



Article

Family Leisure in Rural and Urban Environments: A Question of Context

M^a Ángeles Hernández-Prados ¹ and José Santiago Álvarez-Muñoz ^{2,*}

¹ Department of Theory and History of Education, Faculty of Education, The University of Murcia, 30100 Murcia, Spain

² Department of Method of Investigation and Diagnostic in Education, Faculty of Education, The University of Murcia, 30100 Murcia, Spain

* Correspondence: josesantiago.alvarez@um.es

Abstract: Family leisure increasingly plays a fundamental role as an educational resource that enhances human development and enriches intrafamily relationships. Theoretically, the conceptualization of free time and leisure, the typologies and agents of family leisure, and the benefits, difficulties, and satisfaction are discussed at home. This empirical study aims to describe the family leisure patterns shown by adolescents according to the context in which they reside, allowing a comparison of the rural leisure profile with the urban leisure profile, which are traditionally considered as differentiated contexts. The sample consisted of 1054 adolescents (51.6% boys and 48.4% girls) from Spain, stratified by place of residence (48.2% urban and 51.8% rural), who were administered the questionnaire “Evaluation of family leisure practices”. The data were processed using SPSS, and the results indicate that scarcity of time and economic resources in an urban setting and repetition and family conflicts in a rural setting are the most representative difficulties. In addition, the adolescents living in urban environments identify more benefits, have a more diversified practice, and have greater family satisfaction than the adolescents in rural areas. Both coincide with the importance of the family itself as a promoter of family leisure. In conclusion, the reconversion of social policies and the promotion of family educational procedures in rural areas to reduce the differences between the two contexts are highlighted.

Keywords: parent–child relationship; family education; leisure; urban area; rural area



Citation: Hernández-Prados, M.Á.; Álvarez-Muñoz, J.S. Family Leisure in Rural and Urban Environments: A Question of Context. *Societies* **2023**, *13*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13020035>

Academic Editor: Sandro Serpa

Received: 23 November 2022

Revised: 28 January 2023

Accepted: 31 January 2023

Published: 2 February 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The relevance of free time in the totality of citizenship is not something trivial nor a whim; rather, it is a matter of health and well-being, which is scientifically endorsed [1–3] and even recognized by the Spanish constitution. It is a right that has cost a lot of battling and a topic on which the debate on working hours, work–life balance policies, and other issues are based. Its political recognition has been the result of workers’ struggles during the socialist movement for an increase in citizens’ rights and freedoms, in which leisure is considered a universal right that must be protected by the political dimension for its protection and guarantee [4–6]. For Tyssedal [7], time as a value is a matter of law; therefore, any discriminations or inequalities with respect to it, which are understood as inequalities in free time for any reasons or social conditions, constitute a matter to be addressed by justice.

Although they are sometimes used interchangeably, it is one thing to have free time and non-work time to do something that a person chooses, and it is quite another to choose leisure, entertainment, and fun as an activity to be carried out that is free from any obligation. By definition, free time refers to “the time people have left after necessities have been taken care of, that is, after people have spent the time, they just have to spend for things such as sleep, work, and housework” (Tyssedal, 2021, p. 184) [7]. It is the period of time in which a person freely escapes from obligations to perform a voluntarily chosen activity [8].

As a definition, leisure is “the time an individual can organize and use according to his own needs and desires while respecting the principle of freedom of choice as a basic principle of free time use” (Petrović et al., 2018, p. 424) [9]. The non-work and voluntary activities that are engaged in for enjoyment are frequently defined as leisure activities and include a multitude of actions, such as volunteering; socializing; joining religious activities; participating in social clubs; cooperating in community, neighborhood, or tenants’ groups; engaging in archival, cultural, and heritage activities; and other activities, including shopping, reading, listening to music, and watching television [2]. Many of these leisure experiences can be carried out individually or collectively, and group-based activities are those with a greater educational component.

The latter activities are the ones that arouse the greatest educational interest as they emphasize the social character of human beings. Specifically, this work focuses on family leisure, which is understood as experiences that are freely and voluntarily developed inside and outside the home, integrating as far as possible more than one member of the family unit, and which contributes to both personal training and family satisfaction. To be categorized as a quality educational unit or resource, family leisure should be characterized by the following principles: choice voluntariness, communication–negotiation, sense of belonging, collectivity, contextualization, and subjectivity [10].

The previous scientific background shows how gender, age, nationality, family type, and economic situation are some of the variables that have a significant influence on the preferences of activities carried out during family leisure time. Thus, according to gender, while physical activity and technology are generally associated with the male gender, women tend to show a more active profile in social activities, family activities, and commercial and cultural leisure, perhaps due to cultural stereotypes [11]. In the case of age, time spent on family leisure decreases as age increases [12], although it is one of the most relevant areas of work for a healthy adolescence [9,13]. “Free time is a legal and valuable area that teenagers could find their own personalities” (Üstün et al., 2016, p. 25) [8]; because of this, knowing and delimiting the activities that adolescents perform and which of these activities are actually considered leisure has been, and continues to be, the subject of socio-educational research.

On the other hand, studies that analyze leisure according to family typology recognize the decrease in free time in single-parent families, affecting women in particular, as they face income and time poverty, which has negative consequences for the organization and life at home [3,7,14]. Social economic growth is unfortunately not always accompanied by an increase in free time that enriches the quality of life. On the contrary, the scarcity of free time has increased the infringement on consumer family leisure offers, being hardly accessible to low-income family units and opening a new social gap. In this way, it is clear that economic constraints are one of the elements that alter the possibilities of enjoying family leisure time [15].

Finally, leisure trends vary from one country to another, and from one environment to another, as they have an important cultural weight. Environmental conditions influence leisure practices in general and family leisure in particular. In this sense, the context of residence as urban or rural is one of the traditional variables to be considered. According to previous studies, the activity of walking for pleasure is common in urban and rural environments, but as a transportation option, it is significantly higher in cities [1]. Similarly, although total physical activity levels do not differ significantly, physical activity is incorporated more into leisure for urban residents and more into daily responsibilities for rural residents [16].

Theoretically, we share the new Multi-level Leisure Mechanisms Framework [2], which contemplates five basic principles: (1) leisure activities involve multiple components and simultaneous causal strands; (2) the mechanisms involved are non-linear and can involve positive and negative feedback loops; (3) leisure activities do not exist in isolation from their contexts; (4) complex systems do not exist in equilibrium and are not static; and (5) the mechanisms of action is incomplete. Taking into account the role played by context and

the relevance of leisure in adolescence, the present study poses the following question as a research problem: are there differences in the pattern of family leisure shown by adolescents living in rural environments when compared to those living in urban environments? In line with this, the research objectives are set out as follows:

1. To find out whether there are significant differences in adolescents' perceptions of the benefits and difficulties of family leisure activities depending on the context of residence (rural or urban).
2. To establish whether or not there are significant differences in the typologies and family leisure promotion agents between adolescents in urban and rural areas.
3. To find out whether the context of residence (rural or urban) significantly influences family satisfaction as perceived by adolescents in regard to their family life and family leisure.

