UAB

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Centre d'Estudis i de Recerca d'Humanitats

HUMANITIES DOCTORATE PROGRAM:

The production and Consumption of Culture

DOCTORAL DISERTATION

Degree of Doctor Philosophy, PhD

DIGITAL LEISURE STUDY:

THE CONSUMPTION EXPERIENCE, HABITS AND SOCIAL USES

By

LAURA ISABEL ROJAS DE FRANCISCO

Under the supervision of

DR. JORDI LÓPEZ - SINTAS

Bellaterra   **(Barcelona)**   **2015**

DIGITAL LEISURE STUDY:

The Consumption Experience, Habits and Social Uses

Thesis presented to obtain the degree of doctor philosophy PhD

_____   _____

Laura Rojas de Francisco   **Jordi López – Sintas**

Author   **Advisor**

Bellaterra (Barcelona) 2015

Acknowledgements

This is the result of a long process, a lonely travel pursuing something that started as an idea, but changed with each step into a many real forms. However, I always received the support of some people and the company and cheering of many people. This is the way to recognize them.

To my family.

To all those friends, for understand me; this is a kind of alienation by choice.

To my supervisor Jordi López-Sintas for give the opportunity to learn working together, for all the lessons, for the patience and most of all for being always available.

To Ercilia García-Álvarez from the Universitat Rovira i Virgil, for her advice and faith in me.

To the present and previous fellow researchers at the CMC research Group from the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya and specially to Nuria Ferrán Ferrer for giving me the opportunity to work with her.

To the present and previous fellow researchers at the CMC research Group from the Autonomous University of Barcelona and particularly to Ana Gabriela Hernández for her priceless ideas, support and help and to Karina Acosta for recommend me this doctorate program.

To the present and previous fellow researchers at the CMC research Group from the Universitat Politécnica de Catalunya, Universitat of Gerona and Universitat Rovira i Virgil.

To the Centre for Research and Studies in Humanities in which I made my work as a scholar and as a fellow researcher with the funding support of the Agency for University and Research Grant Management (Agència de Gestió d'ajuts Universitaris i de Recerca –AGAUR), within the research group Consumption, Marketing and Culture – CMC, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and

DIGITAL LEISURE STUDY:

The Consumption Experience, Habits and Social Uses

Contents Index

Tables Index

Preface

This doctoral thesis is following the format of a modern monograph, as specified the doctoral normative of the UAB, prepared to be published under the article format. During my period of assistant researcher funded by the AGAUR I've produced three pieces of research, in collaboration with my supervisors, which are included in this monograph.

The structure of this investigation is divided in three components: begins with an introductory chapter in which I describe the reasons that justify the study, present the research objectives and the theoretical background that support the research, explain the research methodology—describing the methods, sources of data and analysis conducted. This first chapter ends by outlining the three pieces of research depicted in the following three chapters.

The second part describes the three chapters, which are presented as complete essays prepared to be published as article (in fact, one article is already in press to be published in Journal of Leisure Research, and the other two are under revision). The last part closes this thesis with a chapter discussing the three pieces of research altogether, their substantive and methodological implications, and ends presenting the limitations of the research and future studies.

Some articles were developed during this research, from those shaping this doctoral thesis, one is accepted in the forthcoming 2015 first issue of the *Journal Leisure Research*, a second is under review to be published in the *New Media and Society Journal* and the third is also under review for publication in *Leisure and Society*.

Earlier versions of the manuscripts that form this dissertation have been published in Spanish, in conference proceedings like Ociogune's forums from the University of Deusto. *El Ocio digital como ocio serio* (López, Rojas & García, 2010). Is published as a book chapter in Deusto's book *Ocio y valores: un horizonte de cambio, choque e Innovación* (Lazanao, Idurre, & Doistua, 2010). This book chapter discusses digital leisure activities in relation to the concepts of casual leisure and serious leisure, addresses social interaction and finds evidence about how leisure and work juxtapose when

digital activities are performed. The book chapter *El ocio usando tecnologías digitales: Impacto y transformaciones* (López, Rojas & García, 2013), is published in Deusto's book *El papel del ocio en la construcción social del joven.* (Ortega & Bayón, 2013). This chapter addresses leisure activities transformation and introduces how digital leisure facilitates to acquire skills and develop knowledge.

The results and data provided by the research were discussed and analysed in international conferences, seminars and workshops related to leisure studies. The essays of this manuscript were discussed to obtain a feedback from those involved into the areas of digital culture and leisure studies, in which the articles of this study are based and were published in proceedings. In the conference 3rd Digital Culture: Innovative Practices and Critical Theories of the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA), we discussed: The production of meanings in Heterotopic Spaces dedicated to digital leisure (with López & García, 2012). This paper addresses how ICT enables leisure into the workspace and work into leisure space from the perspective of heterotopic spaces (Foucault, 1984) and proposes to take into account the subjectivity of the individual experience when juxtaposition happens in digital leisure studies and consider digital and leisure properties.

In the XII World Leisure Congress held in Rimini, Italy we presented: The Nature of Leisure revisited: The Digital Leisure Interpretation (with López & García, 2012). This paper addresses the meanings and nature of leisure activities with digital technologies and its properties and the challenge to the traditional divisions between work and leisure. This issue was also exposed in the CMC group workshop carried out in 2012 at the Autonomous University of Barcelona.

CHAPTER I: Introduction to the Dissertation and General Aspects

Abstract

Purpose: Digital technologies have offered individuals many possibilities for leisure, transforming leisure activities in the process, which involves changes in the leisure experience and practices. In this regard, we explore leisure transformation to find the meanings, transformations and motivations related with the digital leisure experience. The findings have leaded us to conceptualize the nature of leisure.

Design/methodology/approach: Research is framed in the interpretive/ constructivist paradigm and the hermeneutic tradition. We interviewed 30 individuals that used to perform leisure activities with digital technologies, over a period of six months in 2009 in Barcelona. The analysis leaded to a set of conceptual themes by applying narrative thematic analysis to the corpus of texts. We searched for spaces and moments in which the activities were performed, the technologies used and the meanings, satisfactions and benefits of those activities.

Findings: We revisited the research about the nature of leisure after the used of digital technologies. The findings suggest properties and features of leisure activities that are associated with the freedom to choose and carry out activities and with the technological characteristics. Traditional leisure is transformed when digital technologies are used for leisure. We provide evidences about it by describing digital based leisure in the homes and social leisure activities with digital technologies.

Research implications/limitations: The study suggests that digital leisure has transformed the nature of leisure and the findings can be used for the design and development of home leisure technologies and the management of social activities. There is an opportunity to go deeper and find more information about digital leisure in other areas of people's life considering their families or other social connections. Also study digital leisure according to the evolution of digital technologies, devices and applications.

Originality/value: The study provides a basis to redefine the nature of leisure and also explores the transformations in leisure brought about by digital technologies.

Resumen:

Propósito: Las tecnologías digitales han ofrecido a los individuos muchas posibilidades para el ocio, transformando las actividades de ocio en el proceso, lo que implica cambios en la experiencia y las prácticas ocio. En este sentido exploramos esas actividades para encontrar los significados, efectos y motivaciones relacionadas con la experiencia de ocio digital. Los hallazgos nos han llevado a conceptualizar la naturaleza del ocio.

Diseño / metodología / enfoque: La investigación se enmarca en el paradigma interpretativo / constructivista y la tradición hermenéutica. Entrevistamos a 30 personas que realizaban actividades de ocio con tecnologías digitales, en un período de seis meses en el año 2009, en Barcelona. El análisis de las narraciones proporcionadas por los informantes produjo un conjunto de temas con los que estructuramos las explicaciones realizadas. El análisis tiene en cuenta las actividades, espacios y momentos en que se realizan las actividades, las tecnologías utilizadas y los significados, satisfacciones y beneficios de dichas actividades.

Resultados: Revisamos la naturaleza de ocio teniendo en mente, las condiciones de tecnologías digitales. Los hallazgos sugieren propiedades y características de las actividades de ocio digitales que están asociados con la libertad de elegir llevar a cabo actividades y con las características de las tecnologías. El ocio tradicional se transforma cuando se utilizan tecnologías digitales para el ocio. Proporcionamos evidencias al respecto al describir ocio digital en los hogares y las actividades de ocio social, con tecnologías digitales.

Implicaciones de la investigación / limitaciones: El estudio sugiere que el ocio digital ha transformado la naturaleza del ocio y los hallazgos pueden ser usados para dar pautas en el diseño y desarrollo de tecnologías para el ocio en casa y la gestión de las actividades sociales. Hay una oportunidad para profundizar y encontrar más información sobre ocio digital en otras áreas de la vida

de las personas, teniendo en cuenta sus familias u otras conexiones sociales. Además de estudiar ocio digital de acuerdo con la evolución de las tecnologías digitales, dispositivos y aplicaciones.

Originalidad / valor: El estudio nos ha permitido redefinir la naturaleza del ocio y explorar las transformaciones de las actividades de ocio descritas en la investigación.

Palabras clave: ocio digital, significado del ocio, ocio doméstico, ocio social, TIC e Internet, cultura digital

Resum:

Propòsit: Les tecnologies digitals han ofert als individus noves possibilitats per realitzar activitats d'oci, transformant així les activitats tradicionals de lleure en el procés, implicant un canvi en l'experiència i les pràctiques d'oci. En aquest sentit explorem aquestes activitats per trobar els significats, efectes i motivacions relacionats amb l'experiència d'oci digital. Els resultats ens han portat a conceptualitzar la naturalesa de l'oci.

Disseny / metodologia / enfocament: La recerca s'emmarca en el paradigma interpretatiu / constructivista i la tradició hermenèutica. Entrevistem 30 persones que realitzaven activitats d'oci amb tecnologies digitals, en un període de sis mesos in l'any 2009, a Barcelona. L'anàlisi de les narracions proporcionades pels informants va produir un conjunt de temes amb el quals estructurem les explicacions realitzades. L'anàlisi té en compte les activitats, espais i moments en què es realitzen les activitats, les tecnologies utilitzades i els significats, satisfaccions i beneficis d'aquestes activitats.

Resultats: Revisem la naturalesa d'oci tenint en ment, les condicions de tecnologies digitals. Els resultats suggereixen propietats i característiques de les activitats de lleure digitals que estan associades amb la llibertat d'escollir fer activitats i amb les característiques de les tecnologies. L'oci tradicional es transforma quan s'utilitzen tecnologies digitals per a l'oci. Proporcionem evidències quan descrivim l'oci digital a les llars i les activitats d'oci social, amb tecnologies digitals.

Implicacions de la investigació / limitacions: L'estudi suggereix que l'oci digital ha transformat la naturalesa de l'oci i els resultats poden ser usats per donar pautes en el disseny i desenvolupament de tecnologies per a l'oci a casa i la gestió de les activitats socials. Hi ha una oportunitat per aprofundir i trobar més informació sobre oci digital en altres àrees de la vida de les persones, tenint en compte les seves famílies o altres connexions socials. A més d'estudiar oci digital d'acord amb l'evolució de les tecnologies digitals, dispositius i aplicacions.

Originalitat / valor: L'estudi ens ha permès re definir la naturalesa de l'oci i explorar les transformacions de les activitats d'oci descrites en la recerca.

Paraules Clau: lleure digital, significat del lleure, social, TIC e Internet, cultura digital

Introduction

Digital technologies and the Internet are rapidly made their way to various areas of everyday life. They have evolved becoming more accessible and easier to use, and have become part of daily routines. More and more people have devices with which they perform activities from all the practices of their lives. Now, with the availability of technologies such practices converge in different places, whether at work, home, school, or other locations: The possibility to carry technological devices offer individuals many opportunities to realize leisure activities. Individuals use digital technologies that make them available everywhere. Also, in their workplaces it is possible to do several activities at the same time, for example using tabs in the browser or clicking in the task bar they have control of various browser contents, but also opportunities for conducting leisure activities: Then, they make some leisure activities like reading news, searching for a song or browsing messages in a social network, while performing duties. And when they have leisure time, they can enjoy a movie on the laptop monitor, read books in the e reader or tablet anytime and anywhere, talk screen to screen with friends, have a conversation over text with family members in a group by using smart phone apps, or play with multiple people in different locations around the world using online game platforms. Leisure options are available constantly.

Internet and digital devices have become 'normal' technologies of leisure activities, transforming experience of leisure, but the effects of this transformation are still shaping leisure and need to be explored, both in how supplement, replace or transform other leisure activities, and on what implications do digital leisure have on the lives of people. Besides considering the constant evolution of digital technologies, it is always interesting to follow changes in order to know how the leisure experience transformation is happening. New devices, services and application are being introduced day after day and study leisure transformation becomes a research opportunity.

Issue interests and research gap

Leisure has always played an important role in the lives of people and given that digital technologies have also been incorporated in their life spaces, —work as well as leisure, we find in it an important line of research. Therefore we want to know the possibility to have multiple leisure options with digital technologies and the changes that may be involved in the leisure experience and practices. In this regard, we explore whether or not technologies affect leisure, in order to discover the nature of leisure (what is common to many leisure activities), also to know what motivations moves people towards digital leisure and the possible effects on individuals when doing this kind of leisure.

Our interest in studying those moments in which individuals perform leisure activities using digital technologies and Internet access is to understand that experience and its meaning(s). We do it based on how a leisure activity is experienced by individuals and analyzing the elements of their practices related to their leisure experiences, the technologies used and the different places and times where it happens, to provide a broad overview. In this research, we interpret informant's narratives in order to build the conceptual basis of what we call leisure.

Research about the use of technology for leisure consumption is emerging because it is a recent phenomenon, however, this issue is mentioned in some of the results of studies on technologies as a part of the uses or as a phenomena to be studied having in mind economic, cultural or social implications (Bryce & Rutter 2003; Juniu 2010; Buse 2009; Rojek 2005; Arora 2011; Gershuny 2002; Robinson 2011). Taking this into account, we found an opportunity to study the leisure experience in order to know why is it chosen as an option, how it operates, how it can influence social and personal aspects of those who perform those activities, what are the implications in the life of those who practice this leisure and find the meanings assigned to this type of leisure.

Thesis Objectives

We started with questions about the possibility of leisure activities with digital technologies: What is the meaning of leisure for individuals? When do they perform leisure activities with digital technologies? Why they choose to make digital leisure? Where are engaged in digital leisure? Which involves carrying out this kind of leisure? And what activities do they prefer to perform in digital technologies? From these questions we construct the study objectives.

