where excess energy is diverted), the rest proposition (leisure has the central function of rest), the cleansing proposition (leisure is the domain where feelings and mental stresses, suppressed at work, are released), the counterbalance proposition (leisure is the domain where deficiencies, failures, burdens and coercion from work are counterbalanced), the limitation proposition (limitations of work experience lead to poorer leisure time), the generalization proposition (leisure time is the domain in which the range of behaviours acquired at work is replicated) and the identity proposition (work is the domain, in which people do what they would do in their leisure time).

Finally, these propositions can be summarized in three broader theoretical propositions, which are logically derived from the following sentences: If leisure time is significantly contrary to work, the theory of contrast applies, which may e.g. manifest itself in leisure time of counterbalance or revitalization. If there are similarities between leisure and work, then the theory of proportion applies, which may for example manifest itself in suspensive leisure time. If there is no direct correlation between leisure time and work, the theory of neutrality applies; leisure and work are two independent areas of life, having their own quality. At present these theoretical propositions have only been empirically investigated.

The apparent plausibility of the theory of contrast - without providing convincing empirical evidence - has led so far to the polarization of work and leisure in the context of opposing fields in public debate. Although the assumptions underlying the theory of roles in the definitions of leisure time have been wholly accepted, they are not taken into account further for the development of leisure time theories. Likewise, the functional analysis of the leisure time subsystem of the total system of society as well as systems-based assumptions have so far remained fragmented. Propositions based on the action theory have been found in many studies but have not been elaborated as closed-loop leisure time models based on the action theory. Since the early 1980s, newer proposals have examined in more detail the correlation between leisure time and lifestyle, and here they see the possibility of drawing together the many detailed results of leisure time research through life-style ideas in leisure time style. Here, lifestyle is meant as a thematically structured model of motivation, behaviour, and experience in order to meet needs, accomplish tasks, and reach or achieve goals. The more reasonable the use of the lifestyle proposition for leisure time research, the more difficult its operationalization. Since the early 1990s the science of leisure time - and here in particular the psychology of leisure time - has been dealing with time as a more general phenomenon that involves both work and leisure. There are two directions here, but they have a definite relation to each other: on the one hand the focus is on the sense of time, on the other on the time templates of the individuals. Here, time sense is understood as the means for the individual to classify time and interpret changes he or she has perceived in any area of life. Depending on the kind of time sense, leisure time has a certain meaning, where this in turn influences the motivation, behaviour and experience of leisure time, and leads to actions. The use of time templates begins with the acceptance that modern societies can be considered as individual systems, and from the synthesis of time budget data and leisure time derives a model of society's activities' structure, its dynamics of reformation and change, and the quality of life. In this application, time is examined from both real and ideal aspects, that is, in addition to the actual time structures and time rhythms of the individuals, the subjectively desired or the time structures and rhythms that exist as guiding ideas are examined. The basis for this is the sequence of activities as well as the temporal relationships that are interrelated. In almost 50 years of its existence, leisure time psychology has evolved from a study field "without a theory" to a discipline that may refer to existing general psychological theories but has also developed - albeit to a lesser degree - original propositions of leisure time Psychology. Social developments increasingly perceive work and leisure as activities that, unlike the past, have a new relationship with each other (Zarotis et al., 2011).

METHODOLOGY

The present study is a bibliographical survey study that presents the critical points of existing knowledge about a theoretical approach to the topic of "Definition, concepts and science of leisure".

There is no specialized and comprehensive research in this area. This study attempts to fill this gap and may be a useful aid for those who will make similar efforts in the future. The main objective of the bibliographical review is to integrate the study into the "body" of the subject in question. The review of the current study refers to clearly formulated questions and uses systematic and explicit criteria for the critical analysis of a published paper by summarizing, sorting, grouping and comparing.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REVIEW STUDY