1.1. Benefits and Difficulties in Family Leisure

Like any other educational resource that enhances the integral development of human being, family leisure presents lights and shadows, as well as benefits and difficulties. Of the multiple and varied benefits attributed to family leisure, those linked to relational coexistence and emotional satisfaction stand out [17]. In this sense, sharing time together improves cohesion, adaptability, and family functionality in general [18], and cohesive intrafamily relationships favor dialogue, increase confidence and self-esteem, and promote interaction and communication [19], thus breaking the excessive individualization that is sometimes transferred in households. Living together is not a sum of individual people but favors collectivity. This is something that the Melton's family activity model is very clear about when it integrates the theoretical construct of joint and parallel activities with that of family interaction [20]. Thus, despite the disadvantages assignable to a rural context, family leisure contributes to creating a sign of identity that further unites the members of a family [3].

Although each family autonomously chooses leisure activities according to their beliefs, objectives, and interests [21], it is considered a benefit to plan and structure the experiences to be carried out as a result of a consensus, thus encouraging the desire to participate in minors [19] and avoiding unilateral parental decisions that gives the experiences an imposing and authoritarian character. Thus, parents should teach children to value time and intelligently choose activities that best suit their abilities among those that favor rest, entertainment, and personal development [9].

Beyond the understanding of family leisure as related to academic performance and learning curricular content [22,23], it is a practice capable of fostering and enhancing creative thinking and other cognitive abilities [19]. In addition, family leisure destroys barriers of communication [24,25] and promotes better knowledge among members [24], more intense relationships [2], a reduction in family conflicts [19], or a more complete vision of the family as a unit [5]. Other elements also come into play, such as emotional language [24], which requires trust as a key element, and a certain continuity, although not repetition, of family practices [26], in addition to a commitment and an active role on the part of all family members, since a passive subject does not experience the same advantages in a dynamic scenario in which everyone is an essential part [25]. Hence, it is important to design activities that require contact with others, as they enhance the communicative dimension.

It is now time to mention the difficulties affecting the enjoyment of family leisure time. Firstly, difficulties related to the reconciliation of time should be mentioned, as an overload of family obligations greatly hinders intra-family dynamics, triggering the following problems: increased conflict [27]; high levels of anxiety and stress [24]; the difficulty with balancing work, school, and family time; and an imbalance in dedication by spending more time on school support than on enjoyment [28]. A series of difficulties leads to family distancing that minimizes the desire to spend time together [5,20], a disinterest that is aggravated if activities are chosen unilaterally and if they are constantly repeated [5].

Finally, there are also barriers to family leisure. In fact, during COVID-19-related confinement, despite an unimaginable increase in time spent at home, families identified teleworking, household obligations, repetition of activities, and family conflicts as the most persistent obstacles to family leisure [29].

During the COVID-19 pandemic, members of a family unit could be overloaded with responsibilities, regardless of whether they are adults or minors, which ended up saturating time, generating levels of discomfort and emotional exhaustion, and giving rise to intra-family difficulties [27]. Long working hours, coupled with the harshness of parenting subjected to new parental rules of protection and continuous accompaniment, left little room for rest and enjoyment. It can, thus, be seen that work–life balance strategies in today’s society are insufficient and unsatisfactory. The growing impossibility of maintaining a balance between work, school, and family time [28] forces families to resort to extracurricular activities, outsiders, or other family members to cover a child’s time until the end of the working day.

There is no doubt that the increase in homework is an element to consider; as described by Gil-Noguera et al. [30], it is tedious that children, after a school day, and their father and/or mother, after work, are obliged to spend the whole afternoon doing homework. The imbalance in the amount of time devoted to school support versus common enjoyment triggers family estrangement that minimizes the desire to spend time together [5,31].

On the other hand, sharing time always increases the possibility of conflict, as conflict is inherent to human beings and is mainly shown in relationships with others. In this sense, although a leisure experience is initially intended to promote enjoyment and satisfaction and to recover from the stress associated with the dizzying pace of life in developed societies [32], it is true that it can also contribute to increasing conflict, another underlying difficulty of family practices [24]. Conflicts that are generated because of differences or disagreements between members contribute to lower levels of satisfaction [33], especially if leisure experiences have been imposed on children without taking into account their opinions and interests. Thus, leisure does not remain untouched by the recognized generation gap between older family members and adolescents, leading to a decrease in relational time between parents and children to the benefit of an increase in peer group time.

Finally, another difficulty related to family leisure is the boredom it evokes in adolescents, a disinterest that is exacerbated if activities are chosen unilaterally and if they are constantly repeated [5]. A diversity in leisure experiences and negotiation with joint decision making are elements to consider in order to reduce this danger. However, families with low economic resources find it difficult to afford family leisure activities associated with consumption or tourism [31], which they must compensate for with creativity and ingenuity in other types of more homemade experiences, such as board games, hiking trails, sports, gardening, and crafts, without forgetting that the aim is to break the monotony and generate a satisfactory family gathering.

1.2. Types and Agents of Leisure Activities Preferred by Adolescents

In light of the previous section, leisure time is defined as a resource with socio-educational potential for individuals that transcends the mere quantification of available free time, giving it a certain value of use that confers quality to life itineraries. For adolescents, leisure provides unique opportunities for self-determination and transition to adult life [13]. Therefore, an appropriate use of leisure time involves responsibly choosing the leisure activities to be performed; it is a moral issue, as well as a right, that must be assumed personally and educationally.

Moreover, leisure opportunities are increasing considerably for young people in modern societies, which complicate decision making when choosing leisure activities. In fact, preferences for leisure activities are undergoing changes, especially during adolescence, which is understood as a volatile stage of identity crisis in which adolescents are strongly malleable to current popular trends. As Petrović et al. [9] point out, it is necessary to

provide education in self-planning, self-responsibility, and self-evaluation as the essential elements of a leisure culture.

Traditionally, because of archaic practices in which minors were relegated from social life, family leisure was defined as something which took place at home. Nowadays, this type of experience is known as domestic family leisure. Confinement due to COVID-19 has increased the value of this type of family leisure, offering simple low-cost experiences with little planning, such as talking, eating together, engaging in activities related to intrafamily solidarity, sharing household chores, playing board games, and having home cinema sessions, among others [18,22,34], since, in adolescence, there is an increasing tendency to experience activities outside the home, especially commercial, gastronomic, or tourist-type consumption activities [2,5]. However, despite this growing independence in matters of leisure, there is still a significant proportion of young people who depend, at least financially, on their parents [35].

In a society where ICTs are becoming increasingly prominent, it is not surprising that digital leisure is one of the most demanded leisure activities by adolescents, despite the dangers involved [35,36]. Regarding the rural–urban differences, the presence of daily sedentary behaviors as a consequence of more passive leisure time in front of screens is significantly higher in urban residents than in rural residents [16]. Thus, adolescent boredom and dissatisfaction toward active leisure is changing the “sporting nation” image of countries, such as Australia [37].