In this research we focus on the meaning of leisure, we explore leisure activities, traditional as well as digital, that takes place at home and the social aspects of this leisure. All this is based on three objectives: 1) to establish the nature and meaning of leisure; 2) to explore and describe the experiences with digital leisure activities, the transformation of leisure and its contribution to individuals' satisfaction and 3) to analyse and describe the activities of digital leisure that are made for purposes of socialization and its implications.

In this way we can examine the digital leisure experience to be considered as a starting point to revisit the research about the nature of leisure and to describe the transformation of leisure brought about by digital technologies. This is why we chose an interpretive approach, where we rely on narratives about the experiences of a group of people who claim to perform digital leisure. We interpret their leisure experience narratives using thematic analysis (Riessman, 2003).

Theoretical Background

Studies of leisure are varied and their conclusions are different. Leisure activities have been studied from the point of view of individuals (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001), from the perspective of leisure time (Coalter, 2009), either considering the ability to perform leisure (Kelly, 2009/1972), the

motivations for leisure activities (Iso-Ahola, 1980; Iso-Ahola, 1999), individuals behaviour during leisure activities (Haworth & Veal, 2004) or their satisfaction (Hills, Argyle, & Reeves, 2000; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). Leisure has also been studied according to its relationship to work (Kelly, 2009/1972) or in opposition to the concept of work (Neulinger, 1981/1974). For this study we seek everything that has been proposed as a definition of leisure and from that we propose what is digital leisure.

The meaning of Leisure

Studies about the meaning(s) of leisure have addressed several aspects: the subjective states that people experience during leisure (Mannell, 1979); the position of individuals on leisure and the moments in which leisure is performed (Kernan Unger, 1983); the perception of leisure according to the situations where leisure and non leisure activities are conducted (Shaw 1985); seeking to differentiate the leisure of the obligations (Dupuis, 2000; Dupuis & Smale, 2000); the structural dimensions of the meaning(s) in leisure experiences (Watkins & Bond, 2007); the context where leisure is developed (Roadburg, 1983). Furthermore in relation to the contexts, leisure can be regarded as a social phenomenon experienced by individuals in specific contexts (Coalter, 2009/1997), because meanings are taken as identities associated to the context (Kivel, Johnson, Scraton, & Arai, 2009).

Finding just one definition for leisure is complex, because according to Shaw (1985) there is not a well defined pattern. Shaw explains that both leisure and perception do not perform a clear cut pattern and suggests that the meaning of leisure can be understood from the context where leisure activities take place in people's daily life, rather than in the activities themselves. Explores the notion of leisure experience as a holistic phenomenon and according to the interaction between individuals and objects. Shaw (1997) also studies the meanings of leisure, watching different paradigms and, placing in context the interactions for leisure, to comprehend and understand its implications.

19

With that in mind, for this study we analyse the different paradigms and the diverse approaches in which the studies on leisure have been relied, to understand the issues associated with leisure and how they are supported from different views. According to the line of thought of the proposals by Unger and Kernan (1983), leisure can be conceptualized based on how it is performed, how it is lived and how the experience is perceived when leisure activities are carried out and then explore and add the features and properties shown in leisure activities, contexts and experiences. We review the concepts associated with leisure and then organize the definitions and concepts from the properties and characteristics given to leisure by each paradigm, to review the leisure nature. This analysis is provided in the table below:

Table 1 Characteristics and properties of leisure under authors' definitions

LEISURE PROPERTIES AND CHARACTERISTICS	
Research paradigm	
Positivist/post-positivist: leisure experience definitions	*Constructivist/interpretive: leisure experience meanings*
Free time, freedom of choice (Soule, 1957) Perceived freedom and work (Kelly 1972; Neulinger, 1981; (Parker, 1971) Perceived freedom and motivations (Neulinger, 1972) Perceived freedom and satisfaction (Iso-Ahola, 1979; Kelly, 1978; Dumazedier, 1974/1981) Authonomy (Neulinger & Breit, 2009) Free time, recreation and play (Miller & Robinson, 1963) Intrinsic satisfaction, perceived freedom and involvement (Unger & Kernan, 1983) Enjoyment (Dumazedier, 1974) Relaxing, different from work (Roadburg, 1983) Effortlessness (Pieper, 1963) Enjoyment, freedom of choice, relaxation, intrinsic motivation, lack of evaluation (Shaw, 1985) Personal development, growth, or creativity (Dumazedier 1967;de Grazia, 1962; Iso-Ahola, 1979) No evaluation (Cavan, 1969) Social interaction (Cheek &Burch 1976) Enjoyment, companionship, novelty, relaxation, aesthetic appreciation, intimacy (Tinsley et al., 1993) Engagement, freedom from constraint (Gunter & Gunter, 1980)	Place meanings are constructed during interaction (Kyle & Chick, 2002) Perceived freedom, enjoyment, sense of connectedness, escape (Dupuis, 2000) The context influences the activity's meaning (Dupuis, 2000; Dupuis & Smale, 2000) The activity's meaning changes with time (Dupuis & Smale, 2000) Satisfaction, commitment (Kelly &Kelly, 1994) Fulfilment, escaping pressure, exercising choice, passing time (Watkins & Bond, 2007) Purposive leisure not freely chosen (Shaw & Dawson, 2001) Transgender expressions in leisure spaces (Lewis & Johnson, 2011) What activities are fun depends on a family's contexts, its microsystem and exosystem (Churchill et al., 2007) The nature of wilderness experiences, challenge, closeness to nature, decisions not faced in everyday environments, stories of nature (Patterson, Watson, Williams, & Roggenbuck, 1998)

This exercise allowed us to have a base to sustain the search for those aspects of the leisure experience in order to focus the study and determine the process to follow. This was decisive to find the meaning of leisure.

Towards a definition of leisure according to its meaning

The meaning of leisure, or what distinguishes leisure compared to other experiences, has been found asking for that definition (Neulinger, 1981; Young & Willmott, 1973; Roadburg, 1977) and identifying factors that lead to label a moment as leisure (Mannell & Kleiber, 1997; Neulinger, 1984). Thus it has been found that from an experiential perspective, if the individual defines the context as leisure, then leisure could be experienced conducting any kind of activity, not just in free time activities or traditional leisure (Kelly, 1999b; Kelly and Kelly, 1994; Shaw 1985 - 1986).

In that sense Kelly & Kelly (1994) consider the various aspects of life without a separation of leisure from other life spaces, they suggest that there is an interconnection between domains, because people rarely compartmentalize their lives in work, leisure, school, family, and others. There are also forms of leisure that can develop into multiple domains, where work, family and leisure are not separated.

Actually, a significant amount of time each day is used for activities that are experienced as leisure, so Kelly (1978) states that leisure must be connected to the conditions that occur in everyday life. Shaw (1985) considers that leisure should not be researched focusing on the activities of free time, or simply recreation, since it might exclude or ignore a substantial amount of leisure, therefore to understand the meaning of leisure in the lives of people, is necessary to ask about their attitudes, perceptions and all that surround a particular leisure situation and not intrinsically by the types of activities.

Therefore a combination of factors is what can predict whether a situation is perceived as leisure or not, and given that technologies are part of everyday life and can be found in almost all areas, we see a research opportunity in finding those situations in which technology and leisure merge creating digital leisure experiences with new aspects to understand. Determine the meaning of leisure has always been a topic of interest and having that in mid, the same happens in the case of digital leisure.

The technological factor in leisure

Some technological inventions have made it possible to increase access to information and thereby to leisure (Rojek, 1995), and changes in the organization and leisure experience have often been driven by technological advances (Rojek, 2001). Thus Bryce (2001) believes that technological changes are involved in changing concepts of leisure and organization, because now, the computer technology and the Internet are emerging as important spaces for the activity in contemporary leisure, by creating new spaces for participation in leisure activities that can also be performed alongside with traditional leisure activities.

In addition, there are changes in activities and leisure experiences that have implications for leisure experience in social and individual levels, contributing to the construction of what is set up as digital leisure. Kelly (1999b) states that technologies can be entangled with the roles and responsibilities of individuals, with an impact on behaviour and ways of leisure, which implies that there are aspects of the technologies to be considered in the definition of leisure. There are also changes in the contexts of leisure (Dupuis, 2000) and the organization of time and space around the use of technology in those places where leisure has its time and place (Buse, 2009). This leads us to take into account the relationship with the context where the leisure takes place and the technologies used to realize it, but also that technological devices are becoming portable and then the leisure context can change.

Moreover, as posed by Mokhtarian, Salomon, & Handy (2006), leisure activities with technological devices can fulfil the same functions of traditional leisure activities; that is, provide relaxation, stimulation, escape, social interaction, development of identity and contribute to lifestyle, which suggest a continuity of leisure functions. According to these researchers, the degree in which ICT-based activities are chosen over other activities depends on the characteristics of ICT being used and the utility they offer compared to other activities. Among them, are those characteristics that enhance the usefulness of ICT-based activities, like independence of location and time, fragmentability and the possibility of multitasking,--either as multiple or overlapping activities. With these characteristics, the activities based on ICT are inserted in small blocks of time during the day, during moments that are too short or too inconvenient for other activities.

To this must be add what Bryce (2001) considers, the author argues that when technologies are introduced on leisure, individuals may simultaneously be involved in synchronous and asynchronous interactions, when they are in spaces of virtual leisure. This challenges traditional conceptions of spatial organization and interaction in leisure, because now with digital technologies, the boundaries between leisure and other spaces become blurred. This is an aspect of leisure that happens in certain situations, where the divisions of the spaces and times of work and leisure fade and meanings may continue or be disturbed (Dart 2006). Thus, we look to find how the individuals perceive activities as leisure when this is facilitated by digital technologies, how boundaries are conceived and establish the way the individuals assign a meaning for each digital activity building constraints that are not physical.

To summarize, the definition of leisure has been studied from different approaches, experiences and contexts and is still complex; this fact may also apply to leisure performed with technologies. That is why this study proposes to interpret leisure according to individuals' narratives about their leisure experiences with digital technologies, looking for what they express as the meaning they attach to digital leisure activities.

We also take into account the context and therefore we have chosen the domestic space, because traditionally the home has been defined as a space for leisure (Dart, 2006), both because it is where most aspects of people's life develops (Parker, 1971), and because in their homes, individuals have various options to use their free time, and among those options there are those activities performed with technological devices, many times purchased for leisure activities (Hamill, 2003).

Finally, there is a part of digital leisure that individuals choose in relation to sociability. That is mentioned in the results of some ICT studies in its use for leisure purposes, but those studies don't address the issue of leisure (Cummings, Butler, & Kraut, 2002; Swickert, Hittner, Harris, & Herring, 2002; Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Boase, 2008). However, those results lead us to search whether digital leisure activities can be aimed to have contact with others, to have and perform social support, facilitate interpersonal relationships or contribute to social capital.

Research purpose and process design

The purpose of this research is to establish and describe the digital leisure and with this in mind, we seek to: 1) examine what leisure means when digital technologies provide the ability to do it in different contexts, 2) describe the experience of digital leisure at homes and its implications and 3) explore the social aspects of digital leisure.

Research process

The purpose of this study is focused on exploring and describing the experience of leisure activities with technologies from the perspective of the individuals who perform them. We seek to get into its complexity analyzing the experience of conducting leisure activities with digital technologies.

24

To achieve it, we adopted theoretical perspectives designed to interpret the experience from the narratives of individuals (Crotty, 1998), to establish the meaning of digital leisure from how individuals associate their experiences and give a meaning to what they do. We did it by semi-structured interviews with the aim to obtain descriptions of leisure activities using digital technologies.

We made an initial protocol of 20 questions, based in the objectives and research questions. Then, in the fieldwork sometimes questions were added during the interviews, looking for various perspectives when a related subject arose during the interview, or to obtain more information in order to describe the activities and the technologies used. Some of those questions are added in this document as a part of the final protocol questionnaire in the methodology chapter.

For the sampling, as first and general criteria, we consider relevant to know why individuals engage in digital leisure and their reasons to make digital leisure activities, having in mind this, the experience vary according to each individual, but is possible to find aspects shared by all. We made the sample with individuals that claimed to use digital technologies for leisure, so they were questioned in this aspect to start with the research.

Here we present the principal findings, in three aspects. The first came where individuals reported their activities in workplaces and leisure spaces indistinctly, because the technologies are present in many of their everyday spaces and leisure occurs in circumstances that are the opposite of what is usually considered as leisure in the traditional way. That is, a leisure in which limits are defined, attached to the spaces where they take place. This led us to find a way to describe how this phenomenon occurs and in the process, analyze the way that respondents assign meaning to each of the spaces, even when these are mixed or lose the boundaries.

The second issue was contemplated since the beginning, where the idea was to study the leisure activities developed with technologies at home. In order to expose digital leisure in the domestic context of individuals and their experience when having free time and expend it doing digital leisure. We describe how this has transformed traditional activities associated with leisure and entertainment. It also describes the benefits and satisfactions obtained from this type of leisure.

The third issue arises when our respondents associated interaction and communication activities with their friends, family and acquaintances, as digital leisure activities. They describe leisure activities performed for social purposes, to exploit the features of the technologies used for social interaction. We approach the experience as a social digital leisure, showing how individuals socialize in their leisure time and how they use them to socialize.

Research topics

1. Describe how individuals make leisure activities at home using digital technologies.

2. Identify the purposes that will lead individuals to use digital technologies for leisure activities.

3. Conceptualize the meaning of leisure activities for individuals interviewed

4. Describe the transformation of leisure activities at home based on digital technologies

Essays briefing

The research is formed by three qualitative studies as essays that we summarize in the following paragraphs.

The first essay makes an exploration of the literature on leisure in order to check the nature of leisure, first as a subjective experience into context and second as an experience situated in space and time. We explore the meaning assigned to spaces, the way these are shared and how may be changed within each context. Also the perception of individuals during their leisure experiences, for example, freedom for leisure and compulsory for work.

Studies in which the meaning is reviewed, shows experiences, attitudes, beliefs and motivations with respect to leisure, allowing us to understand and interpret leisure, or find ways to classifying or valuing leisure. Those were a basis to understand the dimension of leisure experiences under contexts and moments in time to compare meanings

We present a literature review and discuss the issues raised by digital leisure, in relation to the boundaries when seems blurred, We find and have in account that in workspaces digital leisure can be carried out using available technologies, or in domestic spaces work tasks can be developed even if the home is considered a place for leisure. The essay addresses this situation and considers a transformation in the nature of leisure, exploring how the informants give meanings to activities as leisure or work, when boundaries between spaces are blurred.