Theoretical directions of the concept and perception of leisure time

In the relevant literature there is a significant number of leisure time definitions, something that reflects the wide variety of leisure and the large voluntary leisure time phenomenon. The so-called "negative definitions of leisure time", which perceive as leisure the time that remains after work, and after deducting time for sleep, food, transportation, etc. and therefore regard leisure as secondary, in the course of the developmental dynamics of leisure time in advanced societies have been replaced by the so-called "positive definitions of leisure time". These definitions have abolished the strict separation of work and leisure, and have emphasized

the more subjective view of leisure. Endogenous sides mainly determine what leisure is. Correspondingly, as regards the 'positive definitions of leisure', at the heart of the examination are the importance, content, motivations, functions and ways of experiencing leisure time and they are defined in terms of development potential, emancipation, integration and / or subjective will decisions, and are no longer defined as other categories. In the same way, among the "positive definitions of leisure" there are definition propositions and views that are based on role theory, holistic, life-style oriented, based on the system theory, as well as critical-theoretical. By overcoming the primacy of work in defining leisure time and understanding it, as well as emphasizing roles, wholeness, lifestyles, of systems-oriented and critical social elements, the science of leisure time has evolved from an empirical, without a theory, research field that brings together many unrelated sub-elements into a discipline.

To date, in the scientific literature there is no agreement on a single definition of the concept of leisure time (Zarotis et al., 2011; Dux, 2017). Agricola (1990) classifies the concept of leisure time in the following four theoretical directions:

«1. Leisure time as a subcategory of work. 2. Leisure time as an ideological and functional separate part of everyday life, which, while still intertwined with work, has a very significant potential. 3. Leisure time as a separate domain of a socio-cultural lifestyle of the post-industrial society. 4. Leisure time as an integrated component of general time structures, overestimated as a domain of life and time, and therefore analytical». (AGRICOLA, 1990, 40).

Franke, Becker, Digel, Klein, & Pilz (1983) confirm that people primarily regard 'leisure time' as the opposite of work. This negative definition is mainly suited for the delimitation of the free time of employees who have a completely set work schedule. For this large category, leisure time can actually be the opposite of work. Thus, employees' leisure time data are often interpreted as an indication of a general increase in leisure time. This narrow notion of leisure time applies to those who work as employees and, given the high quantitative importance of this group, it certainly provides useful results.

However, this interpretation raises problems when it comes to housewives, artists and freelancers, because these groups have very variable working hours. Accurately identifying their free time is difficult in this sense of leisure. Pupils, students, apprentices, unemployed and retired people do not regularly earn a living. But that doesn't mean they have unlimited free time. By definition, these groups do not fit into this model of leisure either (JUETTING, 1983). Eichler's objection is justified that leisure as the opposite of work only describes a period of time, but does not permit any evidence of the content of that leisure time (cited in: JUETTING, 1983).

Another point of criticism is that the narrow definition of the concept of leisure as time without work ignores the increasing time spent on obligations, such transportation to work, house chores, child care, social and family obligations, etc., which in turn reduce the free time found. For this reason, a subjective concept of leisure time would sometimes be more useful, because for everyone leisure becomes the 'right' leisure time with subjective criteria. The subjective perception of leisure is supported by many authors. Tokarski believes that leisure time is subjectively experienced, according to Andreae leisure is the feeling that one has free time, Neulinger considers leisure time as a state of mind and for Iso Ahola it is a subjective perception (all are cited in: OPASCHOWSKI, 1993, 27). The importance of this subjective concept of leisure time is confirmed by a study carried out in 1989 by the Leisure Research Institute B.A.T. According to this study, 53% of the respondents reported that despite the reduced work time, they were subjectively feeling that they did not have sufficient leisure time (OPASCHOWSKI, 2012). Franke, Becker, Digel, Klein, & Pilz (1983) describe two basic concepts of leisure time that have been established in leisure time research, the so-called complementary theories, and contrast theories. Complementary theories view work as a structural principle of central importance in human life, while leisure time has a complementary function. Complementary theories are

rooted in the Calvinist-Protestant work ethic of the 6th century and were crucial until the end of industrialization.