Previous literature often contrasts physical activity with a sedentary lifestyle associated with screen consumption, pitting the sports–natural leisure mode against the digital one. In short, the former is categorized as a healthy habit, and the latter is categorized as a potential risk that requires self-control and supervision, as well as external supervision in the case of minors. Through sports and physical activities, children can fulfill the three main functions of leisure [9]: rest (walking, swimming, sunbathing, hiking, etc.), entertainment or fun (dancing, circuits, games, etc.), and personality development (strengthening personality traits, such as constancy, self-confidence, discipline, and tolerance). Although the benefits attributed to healthy leisure (restorative, self-determined, and social) are recognized, adolescents are aware that an excess of this type of leisure can become unhealthy, causing potentially problematic self-control issues [13].

The exercise of leisure is not only related to physical activities; more and more initiatives are dedicated to the mind, feeding human culture with a variety of activities ranging from visits to museums to popular festivals [22]. Young people become aware of the psychological, cognitive, and emotional benefits of this type of cultural activities; although they attend few cultural events, they have highly integrated music, reading, cinema, and the performance of artistic activities in their lives [38]. During the pandemic crisis, pre-existing initiatives to digitize some cultural activities were boosted, as well as creativity to take on personal projects [39].

On the other hand, the capitalist movement expands the possibilities of family leisure in economic sectors, such as tourism, hotels, and restaurants, with shopping malls being a clear example of a space for leisure consumption with greater prominence among young people. These are usually located in areas of good economic status, foster the role of money as a driving force in the world of leisure, undermine the possibilities of diversified and generalized leisure, and establish class gaps based on the purchasing power of one's family or the scarcity of services in the immediate environment [6,15,40]. Reducing these differences depends on the dual action of social agents in planning sustainable and creative leisure activities, which are less dependent on financial situations, and in providing these experiences to those who, due to economic resources, are not able to engage in higher-cost activities [41].

Finally, home and school are the ideal spaces for the acquisition and consolidation of attitudes, values, and habits that are useful for everyday life [20,42]. Therefore, the family itself should take care of and plan for shared leisure time because it improves family coexistence, increases the quality of family life, and reduces conflicts between family

members [24,43]. In short, the family has to promote encounters that go beyond well-being, highlighting the educational role of family leisure.

1.3. Satisfaction with Family Life and Family Leisure Activities

Contributing to family satisfaction is another advantage associated with this type of leisure [5,18,43]. This relationship, which has been demonstrated in different types of cultures [44] and which presents discrepancies due to the rural–urban differences, with urban adolescents being more active than rural adolescents [37,45], is not mainly produced from long-term, one-off activities [18] but also from leisure occurring at home. Likewise, although comparative research is scarce, in rural environments, family legacy remains more consolidated than in urban areas, where there is a lower frequency, diversity, and quality of family leisure practices [46]. In contrast, family leisure is less planned, productive, and enriching in a rural environment, producing an impoverishment of family relationships, while in urban areas, there are more creative and innovative experiences [47].

Sharing family time does not necessarily mean optimizing it. Sometimes, parents are not prepared to make the most of family life. Sometimes, family members spend too much of their scarce free time on individual needs and interests, instead of giving priority to meeting each other and to sharing time [48]. In order to prevent intra-family isolation, it is essential to offer alternatives to technological resources to occupy leisure time [49]. However, family leisure does not run that risk, as it conceptually and indisputably involves collectivity, i.e., it necessarily requires an interaction with different members of the family unit performing a joint task [31].

On the other hand, family leisure necessarily has a playful, fun, disconnected, restful, or relaxing characteristic. In this sense, it contributes to the creation of an affective environment [50] that promotes subjective well-being, which in turn affects the quality of our individual [51] and family lives [43]. In fact, leisure is conceived as recovering from stress and emotional discomfort caused by an over-acceleration of the rhythm of life [32], and it is positively related to happiness and life satisfaction, being understood as an internal condition or a pleasurable state reached by a person who positively evaluates the vital moment in which they find themselves in [52].

More specifically, according to Williamson et al. [53], family leisure contributes to the enhancement of several aspects that make it possible for a family unit to function well and increase levels of satisfaction within family life. This relationship has been demonstrated in different types of cultures [44] to the point that family satisfaction is considered another advantage associated with this type of leisure [5,18,43]. Based on this, an educational challenge is to promote and raise awareness of the relevance of healthy leisure experiences in the family context, as well as parental training to be able to perform their task as educators effectively [17].

On the other hand, the subjective condition of the concept of life satisfaction further exposes it to socio-cultural fluctuations. Some studies in this direction point out that people are happiest when activities take place in an open space and involve tranquility, success, autonomy, and interest [5]. Thinking of a rural environment sometimes conjures up an idyllic image of peace, quiet, and tranquility, which has been used as a lure to increase tourism in rural environments.

The benefits, difficulties, typologies, agents, and family life and leisure satisfaction have been studied in different studies, mainly from a parental perspective. Therefore, the present research aims to collect information from minors by including an urban and a rural population in the same study, with the main purpose of evaluating the family leisure practices of adolescents and identifying significant differences, depending on residence in a rural or an urban context, in the following dimensions: benefits, difficulties, typologies, agents, and family life and leisure satisfaction.

2. Method

With the purpose of verifying the relationship between family leisure according to the context (rural or urban), a descriptive correlational, cross-sectional, and non-experimental quantitative research was designed to provide specific information regarding a specific socio-educational phenomenon: family leisure. It is outlined as evaluative research developed in the informal educational context of the family.

2.1. Sample

For the selection of the sample, the following inclusion criteria were used: being enrolled in one of the courses of Compulsory Secondary Education and being a resident of the autonomous community of the Region of Murcia, which is located in south-eastern Spain. In this sense, a non-probabilistic convenience sampling method was used to determine the sample based on the context of residence: rural or urban. Thus, a study population of 1054 adolescents (508 urban adolescents from 4 educational centers and 546 rural adolescents from 5 educational centers) from 9 educational centers (2 public and 2 subsidized-private) was constituted to form the sample size. These adolescents participated voluntarily and anonymously after the families of the adolescents had read and signed the informed consent form, thus taking into consideration the APA regulation 8.2 regarding the ethical principles of research in an educational setting. The sociodemographic data according to the context of rural or urban are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Sampling distribution of participants according to geographical context.

Socio-Demographic Variables	Categories	Urban n = 508 (48.2%)	Rural n = 546 (51.8%)
Gender	Male	261 (51.4%)	283 (51.8%)
	Female	247 (48.6%)	263 (48.2%)
Nationality	Spanish	490 (96.5%)	534 (97.8%)
	Foreign	18 (3.5%)	12 (2.2%)
Type of family	Nuclear	378 (74.4%)	436 (79.9%)
	Single Parent	30 (5.9%)	34 (6.2%)
	Extensive	39 (7.7%)	46 (8.4%)
	Assembled	60 (11.8%)	30 (5.5%)
Nationality of father	Spanish	440 (86.6%)	478 (87.5%)
	Foreign	65 (12.8%)	67 (12.3%)
Nationality of mother	Spanish	433 (85.2%)	467 (85.5%)
	Foreign	75 (14.8%)	79 (14.5%)
Age of father	21 to 30 years old	2 (0.4%)	4 (0.7%)
	31 to 40 years old	67 (13.2%)	68 (12.5%)
	41 to 50 years old	316 (62.2%)	344 (63%)
	51 to 60 years old	107 (21.1%)	118 (21.6%)
Ager of Mother	21 to 30 years old	5 (1.0%)	7 (1.3%)
	31 to 40 years old	115 (22.6%)	114 (20.9%)
	41 to 50 years old	332 (65.4%)	362 (66.3%)
	51 to 60 years old	53 (10.4%)	60 (11.0%)

2.2. Instrument

A questionnaire was used for this research: the “Evaluation of family leisure practices. Questionnaire for adolescents” was designed and developed through a three-step process: literature review, expert panel validation, and inter-rater validation. Based on the opinion of 17 experts and the evaluation of 14 judges of the initial model, it was possible to elaborate the final version, which composed of a total of 48 items organized into five dimensions: difficulties, benefits, typologies, agents, and family life and leisure satisfaction. The items

were rated on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 4 with the following values: not at all (1), a little (2), quite a lot (3), and a lot (4) [54].