Our results suggest that the nature of leisure activities is associated with the freedom to choose and carry out activities. Also how varies the way the spaces are mixed, integrated or segmented according to activities and demographic aspects such as the occupation, sex and marital status. The findings challenge the traditional divisions between work and leisure, so we make a review of the nature of leisure.

The second essay focuses on describing how digital technologies available in the home are used for leisure activities and the transformations in leisure that implies. We make a comparison with all that involves the presence of technology at home in relation to leisure experiences and in general. We do this to know how the transformation happen in the way of doing leisure and the manner this kind of leisure replace other technologies or is integrated with other activities. We expose all those activities related with both, digital leisure as with other technologies used for leisure, entertainment or for communication and social interaction.

As a basis, we explore studies addressing the technologies used for home leisure, to highlight the implications of their use among household members. Their interactions, the family functioning, other leisure components at home and the satisfaction obtained by digital leisure activities. This in order to know how respondents assign typologies for activities, the benefits and satisfactions obtained

in this way and how they interpret leisure. We also found that even that there are a lot studies of leisure at home, household devices for leisure and entertainment, and family leisure, there are not enough studies that have been interested in the changes in leisure activities for using digital technologies. The results reveal that leisure activities that take place at home during free time using digital technologies can transform traditional leisure activities. We describe both the transformations and the satisfactions that individuals get in their leisure activities and how they use digital technologies to do social activities.

The third essay discusses the social component of digital leisure activities, from social interaction made possible during them. Just a few studies address the social digital leisure, but between the results and approaches of some studies on ICT and the Internet, are found that the contact with others is a social aspect, and some of the social objectives of leisure activities using digital technologies are seen as a reason to perform digital leisure. For example, technological applications such as social games or virtual environments for interaction and ICT foster the social interaction of users.

Then, arise out the question of what means to manage relationships in social networks, social interaction and sociability during leisure activities using digital technologies and its effects in the socialization of individuals. We found that although the social aspect of digital technologies is a subject of study, it has not been addressed exclusively from the perspective of leisure. We resume some research that considers sociability in digital environments to establish the characteristics and properties of social interaction. Thus we describe characteristics such as social time, social connectedness and sociability by shared interests, which provide a basis to explain implications and to propose properties.

In the findings, the digital social leisure activities undertaken by respondents are described and is discussed how the sociability of individuals develops when engaged in leisure using digital technologies and the motivations behind this kind of leisure. It also raises the characteristics and properties that define the social digital leisure and explores the possible effects on individuals.

28

Chapter references

Arora, P., 2011. Online Social Sites as Virtual Parks: An Investigation into Leisure Online and Offline. *The Information Society*, 27(2), 113–120.

Bryce, J. (2001). The technological transformation of leisure. *Social Science Computer Review*, *19*(1), 7–16.

Bryce, J. & Rutter, J., 2003. The Gendering of Computer Gaming: Experience and Space. In S. Fleming & I. Jones, ed. *Leisure Cultures: Investigations in Sport, Media and Technology*. Leisure Studies Association, pp. 3–22.

Buse, C. E. (2009). When you retire, does everything become leisure? Information and communication technology use and the work/leisure boundary in retirement. *New Media & Society*, *11*(7), 1143–1161.

Coalter, F. (2009). Leisure sciences and leisure studies: Different concept, same crisis? *Leisure Sciences*, (November 2011), 37–41.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process* (p. 248). London: Sage.

Cummings, J. N., Butler, B., & Kraut, R. (2002). The Quality of Online Social Relationships. In *Communications of the ACM* (Vol. 45, pp. 103–108). ACM.

Dart, J. (2006). Home- based Work and Leisure Spaces: Settee or Work- Station? *Leisure Studies*, *25*(3), 313–328.

De Grazia, S. (1962). *Of time, work, and leisure* (1994th ed., p. 460). New York: Vintage Books Ed.

Dupuis, S. L. (2000). Institution-based care giving as a container for leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, *22*(4), 259–280.

Dupuis, S., & Smale, B. (2000). Bittersweet journeys: Meanings of leisure in the institution-based care giving context. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *32*(3), 303–340.

Gershuny, J.I., 2002. Social Leisure and Home IT: A Panel Time-Diary Approach. *IT&SOCIETY*, 1(1), pp.54–72.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). London: SAGE.

Hamill, R. (2003). Time as a Rare Commodity in Home Life. In R. Harper (Ed.), *Inside the Smart Home.* (pp. 63 – 78). London: Springer-Verlag.

Haworth, J., & Veal, A. J. (2004). *Work and leisure. Work and leisure.* East Sussex, UK: Routledge.

Hills, P., Argyle, M., & Reeves, R. (2000). Individual differences in leisure satisfactions: an investigation of four theories of leisure motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *28*(4), 763–779.

Iso-Ahola, S. (1980). *The social psychology of leisure and recreation*. (D. Gray, R. Kaplan, & A. Lockhart, Eds.) *Social Psychology* (p. 215). Toledo, OH: William C Brown.

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1999). Motivational foundations of leisure. In E. L. Jackson and T. L. Burton (Ed.), *Leisure Studies: Prospects for the Twenty-First Century* (p. 538). State College, PA: Venture Pub.

Juniu, S., 2010. The transformation of leisure The Transformation of Leisure. *Technology*, (November 2011), pp.37–41.

Kelly, J. (2009). Work and leisure: A simplified paradigm. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *3*(3), 439–451.

Kelly, J., & Kelly, J. R. (1994). Multiple dimensions of meaning in the domains of work, family, and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *26*(3), 250.

Kivel, B. D., Johnson, C. W., Scraton, S., & Arai, S. (2009). (Re) theorizing leisure, experience and race. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *41*(4), 473–493.

Kyle, G., & Chick, G. (2002). The social nature of leisure involvement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *34*(4), 426–448.

Lejeune, C. (2011). From Normal Business to Financial Crisis... and back again. An Illustration of the Benefits of Cassandre for Qualitative Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum*, *12*(1).

Mannell, R. (1979). A conceptual and experimental basis for research in the psychology of leisure. *Society and Leisure*, *2*(1), 179–196.

Mannell, R., & Kleiber, D. (1997). *A social psychology of leisure. Social Psychology*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing Inc.

Miller, N. P., & Robinson, D. M. (1963). *The leisure age*. *Recreation* (p. 497). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Mokhtarian, P. L., Salomon, I., & Handy, S. L. (2006). The impacts of ICT on leisure activities and travel: A conceptual exploration. *Transportation*, *33*(3), 263–289.

Neulinger, J. (1981). *The psychology of leisure*. *America* (p. 247). Charles Thomas Pub.

Neulinger, J., & Breit, M. (2009). Attitude Dimensions of Leisure: A Replication Study. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *41*(3), 361–368.

Parker, S. (1971). *The Future of work and leisure.* London: Mac Gibbon and Kee.

Patterson, M. E., Watson, A. E., Williams, D. R., & Roggenbuck, J. R. (1998). A Hermeneutic Approach to Studying the Nature of Wilderness Experiences, *30*(4).

Pieper, J. (1963). *Leisure: the basis of culture.* New York (N.Y.): The New American Library.

Riessman, C. (2003). Analysis of personal narratives. In *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns*. Online.

Roadburg, A. (1983). Freedom and enjoyment: Disentangling perceived leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *15*(1), 15–26.

Robinson, J.P., 2011. IT use and leisure time displacement. *Information, Communication & Society*, 14(4), pp.495–509.

Rojek, C. (2001). Leisure and Life Politics. *Leisure Sciences*, *23*(2), 115–125.

Rojek, C., 2005. P2P Leisure Exchange: Net Banditry and the Policing of Intellectual Property. *Leisure Studies*, 24(4), pp.357–369.

Shaw, S. (1985). The meaning of leisure in everyday life. *Leisure Sciences*, 7(1), 1-24.

Shaw, S. (1997). Controversies and contradictions in family leisure: An analysis of conflicting paradigms. *Journal Article by Susan M. Shaw; Journal of Leisure*, *29*(1), 98–112.

Soule, G. (1957). The Economics of Leisure. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *313*(1), 16–24.

Swickert, R. J., Hittner, J. B., Harris, J. L., & Herring, J. A. (2002). Relationships among Internet use, personality, and social support. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *18*(4), 437–451.

Unger, L. S., & Kernan, J. B. (1983). On the meaning of leisure: An investigation of some determinants of the subjective experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *9*(March), 381–392.

Watkins, M., & Bond, C. (2007). Ways of Experiencing Leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, *29*(3), 287–307.

Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2003). Parent and child perspectives of family leisure involvement and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *35*(2), 163–189.

CHAPTER II: Research Methodology

Epistemology and theoretical framework

Our research is framed in the interpretive/ constructivist paradigm (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), which asserts that human beings construct meanings for leisure activities as they interact with the world where the activity takes place, and with other individuals and objects. Individuals, then, interpret the contexts, objects and other individuals, according to their meaning for the individual, and in so doing make sense of the activity they are doing (Crotty, 1998; Schwandt, 1994). Individuals, then, construct meanings and associate them with other individuals or objects when performing a leisure or work activity; they are, according to Crotty (1994) and Schwandt (1994), intentional subjects. Under this paradigm it is possible that the same people construct different meanings for a leisure activity performed in different contexts, and that different people construct different meanings in regard to the same activity in the same context (Crotty, 1998).

This research aimed at describing and understanding the production of meanings regarding activities performed in and out of the normal space and time context, is framed in the hermeneutic tradition. Hermeneutics treats narratives (interviews, field notes, etc.) as strange texts that need to be interpreted (Crotty, 1998). At the same time hermeneutics also assumes an affinity of some kind between the set of texts and the reader. This affinity is what makes it possible to interpret texts that are unrelated to the interpreter. The interpretation of texts makes it possible to share and communicate meanings among people, and doing so situates the interpretation within history and culture (Rundell, 1995). In line with the hermeneutic tradition, the purpose of interpreting a set of narratives is to gain an understanding that goes further than the interviewee's own interpretation. To complete that enterprise, hermeneutics claims that understanding the whole set of texts is only possible through understanding its parts, and interpreting their meaning by dividing up the whole (analysing each interview, segmenting each interview, and then interpreting the set of interviews or texts). This procedure is called the hermeneutic circle.

Sampling criteria

We used selective sampling to identify informants with experiences of digital leisure activities; these were asked whether during the last year they had used digital technologies (computers, consoles, smart phones or any kind of digital devices over the Internet) to perform activities for leisure purposes, with digital leisure defined as any freely chosen activity conducted with digital technologies during free time. We started at an ICT training centre and the initial informants help us to access additional informants via snowball sampling. Maximum variation sampling was used with the aim of capturing and describing shared analytical categories in terms of sex, educational capital (secondary, vocational and university education) and occupation. Sampling stopped when additional informants did not add any new analytical category (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Data collection

The interviews, conducted over a period of six months in 2009 in two stages coinciding with teaching blocks at the ICT training centre (March-June and September-November), took place in different social settings in Barcelona and were conducted at the homes of respondents, however, in some cases, when anyone was interested in telling us about their leisure activities in other areas, the interview continued in some places of work or study or following them on their daily movements. In two cases, we made also a contact online to share with them during their leisure activities online.

Interviews were conducted on the basis of a protocol of twenty topics focused on obtaining a description of the kind of activities and technologies used to perform leisure and to find when, where and how those activities were performed, to produce a top-centred narrative (Riessman, 2002, p. 231) and foster theoretical sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1994).

Semi-structured interviews provided the necessary narratives about leisure activities at home and work. The interviews lasted between 30 and 90 minutes, were digitally recorded, and were transcribed verbatim with voice recognition software. Informants were guaranteed confidentiality, and were informed of the aims of the research and of the right to interrupt the recording if they wished.

Tabla 2 Interview protocol

1. Are you a user of digital technologies (devices and Internet access)?
2. What activities do you generally do in your free time?
3. Imagine a day with free time. How do you spend it? What do you do? How do you organize each activity and why?
4. If you decide to stay at home to use your leisure time, why do you do so?
5. Of the possible activities, do you realize some related to technologies and digital spaces? Please choose one, and explain what you do.
6. Why do you choose to perform digital leisure activities instead of others?
7. What digital devices do you have at home? What do you use them for?
8. What kind of activities associated with digital leisure do you do? What do you like about technologies for leisure?
9. Could you tell me, how you distinguish between work and leisure when you engage in the digital activities you describe?
10. What time can you spend on them [leisure activities] and when you do them?
11. How do you think you started to engage in digital leisure activities? How long ago?
12. Since you get engaged whit digital leisure activities, has anything changed in your way of doing or use them?
13. Describe the part of the house you use to engage in digital leisure activities (shared space or private space).
14. Apart from you, does any other member of the household engage in digital activities in their leisure time? Do you share any aspect? Or any activity?
15. Could you describe what you feel when you use digital technologies for leisure?
16. Describe what you get from digital leisure activities that you do not get from other activities. Why?
17. Has the fact that you engage in digital leisure changed your way of life? Your routines, for example?
18. Have you had any problem that affected you (e.g.in your relationships with your family/partner/work mates)?
19. If you have children. Do you give your children access to these digital devices for their leisure time?
20. Are there any rules in your home regarding the timing and use of digital devices for leisure activities?
21. How and where do you usually acquire the digital devices you use? When you acquire them, how much do you spend, and why?
22. What features would your ideal digital product have? Having in account also leisure purposes.
23. Do you have any other comments to add?

Informants

The sample consisted of 30 informants, 15 women and 15 men. Education levels were varied: 11, 10, and 9 informants had completed or were completing a postgraduate course, an undergraduate course, and a general or vocational secondary school course, respectively. Data on respondent employment and occupational profiles were also recorded, as follows: 17 were in full-time paid work (three informants worked as engineers: three as journalists; two works in audiovisual industry, five in administrative and operational tasks, three in education and training, and one in entertainment); ten were students (including two combining studies with part-time paid work as clerks and two receiving payments for occasional projects related to their studies); two women performed unpaid work at home (one a home worker and the other a carer for a relative) and one man was unemployed. Most respondents were aged 20 to 30 years (range 17-58 years old); this was a result of the sample having been selected from among technology users and individuals who stated that they engaged in digital leisure.