Work was used as an instrument for the road to religious self-cleansing; the absence of work or other employment in free time was undesirable. Later these were further developed by capitalist and Marxist ideologies. Labour remains an essential pillar in capitalism, for it alone makes economic profit possible. Leisure time is downgraded in the face of workforce recovery. In Marxism the alienation of labour is denounced by the enhanced division of labour. This alienation impedes human self-realization in the context of work. Contrast theories view leisure time as an autonomous field of action and a pursued situation of self-determined time, which is in contrast to dependent employment. Increasing free time, reducing work-related physical burden and shifting importance from work to leisure are positively assessed. The standards of work ethics, such as performance and competition, have no place in leisure time. Contrasting theories are becoming increasingly important in highly industrialized societies. They contributed to the revival of the ideal of Greek humanism and to the organization of work. Labour serves mainly as a means to an end, having lost its own value. The increasing division and the alienation of labour in modern economic systems have created an increased need for leisure time. The working people are only partially involved in the overall production process of a product. They lack the ability to identify with their work and experience the success of participating in as many stages of the overall production process as possible, and finally creating their own product. Since self-realization is often lacking in the workplace, it should be sought more in leisure time. Opaschowski substantiates this view in his own studies of 1988 and 1989 (OPASCHOWSKI, 1992).

The domain of leisure time then becomes increasingly independent and comes to be a separate area of life in which people can regain the joy of life because they can find there pleasure, entertainment and fun. That is why free time is worth pursuing. In this sense we can talk about the increasing importance of leisure in today's society. Indeed, JUETTING (1983) talks about the leisure time society that emerged from industrial society. Its characteristics are "the abundance of goods, energy and time, the constant improvement of living standards and prosperity as a whole" (JUETTING, 1983, 28).

In leisure time research there is widespread agreement that free time has increased. Thus, for example, it results in "1/3 time saved from reducing house work, 2/3 from reducing professional work" (TOKARSKI & SCHMITZ-SCHERZER, 1985, 65).

The evolution of leisure time depends on working time. On the basis of this interdependence, the future developments of leisure time should always be considered in conjunction with the evolution of working time. This in turn has decreased for large sections of the population. An indicator for the reduced working time is a table of the collective annual working time of industrial workers (DGF, 1995). The annual working time contains real reductions in weekly working hours as well as the increased vacation requirements in relation to the past. According to this table, weekly working time is reduced and leisure time increases. It took only a century to reach, from the 60-hour week with six working days in 1990, the 35-hour week with five working days in the metallurgical industry in 1996 (also compared to OPASCHOWSKI, 1993).

Regarding the relationship between leisure time and working time, a further increase in leisure time is generally considered to be certain compared to working time. This is due to the decrease of the working time in a person's life (longer training and early retirement with a longer life expectancy), a decrease in annual working time (increased vacation days and flexibility of working hours) as well as a decrease in weekly and daily work time.

In 1964 the ratio of annual leisure time to work time was approximately 1: 1 (TOKARSKI & SCHMITZ-SCHERZER, 1985). Only 20 years later, in the mid-1980s, this relationship had already changed to 3: 2 in favour of leisure time (Agricola, 1990; Digel, 1990; DGfZP, 2005).

This rapid development of leisure time, which is being reviewed, leads Opaschowski to talk about the century of leisure. According to him, the reason for this process is on the one hand the increased labour productivity, which is strongly supported by the increasing use of technology, on the other hand the reduction of working time, which is used as a means of tackling unemployment. However, considering it subjectively, people do not perceive the increase in leisure time (OPASCHOWSKI, 2012).

Looking at it from an objective angle, never before had a generation so much free time. Leisure time on weekdays over the last forty years has increased from 1.5 hours (Allensbach, 1952) to 4.1 hours (B.A.T Institute, 1992).

Weekend free time increased from 1.5 to 2 days, and vacation time more than tripled from 9 to 31 days. But the objectively perceived gain of leisure time subjectively does not contradict the corresponding sense of leisure '(OPASCHOWSKI, 1993, 17).