According to an evaluation of the psychometric properties of the questionnaire, it has a Cronbach's α coefficient of 0.959 at the general level, which is identified as very high [55]. Considerable reliability is also obtained for the different dimensions, with the following descending order: difficulties (0.923), benefits (0.897), family life and leisure satisfaction (0.837), typologies (0.736), and agents (0.723), demonstrating a high consistency of the instrument.

2.3. Procedure

To implement the questionnaire, 243 secondary schools were initially contacted by email to request their participation, inform them of the research, and show them the questionnaire. After a period of 14 days, once the initial contact had been established, nine centers were willing to participate, and a meeting was held to inform them about the ethical parameters, the application guidelines, and the time frame. The centers were then visited to give an informative talk to potential adolescent participants, thus facilitating the subsequent completion of the questionnaire. The data were collected during the nine visits carried out in 30 days and, subsequently, in order to have the data ready for analysis, the following types of responses were removed: non-completion, more than 50% of the questionnaire unanswered, and poor completion of the questionnaire.

2.4. Data Analysis

Once the questionnaires had been collected and subsequently coded, the information was entered into the SPSS version 25 statistical program. Initially, descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were calculated for all the items and their overall scores according to the context grouping variable, establishing two differentiated groups: rural and urban. Subsequently, normality statistics were performed to determine that the parametric inferential statistics should be applied since; in addition, the N is greater than 30, and it was confirmed, from the use of the Levene's test, that there is equality of variances or homoscedasticity [56]. Therefore, in order to determine whether there are significant differences depending on the context, Student's t -test was performed with a statistical significance level of $p < 0.050$. Finally, in order to determine the degree of magnitude of the existing relationships, Cohen's d -test was applied to determine the size of the effect of the differences, and Cohen's stipulations were followed, establishing the following relationship according to the results obtained: non-existent ($d < 0.20$), weak ($0.20 < d < 0.50$), moderate ($0.50 < d < 0.80$), or large ($0.80 < d$). We set the typical value at the limit of weak and moderate ($d = 0.500$). Both the significance value (p) and the effect size (d) were considered, as there are several authors who argue that the significance level, despite obtaining a low or non-existent effect size, must be considered when interpreting and discussing data [57].

3. Results

The results obtained based on the dimensions of the questionnaire are presented below in the following order: difficulties, benefits, typologies, and satisfaction. The descriptive and inferential results are presented according to the main study variable (context: rural or urban).

3.1. Objective 1: Difficulties and Benefits of Family Leisure in Rural and Urban Contexts

As shown in Table 2, by focusing on the descriptive data, for both rural and urban adolescents, meaningless tradition, lack of time, and not leaving one's environment are the difficulties most frequently observed in families in both areas.

When focusing attention on the contrast statistics, there are significant differences according to the context (rural or urban) in time scarcity ($p = 0.000$), economic problems ($p = 0.000$), repetition of activities ($p = 0.024$), conflicts ($p = 0.001$), and perception of importance ($p = 0.000$). The identification of conflicts and the repetitiveness of activities

as difficulties are significantly more perceived by the adolescents from rural areas; for the other difficulties, they are always perceived more by those residing in urban areas. Specifically, taking into account the Cohen's d value, which establishes the magnitude of the meanings found, it is determined that these difficulties have a weak strength of association since they do not reach the mean value ($d = 0.500$). Finally, it has to be mentioned that the area of residence is not a significant variable associated with the following difficulties: different tastes ($p = 0.266$), same environment ($p = 0.837$), unilateral parental decision ($p = 0.169$), preference for individual leisure ($p = 0.723$), and tradition ($p = 0.121$).

Table 2. Descriptive and inferential statistics of family leisure difficulties as a function of context.

Items	Category	\bar{X}	σ	t	F	$p(1)$	$d(2)$
In my family ...							
Spend little time together as a family	Urban	2.73	0.994	5.560	0.266	0.000 **	0.344 *
	Rural	2.39	0.974				
Have different hobbies or interests with regard to leisure practices	Urban	2.53	0.967	−1.113	0.348	0.266	-
	Rural	2.60	0.944				
Our economy does not allow us to do some leisure activities as a family	Urban	2.28	1.161	3.687	25.749	0.000 **	0.225 *
	Rural	2.03	1.056				
All the leisure activities we do come from our immediate environment	Urban	2.66	0.977	−0.205	0.439	0.837	-
	Rural	2.65	0.956				
Parents decide on the type of activities to do	Urban	2.37	0.951	1.377	1.376	0.169	-
	Rural	2.29	0.999				
Preference is given to individual leisure (reading, computer ...)	Urban	2.57	1.045	−0.355	1.133	0.723	-
	Rural	2.56	1.016				
Family leisure activities are repetitive	Urban	2.10	0.965	−2.254	7.060	0.024 *	0.131 **
	Rural	2.23	1.009				
Conflicts, tensions and feelings of discomfort tend to appear in family leisure activities.	Urban	1.68	0.959	−3.289	0.158	0.001 **	0.204 **
	Rural	1.88	0.998				
There are activities that are a tradition in the family with no sense	Urban	3.01	1.027	1.554	1.739	0.121	-
	Rural	2.91	1.062				
They do not attach importance to family time	Urban	2.36	1.239	3.962	22.348	0.000 **	0.250 *
	Rural	2.06	1.150				
GLOBAL	Urban	2.37	0.470	0.051	2.528	0.093	-
	Rural	2.32	0.524				

(1) * $0.01 < p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.05$. (2) * In favor of rural; ** In favor of urban.

According to the descriptive data (Table 3), the adolescents in rural and urban areas consider improved communication, family unity, and coexistence as the main benefits obtained from the practice of family leisure. However, the adolescents in both contexts are least likely to identify conflict resolution, fostering creativity and innovation, and greater respect for parents as the benefits of family leisure. In terms of significance values, significant mean differences were found for all items in favor of the adolescents living in urban areas. However, the magnitude of the effect size is not considerable in any of the items as the typical value ($d = 0.500$) is not reached.