The sample is composed by diverse home inhabitants, which share a relationship of coexistence; by consanguinity, affinity, or by co-residence/shared consumption and nurture kinship or affective kinship (Morgan, 1871; Sahlins, 1992). The exploration of gender differences was limited due to the fact that these generally appear after marriage and having children. The sample was not distributed evenly by age because digital technology use was unevenly distributed. According to Spanish indicators about Internet and ICT use in households in the 2009 survey on Equipment and Use of ICT, in Spanish households of the population between 16 and 74 years old, that accessed to the Internet during the previous 3 months, was evenly distributed by age, 92.3 % in the range of 16-24 years old and the percentage was going down as age brackets when up: 80.1% for the bracket 25-34; 72.3% for 35-44, 54.9% for 45-54, 29.1% for 55-64, 11% for 65-74. Even so, we tried to obtain a sample with representation of each age group; however our sample was composed by 12 individuals in

the bracket 16-25; 12 in 26-34; 4 in 35-44; 1 in 45-54 and 1 in 55-64.

Interviewee's profile

The majority reported using laptops for their leisure activities and only six of those who had it, also claimed to have a desktop computer used for other activities or shared with other home members. Regarding other devices, six said they used some kind of consoles for their leisure time, two had a tablet, and six had smart phone, but only three of them claimed to use it for leisure. Most of them agreed that is an option always at hand, available, easy to perform and can be done alone or shared with others. They said most activities are conducted on weekdays, at night, or in short moments available where there is no other option. On weekends they can also engage in digital leisure if they don´t have anything else to do, most of them make it clear that if they are able to perform outdoors leisure activities or leisure in company with others, they prefer these options and maybe late in the night they do some digital leisure.

Tabla 3 Interviewee data

Name	Sex	Age	Marital Status	Education	Occupation
Adela	F	23	Single, in a relationship	Postgraduate (audiovisual documentaries)	Documentary maker
Adriana	F	17	Single, living with parents	Vocational (computers)	Student/data entry clerk
Albert	M	30	Single	Postgraduate (economics)	Clerk/student
Alex	M	35	Single	Postgraduate (engineering)	Doctoral student
Andrés	M	18	Single, in a relationship	Vocational (electronics)	Warehouse worker
Antonio	M	22	Single, living with parents	Graduate (audiovisual communication)	Student/blogger
Camilo	M	23	Single, living with parents	Graduate (journalism)	Student
Carles	M	29	Common-law partnership	Vocational (business studies)	Freelancer
Carmen	F	22	Single	Postgraduate (public relations)	Public relations
Clara	F	27	Married	Graduate (accounting)	Accountant
Daniel	M	42	Married	Vocational (pharmacy)	Unemployed

Eli	F	19	Single, living with parents	Vocational (beauty consultancy)	Student
Felipe	M	36	Single	Graduate (systems engineering)	Systems engineer
Goyo	M	32	Single	Vocational (image and sound)	Disc jockey/bookshop assistant
Isa	F	58	Divorced, adult daughter	Vocational (auxiliary nursing)	Unpaid work (carer for dependent mother)
Jaime	M	34	Single	Graduate (telecommunications)	Telecommunications engineer
Javier	F	23	Single, in a relationship	Postgraduate (journalism)	Sports journalist
Juan	M	29	Single	Graduate (audiovisual communication)	Audiovisual technician
Juliana	F	26	Single	Postgraduate (advertising and marketing)	Marketing agency employee
Manuel	M	29	Married	Postgraduate (statistics)	Analyst
Marcos	M	23	Single, in a relationship	Graduate (psychology)	Student
María	F	37	Common-law partnership	Postgraduate (communication and education)	Trainer (Teachers Without Borders)
Mariana	F	23	Single	Graduate (communications)	Community manager
Martina	F	26	Single	Postgraduate (project management)	Designer and student
Miquel	M	29	Single	Graduate (architecture)	Student
Samuel	M	33	Divorced, son aged 7 years	Graduate (engineering)	Industrial robot engineer
Sandra	F	24	Single, in a relationship	Postgraduate (travel journalism)	School trip coordinator
Sara	F	21	Single, in a relationship	Graduate (architecture)	Student
Sonia	F	27	Married, two children	Secondary	Unpaid work (home worker)
Teresa	F	46	Divorced, teenage daughter	Vocational (art)	School monitor

Analysis

Narrative analysis in sociology refers to extended accounts of lived experiences in context, narrated in one or several interviews. Despite differences in definitions of narrative, all the methods of analysis involve constructing texts (interview transcripts, field notes, photos, etc.) that require analysis in order to be interpreted. We applied thematic analysis as it focuses on the context and on what is said

(see Riessman, 1993; 2004). Our interest lies in the contexts in which leisure and work activities are engaged in, because, on this basis, we interpret the meanings in our informants' narratives. Researchers usually collect many narratives and inductively create conceptual groups from the data, then present segments of narratives organized by themes. Thematic analysis is useful for understanding what is said across a number of cases, and for identifying themes across informants.

The qualitative analysis was assisted by the computer program EdEt, an editor for ethnographers (available in the next link: http://www.etnologia.uw.edu.pl/etno/dlaStudentow/edet), and by Cassandre's environment for qualitative analysis (Lejeune, 2011). Both computer-aided qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) are designed to aid in conducting collaborative analyses. Both are based on a server-client framework where the server acts as a data repository (EdEt) and as a backend data analysis tool (Cassandre's environment).

During several meetings we shared, discussed and interpreted texts, codes, categories, and properties inductively constructed a simple set of themes in order to group narratives according to the activities performed, the technologies used for the activities, the spaces (work and leisure) where the activities were performed, the times when the activities were performed (work and leisure), and one final theme that grouped the meanings assigned to activities. After coding, simple and conditional searches of the co-occurrence of categories produced the meanings of the activities performed (and the technologies used) in different spaces and times.

Research Focus and Analysis description

We analyze the experiences lived in the context of leisure from the narratives of the interviewees. Through thematic analysis, we study what is said, considering the contexts in which leisure activities are performed. We make an interpretation of the experiences of our informants to

create groups of concepts, segmented by topics by using the qualitative analysis software ―Cassandre and Edet, both designed to work collaboratively, that allowed us to create the categories and themes together.

With Cassandre, using semi-automatic coding, we identified markers grouped by themes. With the results of Cassandre in Edet, we constructed a set of themes which structure the analysis categories; we did that having in mind previous literature review and the research objectives. Then we delve into these categories through a logical search data, so that these would allow us to respond the research questions.

Thus, when categories and subcategories were established, we used the query tool from Edet to establish the relationship between categories and themes provided by the interviews and define the subjects to interpret in the study. The analysis was done by coding words related to themes, which allowed us to draw the initial categories: 1) the leisure activities, 2) the technologies used, 3) the contexts in which activities occur 4) and the meanings assigned.

These represent the properties and dimensions of the informant's experiences and cut across the three chapters. Thereafter these categories ranged to those that were used to build the categories for the second issue settled as leisure activities and experiences at home, aspects for choosing digital leisure, benefits and satisfactions. Then from one of the categories from the second issue, we found from those related with the factors to choose digital leisure, some categories in which emerged the social aspects that settled the categories of social and communication activities, ability to connect with the social network and improve sociability.

Table 4 Categories of Analysis of Digital Leisure

Essay	Categories	Themes
First essay	Leisure Activities	Nature of leisure
	Technologies used	
	Spaces	
	Time	
	Meanings	
Second essay	Leisure activities at home	Home activities
	Routines	
	Technologies used	
	Leisure experience	
	Factors for choosing DL	
	Acquired benefits	
Third essay	Social activities	Social interactions
	Communicative activities	
	Connections	
	Social experiences	
	Sociability online	

Quality and trustworthiness of the study

Qualitative studies based on informants' narratives seek to interpret the meanings that individuals attach to their experiences taking into account their social context. The interpretation of narratives also explores social perspectives that construct the reality for the participants in the study (Loh, 2013). Thematic analysis was used in this study to examine, pinpoint and emphasize patterns of

meaning within informants narratives by familiarization with data, the generation of codes that establish shared points, to search themes among codes in order to build categories containing thematic and review and discuss those, to define possible themes in order to produce each one of the essays.

During the fieldwork, we paid special attention to participant's perspectives and contexts, in order to describe the situation from their point of view and experience, by accompanying them during their activities. During the course of the interviews we questioned informants to ensure consistency and accuracy of responses and to increase information. These questions were formed either as queries channelled to the objectives, or interrogations to delve into the responses. Additionally, we added other questions to find prospects that could help to make dense the narratives and interpretations.

To verify trustworthiness and quality we followed Lincoln & Guba's (1985) four criteria of qualitative research. Those criteria are credibility, transferability, dependability and conformability. For addressing credibility, researchers attempt to demonstrate that a true picture of the phenomenon under scrutiny is being presented. To allow transferability, there must be provided sufficient detail of the context of the fieldwork to be able to decide whether the prevailing environment is similar to another situation ─with which is familiar, and whether the findings can be applied to the other setting. The meeting of the dependability is to ensure that procedures followed are coherent and transparent so that other researchers would come up with the same findings if they follow the same procedure. Finally, to achieve conformability, researchers must take steps to demonstrate that findings emerge from the data and not their own predispositions.

For credibility (thick description) we read, heard and reviewed the interviews transcripts by listening interviews, reading them repeatedly prior to the coding and analysis and then during the development of categories, discussion and reviews were made to establish and verify the perspective of the participants in order to describe each theme from the participant's eyes and reduce subjective interpretations ─ and re-look and re-analyse if needed. Also the interpretation of findings, and outcomes were discussed during the analysis.

The degree of transferability in the results of this qualitative research, checks if the study can be transferred to other contexts or settings. For that purpose we applied Thick description seeking for verisimilitude (Loh, 2013), to assure if writing transport the reader directly into the world of the study (Creswell, 2007) by discussing the relevance or use of the study.

To that extent we checked for the dependability (clear procedure) having into account the ever-changing context of digital technologies within which this research occurs. For this purpose we examined the utility of the study to verify its usefulness (Loh, 2013), by checking its contributions and the descriptions and interpretations that helps to explain and understand the digital leisure, but also having in account those changes occurred during the analysis and writing to have in mind retake those aspects for future research.

Finally, confirmability (bias) , which refers to the degree to which the results could be replicated by others, was treated by examining the findings to attest them by reading and reviewing in order to reduce subjective interpretations, having discussions to confirm or corroborate the procedures, and checking and rechecking the data throughout the study.

Chapter references

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Designing a qualitative study: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (3rd *Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.*

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). London: SAGE

Lejeune, C. (2011). From normal business to financial crisis... and back again. An illustration of the benefits of Cassandre for qualitative analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum:*, *12*(1).

Lincoln, Y.S. (1995) Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretive research, *Qualitative Inquiry*1, 275–289. Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods. T*housand Oakes, CA: Sag*e Publications.*

Loh, Jason (2013). Inquiry into Issues of Trustworthiness and Quality in Narrative Studies: A Perspective. *The Qualitative Report* 2013 Volume 18, Article 65, 1-15

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative Analysis. Newbury Park: Sage.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Riessman, C. K. (2002). Narrative Analysis. In A. M. Miles & H. M.B. (Eds.), *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion.* (pp. 217–270). Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage Publications.

Rundell J. (1995). *Gadamer and the circles of interpretation.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In Y. S. Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* (pp. 118–137). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded Theory methodology. In Norman K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

CHAPTER III: The Nature of leisure revisited: An interpretation of digital leisure[1]

[1]

Research conducted with Jordi López and Ercilia García. To be published in the *Journal of Leisure Research*, first issue in 2015. Tourism, Leisure and Hospitality Management subject category in citation rankings. H index 35, SJR impact factor 0,824; ranked in first quartile.

First Essay: The Nature of Leisure Revisited: An Interpretation of Digital Leisure

Abstract

Information and communication technologies have made it possible to engage in leisure and paid-work activities outside their usual context, thereby challenging the construction of their meanings. We explored 30 individuals narratives in an endeavour to identify the properties of digital leisure and paid-work activities performed in and out of their usual contexts. Our interpretation suggests that the nature of leisure activities is only associated with the freedom of individuals to choose which activity to do and how to do it. The patterns of interpenetration, integration and segmentation of spaces varied according to informants occupations, but were also moderated by marital status and gender. We conclude with a discussion of how these findings challenge the traditional divisions between work and leisure.

Keywords: Digital leisure, border crossing, space boundaries, digital culture, interpretive research, space integration/segmentation.

References

Bittman, M., Rice, J. M., & Wajcman, J. (2004). Appliances and their impact: the ownership of
domestic technology and time spent on household work. *The British Journal of Sociology*,
55(3), 401–23.

Bittman, M., & Wajcman, J. (2000). The rush hour: The character of leisure time and gender equity.
Social Forces, *79*(1), 165–189.

Boczkowski, P. J. (2010). The Consumption of Online News at Work. *Information, Communication &
Society*, *13*(4), 470–484.

Bowers, T. (2007). Cultivating a Leisurely Life in s Culture of Crowded Time: Rethinking the
Work/Leisure Dichotomy. *World Leisure Journal*, *49*(1), 30–43.

Bryce, J. (2001). The Technological Transformation of Leisure. *Social Science Computer Review*,
19(1), 7–16.

Bryce, J., & Rutter, J. (2003). The Gendering of Computer Gaming: Experience and Space. In S.
Fleming & I. Jones (Ed.), *Leisure Cultures: Investigations in Sport, Media and Technology*
(pp. 3–22). Leisure Studies Association.

Cavan, S. (1966). *Liquor license: ethnography of bar behaviour*. *Homo*. Chicago: Aldine.

Cheek, N. H., & Burch, W. R. (1976). The social organization of leisure in human society. New York:
Harper & Row.

Churchill, S. L., Clark, V. L. P., Prochaska-Cue, K., Creswell, J. W., & Ontai-Grzebik, L. (2007). How
Rural Low-Income Families Have Fun: A Grounded Theory Study. *Journal of Leisure*, *39*(2),
271–294.

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/Family Border Theory: A New Theory of Work/Family Balance. *Human Relations*, *53*(6), 747–770.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process* (p. 248). London: Sage.

De Grazia, S. (1962). *Of time, work, and leisure* (1994th ed., p. 460). New York: Vintage Books Ed.