Opaschowski's position is substantiated in the results of a 1989 study by the Leisure Research Institute B.A.T. More than half of the respondents (53%) in this survey complain about lack of free time despite a significant reduction in working time (which only partially compensates them, due to the increased time consumed by their obligations) (OPASCHOWSKI, 2012). And Rittner points out the growing complaints of tension, anxiety and overburdening of the population. In his opinion, there is a need for time and a lack of time despite the increased leisure time (RITTNER, 1987). According to Franke, Becker, Digel, Klein, & Pilz (1983), the reason is that prosperity and consumer demands increase relatively faster than free time. Consequently, leisure time is an item in shortage:

"Because leisure time, when experienced subjectively, seems to be too little, it is increasingly valued as more precious and of greater worth. Working people are really chasing the multifaceted possibilities of leisure time - even for fear of losing something"(OPASCHOWSKI, 1993, 18). The consequence of this attitude is the stress of leisure time, which is becoming more and more common.

By a rough estimate, the modern man spends only one sixth of his life at school or at work. Therefore, 5/6 of the lifetime is 'leisure time' and can be filled with various activities or tranquillity (LAMPRECHT & STAMM, 1994). Leisure time activities range from sleep and rest, 'caring for the family', 'looking out of the window in reverie', watching television, reading, listening to music, home constructions, work in the garden, sports, concerts / cinema, visiting friends or travelling.

People do not feel all the activities they do in their free time as leisure. Particularly, women's daily routine demonstrates clearly that leisure time is dependent on the context. A number of activities, e.g. taking the children out for a walk, depending on the circumstances, they are perceived either as an obligation or as leisure. This example makes it clear that leisure is not defined by the activity itself, but by the "experience" associated with it (Dollase, 1995; Dollase et al., 2013).

A comprehensive understanding of leisure time is based on the criteria of perception / experience', 'time' and 'activity', taking into account gender, age and also the stratum to which one belongs as a social class. Thus the definition of leisure as a counterpart to labour was expanded as a window into the time used to renew the workforce. In the meantime, leisure time has expanded enormously and with its multifaceted occupation opportunities it takes on a self-evident position in the life of modern humans. Free time is no longer exclusively associated with renewal and relaxation, but with concepts such as alternation, experience, liberation and self-development.

Positive definitions of leisure time strive to respond to these developments by defining the content of leisure as an autonomous social system of action that is oriented beyond the narrow perspective of time. Thus, leisure time becomes an area of action, which is no longer restricted only negatively by work, but has its own creative characteristics. LUEDKE (1975) extended, for example, the traditional definition of leisure time as "[. . .] free time plus freely selected action."

KELLY (1982) completely abandons the temporal side and states: "Leisure is activity chosen for its relative quality of satisfaction". These definitions shift the problem from precisely defining the boundaries of work to defining the content of concepts like self-selection, freedom or satisfaction, and in addition it is unjustifiably based on the assumption that performance at work and voluntary elements of leisure time cannot fundamentally be demonstrated.

Thus, - even using the positive definition of leisure time - it is extremely necessary to create the link to work so that we can decide on the way work is related to leisure, in order to affiliate leisure time in a social context. Summarizing the definition of leisure time, it is true that to date the concept of leisure has not been unambiguously defined. It is clear that leisure unites temporal and emotional elements of action and is constituted differently in every society, in which leisure time segments and subjective voluntary actions can be selected, and 'leisure does not exist in parallel with and independently of social reality, but is an important constituent of modern society (LAMPRECHT & STAMM, 1994). Therefore, leisure as a constituent element of society constantly determines the social life and the pattern of human thinking and perception.

Leisure time research as a spectrum science

The concept of leisure time science to date has not been established either internationally or in the German-speaking areas. However experts consider such an establishment necessary and think that it has already been delayed. Instead of a term, synonyms such as leisure time research, leisure time theory, leisure time studies, etc. are commonly used. The form and level of leisure time research are respectively heterogeneous.

Overall the development of leisure time science is lagging behind the development of leisure time practice; the great need to supplement leisure time science, leisure time research and leisure time theory is evident- as always that is -. This is in particular due to the difficulty of unambiguously and precisely defining the subject of the research. Thus, in the German-speaking world different concepts are confused with one another, such as leisure time, recreation, rest, entertainment, education, sports, culture, media, tourism, etc.

