

A Study of leisure psychology factors for leisure industry development

Byoungwook Ahn¹, Dongkee Kim², Suhwang Seol³, and Sejoong Lee⁴

¹Hanseo Univ. ²Yonsei Univ. ³Joongbu Univ., ⁴Yonsei Univ., ⁴Korea National Sport
¹bwahn75@hanseo.ac.kr, ²dkk@joongbu.ac.kr, ³seolsh4227@naver.com,
⁴72000523@naver.com

Abstract

This study aimed to contribute a leisure industry development in South Korea. A total of 362 adults were recruited and administered questionnaires assessing demographic characteristics, leisure facilitation, recreation specialization, and wellness. I conducted frequency, reliability, correction, confirmatory factor, and structure equaling modeling analyses using PASW Statistics 18.0 and AMOS 18.0. The results were as follows: The first, leisure facilitation had no influence on recreation specialization. The second, leisure facilitation had no influence on wellness. The third, recreation specialization had a positive influence on wellness. These results suggest the need for a supportive leisure industry such as facilities, programs, leaders, and application for leisure activities.

Keywords: *leisure industry, leisure facilitation, recreation specialization, wellness¹*

1. Introduction

Leisure is a necessary condition for a productive life [1]. Among Koreans, about 70% of leisure time spent not doing anything [2]. However, leisure time considered in terms of quality, as opposed to quantity—that is, it matters more what people spend their extra time on, rather than the amount of extra time that they have it [3]. Subjective and internal factors come into play in leisure activity selection and participation. Particularly, the subjective and conscious values of leisure will differ depending on the leisure activities actually pursued. As such, the effect of leisure activities on individuals' merits investigation in social psychology.

The first, leisure facilitation refers to the induction or strengthening of participation in a leisure activity by forming or facilitating leisure preference situations [4]. The notion of leisure facilitation was born out of an attempt to address the limitations of leisure constraints theory. Raymore [4] argued that even when leisure constraints are reduced or entire eliminated, some people simply do not participate in leisure activities. Therefore, constraints do not fully explain leisure participation. The leisure facilitation model comprises three subcategories: internal personal facilitation, personal facilitation, and structural facilitation factors [5]. Internal personal facilitation refers to the facilitating effects of personal characteristics or beliefs, such as the formation or facilitation of leisure preferences. Personal facilitation refers to the facilitating effects of other people based on their relationship with the person, including family, friends, social groups, and people who create leisure preferences. Finally, structural facilitation

¹ **Article history:**

Received (March 9, 2019), Review Result (April 10, 2019), Accepted (May 11, 2019)

is defined as the facilitating effects of a structure, social system, or social belief system in which external conditions can strengthen individual leisure participation [5].

The second, many people involved in specific leisure activities have experienced the development of expertise in those activities [6]. Since the late 1970s, leisure research has been interested in theories of recreational specialization. Bryan [6] defined recreation specialization as “a sequence of behaviors that change from the general to the special, reflected by the equipment and techniques used in sports activities or leisure activities.” Although research on recreational specialization has conducted for more than 30 years, its precise definition and method of measurement have remained unclear. Most researchers have measured recreational specialization by simultaneously measuring behavioral and attitudinal factors based on Bryan’s claim [7].

The third, Wellness might variously refer to a state of health, a lifestyle, and an attitude to achieve a state of health characterized by maximized potential and improved quality of life [8]. At the core of the wellness movement is a healthy lifestyle and activities that a person should choose and practice to reach the highest level of health, which in turn can maximize individual happiness [9]. Wellness also defined as a holistic way of life involving mental and spiritual health rather than solely focusing on physical health [10]. Others have defined it as a perfect state of harmony of mental, intellectual, and emotional health [11]. Various issues related to wellness have been examined.

Therefore, this study aimed to identify the factors that could induce active participation in leisure activities. In modern society, people can select and participate in various leisure activities, as well as decide how to reach specialization in those activities. Recognizing the empirical value of understanding the leisure culture in South Korea, I sought to accumulate experiential data related to leisure facilitation, recreation specialization, and wellness. The findings can contribute to the improvement of quality of life through encouraging more people to participate in leisure activities. The basic data gathered in this work could also be used to improve quality of life of Koreans.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

The participants of this study were male and female adults engaged in leisure activities living in South Korea. They all participate in more than one leisure activity and had done so for more than one year. This sample population consisted of 362 persons in South Korea.

2.2. Measurement

2.2.1. Leisure facilitation

Raymore [4] developed the leisure facilitation scale, which Kim and Lee [12] adapted in their study. The present study modified the items used by Kim and Lee [12].