Drotner, K. (2008). Leisure is hard work: Digital practices and future competencies. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media* (Youth, Ide., pp. 167–184). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dumazedier, J. (1967). *Towards a Society of Leisure*. Barcelona: Estela.

Dumazedier, J. (1974). *Sogiologie empirique du loisir: critique et contre-critique de la civilisation du loisir* (p. 270). París: Editions du Seuil.

Dupuis, S. L. (2000). Institution-based care giving as a container for leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, *22*(4), 259–280.

Dupuis, S., & Smale, B. (2000). Bittersweet journeys: Meanings of leisure in the institution-based care giving context. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *32*(3), 303–340.

Foucault, M., & Miskowiec, J. (1986). Of Other Spaces. *Diacritics*, *16*(1), 22–27.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of Grounded Theory. Strategies for Qualitative Research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). London: SAGE.

Haworth, J., & Veal, A. J. (2004). *Work and leisure. Work and leisure.* East Sussex, UK: Routledge.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2010). User-generated content, free labour and the cultural industries. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics*, *10*(3/4), 267–284.

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1979). Basic Dimensions of Definitions of Leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research.*, *11*(1), 28–39.

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1999). Motivational foundations of leisure. In E. L. Jackson and T. L. Burton (Ed.), *Leisure Studies: Prospects for the Twenty-First Century* (p. 538). State College, PA: Venture Pub.

Kelly, J. (2009). Work and leisure: A simplified paradigm. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *3*(3), 439–451.

Kelly, J., & Kelly, J. R. (1994). Multiple dimensions of meaning in the domains of work, family, and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *26*(3), 250.

Kelly, J. R. (1978). Family leisure in three communities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *1*, 47–60.

Lejeune, C. (2011). From Normal Business to Financial Crisis... and back again. An Illustration of the Benefits of Cassandre for Qualitative Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum:*, *12*(1).

Lewis, S. T., & Johnson, C. W. (2011). "But it's not that easy": negotiating (trans)gender expressions in leisure spaces. *Leisure/Loisir*, *35*(2), 115–132.

Mannell, R. (1979). A conceptual and experimental basis for research in the psychology of leisure. *Society and Leisure*, *2*(1), 179–196.

Mattingly, M. J., & Bianchi, S. M. (2003). Gender Differences in the Quantity and Quality of Free Time: The U.S. Experience. *Social Forces*, *81*(3), 999–1030.

Neulinger, J. (1981). *The psychology Of leisure*. *America* (p. 247). Charles Thomas Pub.

Neulinger, J., & Breit, M. (2009). Attitude Dimensions of Leisure: A Replication Study. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *41*(3), 361–368.

Nippert-Eng, C. E. (1996). *Home and work: Negotiating boundaries through everyday life*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Nomaguchi, K. M. (2006). Time of One's Own: Employment, Leisure, and Delayed Transition to Motherhood in Japan. *Journal of Family Issues*, *27*(12), 1668–1700. 1

Parker, S. (1971). *The Future of work and leisure*. London: MacGibbon & Kee.

Patterson, M. E., Watson, A. E., Williams, D. R., & Roggenbuck, J. R. (1998). A Hermeneutic Approach to Studying the Nature of Wilderness Experiences, *30*(4).

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods.* Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage Publications.

Pieper, J. Leisure: the basis of culture (1963). New York (N.Y.): The New American Library.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2007). Validity Issues in Narrative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *13*(4), 471–486.

Postigo, H. (2003). From Pong to Planet Quake: Post-Industrial Transitions from Leisure to Work. *Information, Communication & Society*, *6*(4), 593–607.

Rainie, L., & Wellman, B. (2012). *Networked: The new social operating system* (pp. 1–37). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ravenscroft, N., & Gilchrist, P. (2009). The emergent working society of leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *41*(September), 1–35.

Riessman, C. K. (2002). Narrative Analysis. In A. M. Miles & H. M.B. (Eds.), *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion.* (pp. 217–270). Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage Publications.

Roadburg, A. (1983). Freedom and enjoyment: Disentangling perceived leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *15*(1), 15–26.

Robinson, J. P., & Godbey, G. (2000). *Time for Life: The Surprising Ways Americans Use Their Time.* Pennsylvania Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Rojek, C. (2001). Leisure and Life Politics. *Leisure Sciences*, *23*(2), 115–125.

Rundell J. (1995). *Gadamer and the circles of interpretation.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Schulz, J., & Watkins, M. (2007). The development of the leisure meanings inventory. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *39*(3), 477–497.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In Y. S. Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* (pp. 118–137). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage.

Shaw, S. (1985). The meaning of leisure in everyday life. *Leisure Sciences*, *49*(0), 0–24.

Shaw, S. M., & Dawson, D. (2001). Purposive leisure: Examining parental discourses on family activities. *Leisure Sciences*, *23*(4), 217–231.

Soule, G. (1957). The Economics of Leisure. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *313*(1), 16–24.

Stebbins, R. A. (1992). *Amateurs, professionals, and serious leisure*. Montreal [etc.]: McGill-Queen's University press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded Theory methodology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strauss, A. & Corbin, J., (1994). Grounded Theory methodology: An overview. In Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds), Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Taylor, & Kolko, B. (2003). Boundary Spaces. *Information, Communication & Society*, *6*(4), 497–522.

Terranova, T. (2000). Free Labor: Producing Culture for the Digital Economy. *Social Text*, *18*(2 63), pp.33–58.

Tinsley, H. E., Hinson, J. A., Tinsley, D. J., & Holt, M. S. (1993). Attributes of leisure and work experiences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *40*(4), 447–455.

Unger, L. S., & Kernan, J. B. (1983). On the meaning of leisure: An investigation of some
      determinants of the subjective experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *9*(March), 381–
      392.

Watkins, M., & Bond, C. (2007). Ways of Experiencing Leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, *29*(3), 287–307.

Zuzanek, J., & Mannell, R. (1983). Work-leisure relationships from a sociological and social
      psychological perspective. *Leisure Studies*, *2*, 327–344.

CHAPTER IV: Home-based digital leisure. Doing the same things – but differently[2]

---

[2]   Research conducted with Jordi López and Ercilia García. It is under review in New Media & Society; Impact Factor: 2.052. Ranking: Communication 4 out of 74 5-Year Impact Factor: 2.441 5-Year Ranking: Communication 10 out of 74; SJR 2013: 2,142 Q1.

Second Essay: Home-based digital leisure. Doing the same things – but differently

Abstract

The introduction of the information and communication technologies in the home has transformed free-time leisure activities. Furthermore, these changes have affected the functioning of families, although we actually know little about these changes. Adopting a constructivist and interpretive perspective, we analysed 30 individual narratives in order to evaluate how digital technologies have transformed home-based leisure activities in Spain. The results show that the changes brought about are qualitatively different from those produced by radio and television broadcasting and reproduction/playback devices. The digital technologies have not only increased exposure to different cultural experiences, they also allow people to control those experiences. Consumption of experiences is no longer homogeneous within families; furthermore, family, friends, acquaintances, or strangers enter the home, symbolically, temporarily and virtually. Individuals now have greater freedom regarding their choice of home-based leisure activities, and family members report being more satisfied with the leisure activities they undertake.

Chapter references

Abbott-Chapman, J., & Robertson, M. (2001). Youth, leisure and home: Space, place and identity. *Loisir et Société*, *24*(2), 485–506.

Allen, M. (2010). The experience of connectivity. *Information, Communication & Society*, *13*(3), 350–374.

Anderson, B. (2008). The Social Impact of Broadband Household Internet Access. *Information, Communication & Society*, *11*(1), 5–24.

Anderson, B., Gale, C., Gower, A. . P., France, E. F., Jones, M. . L. R., Lacohee, H. V., & Trimby, M. (2002). Digital Living — people-centred innovation and strategy. *BT Technology Journal*, *20*(2), 11–29.

Anderson, B., & Tracey, K. (2001). Digital Living: The Impact (or Otherwise) of the Internet on Everyday Life. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *45*(3), 456–475.

Aranda, D., & Sánchez-Navarro, J. (2009). *The young and digital technologies: defining spaces for leisure, participation and learning*. *iiis.org*. Barcelona.

Beck, M. E., & Arnold, J. E. (2009). Gendered time use at home: an ethnographic examination of leisure time in middle- class families. *Leisure Studies*, *28*(2), 121–142.

Boczkowski, P. J. (2010). The Consumption of Online News at Work. *Information, Communication & Society*, *13*(4), 470–484.

Bovill, M., & Livingstone, S. (2001). *Bedroom culture and the privatization of media use*. *Children and their changing media environment: a European comparative study*. London: LSE Research Online.

Buswell, L., Zabriskie, R. B., Lundberg, N., & Hawkins, A. J. (2012). The Relationship Between Father Involvement in Family Leisure and Family Functioning: The Importance of Daily Family Leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, *34*(2), 172–190.

Campbell, S. W., & Kwak, N. (2010). Mobile Communication and Civic Life: Linking Patterns of Use to Civic and Political Engagement. *Journal of Communication*, *60*(3), 536–555.

Carr, D., Schott, G., Burn, A., & Buckingham, D. (2004). Doing game studies: A multi-method approach to the study of textuality, interactivity, and narrative space. *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy*, *110*, 19–30.

Churchill, S. L., Clark, V. L. P., Prochaska-Cue, K., Creswell, J. W., & Ontai-Grzebik, L. (2007). How Rural Low-Income Families Have Fun: A Grounded Theory Study. *Journal of Leisure*, *39*(2), 271–294.

Colwell, J., Grady, C., & Rhaiti, S. (1995). Computer games, self-esteem, and gratification of needs in adolescents. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *5*(3), 195–206.

Cox, A. M., Clough, P. D., & Marlow, J. (2008). Flickr: a first look at user behaviour in the context of photography as serious leisure. *Information Research*, *13*(1), 336.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process* (p. 248). London: Sage.

Dolfsma, W. (2004a). Consuming pop music/constructing a life world: The advent of pop music. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, *7*(4), 421–440.

Dolfsma, W. (2004b). *Institutional economics and the formation of preferences: the advent of pop music*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

English-Lueck, J. (1998). Technology and social change: the effects on family and community. *COSSA Congressional Seminar.*, 1–9.

Flichy, P. (1995). *Dynamics of modern communication: the shaping and impact of new communication technologies*. (J. Corner, N. Garnham, P. Scannell, P. Schelsinger, C. Sparks, & N. Wood, Eds.)*Media Culture and Society* (p. 181 p.). Sage Publications.

Gershuny, J. (2003). Web-use and net-nerds: a neo-functionalist analysis of the impact of information technology in the home. *Social Forces*, *82*(1), 141–168.

Green, E., & Adam, A. (1998). On‐ line leisure: Gender, and ICTs in the home. *Information, Communication & Society*, *1*(3), 291–312.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). London: SAGE.

Hargittai, E., & Hinnant, A. (2008). Digital inequality Differences in Young Adults ' Use of the Internet. *Communication Research*, *35*(5), 602–621.

Helsper, E. J. (2010). Gendered Internet Use Across Generations and Life Stages. *Communication Research*, *37*(3), 352–374.

Jupp, B., & Bentley, T. (2001). Surfing alone? E commerce and social capital. In J. Wilsdon (Ed.), *Digital Futures: Living in a Dot-com World* (pp. 97–118). London: Earthscan.

Kennedy, T., & Wellman, B. (2007). The networked household. *Information, Communication & Society*, *10*(5), 645–670.

Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J., Helgeson, V., & Crawford, A. (2002). Internet paradox revisited. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*(1), 49–74.

Lally, E. (2002). *At Home with Computers*. Oxford: Berg.

Larson, R. W., Gillman, S. A., & Richards, M. H. (1997). Divergent experiences of family leisure: Fathers , mothers , and young adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *29*(1), 78–97.

Lejeune, C. (2011). From Normal Business to Financial Crisis... and back again. An Illustration of the

    Benefits of Cassandre for Qualitative Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum:*,

    12(1).

Leung, L. (2001). College Student Motives for Chatting on ICQ. *New Media & Society*, *3*(4), 483–500.

Livingstone, S. (2004). The Challenge of Changing Audiences: Or, What is the Audience Researcher

    to do in the Age of the Internet? *European Journal of Communication*, *19*(1), 75–86.

    doi:10.1177/0267323104040695

Livingstone, S. (2007). From family television to bedroom culture: young people's media at home. In

    E. Devereux (Ed.), *Media studies: Key issues and debates* (pp. 302–321). London.

Martinson, a. M., Schwartz, N., & Vaughan, M. W. (2002). Women's experiences of leisure:

    Implications for design. *New Media & Society*, *4*(1), 29–49.

Mesch, G. S. (2006). Family characteristics and intergenerational conflicts over the Internet.

    Information, Communication & Society, *9*(4), 473–495.

Morgan, Lewis H. (1871). *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*. Washington:

    Smithsonian institute.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods.* Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage

    Publications.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2007). Validity Issues in Narrative Research Donald. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *13*(4),

    471–486.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants Part 2: Do they really think differently? *On the

    Horizon*, *9*(6), 1–6.

Rainie, L., & Wellman, B. (2012). *Networked: The new social operating system* (pp. 1–37).

    Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Richardson, H. J. (2009). A "smart house" is not a home: The domestication of ICTs. *Information Systems Frontiers*, *11*(5), 599–608.

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative Analysis. Newbury Park: Sage.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Riessman, C. K. (2002). Narrative Analysis. In A. M. Miles & H. M.B. (Eds.), *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion.* (pp. 217–270). Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage Publications.

Rompaey Van, V., & Roe, K. (2004). The home as multimedia environment. Families' concept of space and the introduction of information and communication technologies in the home. In K. Renckstorf, D. McQuail, J. E. Rosenbaum, & G. Schaap (Eds.), *Action Theory and Communication Research: Recent Developments in Europe* (pp. 231–251). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Rundell J. (1995). *Gadamer and the circles of interpretation.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Sahlins, M. (1992). *What Kinship Is-And Is Not*. Chigago: University Of Chicago Press.

Sánchez-Navarro, J., & Aranda, D. (2011). Internet como fuente de información para la vida cotidiana de los jóvenes españoles. *El Profesional de la Información*, *20*(1), 32–37.

Schroeder, R. (2010). Mobile phones and the inexorable advance of multimodal connectedness. *New Media & Society*, *12*(1), 75–90.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In Y. S. Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* (pp. 118–137). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage.

Shaw, S. M., & Dawson, D. (2001). Purposive leisure: Examining parental discourses on family activities. *Leisure Sciences*, *23*(4), 217–231.