3.2. Objective 2: Typologies and Agents of Family Leisure in Rural and Urban Contexts

Table 4 shows the contrast statistics for family leisure typologies according to the context of residence: rural or urban. First of all, addressing the descriptive data, the adolescents in both rural and urban areas identify their most practiced modalities as gastronomic, commercial, and digital leisure activities, while spiritual, solidarity, domestic, and cultural leisure activities are the least practiced. Secondly, digital leisure ($p = 0.354$) and spiritual leisure ($p = 0.515$) do not show significant differences according to the context

of residence. However, for the rest of the typologies, significant differences are obtained in favor of the adolescents residing in urban areas, who show a significantly greater practice than those residing in rural areas with respect to the following typologies: sports, naturalistic, tourist, cultural, popular, domestic, gastronomic, solidarity, commercial, and other types. Regarding Cohen's *d*-value, it is worth mentioning that significant differences, with a considerably high association value, are found in naturalistic leisure ($d = 0.449$), in popular leisure ($d = 0.475$), and at the global level ($d = 0.474$).

Table 3. Descriptive and inferential statistics of family leisure benefits as a function of context.

Items	Category	\bar{X}	σ	<i>t</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i> (1)	<i>d</i> (2)
My participation in family leisure activities promotes ...							
Improving relationships with parents	Urban	3.08	0.963	3.153	0.351	0.002 **	0.199 *
	Rural	2.89	0.940				
Getting to know family members better	Urban	3.07	0.966	3.263	0.619	0.001 **	0.195 *
	Rural	2.88	0.978				
Communication between family members	Urban	3.30	0.858	2.955	0.125	0.003 **	0.174 *
	Rural	3.15	0.859				
Conflict resolution	Urban	2.95	1.010	3.516	0.270	0.000 **	0.222 *
	Rural	2.73	0.969				
Togetherness as a family unit	Urban	3.30	0.887	4.694	0.208	0.000 **	0.285 *
	Rural	3.04	0.933				
A healthy lifestyle	Urban	3.08	0.900	3.780	5.324	0.000 **	0.234 *
	Rural	2.86	0.975				
Diversity of different types of leisure activities	Urban	2.96	0.922	4.157	7.467	0.000 **	0.257 *
	Rural	2.72	0.944				
A time for fun and relaxation	Urban	3.20	0.890	2.952	0.632	0.003 **	0.177 *
	Rural	3.04	0.916				
The opportunity to express emotions	Urban	2.83	1.050	3.263	0.856	0.001 **	0.209 *
	Rural	2.61	1.057				
Motivation and desire to spend more time as a family	Urban	3.13	0.993	2.180	3.397	0.029 *	0.132 *
	Rural	3.00	0.973				
GLOBAL	Urban	3.08	0.685	4.683	0.142	0.000 **	0.294 *
	Rural	2.89	0.673				

(1) * $0.01 < p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.05$. (2) * In favor of rural; ** In favor of urban.

In regard to agents, as seen in Table 5, we can identify that the adolescents in both rural and urban areas identify the family itself, shopping centers, and sports clubs as the main agents that promote family leisure, while other families, public administrations, associations, and private companies are perceived as the least active agents.

In regard to the results obtained from the Student's *t*-test, there are no significant differences between the rural and urban adolescents in their perception of the following agents: public administrations ($p = 0.403$), educational centers ($p = 0.105$), sports clubs ($p = 0.888$), associations ($p = 0.373$), shopping centers ($p = 0.892$), private companies ($p = 0.810$), and other families ($p = 0.098$). However, there are significant differences with respect to the family itself, which is more often identified by the urban adolescents, and with respect to other agents, which is better perceived by those living in rural areas. In both cases, according to the value of the effect size (Cohen's *d*), the magnitude of the associations is weak ($d < 0.500$).

3.3. Objective 3: Satisfaction with Family Life and Family Leisure in Rural and Urban Contexts

Finally, Table 6 addresses the dimension of satisfaction with family life and family leisure. The adolescents in rural areas have an excellent and highly satisfied family life

and have obtained important achievements in this regard, as indicated by the items. As for those residing in urban areas, they show the same results, but they also stress the importance of family leisure as a means of quality. From the significance values ($p = 0.000$ for all items), it is established that the urban adolescents have significantly higher family life and family leisure satisfaction than the rural residents. Furthermore, according to the effect size (Cohen's d), in all cases, a considerable strength of association is found, which is close to or above the moderate value ($d = 0.500$).

Table 4. Descriptive and inferential statistics of family leisure typologies as a function of the context.

Items	Category	\bar{X}	σ	t	F	p(1)	d(2)
How often do you participate in this type of leisure?							
Sporting leisure (practising sport or physical activity)	Urban	2.59	1.143	2.181	0.271	0.029 *	0.140 *
	Rural	2.43	1.131				
Naturalistic leisure (going out to the forest, countryside ...)	Urban	2.58	0.992	5.693	4.268	0.000 **	0.449 *
	Rural	2.24	0.956				
Tourist leisure (summer trip, visit to a city ...)	Urban	2.97	0.958	3.966	12.015	0.000 **	0.242 *
	Rural	2.73	1.024				
Cultural leisure (museums, exhibitions, concerts ...)	Urban	2.21	1.002	4.223	1.989	0.000 **	0.262 *
	Rural	1.95	0.977				
Popular leisure (popular festivals in a city, village or neighbourhood ...)	Urban	2.95	0.992	6.148	3.683	0.000 **	0.475 *
	Rural	2.58	0.979				
Domestic leisure (board games, handicrafts ...)	Urban	2.40	1.050	2.084	1.874	0.037 *	0.125 *
	Rural	2.27	1.022				
Gastronomic leisure (family meals ...)	Urban	3.20	0.894	3.458	3.325	0.001 **	0.219 *
	Rural	2.99	1.019				
Solidarity leisure (NGOs, associations, voluntary work ...)	Urban	1.83	0.960	2.292	1.126	0.022 *	0.148 *
	Rural	1.69	0.921				
Digital leisure (Internet, watching films, series ...)	Urban	3.18	1.584	0.927	0.596	0.354	-
	Rural	3.10	0.959				
Commercial leisure (shopping, shopping centre ...)	Urban	3.08	0.888	2.672	1.783	0.008 **	0.163 *
	Rural	2.93	0.951				
Spiritual leisure (Eucharist, catechesis, convivences ...)	Urban	1.75	1.027	0.652	1.127	0.515	-
	Rural	1.79	0.984				
Other	Urban	1.78	1.049	-2.011	4.326	0.045 *	0.120 *
	Rural	1.65	1.102				
GLOBAL	Urban	2.61	0.555	5.806	7.322	0.000 **	0.474 *
	Rural	2.42	0.511				

(1) * $0.01 < p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.05$. (2) * In favor of rural; ** In favor of urban.

Table 5. Descriptive and inferential statistics of family leisure agents as a function of context.

Items	Category	\bar{X}	σ	t	F	p(1)	d(2)
The family leisure activities I do are managed or promoted by ...							
Public Administrations (city councils, councils, town councils ...)	Urban	1.65	0.897	0.837	0.073	0.403	-
	Rural	1.60	0.881				
EducationalCenter	Urban	1.88	1.049	1.620	3.127	0.105	-
	Rural	1.78	0.978				
Sports clubs	Urban	2.15	1.174	0.141	0.368	0.888	-
	Rural	2.14	1.162				

Table 5. Cont.