2.2.2. Recreation specialization

Korean Recreational Specialization Scales developed by Lee et al. [13] were revised by a specialist group for use as the recreation specialization scale in this study.

2.2.3. Wellness

Based on Choi et al. [8] concept that health and sustainability imply wellness, we modified the wellness scale of the Lifestyle of Health and Sustainability (LOHAS) scale so that it could effectively complement the LOHAS health scale.

2.3. Data processing

Data processed using PASW Statistics 18.0 and AMOS 18.0. First, PASW Statistics 18.0 was used to conduct the descriptive, reliability, and correlational analyses of the demographic characteristics. It was also used for the verification of the relationships of wellness with leisure attitude, leisure facilitation, and recreational specialization. Second, AMOS 18.0 was used to perform structural equation modeling in order to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis and verify the research hypotheses.

3. Results

3.1. Research subjects

Of the total 362 study participants, there were more males ($n = 248, 68.5\%$) than females ($n = 114$). Those aged in their 40s accounted for the largest group in terms of age, at 96 participants (26.6%), followed by those in their 30s ($n = 92, 25.4\%$), 20s ($n = 91, 25.1\%$), and over 50s ($n = 83, 22.9\%$). Regarding the types of leisure activities, the participants reported engaging in hobbies (107 participants, 29.5%), sports (105, 29.0%), watching TV (94, 26.0%), and travel (56, 15.5%).

3.2. Confirmatory factor analysis

The results of the confirmatory factor analysis, shown in Table 1, indicated that all of these fit indexes were found to be appropriate. Therefore, the measurement scales could adequately describe the potential variables.

Table 1. Results of confirmatory factor analysis

	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
	Higher than 3.0	Higher than .9	Higher than .0	.08 or less
Leisure facilitation	.227	.916	.935	.058
Recreation Specialization	2.553	.959	.950	.066
Wellness	2.967	.967	.956	.058

3.3. Reliability verification

The Cronbach's α value for the leisure facilitation scale was .837, indicating that it had good reliability; the values of the internal person leisure facilitation, person leisure facilitation, and structural leisure facilitation subscales were .682, .710, and .807, respectively. As for the recreational specialization scale, the Cronbach's α value was .963 for the whole scale. The subscale values were as follows: information, .851; technical knowledge, .857; experience, .917; skills, .883; importance, .901; centrality, .863; and physical passion, .911. The Cronbach's α value was .930 for the whole wellness measurement scale, while those for the subscales were

as follows: physical wellness, .702; emotional wellness, .875; social wellness, .661; mental health wellness, .840; and intellectual health wellness, .851 Table 2.

Table 2. Results of reliability verification

Variables	Sub-factors	Cronbach's	
Leisure facilitation	Internal person	.682	.837
	Person	.710	
	Structural	.807	
Recreational Specialization	Information	.851	.963
	Technical knowledge	.857	
	Experience	.917	
	Skills	.883	
	Importance	.901	
	Centrality	.863	
	Physical passion	.911	
Wellness	Physical	.702	.930
	Emotional	.875	
	Social	.661	
	Mental	.840	
	Intellectual health	.851	

3.4. The verification of hypothesis

The first, this hypothesized that leisure facilitation would influence recreation specialization. However, we rejected this hypothesis, as this path was not significant ($\beta = -.041$, $t = -.639$, $p > .05$). The second, this hypothesis was similarly rejected because leisure facilitation did not have a significant path to wellness ($\beta = .039$, $t = .614$, $p > .05$). The third, this hypothesis was accepted because recreation specialization had a significant positive effect on wellness ($\beta = .417$, $t = 10.308$, $p < .001$), as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of verification of hypothesis

	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.
Leisure facilitation → Recreation specialization	-.057	.084	-.673
Recreation specialization → Wellness	.436	.048	9.030***
Leisure facilitation → Wellness	.039	.062	.527

*** $p < .001$

S.E. : Standard Error

C.R. : Critical Ratio

4. Discussion

First, leisure facilitation had no influence on recreation specialization. Leisure facilitation theory explains that various factors are needed to facilitate participation in leisure activities, such as a program, instructor, and facility, and that the mere removal of constraints is not

enough. South Koreans overcome plenty of constraints to participate in leisure activities, particularly those associated with time and finances. A somewhat similar result was obtained by Ahn [14], who noted that facilitation of leisure sports participation does not affect leisure satisfaction or re-participation. Kang et al. [15] provided the more direct evidence indicating that interpersonal leisure facilitation did not affect recreational specialization.