Shaw, S. M., & Dawson, D. (2003). Contradictory aspects of family leisure: Idealization versus experience. *Leisure/Loisir*, *28*(3-4), 179–201.

Stald, G. (2008). Mobile identity: youth, identity, and mobile communication media. In *Youth, Identity and Digital Media* (pp. 143–164).

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded Theory methodology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strauss, A. & Corbin, J., (1994). Grounded Theory methodology: An overview. In Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds), Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Venkatraman, M. (2012). Consuming digital technologies and making home. *Journal of Business Research*, 1–8.

Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2001). The Influences of Family Leisure Patterns on Perceptions of Family Functioning*. *Family Relations*, *50*(3), 281–289.

Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2003). Parent and child perspectives of family leisure involvement and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *35*(2), 163–189.

CHAPTER V: Social Leisure in the Digital Age[3]

Third Essay: Social Leisure in the Digital Age

Abstract

The fact that leisure is a social activity is recognized by individuals and researchers. Also free-time activities differ in their social dimension. Then since digital technologies alter the meaning of leisure activities, they may also affect their social properties. In order to examine, within the interpretive paradigm, the social properties of digital leisure activities, we analysed the narratives of 30 users of home-based digital technologies for leisure purposes. Our results suggest that digital leisure activities have different social properties to traditional leisure activities. The social properties of digital technologies transform the meaning of leisure activities, creating interconnected leisure spaces where it is possible to be socially connected and available.

Keywords: digital culture, digital leisure, social leisure, social interaction, social connectivity

Chapter references

Allen, M. (2010). The Experience of Connectivity. *Information, Communication & Society*, *13*(3), 350–374.

Amichai-Hamburger, Y., Wainapel, G., & Fox, S. (2002). "On the Internet No One Knows I'm an Introvert": Extroversion, Neuroticism, and Internet Interaction. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, *5*(2), 125–128.

Anderson, J. Q., & Rainie, L. (2010). *The future of social relations* (pp. 1 – 27). Washington D.C.

Boase, J., & Wellman, B. (2006). Personal relationships: On and Off the Internet. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships* (pp. 709–724). Cambridge Books Online: Cambridge University Press.

Bryce, Jo (2001). The Technological Transformation of Leisure. *Social Science Computer Review, 19* (1) 7-16

Cole, H., & Griffiths, M. D. (2007). Social interactions in massively multiplayer online role-playing gamers. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior: The Impact of the Internet, Multimedia and Virtual Reality on Behavior and Society*, *10*(4), 575–83.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process* (p. 248). London: Sage.

Cummings, J. N., & Kraut, R. (2002). Domesticating Computers and the Internet. *The Information Society: An International Journal*, *18*(3), 221–231.

Ducheneaut, N., & Moore, R. J. (2004). The social side of gaming. In *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work - CSCW '04* (p. 360). New York, New York, USA: ACM Press.

Ducheneaut, N., Yee, N., Nickell, E., & Moore, R. (2006). Alone Together?: Exploring the Social Dynamics of Massively Multiplayer Online Games. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in computing systems - CHI '06* (pp. 407–416).

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of Grounded Theory. Strategies for Qualitative Research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Goffman, E. (1982). *Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Green, N. (2002). On the move: Technology, mobility, and the mediation of social time and space. *The Information Society*, *18*(4), 281–292.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). London: SAGE.

Gunter, B., & Gunter, N. C. (1980). Leisure Styles: A Conceptual Framework for Modem Leisure•. *Sociological Quarterly*, *21*(3), 361–374.

Hamill, R. (2003). Time as a Rare Commodity in Home Life. In R. Harper (Ed.), *Inside the Smart Home.* (pp. 63 – 78). London: Springer-Verlag.

Henderson, S., Taylor, R., & Thomson, R. (2002). In touch: Young people, communication and technologies. *Information, Communication & Society*, *5*(4), 494–512.

Hoerner, J. (1999). Scaling the web: a parasocial interaction scale for world wide web sites. In D. W. Schumann & E. Thorson (Eds.), *Advertising and the World Wide Web* (pp. 135 – 147). Taylor & Francis e Library.

Horton, D., & Strauss, A. (1957). Interaction in Audience-Participation Shows. *American Journal of Sociology*, *62*(6), 579–587.

Juniu, Susana (2009) The transformation of leisure, *Leisure/Loisir*, 33(2), 463-478.

Katz, J., & Acord, S. . (2008). Mobile Games and Entertainment. In J. E. Katz (Ed.), *Handbook of Mobile Communication Studies* (pp. 403–418). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Keenan, A., & Shiri, A. (2009). Sociability and social interaction on social networking websites. *Library Review*, *58*(6), 438–450.

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., & Mukophadhyay, Tridas Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, *53*(9), 1017–1031.

Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J., Helgeson, V., & Crawford, A. (2002). Internet paradox revisited. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*(1), 49–74.

Lejeune, C. (2011). From Normal Business to Financial Crisis... and back again. An Illustration of the Benefits of Cassandre for Qualitative Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum*, *12*(1).

Licoppe, C. (2004). "Connected" presence: the emergence of a new repertoire for managing social relationships in a changing communication technoscape. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *22*(1), 135–156.

Licoppe, C., & Smoreda, Z. (2006). Rhythms and ties: toward a pragmatics of technologically mediated sociability. In R. Kraut, M. Brynin, & S. Kiesler (Eds.), *Computers, Phones and the Internet: Domesticating Information Technology.* (pp. 296–313.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Mead, G. H. (1962). *Mind, self, and society: from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nie, N. H. (2001). Sociability, Interpersonal Relations, and the Internet: Reconciling Conflicting Findings. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *45*(3), 420–435.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods.* Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage Publications.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2007). Validity Issues in Narrative Research Donald. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *13*(4), 471–486.

Quan-Haase, A., & Wellman, B. (2002). How does the Internet affect social capital. In M. Huysman & W. Volker (Eds.), *IT and Social Capital* (pp. 1–14). Toronto: University of Toronto.

Riessman, C. (2003). Analysis of personal narratives. In *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns*.

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative Analysis. Newbury Park: Sage.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Robinson, J. P. (2011). IT use and leisure time displacement. *Information, Communication & Society*, *14*(4), 495–509.

Rojek, C., Shaw, S. M., & Veal, A. J. (2006). *A Handbook of Leisure Studies*. (Pallgrave Macmillan, Ed.) *Childhood A Global Journal of Child Research*. New York.

Rundell J. (1995). *Gadamer and the circles of interpretation.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Schroeder, R. (2010). Social Life in Online Worlds. In *Being There Together: Social Interaction in Shared Virtual Environments*. Oxford: Oxford scholarship online.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In Y. S. Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* (pp. 118–137). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage.

Shklovski, I., Kiesler, S., & Kraut, R. (2006). The Internet and social interaction. In *Computers, Phones, and the Internet: Domesticating Information Technology* (pp. 251 –264). Oxford: Oxford Scholarship Online.

Simmel, G. (1972). *Sociología: Estudios sobre las formas de socialización*. Madrid: Alianza.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded Theory methodology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln
(Eds.), *Strauss, A. & Corbin, J., (1994). Grounded Theory methodology: An overview. In
Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds), Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand
Oaks: Sage.

Swickert, R. J., Hittner, J. B., Harris, J. L., & Herring, J. A. (2002). Relationships among Internet use,
personality, and social support. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *18*(4), 437–451.

Tapscott, D. (1996). *The Digital economy: promise and peril in the age of networked intelligence*. New
York: McGraw-Hill.

Toffler, A. (1985). *La tercera ola*. Espluges: Orbis.

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: why we expect more from technology and less from each other*.
Vasa. New York: Basic books.

Van Ingen, E., & Van Eijck, K. (2009). Leisure and Social Capital: An Analysis of Types of Company
and Activities. *Leisure Sciences*, *31*(2), 192–206.

Zhao, S., & Elesh, D. (2008). Copresence As "Being With." *Information, Communication & Society*,
11(4), 565–583.

CHAPTER VI: General discussion and conclusions

General conclusions

The purpose of this research was to find how ICT and Internet provide opportunities for leisure. That led us to consider the experiences of leisure through technologies in the daily lives of people and ask a group of individuals about their digital leisure activities. In this section we make a written synopsis of the findings in the thesis chapters, then we analyze and discuss some other aspects of digital leisure, implying digital leisure activities implications on the traditional ways of using leisure time at home and the its social perspective and ended up exposing some aspects that pose limitations to the study, or may be considered for future investigations.

Summary of results

First Essay

The nature of leisure revisited: An interpretation of digital leisure

The first article deals with the nature of leisure activities conducted in different social contexts. We take into account leisure and work spaces as well as the time and context when leisure activities are conducted. We start with the concept of heterotopic spaces (Foucault & Miskowiec, 1986) to explain that in the digital domain the space can be juxtaposed and thus the barriers that distinguish leisure and work become blurred, so the meaning —whether for leisure or work, when this happens is not assigned to the space, but to the purpose of the activity in which it is based and on the properties conventionally allocated to leisure or to work activities in traditional spaces.

Therefore we first determine the properties and the characteristics of the digital leisure experience, to review the nature of leisure, comparing both leisure activities and work activities carried

out in usual times and spaces and in not usual or mixed spaces. In order to understand the meaning that individuals associate with the activities.

Research on leisure has always sought the nature and meaning of leisure to signal their properties, although this has been done from different perspectives. Then, for this study we explored the approaches and the conclusions of various studies, to organize the different conclusions from various perspectives in order to analyse our results. There are shared properties in leisure and work, as indicated by previous research (Kelly & Kelly, 1994; Unger & Kernan, 1983; Tinsley, Hinson, Tinsley, & Holt, 1993), for example, the effort is a property traditionally associated with the work, but also can be applied to digital leisure, because in this, the individual chooses to make a digital activity and how to do it. This may require effort, but the activity is not performed because it is required, but because it is chosen to be made. Indeed, this is the case in creative activities or wherein skills are developed, or can gain financially, or are serious leisure (Stebbins, 1992). In those cases when the activity takes place using technologies, interpreting the meaning is more difficult and therefore it is the degree of choice what makes the difference. Thus, we interpret from the narratives of our informants, which in the case of digital leisure the degree of choice, is the property that characterizes and differentiates leisure in relation to work.

There is something else about the nature of leisure in digital activities; it is possible that the perception of time changes when a digital leisure activity is performed. At work time is reduced, and short moments are used to do some digital leisure activities, so leisure activities are realized taking advantage of those moments. This is because the workspace is associated with the meaning of productivity and work performance is prioritized. In leisure space time lengthens, digital activities can last a lot of time, because there is no awareness of its passing, in leisure time and leisure spaces there is freedom to realize leisure activities. That also applies for those digital activities that are more similar to a task, but due to the characteristics of digital technologies are enjoyed and time passes in a similar way that passes in leisure.

Second Essay

Home based digital leisure: Doing the same things – but differently

In the second article we describe what our informants do when performing leisure activities using digital technologies at home and found changes in the way traditional leisure activities are performed, thereby transforming the leisure experience. Now, given the digital leisure property of being able to choose what to do and considering also the properties of the technologies, informants can for example decide to watch audiovisual contents on the computer and also select what to watch, with whom share the experience and choose it according to the time available and what is offered. Thus, digital technologies have enhanced the ability to fragment the leisure time and the simultaneity of activities and it is possible to overlap activities that usually took place at different moments in time and space.

There are two situations to be mentioned from our findings, the narratives let us know that digital technologies also enable that people living in the same household have different leisure experiences (Flichy 1995), interviewees tell us about people watching films in the same home but privately in their rooms or headphones (Bovill & Livingstone, 2001). The other is related with an opposite situation; all our informants assure that with digital leisure it is possible to live situations of social connectivity. Our informants mention ICT activities as leisure, because these technologies are allowing household members to connect, to keep in touch with friends and acquaintances and to meet other people (English-Lueck, 1998; Allen, 2010; Venkatraman, 2012)

These changes may have implications for the meaning of leisure activities in relation to satisfaction. On one hand, they can be interpreted as core activities or balance activities (Churchill et al, 2007) according to the situation. For example, friends, family or strangers through the Internet and communication devices can access the home virtually, transforming the balance activities in core activities. On the other hand, home, which is a private space, may be open to public spaces online and

thereby household members can interact with strangers or share with them other personal issues and interests. Therefore the informants of the study are inclined towards social interaction activities, which expand the spectrum of social activity and also lead to experience digital leisure by their own, and in privacy.

So we can say that digital leisure has two faces to consider, one that seems to happen in their own environments and alone, and other that connect them to other environments digitally, enhancing their possibilities of interaction and leisure.

Third Essay

Social interaction in the digital age

In the third article we describe the digital leisure activities undertaken by our respondents that claim to carry out leisure activities of social interaction. We found that the technologies used, shape into structures that allow interactions to keep in touch, maintain contact or create relationships, so they control and extend their social network. These digital interaction structures are chosen according to the social relationships and the technologies used. There, social structures properties are resumed in the social connectivity, the interpenetration of spaces, and the possibility to provide sociability. This may change according to the technological means chosen for interaction and the degree of closeness in the relationship. With this, the study provides evidence on the observations of Licoppe & Smoreda (2006) with regard to the relationship between sociability and technologies and describes how digital technology is used to track, maintain and develop contacts. It also discusses how social games have these properties.

We provide evidence of the social character of digital leisure, where the structures of social interaction in the digital environment allow individuals to have a connected presence, both to interact within the digital environment, and to manage leisure activities that take place face to face.

With this in mind, a social interaction mediated by technology, does not reduce the quality or deteriorates the relationships. This situation is just using and adapting technologies to the social activities previously made or to strength those that are already part of the lives of the individuals.

This may mean that the traditional social leisure is enhanced or converted according to the elements and characteristics of digital technologies used for social interaction.

Discussion

Following the ideas raised by Bryce (2001), the information society influences the traditional activities and leisure spaces, which exist alongside technological leisure activities, and meanings and attitudes are multiple. Today digital technologies have modified how to access leisure activities and thus have transformed the leisure experience and organization with implications in the meaning of leisure. In this section we discuss those implications in relation with boundaries between leisure and other life space activities in relation with the role of technologies with leisure and the transformations and effects that comes from the conjunction of digital technologies and leisure.