Items	Category	\bar{X}	σ	t	F	p(1)	d(2)
Associations (youth centres, scouts . . .)	Urban	1.62	0.934	−0.892	7.033	0.373	-
	Rural	1.67	1.029				
Shopping mall	Urban	2.42	1.183	0.136	0.522	0.892	-
	Rural	2.41	1.166				
Private companies	Urban	1.67	0.995	0.240	0.797	0.810	-
	Rural	1.66	0.969				
My own family	Urban	3.39	0.915	3.231	12.117	0.001 **	0.201 *
	Rural	3.19	1.065				
Other families	Urban	1.45	0.867	−1.656	5.058	0.098	-
	Rural	1.55	0.919				
Other agents	Urban	1.37	0.814	−3.334	33.310	0.001 **	0.210 **
	Rural	1.56	0.986				

(1) * $0.01 < p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.05$. (2) * In favor of rural; ** In favor of urban.

Table 6. Descriptive and inferential statistics of satisfaction with family life and family leisure as a function of context.

Ítems	Category	\bar{X}	σ	t	F	p(1)	d(2)
Regarding my family life and my family leisure . . .							
In most cases family life is close to ideal	Urban	3.27	0.898	3.862	6.754	0.000 **	0.446 *
	Rural	2.84	0.964				
Family life conditions are excellent	Urban	3.37	0.827	4.829	1.434	0.000 **	0.495 *
	Rural	3.01	0.931				
There is a high satisfaction with family life	Urban	3.41	0.829	4.775	3.137	0.000 **	0.497 *
	Rural	3.01	0.917				
Important things have been achieved for family life	Urban	3.24	0.892	3.931	0.703	0.000 **	0.438 *
	Rural	2.92	0.953				
I would not change almost anything about family life	Urban	2.99	1.045	3.241	7.891	0.000 **	0.496 *
	Rural	2.48	1.089				
Family leisure activities are an important part of family life	Urban	3.24	0.965	4.914	4.718	0.000 **	0.506 *
	Rural	2.74	0.992				
Family leisure activities add quality to family leisure	Urban	3.34	0.908	5.794	7.481	0.000 **	0.555 *
	Rural	2.80	1.005				
GLOBAL	Urban	3.35	0.680	5.910	5.319	0.000 **	0.565 *
	Rural	2.79	0.742				

(1) * $0.01 < p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.05$. (2) * In favor of rural; ** In favor of urban.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

The results of this study denote the persistence of important context-dependent differences which, despite the modernization of agrarian spaces and globalization, persist in sociological domains, such as family leisure. Previous studies support this differentiation [1,16,37,46,47,58,59].

In response to research objective 1, this rural–urban adolescent family leisure participation gap is mainly and significantly due to time scarcity, economic hardship, and how little family time is valued in urban contexts, and repetitive activities and conflicts in family leisure activities in rural contexts. First, regarding urban contexts, on the one hand, the over-acceleration of city life sometimes translates into disinterest and scarcity of time for family [60]; hence, people spend more time on individualized leisure than on family leisure [61]. On the other hand, as a result of the large number of leisure offers provided by

companies in cities, commercial, gastronomic, tourist, and cultural leisure experiences are preferred, which are usually linked to the purchasing power of families [48]; thus, it is not surprising that economic resource is a constraint that is more significantly valued by the urban adolescents.

Second, as evidenced, the limitations presented in rural contexts for family leisure differ from those expressed by adolescents living in cities. In contrast to what has been pointed out by others, who advocate better relationships in rural contexts and attribute leisure limitations to lower socioeconomic levels [16,62], the data obtained for this study implicate boredom that is aroused by the reiteration of experiences, rather than the scarce diversity in family leisure offer in rural environments [63].

In relation to the benefits of family leisure, the results are always in favor of the urban resident adolescents, perhaps because, as Bernand [47] points out, family conflicts reduce the vision of family leisure as a pedagogical tool, leaving it as a mere entertainment. However, in both cases, family communication and union are the benefits most highlighted by the adolescents in both rural and urban environments; in fact, as Melton [20] argues, good communication from family leisure leads to a representation of the family with more uniqueness. Another aspect to highlight is the entertainment dimension; an activity that banishes boredom and makes way for fun makes family members take a positive regard toward family leisure and, consequently, wish to stay longer as a family [25,43].

Below, the results relating to objective 2 of the study are discussed. Despite the significant amount of studies that sustain a rural environment as an idyllic place for personal and family development [64–66], attributing to it a series of benefits that urban residents long for [46], the data show the presence of a more active family leisure profile in urban populations, as previously pointed out by Zenic et al. [59] and Williamson et al. [53], in the totality of typologies, except for digital and spiritual leisure.

Far from what previous studies suggest, which highlights sports and natural family leisure opportunities in rural contexts [65], outdoor recreational activities present significantly higher means in the urban adolescents than the rural youths; these results are in agreement with Chen and Tsai [17]. It is also necessary to highlight that no significant differences are found in the practice of digital leisure, which are contrary to current research that argues that rural areas are obsolete in terms of technologies, showing the extensibility of technologies in both rural and urban areas [67].

This study confirms the role played by families themselves as the main promoters of family leisure, above external agents, such as schools or other public institutions. This valuation of the family as a family leisure promotion agent is more important for the adolescents in urban areas, as the supremacy of tradition in rural environments limits the capacity for creation, planning, and consensus that families have with respect to family practices [53,59]. In addition, shopping malls as a dynamic environment for family leisure outside the home are highlighted by the adolescents in both rural and urban contexts, raising the consumerist value that prevails in both individual and family leisure and transforming the consumption trends in rural areas [68].

Although the data do not show significant differences, cities have more businesses and services, which make it possible to diversify these practices both at the family and personal levels. Thus, it broadens the scope of possibilities that families have within an urban environment [69]. In this sense, Machado-Rodrigues et al. [70] concluded that the economic situation of an area can influence access to recreational facilities and leisure activities, and Huntsinger et al. [58] identified more variety of leisure activities in urban adolescents (bowling alley, art galleries, karaoke bars, cinema, swimming pool, concert spaces, public library, cafeteria, theater, gym, dance club, and tennis courts) than rural adolescents, who dedicate more time to family tasks. In the same direction, it is recognized that urban adolescents devote more time to leisure, and rural adolescents devote more time to daily responsibilities, even having to collaborate financially with their family [16,71].

Finally, research objective 3 is addressed. Satisfaction derived from family leisure is significantly higher in the urban adolescents than the rural adolescents, which contrasts

with studies that define a rural family life as being more peaceful and away from urban over-acceleration, more equitably balanced between work and family, more conducive to bonding, and more conducive to encountering others [71]. The results of this study do not coincide with this position, identifying more with the perspective that indicates a possible impoverishment of relationships [16,62].

Although this research represents an advance in family leisure studies, during the process, some limitations or elements for improvement related to the very nature of the research are identified. As a quantitative cross-sectional study, this makes it impossible to know the magnitude of subsequent findings as they evolve, nor can cause-effect relationships be established. With regard to the sample, since information was collected from a single member of each family unit and not from the complete composition, this prevents comparative analyses. With regard to the instrument, there are few specific questionnaires on family leisure that could serve as a support and reference for this study, which further delayed the course of the research by having to create a completely new instrument.