Second, leisure facilitation had no influence on wellness. Wellness refers to an individual's satisfaction with their physical, mental, social, mental, and intellectual health. Studies have shown that leisure activities afford various benefits and enhance satisfaction in participants. The lack of a relationship in this study might be due to the leisure infrastructure. The infrastructure for participating in leisure activities in South Korea is less developed compared with in other countries. Lee and Kim [16] reported that recreation specialization did not influence happiness, while Kim and Lee [17] found that institutional or systemic factors of tourism did not have significant relationships with behavioral intentions. Therefore, we would extend the leisure activity club such as sport, tour, music, and hobby in internet. It would be effect on leisure industry development.

Third, recreation specialization had a positive influence on wellness. By continuing to participate in leisure activities, people might acquire professional recognition and expert-level skills in their chosen activities. Recreational specialization is defined as expertise in the equipment and techniques specific to particularly leisure activity [6]. By participating in certain leisure activities for more than three years, at four times a week or more, leisure participants are likely to be well on their way to becoming experts in that activity, which in turn can benefit their wellness, health, and quality of life. Although it may be difficult to become an expert in specific leisure activities, it is still important for helping participants experiencing greater wellness.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to contribute a leisure industry development the centered on the theory leisure facilitation, recreation specialization, and wellness in leisure activity participants. The participants were 362 adult men and women who engaged in leisure activities. The results showed that leisure facilitation had no influence on recreational specialization or wellness, while recreation specialization of leisure activity participants had a positive influence on wellness. Therefore, leisure facilitation had no influence on recreation specialization or wellness, whereas recreation specialization had positive influence on wellness. Results appear to vary depending on region, country, and leisure participant.

References

- [1] C. Rojek Capitalism and leisure theory. London: Tavistock (1985)
- [2] J. S. Song, The Korean Leisure a Day 308 min ... a 70% a small work without non-work. The Kyunghyang Shinmun. http://news.khan.co.kr/kh_news/khan_art_view.html?artid=200906141801285&code=940100. Jun 14, 2009.
- [3] H. Lee, C. Jeong, and R. S. Jeong, Influence of five-day workweek on worker's leisure: an internet survey. Tourism Sciences Society of Korea, Vol. 27, No. 1, 63–83. (2003)
- [4] L. A. Raymore, Facilitators to leisure. Journal of Leisure Research, Vol. 34, No. 1, 37–51 (2002)
- [5] J. S. Lim, and T. J. Choon, and G. H. Lee, The relationship among leisure facilitator, recreation specialization, and life satisfaction of sports participants. Journal of Leisure, Parks, and Recreation Studies, Vol. 39, No. 2, 33–43. (2015)

- [6] H. Bryan, Leisure value systems and recreational specialization: the case of trout fishermen. *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 174–187. **(1977)**
- [7] S. H. Hwang, and H. J. Seo, Relationships among leisure constraints, negotiation, and serious leisure. *Korean Journal of Sport Science*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 298–307. **(2009)**
- [8] S. Y. Choi, S. Y. Yoon, and S. J. Moon, A basic study for the LOHAS scale development based on the notion of health and sustainability. *Journal of Leisure Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 19–42. **(2011)**
- [9] M. S. Kim, 2014 Physical White Paper. Sejong: Korea Institute of Sport Science, Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism. **(2016)**
- [10] T. J. Sweeney, and J. M. Witmer, Beyond social interest: striving toward optimum health and wellness. *Individual Psychology: Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research & Practice*, Vol. 47, 527–540. **(1991)**
- [11] B. Hettler, Wellness promotion on a university campus. *Family and Community Health*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 77–79. **(1989)**
- [12] Y. S. Kim, and H. Lee, A study of developing the “Leisure Participation Condition Type” for integration leisure constraints and facilitators. *Tourism Sciences Society of Korea*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 261–277. **(2011)**
- [13] M. J. Lee, I. H. Park, and S. H. Hwang, Recreation specialization scale development. *Journal of Sport and Leisure Studies*, Vol. 44, 453–465. **(2011)**
- [14] B. W. Ahn, Structural relationships between leisure facilitator, satisfaction, and re-participate intention among sport for all participants. *Journal of the Korean Society for Wellness*, Vol. 12, No. 3, 363–371. **(2017)**
- [15] H. Y. Kang, C. W. Lee, and M. J. Kim, The Relationship between Leisure Facilitators and Recreation Specialization of Winter Sports Participants. *Journal of Leisure and Recreation Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 2, 21-30. **(2013)**
- [16] Y. J. Lee, and M. L. Kim, The relationships between serious leisure, recreation specialization, flow, and happiness. *Korean Journal of Sport Science*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 2401–2411. **(2011)**
- [17] H. R. Kim, and G. U. Lee, The relationship between wellness and subjective well-being in the participation of the adults in the laughter activity program. *Journal of Sport and Leisure Studies*, Vol. 46, 901-910. **(2011)**