The boundaries between spaces and digital leisure

When technologies emerged as appropriate locations for contemporary leisure activities, new spaces for leisure were created and these are available wherever technological devices are available Although, that availability makes the boundaries become fuzzy and conventional ideas about rigid and static boundaries of home and work from the industrial society are no longer adequate to make sense of

the contemporary leisure experience, characterized by the use of digital media (Bryce, 2001; Boczkowski, 2010). However, characteristics of the contemporary leisure experience are particularly difficult to categorize, because traditional work divisions of leisure, retirement or home, becomes increasingly blurred, so is important to examine the subjective meanings of leisure and technology as a challenge (Bose, 2009).

In this study we search those characteristics considering the mentioned availability and its effects in boundaries perceptions, due to the fact that in our findings there is evidence of how spaces are blurred when individuals explain that they carry out digital leisure in their work or perform work-related activities in their homes. Those experiences lead us to propose an analysis to understand the nature of leisure with digital technologies and find those changes considering the properties of leisure and technologies, verifying in the process the notions of leisure to find space and time aspects in the routines with digital technologies as Boczkowski (2010) suggests.

To understand the nature of leisure when is developed in digital spaces we can address approaches like those that work the idea of what is cyberspace. Wilken (2007) suggests it is a form of space, which is incorporeal, free from geographical or physical limitations, but consists of a physical space —the computer or device, a perceptual space obtained through the senses, and the conceptual space that the mind interprets. From this, we can consider why the natural areas of leisure are influenced by the presence of technologies that allow unlimited space, but are possible to perceive and conceive. Then we can add to what Crowe & Bradford (2006) argue, that new leisure spaces are formed in the technology used to represent them as in the user's mind. So when entering the virtual dimension, people remember the limits from the relationship between subjectivity, social practices, technology and representations.

In that vein, our informants perceive the spaces in a digital context from what they interpret and apply the limits in relation to the practices they do, so if leisure activity is carried out in work, then work rules apply, and if they are at home doing something related to work or study, there is no requirement and then the leisure features apply, also this way of perceive the activities with technology

allows them to practice social leisure in virtual environments considering the same regions as the social interaction face to face.

Characteristics of digital technologies and boundaries blurred

But why activities are mixed in either space?, this question leads us to look for aspects that influence the performance of digital leisure when blends in different places making the boundaries blurry. We can start by the fragmentation of activities, possible thanks to ICT, which Mokhtarian, Salomon, & Handy (2006) define as the possibility to do multiple types of activities that are inserted sequentially, or occur simultaneously and could be carried out as multitasking. Activities are broken down into parts and fragments, and embedded in other activities, and also can be extended through a greater number of locations. The authors also add the complementary factor between technologies, the cost reduction of activities and the portability of devices, as reasons that lead to choose to do a leisure activity with digital technologies.

To this, may be added the proximity ─distance presence and the possible fragmentation of temporality, which Green (2002) explains proposing the concept of mobility. This concept explains how technologies are ready to use all the time because are available and portable, and also when connected to the Internet, can allow digital activities in a continuity through space and time. Such mobility also facilitates an increase the chances of individuals' social mobility when they incorporate ICT into their everyday life, growing with that, the degree of connectedness. Also Internet is regarded as central to the lives of the users because it provides a communications infrastructure in which is possible to socialize (Loges & Jung, 2001; Jung, Kim, Lin, & Cheong, 2005). We found evidence for these aspects in the way our informants fragment or extend their activities as in the case of reading or watching TV or when realize multiple activities using the tabs or continue tasks between locations. Also when they describe how they manage their relationships being available and with that improving their connectedness.

There is also an explanation in the way digital technologies have become part of everyday life. Jung (2008) found in a study that targets and the intensity of goals that someone seek to achieve online, shapes what one actually do, i.e. if a person has a greater number of goals on which the Internet is useful or perceives that an objective related to Internet is very important in life, is likely to be involved in a wider range of Internet activities to achieve the objectives. In turn the study of Johnson (2009) with teenagers states that they use digital technologies mixing leisure and learning because provide topics of interest to them, to fulfil their tasks but also allowing them to develop skills that make them experts. This in the case of our interviewees applies, when they say that develop digital activities thinking about projects or enrichment, but also having more opportunities and variety of leisure.

We also found that to our informants there is a degree of enjoyment, since activities using digital technologies can be pleasant or stimulant, or because it may involve creativity, or they can do several activities at once. Dupuis (2000) notes that from an experiential perspective, leisure may be experienced at any type of activity, not necessarily only those activities that are recreational activities or traditional leisure activities. In this regard, we find in this study that individuals' social purposes are the excuse to develop digital activities, or learn and increase skills doing some digital leisure activities, or enjoy their work when using digital technologies to do it. It seems that through ICT and Internet there is more freedom to choose activities and decide how often or how long are going to be performed, compared to traditional media, This explain why some of our respondents didn't know where work ends and leisure arrives, or conversely. It also gives an idea to understand why some interviewees can expend a lot of time online doing many things, sometimes at the same time.

Finally, people may have a higher degree of connectivity that enables them to maintain existing social contacts and also share hobbies and interests extending that way their network. Internet and ICTs offer a meeting place for people with common interests, without limitations of space and time that helps to establish social relations, or provides information and participation and restores a sense of community (Wellman, Quan Haase, Witte, & Hampton, 2001), and all this is seen as opportunities that contribute to social capital improvement (Van Ingen & Van Eijck, 2009), the

cultivation of sociability (Henderson, Taylor, & Thomson, 2002) and to increase existing patterns of social contact (Wellman et al., 2001). Our informants mentioned communication, interaction and socialization activities when were asked by the leisure they do, because they use digital technologies at any time to connect with friends, relatives and others.

Changes prompted by the digital leisure

Digital technologies possibilities are changing leisure. To address these changes, we followed the digital leisure experience at the interviewees' homes. Why is that important? The computer came into the households linked to tasks and a place was assigned in an office, then in the course of time the computer was improved to its multimedia features and was passed to the living room or in an entertainment area and finally when became portable, was integrated into the rooms (Bovill & Livingstone, 2001; Surman, 2002; Livingstone, 2007; Buse, 2009). The same is done by our informants who have computer and other devices.

Findings in this study suggest that digital technologies have changed patterns of home leisure, with implications that go beyond leisure activities, either supplementing or displacing other technologies used for leisure and entertainment, or expanding outside leisure activities. The way to carry leisure is still changing, i.e. the case of social leisure that now takes place in the company of friends or strangers that are located outside the home, developed in areas that are public and private at the same time, because they are developed online (Quan-Haase & Wellman, 2002).

At the beginning of the introduction of technology in the households, few changes were reported (Anderson & Tracey, 2001). But with the introduction of internet and ICT development now the user is not only a consumer, also produces through technological means and the use of different information sources (Hesmondhalgh, 2010; Arora, 2012). Internet access and ICT development caused a change in our informants leisure, the transformation begins with the replacement of traditional activities and the way in which they develop them, an example is the way they watch TV on their

computers though Internet without TV commercials so they can get hooked, or when they can watch movies counting with an access to a wider sample of options and decide what they consume, or when follow the news at any time from a computer and look for more information by searching and using not traditional sources.

Our informants confirm that those activities are done in brief moments and they choose them, because are available and have low monetary cost confirming what Mocktarian et al (2006) pose. This is also explained in the transverse nature of digital technologies that allows access and availability, expanding possibilities for action and a perpetual coordination of activities with others (Larsen, Urry, & Axhausen, 2008).

Digital leisure has also caused changes in the way to see other activities, while the rewards obtained in the digital leisure comply with an associated leisure, also foster personal enrichment. This can be seen through the competencies and online skills developed during leisure activities to make the process of unsystematic development of competencies and skills useful for work and academia (Dutton, & Blank, 2011; Peng, & Zhu, 2011). With these online skills, social capital and participation and capital in its human, political, social, cultural and finance aspects is extended, helping to improve the opportunities in life (Jung, 2008).

Finally, there are changes in social leisure when technologies facilitate contact and communication with others. The findings from Anderson & Rainie (2010) with data from the survey by the Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project suggest a future of social interaction attached to that idea, because experts requested, recognize that Internet has capacity for communication, improve social relations and cultivate relationships at lower costs in money and time, and also because geographical and time boundaries are no longer an obstacle for the maintenance of social connections. This is also explained by Schroeder (2010) by the concept of multi-modal connectivity , where people is intertwined through communication devices in connected presence, co-presence, or always on, and the limits depend on the duration of the experience, the technology used, the costs involved, or environmental factors where the device is used (public transport, car, house, a waiting room).

The effects of digital leisure in social activities

The relationship and affiliation with others, have also been identified as important in defining leisure, and as criteria for characterizing and understand leisure experiences that provide relationship with others (Gunter 1987), because leisure is intertwined in social roles and responsibilities of individuals, fulfilling social roles that impact on behaviours and styles of the leisure experience and leisure contexts (Kelly, 1999).

Social leisure has found new ways of embodiment; it is now possible to lead a social interaction in digital media, where according to Licoppe & Smoreda (2006) previous conventions of sociability are a guide for leisure activities with technology and the purpose of socialization depends on the relationship and the technology. Now is possible an interstitial communication between those who live together or share locations and activities, creating a particular form of mediated sociability, being always in presence (Licoppe & Smoreda, 2006; Zhao & Elesh, 2011). It can be done in a socially and geographically context where actors can regularly be in contact, thanks to the portability and availability that allows them to stay connected (Green, 2002; Allen, 2010). Therefore, our informants tell us how the technologies are used to keep in touch with those who see every day, to coordinate activities with their friends or being able to maintain long distance relationships.

Our informants claim to enjoy leisure activities with technology for social matters, because they interact using the digital technologies and feel connected. Social interaction with technologies differs from physical social interaction in those aspects of technologies that enable the social connectivity, which is theoretically analyzed by Zhao & Elesh (2008), they say there is a connection between people, which is possible thanks to the electronic connection of ICT, being online by electronic connection is not the same as being socially connected in community with others. However there is a feeling of social connectedness.

According to Zhao & Elesh there is a social connectivity that allows a co presence where people are located together in harmony, interacting to have contact with each other; there is a co

location where people are in a joint location, in proximity and within sensory range. So people using ICT can keep in touch from a distance, as the technology can restore sensory issues, they can see and hear each other and feel that they are in the same sensorial range. There are also technological resources and communication devices which control the status of availability and access, so people can be ready to contact and may be present in different locations and time points in co-presence, but also have ways to control the interaction using the same technology to separate and regionalize domains (Giddens, 1991) with involvement shields to ignore, hide, block, filter, relegate or remove the contact. With that, people increase or decrease the social network and feel they can have control of the interaction, something that our interviewees can manage using lists and buttons for close/open chats.

The nature, consequences and meanings of the experience of online social connectivity varies according to exchanges and technology uses. Allen (2010) explores the users' connectivity experience and seeks among other things, the opportunities for social interaction: stay in touch, interact with others, share interests, membership in groups and be part of a wider world. Finds a connectivity that is experienced and seen as a process of communication and collaboration, regarded as knowledge in action, as self-presentation and exploration, and can be understood as an extended part of the life circumstances of individuals. It varies according to the social connection and depends on the type of social relations that are involved, so broader and less defined online social relationships are correlated with broader and meaningful experiences of connectivity, also sometimes is difficult to know what is on life and what is online, because the interactions become online social interactions. This situation is also mentioned by Licoppe and Smoreda (2006) and this study finds evidence to add , when our interviewees say they stay in touch or follow their contacts by sending tweets to share knowledge, use e mail accounts to manage contact connections, or communicate by Facebook.

For Allen (2010), users are social because are naturally inclined to treat with people, enjoy socializing and can have a sociability as a result of a connectivity in which their relationships are socially structured and social interaction is facilitated and amplified by the technological connections. That is, they are able to extend sociability in conversations, messages or interact in a multidimensional space in which relationships are adjusted, exchanges are made and is possible to stay connected. So

technological connectivity is used to keep social (Boase, 2008), create or strengthen ties and closer relationships (Boase & Wellman, 2006). Therefore, those who have stronger ties, use more media to communicate, activate or create connectivity (Haythornthwaite, 2005) and maintain long distance relationships (Jiang & Hancock, 2013).

Contributions of digital leisure

As already stated in other sections, there are aspects of digital technologies that contribute to improve individuals' learning capabilities to develop knowledge and skills (Johnson, 2009; Dutton, & Blank, 2011; Peng, & Zhu, 2011), produce information and knowledge (Toffler, 1985; Hesmondhalgh, 2010; Arora, 2012), improve their social capital and capital in its human, political, social, cultural and finance aspects(Wellman et al., 2001; Quan-Haase & Wellman, 2002; Jung, 2008; Van Ingen & Van Eijck, 2009), to achieve goals and extend capital (Jung, 2008) and surpass individuals' satisfaction obtained from doing ledger activities (Unger & Kernan, 1983; Kelly & Kelly, 1994)

Arora and Ranwasmany (2013) consider the implications and impacts of ICTs as leisure in the context of development and in those considerations they argue, that leisure is a critical area of technology diffusion that lead to discover and magnify technology uses and digital literacies and offers an experimental space for informal learning, binding people and technologies with invaluable social impact. So they suggest more research should be directed to examine the mutual shaping of ICT use in everyday life and users' self-understanding of these tools, situating a framework in issues of identity, expression and agency to provide an alternate lens to view digital artifacts transcending their literal or functional meaning.

In this study we found evidence of digital technology contributions that people obtain related with digital literacies, learning and everyday uses that tells about the leisure meaning in relation to personal development and growth, or creativity (Dumazedier 1967;de Grazia, 1962; Iso-Ahola, 1979) ,

commitment (Kelly &Kelly, 1994) and involvement(Unger & Kernan, 1983). Our interviewees obtain personal enrichment in digital technologies use for leisure when they find in these, a source of knowledge and learning, because they think that world becomes available and they have contact with other cultures and social experiences that broad their culture and build knowledge. Also because they can complement work or study activities, find future income sources and enhance skills and personal knowledge in a way that could be enjoyable and fun.

With digital leisure they say is possible that a leisure activity generate income, or work activities that involve creativity is enjoyable and involvement and commitment, and the possibility to choose the activity and how it is done set aside the idea of obligation. All situations have a degree of productivity (Terranova, 2000), that is not attached to paths and constraints, challenge traditional concepts of paid work and leisure (Haworth & Veal, 2004) and gives a way to unsystematic learning (Philips, 1999) opportunities to improve personal skills satisfy personal interest when mixing leisure and learning (Johnson, 2009).