In conclusion, it can be pointed out that the urban adolescents practice various forms of family leisure more frequently than the rural adolescents and are also more aware of both the difficulties and the benefits they bring. They are also significantly more satisfied with their family life; thus, improving the family leisure of rural adolescents not only contributes to their healthy development, but also to a more positive appreciation of the parent-child relationship and family life. It seems that “Ascribed rural status may cause multiple discriminated living conditions, which, in turn, affect his or her leisure engagement”, as well expressed by Chen and Tsai [62]. However, in future research, it may be of interest to complement this information by qualitatively inquiring into the reasons why family leisure is less valued by rural adolescents from a problem-focused perspective, or what aspects urban adolescents highlight about family leisure, as motivations for these aspects can be a source of satisfaction, from a positive perspective.

Finally, the present study also raises several questions that can provide direction for further research on this topic: Do urban and rural adolescents value family leisure equally? What family leisure opportunities are presented to adolescents in rural contexts? What are their preferences? What are the main obstacles to family leisure experiences in both urban and rural contexts? How much time do they spend on family leisure in both contexts? Are there differences in the values and capacities attributed to leisure between urban and rural adolescents? How do they affect school performance? What role do schools play in the development of family leisure? All of these require specific consideration in future research.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, M.Á.H.-P. and J.S.Á.-M.; methodology, M.Á.H.-P. and J.S.Á.-M.; software, J.S.Á.-M.; validation, M.Á.H.-P. and J.S.Á.-M.; formal analysis, J.S.Á.-M.; investigation, M.Á.H.-P. and J.S.Á.-M.; resources, M.Á.H.-P. and J.S.Á.-M.; data curation, J.S.Á.-M.; writing—original draft preparation, M.Á.H.-P. and J.S.Á.-M.; writing—review and editing M.Á.H.-P. and J.S.Á.-M.; visualization, M.Á.H.-P. and J.S.Á.-M.; supervision, M.Á.H.-P. and J.S.Á.-M.; project administration, M.Á.H.-P.; funding acquisition, M.Á.H.-P. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study due to the research study went through the doctoral committee evaluating the ethical aspects.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: Data sharing not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Carlson, S.A.; Whitfield, G.P.; Peterson, E.L.; Ussery, E.N.; Watson, K.B.; Berrigan, D.; Fulton, J.E. Geographic and urban–rural differences in walking for leisure and transportation. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* **2018**, *55*, 887–895. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Fancourt, D.; Aughterson, H.; Finn, S.; Walker, E.; Steptoe, A. How leisure activities affect health: A narrative review and multi-level theoretical framework of mechanisms of action. *Lancet Psychiatry* **2021**, *8*, 329–339. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Giurge, L.M.; Whillans, A.V.; West, C. Why time poverty matters for individuals, organisations and nations. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* **2020**, *4*, 993–1003. Available online: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-020-0920-z> (accessed on 1 November 2022). [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Aguirre, P.S. El reconocimiento del derecho al disfrute del tiempo libre en la Declaración Universal de Derechos Humanos. *Aportes Y Transf.* **2021**, *19*, 1–12. Available online: <http://bit.ly/3XHHdH> (accessed on 1 November 2022).
- Álvarez-Muñoz, J.S. El Ocio y la Satisfacción Familiar en la Población Adolescente de la Región de Murcia. Doctoral Thesis, Universidad de Murcia, Murcia, Spain, 2020.
- Lázaro, Y.; Madariaga, A.; Lazcano, I.; Doistua, J. El derecho al ocio: Un derecho humano en ocasiones desconocido. *Rev. Siglo Cero* **2012**, *43*, 1–13. Available online: <https://bit.ly/3wi3Xpy> (accessed on 3 November 2022).
- Tyssedal, J.J. The Value of Time Matters for Temporal Justice. *Ethical Theory Moral Pract.* **2021**, *24*, 183–196. [CrossRef]
- Üstün, Ü.D.; Kalkavan, A.; Demirel, M. Investigating free time motivation scores of physical education and faculty of education students according to different variables. *Online J. Recreat. Sport* **2016**, *2*, 18–26. Available online: <https://www.tojsat.net/journals/tojras/volumes/tojras-volume02-i01.pdf#page=23> (accessed on 1 November 2022).
- Petrović, J.; Cenić, S.; Dimitrijević, D. Sports and physical engagement of elementary school students in their leisure time. *Facta Univ. Ser. Phys. Educ. Sport* **2018**, *16*, 421–434. [CrossRef]
- Álvarez-Muñoz, J.S.; Hernández-Prados, M.Á. Ocio familiar en tiempos COVID: Reflexión desde una nueva realidad. In *La nueva Normalidad Educativa, Educando en Tiempos de Pandemia*; Hernández-Prados, M.Á., Belmonte, M.L., Eds.; Dykinson: Madrid, Spain, 2021; pp. 50–60.
- Amado Alonso, D.; Sánchez Miguel, P.A.; Leo Marcos, F.M.; Sánchez Oliva, D.; García Calvo, T. Diferencias de género en la motivación y percepción de utilidad del deporte escolar. *Rev. Int. De Med. Y Cienc. De La Act. Física Y Del Deporte* **2014**, *14*, 651–664. Available online: <http://bit.ly/3kwR1cJ> (accessed on 1 November 2022).
- Hajdu, G.; Sik, E. Age, period, and cohort differences in work centrality and work values. *Societies* **2018**, *8*, 11. [CrossRef]
- Weybright, E.H.; Son, J.S.; Caldwell, L.L. “To have healthy leisure is to have balance”: Young adults’ conceptualization of healthy and unhealthy leisure. *J. Leis. Res.* **2019**, *50*, 239–259. [CrossRef]
- Seymour, G.; Masuda, Y.J.; Williams, J.; Schneider, K. Household and child nutrition outcomes among the time and income poor in rural Bangladesh. *Glob. Food Secur.* **2019**, *20*, 82–92. [CrossRef]
- Dattilo, J. An Education Model to Promote Inclusive Leisure Services. *J. Park Recreat. Adm.* **2018**, *36*, 1–13. [CrossRef]
- Robertson, M.C.; Song, J.; Taylor, W.C.; Durand, C.P.; Basen-Engquist, K.M. Urban-rural differences in aerobic physical activity, muscle strengthening exercise, and screen-time sedentary behavior. *J. Rural. Health* **2018**, *34*, 401–410. [CrossRef]
- Álvarez-Muñoz, J.S.; Hernández-Prados, M.A. El desarrollo de las capacidades desde el ocio familiar. *Rev. Electrónica Interuniv. De Form. Del Profr.* **2022**, *25*, 35–48. [CrossRef]
- Buswell, L.; Zabriskie, R.B.; Lundberg, N.; Hawkins, A.J. The relationship between father involvement in family leisure and family functioning: The importance of daily family leisure. *Leis. Sci.* **2012**, *34*, 172–190. [CrossRef]
- Martín Quintana, J.C.; Alemán Falcón, J.; Calcines Piñero, M.A.; Izquierdo Clemente, D. Analysis of family shared leisure time in early childhood and their relation with parental competencies. *Early Child Dev. Care* **2018**, *188*, 1580–1592. [CrossRef]
- Melton, K.K. Family activity model: Crossroads of activity environment and family interactions in family leisure. *Leis. Sci.* **2017**, *39*, 457–473. [CrossRef]
- Costa, F.M.; Pereira, A.P.; Araujo, N. The experience of family leisure. *Rev. Da SPAGESP* **2020**, *21*, 97–110. Available online: <https://bit.ly/34abhJb> (accessed on 2 November 2022).
- Hernández Prados, M.Á.; Álvarez Muñoz, J.S. Family leisure and academic achievement. Perception of the families. *Ital. J. Educ. Res.* **2019**, *23*, 86–105. Available online: <http://bit.ly/3vBtECa> (accessed on 2 November 2022).
- Park, H.; Lee, K.S. The association of family structure with health behavior, mental health, and perceived academic achievement among adolescents: A 2018 Korean nationally representative survey. *BMC Public Health* **2020**, *20*, 510. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Hodge, C.; Bocarro, J.N.; Henderson, K.A.; Zabriskie, R.; Parcel, T.L.; Kanters, M.A. Family leisure: An integrative review of research from select journals. *J. Leis. Res.* **2015**, *47*, 577–600. [CrossRef]
- Townsend, J.A.; Van Puymbroeck, M.; Zabriskie, R.B. The core and balance model of family leisure functioning: A systematic review. *Leis. Sci.* **2017**, *39*, 436–456. [CrossRef]
- Lee, K.J.; Lee, S.Y. Cognitive appraisal theory, memorable tourism experiences, and family cohesion in rural travel. *J. Travel Tour. Mark.* **2021**, *38*, 399–412. [CrossRef]
- Prime, H.; Wade, M.; Browne, D.T. Risk and resilience in family well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Am. Psychol.* **2020**, *75*, 631–643. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Lau, Y.K.; Lai Chong Ma, J.; San Wan, P.; Ka Ying Wong, T.; Yin Lai, L. Work-family conflicts, family leisure activities, and family functioning in hong kong. *Int. Employ. Relat. Rev.* **2012**, *18*, 82–100. Available online: <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/ielapa.912595275052210> (accessed on 1 November 2022).