In view of current social developments, as well as in relation to the European market and the widespread changes in eastern and middle Europe, and in view of the expected developments in the field of leisure time, until now, the possibilities for predicting or estimating trends in the field of scientific methodology have not been sufficiently developed. Similar techniques, e.g. in the form of special analysis procedures (time series analyses) or scenario techniques, so far have been used in exceptional cases.

The development of appropriate specialized tools or the unbiased acceptance and adaptation of appropriate methods by neighbouring disciplines is still essentially at a prime stage as regards leisure time science and is a specific task for the coming years. Due to the special nature of leisure time science as a spectrum science or an intertemporal science, a large number of methodical applications have been applied in the past that have their origins in the fields of Pedagogy, Social Sciences, Social Psychology, Science of Culture, Media Science, Sports Science, etc. (Zarotis et al., 2011). At this point, time budget research is - especially internationally - a particularly important part of empirical leisure time research. Thus in previous years it has been possible to gain basic knowledge about time expenditure (extent) and time consumption (use) in comparable industrial companies (OPASCHOWSKI, 2008). Time budget studies on the one hand have the advantage of providing a useful empirical basis in the field of leisure time, but at the same time they have a relatively multifaceted character. In view of this theoretical and methodical lack of classical time budget searches, in recent years a new theoretical proposal has emerged, which by constructing 'time templates' (i.e. the time combination and the individual evaluation of certain activities and successive activities) complements the objectively found ways of behaviour with a subjective and individual evaluation of these activities. Thus, as opposed to what was common so far, activities are not just registered for a certain period of time, but rather formative constructs are developed, which codetermine as ideal or real logical, cognitive representations, innate, time-socially acquired or motivated manifestations of the actions of people, organizations, and legal

entities in all aspects of temporal structure (Dollase, 1995; Dollase et al., 2013). Deficiencies in leisure time research are particularly evident in the inadequate data, which e.g. they impede comparative research in an international context. Correspondingly, internationally comparable and methodically compatible investigations are an exception. Leisure time science and leisure time research have been carried out so far almost exclusively in national context. Here too, there is important need for replenishment in view of the European developments in the fields of economics, politics or culture. As is the case with other disciplines, in recent years, also in the field of leisure time research there has been an increasing need for information services. The few leisure time research institutes have been collecting and processing multifaceted information for some years now. With the increasing spread of information and communication technology such as the use of computers and the Internet, it is now possible to make this highly extensive data available to a wider (scientific) audience. The versatile capabilities of modern electronic data processing can be used both for the transfer of data and for their preparation and processing. In the future, a stronger link between the hitherto developed applications and methods of leisure time science should be promoted. In view of the increasing social importance of leisure time, in parallel we should consider the important current problems, which are urgent future tasks particularly as regards European policy, such as the understanding between different peoples', peacekeeping, social security, economic development, environmental protection, energy and nutrition, urban development etc. Another conceptual and systematic clarification of the science of leisure time and its central concepts needs to be pursued. Despite the remarkable scientific work in some areas of the leisure time sector, it appears that there are major shortcomings. The subject of leisure time research, namely its clear delimitation of the other scientific fields, seems to be very different even in individual European countries, and exists only on terms of their compatibility. Social, cultural and historical contexts form the basis for different concepts of "leisure time" and different scientific research applications. So far, there is no consistent and binding theoretical framework as well as an internationally comparable scientific application that could link together the currently fruitful local research of individual European countries.

Stronger scientific cooperation by European leisure time researchers would help improve this situation. Various efforts, such as e.g. proposals to set up European or international research networks (European Leisure and Recreation Association-ELRA or World Leisure and Recreation Association-WLRA) contribute to the reduction of these shortcomings. Communication and co-operation between European leisure scientists can be greatly improved by special meetings of a suitable form.