To summarize, we show satisfactions yielded in digital leisure activities. Individuals in this study reported finding better satisfaction; When using digital technologies because they were able to find and discover things with less effort and develop knowledge; when work results fun because the tasks carried out with digital activities are creative; when they commit digital activities that require effort in their leisure time in order to achieve challenging goals; when they plan their future activities and find a way to generate income doing projects with their ideas; or when they have social interaction experiences and approach to their loved ones and meet new contacts that enhance their social networks.

Implications

According to Kelly (1978), leisure must be connected to the conditions that occur in everyday life rather than being an esoteric and beautiful idea to be updated only in certain rare or elite conditions. In this study we review the nature of leisure in conditions provided by everyday uses of technologies, in which leisure property is the degree of choice, where space and time elapse. Leisure activities limit or expand the capability and the meaning of leisure when this is allocated from previous meanings. This has some implications to consider when treating digital leisure: 1) there is a contamination of traditional spaces (or utopic), where spaces are juxtaposed, so the concept of heterotopic spaces (Foucault, 1986) applies, and 2) serious leisure or productive leisure increases and when doing digital activities at work, those can become something fun and enjoyable.

These study findings, also opens the possibilities to give guidelines for the design and development of technologies for the home leisure. Studying the activities of digital leisure, we study aspects of life, in which we found that technologies have had an impact on how to perform leisure, either transforming traditional leisure activities or experiences, or adapting them to obtain satisfactory leisure experiences and benefits. So leisure experiences give guidelines for the formulation and development of technologies for the home leisure.

The leisure experiences using technologies seen as social structures for meeting have been a subject of interest since the introduction of technologies, for its implications on the lives of people. In the present study, we provide additional evidence for the idea that technologies are used by people in proportion to their previous social behaviour. So technologies are chosen according to what drives the relationship and what makes each one of the technologies used, in order to contribute to sociability. In fact the use of technologies for communication and interaction have been increasingly become a tool to facilitate the management of social activities.

Finally there is a certain aspect in leisure that Stebbins (1992) explain as serious leisure that allows people to commit to leisure activities in a way that those activities become important aspects in people's life, this also happens with digital leisure activities with implications in learning and work.

Limitations

The research was conducted to find leisure activities with technologies at the interviewees' homes, but in the course of fieldwork, evidence of digital leisure activities emerged in other areas. Based on the responses provided by the interviewees, they perform digital leisure activities at their works or other places if they have portable devices. Having that in account, there is an opportunity to go deeper and find more information about digital leisure in other areas of people's life, to know how they experience this leisure and how construct the meaning of their activities in each life space. Also would be interesting to establish how the degree of choice is given in other circumstances and spaces, and study the nature of leisure at work when doing digital activities and according to the mobility provided by portable devices and smart phones, also study leisure nature in transitions between living spaces.

In this research we interviewed individuals using digital technologies in their leisure time at their homes, but we have not interviewed families or other home members. For this study we had in mind children access to digital devices for their leisure time and the rules regarding the timing and use of digital devices for leisure activities, but given the final sample the information obtained is not enough, however all the informants agree to have benefits from digital leisure activities as children and those with children coincide in the importance of rules, but also the benefits obtained. Then, there are aspects not clarified about the influence of digital technologies in the family leisure and the family functioning and also between household members and their leisure activities together. Also having in account the ages of our sample, those brackets below the sixteen years old and over sixty years old are not represented.

Finally, the evolution of technology is so fast that what is done over a period of time can make the evidence insufficient or not be relevant because there have been changes, that is the case Smartphone, since at the time of fieldwork the potential of leisure with these devices had not developed to the level it is today. Also, the study does not value the differences in digital leisure

activities, according to the devices used and its potential to satisfy different needs and this is an interesting issue related with choosing a given activity for the device characteristics.

Future research

Technologies have been studied since their appearance and insertion into people's daily life from various aspects and subjects. However their relationship to leisure becomes a subject of study that can be explored, starting with digital devices and Internet and their possibilities for leisure as well as the effects or the transformation of leisure that may occur. In this regard it is necessary to further explore how digital technologies complement or replace other leisure activities and how their use can itself be a form of leisure. It may also be of interest to know whether digital technologies can be considered by people as necessary for leisure activities, either because they are available or because they have increasingly become part of everyday life and what this may mean in consumption of leisure.

There is also an issue about the evolution of technologies and how they change. This can be traced from the leisure experiences by analyzing new devices introduction in people's life spaces and how they use the applications and services provided for leisure purposes. To mention some examples, we address the use of mobile devices and smart phones for leisure or to study what has changed with portable digital technologies in leisure, i.e., what comprises digital formats in reading for pleasure.

In this study, there are several findings related to digital games, and their role in the leisure and socialization arises. Apparently the fact that some activities are developed online, led some participants to see those activities from a social leisure perspective. That moves the idea of online games as being just an entertainment experience; to consider online games as a social leisure activity, because is possible to interact with other players using the network and the game, so there are more

choices to improve sociability during the game experiences. So could be interesting to follow these interactions online.

There are many aspects to explore in social interaction online, but social network sites stand out in this regard. Having in account our findings, the communication tools bridges and support social interaction by sharing interests is becoming a way to improve social capital, which is mentioned in previous studies regarding ICT uses, but not from the leisure perspective. Other aspect to consider is the one related to the feeling of social connectedness that could be studied from a psychological perspective.

In our study we also found that our respondents can connect leisure activities to work activities because they develop skills and abilities in the field of leisure that can be used for productive purposes. On one hand, the knowledge gained in leisure activities has provided employment opportunities to some of the informants, or leisure time using digital technologies provide a stable occupation to transform those activities into an income source, enhancing productivity or giving the opportunity to develop useful skills. On the other hand, the way to develop those skills differs from the usual learning in schools, is unsystematic by posing the problem to reach or produce knowledge, rather than a systematic way to start from the experience to achieve the resolution of problems. The unsystematic learning is recognized and valued for the ability to solve problems, not an accumulated knowledge or a hierarchy of beliefs (Philips, 1999).

This predominance of unsystematic learning skills can be studied from the data we found in order to give more evidence of how this kind of knowledge is developed in digital leisure activities and be used in school or labour contexts. Summarizing, digital leisure has the potential to develop competencies and skills that are also useful in the workplace or the digital leisure activities become serious leisure (Stebbins, 1992) and develop into an unsystematic learning experience where the people can experiment and improvise the working conditions of the labour market by using technologies.

Finally we also had in account the consumption of digital devices for this study, asking individuals how and where acquire digital devices, how much do they spend and their ideal digital

leisure products. Some of those results were used to understand satisfactions and benefits of digital leisure, but there are evidences about the way they decide to buy and use a device, an application or a service for leisure that can be considered in a leisure consumption study.

Chapter references

Allen, M. (2010a). The Experience of Connectivity. *Information, Communication & Society*, *13*(3), 350–374.

Anderson, B., & Tracey, K. (2001). Digital Living: The Impact (or Otherwise) of the Internet on Everyday Life. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *45*(3), 456–475.

Anderson, J. Q., & Rainie, L. (2010). *The future of social relations* (pp. 1 – 27). Washington D.C. Retrieved from www.pewInternet.org

Arora, P. (2012). The leisure divide: can the "Third World" come out to play? *Information Development*, *28*(2), 93–101.

Boase, J. (2008). Personal networks and the personal communication system. *Information, Communication & Society*, *11*(4), 490–508.

Boase, J., & Wellman, B. (2006). Personal relationships: on and off the internet. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships* (pp. 709–724). Cambridge Books Online: Cambridge University Press.

Boczkowski, P. J. (2010). The Consumption of Online News at Work. *Information, Communication & Society*, *13*(4), 470–484.

Bovill, M., & Livingstone, S. (2001). Bedroom culture and the privatization of media use. In *Children and their changing media environment: a European comparative study.* London: LSE Research Online. Retrieved from http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/00000672

Bryce, J. (2001). The Technological Transformation of Leisure. *Social Science Computer Review*, *19*(1), 7–16.

Buse, C. E. (2009). When you retire, does everything become leisure? Information and communication technology use and the work/leisure boundary in retirement. *New Media & Society*, *11*(7), 1143–1161.

Churchill, S. L., Clark, V. L. P., Prochaska-Cue, K., Creswell, J. W., & Ontai-Grzebik, L. (2007). How Rural Low-Income Families Have Fun: A Grounded Theory Study. *Journal of Leisure*, *39*(2), 271–294.

Crowe, N., & Bradford, S. (2006). "Hanging out in Runescape": Identity, Work and Leisure in the Virtual Playground. *Children's Geographies*, *4*(3), 331–346.

Dupuis, S. L. (2000). Institution-Based Caregiving as a Container for Leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, *22*(4), 259–280.

Dutton, W.H. & Blank, G., 2011. *Next Generation Users: The Internet in Britain Contact OxIS*, Oxford.

English-Lueck, J. (1998). Technology and social change: the effects on family and community. *COSSA Congressional Seminar.*, 1–9.

Flichy, P. (1995). *Dynamics of modern communication: the shaping and impact of new communication technologies*. (J. Corner, N. Garnham, P. Scannell, P. Schelsinger, C. Sparks, & N. Wood, Eds.) *Media Culture and Society* (p. 181 p.). London [etc.]: Sage Publications.

Foucault, M., & Miskowiec, J. (1986). Of Other Spaces. *Diacritics*, *16*(1), 22–27.

Green, N. (2002). On the move: Technology, mobility, and the mediation of social time and space. *The Information Society*, *18*(4), 281–292.

Haythornthwaite, C. (2005). Social networks and Internet connectivity effects. *Information, Communication & Society*, *8*(2), 125–147.

Henderson, S., Taylor, R., & Thomson, R. (2002). In touch: Young people, communication and technologies. *Information, Communication & Society*, *5*(4), 494–512.

Jiang, C. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2013). Absence Makes the Communication Grow Fonder: Geographic

    Separation, Interpersonal Media, and Intimacy in Dating Relationships. *Journal of*

    Communication, *63*(3), 556–577.

Jung, J.-Y. (2008). Internet Connectedness and its Social Origins: An Ecological Approach to

    Postaccess Digital Divides. *Communication Studies*, *59*(4), 322–339.

Jung, J.-Y., Kim, Y.-C., Lin, W.-Y., & Cheong, P. H. (2005). The influence of social environment on

    internet connectedness of adolescents in Seoul, Singapore and Taipei. *New Media & Society*,

    7(1), 64–88.

Kelly, J., & Kelly, J. R. (1994). Multiple dimensions of meaning in the domains of work, family, and

    leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *26*(3), 250.

Kelly, J. R. (1978). Family Leisure in Three Communities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *1*, 47–60.

Kelly, J. R. (1999). Leisure and society: A dialectical analysis. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.),

    Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century (pp. 53–68). State College, PA: Venture.

Larsen, J., Urry, J. & Axhausen, K., 2008. Coordinating face-to-face meetings in mobile network

    societies. *Information, Communication & Society*, 11(5), pp.640–658.

Licoppe, C., & Smoreda, Z. (2006). Rhythms and ties: toward a pragmatics of technologically

    mediated sociability. In R. Kraut, M. Brynin, & S. Kiesler (Eds.), *Computers, Phones and the*

    Internet: Domesticating Information Technology. (pp. 296–313.). New York: Oxford University

    Press.

Loges, W. E., & Jung, J.-Y. (2001). Exploring the Digital Divide: Internet Connectedness and Age.

    Communication Research, *28*(4), 536–562.

Mokhtarian, P. L., Salomon, I., & Handy, S. L. (2006). The impacts of ICT on leisure activities and

    travel: A conceptual exploration. *Transportation*, *33*(3), 263–289.

Nie, N. H. (2001). Sociability, Interpersonal Relations, and the Internet: Reconciling Conflicting

Findings. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *45*(3), 420–435.

Payal, A & Ranwasmany, N. (2013) Digital leisure for development: reframing new media practice in

the global South. *Media, Culture & Society*, 35(7) 898–905

Peng, T.-Q. & Zhu, J.J.H., 2011. Sophistication of Internet usage (SIU) and its attitudinal antecedents:

An empirical study in Hong Kong. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(1), pp.421–431.

Philips, Steven (1999) Systematic minds, unsystematic models: Learning transfer in humans and

networks. *Minds and machines, 9*(3), 383-398

Quan-Haase, A., & Wellman, B. (2002). How does the Internet affect social capital. In M. Huysman &

W. Volker (Eds.), *IT and Social Capital* (pp. 1–14). Toronto: University of Toronto.

Sanchez-Navarro, J., & Aranda, D. (2012). Messenger and social network sites as tools for sociability,

leisure and informal learning for Spanish young people. *European Journal of Communication*,

28(1), 67–75.

Schroeder, R. (2010). Mobile phones and the inexorable advance of multimodal connectedness. *New

Media & Society*, *12*(1), 75–90.

Stebbins, R. A. (1992). *Amateurs, professionals, and serious leisure*. Montreal [etc.]: McGill-Queen's

University press.

Surman, E. (2002). Dialectics of dualism: the symbolic importance of the home/work divide.

Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization, *2*(3), 209–223.

Tinsley, H. E., Hinson, J. A., Tinsley, D. J., & Holt, M. S. (1993). Attributes of leisure and work

experiences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *40*(4), 447–455.

Unger, L. S., & Kernan, J. B. (1983). On the meaning of leisure: An investigation of some

determinants of the subjective experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *9*(March), 381–392.

Van Ingen, E., & Van Eijck, K. (2009). Leisure and Social Capital: An Analysis of Types of Company and Activities. *Leisure Sciences*, *31*(2), 192–206.

Venkatraman, M. (2012). Consuming digital technologies and making home. *Journal of Business Research*, 1–8.

Wellman, B., Quan Haase, A., Witte, J., & Hampton, K. (2001). Does the Internet Increase, Decrease, or Supplement Social Capital?: Social Networks, Participation, and Community Commitment. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *45*(3), 436–455.

Wilken, R. (2007). The Haunting Affect of Place in the Discourse of the Virtual. *Ethics, Place & Environment*, *10*(1), 49–63.

Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2001). The Influences of Family Leisure Patterns on Perceptions of Family Functioning. *Family Relations*, *50*(3), 281–289.

Zhao, S., & Elesh, D. (2008). Copresence As "Being With." *Information, Communication & Society*, *11*(4), 565–583.