In the meantime, in view of the very broad thematic area and the speed of current developments in the field of leisure time, smaller Workshops on specific topics need to be carried out at regular intervals, such as e.g. tourism, education and professions, information systems etc. In addition, a stronger institutional link between leisure time science and university systems should be promoted, as well as the establishment of leisure time science research institutes, national and international leisure research programs, the establishment of a central leisure science research agency of the European Union, regular international, national and local meetings and conferences of European leisure time scientists, the establishment of a network of institutions in the field of leisure time science, the development of a (scientific) leisure time policy in Europe and for Europe, the development of new leisure time ethics, a new relationship between leisure time ethics and work ethics (working time), a new philosophy of leisure time (Zarotis at. al., 2011).

Scientific research can be improved by the creation of information networks, and on the other hand, by the establishment and development of appropriate documentation systems, valuable information services can be offered for other social sectors. For various social sectors such as economics, science, politics or culture, the importance of the leisure time sector in the broader sense in recent years is constantly increasing in relation to certain aspects of leisure in the narrower sense. An efficient documentation system that scientifically evaluates, collects and processes important information of various kinds could accompany the work of financial, political or scientific institutions and support it on a scientific basis. The subject of leisure time

science is the analysis and theoretical explanation of the leisure time system in its multifaceted differentiations. Within this context, leisure time Psychology deals with motivation, perceptions, behaviours and experiences as well as leisure learning processes, and along with Leisure Education, Leisure Sociology, Leisure Economics, Leisure Philosophy, Geography and Social History, are some of the most important sub-disciplines of leisure time science.

In the last 50 years or so, since leisure time has been established as a field of scientific practice, it has processed a great deal of data on many different aspects of leisure, in particular leisure time behaviour. There is significantly less knowledge available as regards leisure time motivation, interests during leisure time and the experience of leisure. Since the early 1980s, the focus was mainly on quantitative and representative studies, over the last 15 years, more and more new areas of knowledge have been opened which are being examined qualitatively: such as for specific target groups, the areas of unemployment, leisure time for the elderly, young people etc., or for specific topics, such as the environment, new media, tourism, sports, culture and leisure.

Apart from the aforementioned difficulty of precisely defining the concept, it is noteworthy that the study of leisure time, according to the 'secondary' or inferior importance of leisure time in society, has virtually always taken place 'incidentally' (TOKARSKI & SCHMITZ-SCHERZER, 1985).

Leisure time science is not yet a Faculty in any of the Universities of the Federal Republic of Germany and in the academic field it has not yet been recognized as an independent discipline. Leisure time research, as a part of leisure time science, has its place in partnering commercial institutes with ministries, associations, authorities and other public services as a socio-technical field of work. Nevertheless, in the context of university research, the science of leisure time appears both in the Federal Republic of Germany and in many other European countries only as a sub-discipline and generally falls under the areas of Pedagogy of Leisure, Sociology, Economics Science, Geography or Psychology (Zarotis et al., 2011).

CONCLUSIONS

The definition of leisure as a counterpart to labour was expanded as a window into the time used to renew the workforce. In the meantime, leisure time has expanded enormously and with its multifaceted occupation opportunities it takes on a self-evident position in the life of modern man. Free time is no longer exclusively associated with renewal and relaxation, but with concepts such as alternation, experience, liberation and self-development. Positive definitions of leisure time strive to respond to these developments by defining the content of leisure as an autonomous social system of action that is oriented beyond the narrow perspective of time. Thus, leisure time becomes an area of action, which is no longer restricted only negatively by work, but has its own creative characteristics.

The concept of leisure time science to date has not been established either internationally or in the German-speaking world. However experts consider such an establishment necessary and think that it has already been delayed. Instead of a term, synonyms such as leisure time research, leisure time theory, leisure time studies, etc. are commonly used.

Leisure time research, as a part of leisure time science, has its place in partnering commercial institutes with ministries, associations, authorities and other public services as a socio-technical field of work. Nevertheless, in the context of university research, the science of leisure time appears both in the Federal Republic of Germany and in many other European countries only as a sub-discipline and generally falls under the areas of Pedagogy of Leisure, Sociology, Economics Science, Geography or Psychology.

REFERENCES

Agricola, S. (1990). Zeitsouveränität, Illusion oder Möglichkeit. Erkrath: Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Freizeit.

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Zeitpolitik (DGfZP) (2005). Zeit ist Leben. Manifest der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Zeitpolitik. Berlin

Digel, H. (1990). Wertewandel im Sport – Eine These und deren begriffliche, theoretische und methodische Schwierigkeiten. In: Anders, G. (Hrsg.). Vereinssport an der Wachstumsgrenze? – Sport in der Krise der Industriegesellschaften (73-96). Witten: Am Steinberg May.

DGF (Hrsg.) (1995). Freizeit in Deutschland 1995, Bd. 2. Erkrath: Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Freizeit.

Dollase, R. (1995). Temporale Muster in der Freizeitforschung. Eine neue methodische Perspektive fuer empirische Untersuchungen. Spektrum Freizeit 17(2-3), 107-111.

Dollase, R., Hammerich, K. & Tokarski, W. (Hrsg.) (2013). Temporale Muster: Die ideale Reihenfolge der Tätigkeiten. Wiesbaden: Springer-Verlag.

Dux, G. (2017). Die Zeit in der Geschichte: Ihre Entwicklungslogik vom Mythos zur Weltzeit. Wiesbaden: Springer-Verlag.

Franke, E./ Becker, P./ Digel, H. et. al. (Hrsg.) (1983). Sport und Freizeit. Reinbek: Rowohlt.

Freericks, R. & Brinkmann, D. (Hrsg.) (2015). Handbuch Freizeitsoziologie. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Juetting, D. H. (1983). Freie Zeit – Zum Zeitkonzept und Zeithaushalt in der Industriegesellschaft. In: Franke, E./ Becker, P./ Digel, H. et al. (Hrsg.): Sport und Freizeit. Reinbeck: Rowohlt.

Kelly, J. R. (1982). Leisure. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Lamprecht, M./ Stamm, H. (1994). Die soziale Ordnung der Freizeit. Zuerich: Rotpunktverlag.

Luedtke, H. (1975). Freizeit in der Industriegesellschaft. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.

Opaschowski, H. W. (1992). Freizeit 2001. Ein Blick in die Zukunft unserer Freizeit. Hamburg: BAT Freizeit-Forschungsinstitut.

Opaschowski, H. W. (2012). Freizeitökonomie: Marketing von Erlebniswelten. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Opaschowski, H. W. (1993). Freizeit und Lebensqualität. Perspektiven fuer Deutschland. Hamburg: BAT Freizeit-Forschungsinstitut.

Opaschowski, H. W. (2008). Einführung in die Freizeitwissenschaft (5. Aufl.). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Rittner, V. (1987). Freizeit und Sport. In: Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Freizeit (Hrsg.): Freizeit, Sport, Bewegung. Stand und Tendenzen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Erkrath: Asgard, 94-105.

Tokarski, W. & Schmitz-Scherzer, R. (1985). Freizeit. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner.

Zarotis, G., Tokarski, W., Kontakos, A., & Katsagolis, A. (2011). Free time. Physical activity, Health and Quality of Life. Athens/Zefyri: Diadrasi.

Author's Biography

Dr. George F. Zarotis is a lecturer at the Faculty for Human Sciences of the Aegean University in Rhodes/Greece since 2004. He studied sports science at the German Sport University in Cologne as well as prevention and rehabilitation through sport at the Ruhr-University Bochum (Master Degree). Furthermore, he studied sports economics and sports management at the Open University Hagen. He achieved the Doctorate in the subjects of leisure science and rehabilitation at the German Sport University Cologne (PhD). He started his academic career as lecturer at the Institute for European Sports Development and Leisure Research of the German Sport University Cologne and at the University of Applied Sciences for Applied Management in Unna. Mr. Zarotis has published a number of books and scientific articles dealing with education, management, kinetic education, psychology of sports and health studies in Greece and internationally. In 2020 Mr. Zarotis received the International Research Leadership Award as “International Distinguished Researcher in Recreational Sport, Leisure and Health Studies”.