29. Álvarez-Muñoz, J.S.; Hernández-Prados, M.A.; Belmonte, M.L. Percepción de las familias sobre los obstáculos y dificultades del ocio familiar durante el confinamiento. *Pedagog. Social. Rev. Interuniv.* **2023**, *42*, 167–180. [CrossRef]
30. Gil-Noguera, J.A.; Hernández-Prados, M.Á.; Álvarez-Muñoz, J.S. Tareas escolares en tiempos de confinamiento COVID-19. Percepción familiar en función de las variables escolares. *Rev. De Investig. Educ.* **2023**, *41*, 281–298. [CrossRef]
31. Melton, K.K.; Hodge, C.J.; Duerden, M.D. Ecology of family experiences: Contextualizing family leisure for human development & family relations. *J. Leis. Res.* **2022**, *53*, 112–131. [CrossRef]
32. Mansour, S.; Mohanna, D. Mediating role of job stress between work-family conflict, work-leisure conflict, and employees' perception of service quality in the hotel industry in France. *J. Hum. Resour. Hosp. Tour.* **2018**, *17*, 154–174. [CrossRef]
33. Cifuentes-Faura, J. Consecuencias en los niños del cierre de escuelas por COVID-19: El papel del gobierno, profesores y padres. *Rev. Int. De Educ. Para La Justicia Soc.* **2021**, *9*, 1–12. Available online: <http://bit.ly/3iVcCuY> (accessed on 1 November 2022).
34. Behar-Zusman, V.; Chavez, J.V.; Gattamorta, K. Developing a measure of the impact of COVID-19 social distancing on household conflict and cohesion. *Family Process* **2020**, *59*, 1045–1059. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
35. Tardivo, G.; Suárez-Vergne, Á.; Cano, E.D. Los jóvenes adoran el ocio digital: Un estudio cuantitativo sobre los jóvenes universitarios y el consumo. *Espac. Abierto* **2018**, *27*, 75–93. Available online: <https://bit.ly/3WqwaFb> (accessed on 1 November 2022).
36. Valenzuela Bandín, Á.L.; García, R.M.; Arias, D.M.E. Prácticas de ocio y tiempo libre de los adolescentes en Galicia: Análisis y reflexiones en clave socioeducativa. *Bordón. Rev. De Pedagog.* **2021**, *73*, 161–177. [CrossRef]
37. Gordon, W.R.; Caltabiano, M.L. Urban-rural differences in adolescent self-esteem, leisure boredom, and sensation-seeking as predictors of leisure-time usage and satisfaction. *Adolescence* **1996**, *31*, 883. Available online: <https://bit.ly/3WqihGQ> (accessed on 1 November 2022).
38. Sanz, E.; Valdemoros, M.Á.; Duque, C.; García-Castilla, F.J. Ocio cultural juvenil, indicador subjetivo del desarrollo humano. *Cauriensia XIV* **2019**, *14*, 491–511. [CrossRef]
39. Marques, L.; Giolo, G. Cultural leisure in the time of COVID-19: Impressions from the Netherlands. *World Leis. J.* **2020**, *62*, 344–348. [CrossRef]
40. Maldonado Martínez, G.A.; Cuenca Amigo, J. Espacios de ocio para el desarrollo humano. *TERRA: Revista de Desarrollo Local* **2021**, *14*, 628–644. Available online: <https://bit.ly/3XpFQB7> (accessed on 2 November 2022). [CrossRef]
41. Martínez García, R.; Caballo Villar, M.B.; Varela Crespo, L. El ocio en el medio natural como promotor de la conexión emocional con la naturaleza. Un estudio en clave ambiental con adolescentes pontevedreses (Galicia-España). *Pensam. Educ. Rev. De Investig. Latinoam. (PEL)* **2020**, *57*, 1–16. [CrossRef]
42. Ponce-de-León-Elizondo, A.; Sanz-Arazuri, E.; Sáenz-de-Jubera-Ocón, M.; Alonso-Ruiz, R.A. La jornada lectiva a debate para (re) convertir los centros educativos en espacios para el ocio. *Rev. De Investig. Educ.* **2019**, *37*, 395–411. [CrossRef]
43. Hodge, C.J.; Duerden, M.D.; Layland, E.K.; Lacanienta, A.; Goates, M.C.; Niu, X.M. The association between family leisure and family quality of life: A meta-analysis of data from parents and adolescents. *J. Fam. Theory Rev.* **2017**, *9*, 328–346. [CrossRef]
44. Agate, J.R.; Zabriskie, R.B.; Agate, S.T.; Poff, R. Family leisure satisfaction and satisfaction with family life. *J. Leis. Res.* **2009**, *41*, 205–223. [CrossRef]
45. Christiana, R.W.; Bouldin, E.D.; Battista, R.A. Active living environments mediate rural and non-rural differences in physical activity, active transportation, and screen time among adolescents. *Prev. Med. Rep.* **2021**, *23*, 101422. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
46. Hebblethwaite, S. “Grannie’s got to go fishing”: Meanings and experiences of family leisure for three-generation families in rural and urban settings. *World Leis. J.* **2014**, *56*, 42–61. [CrossRef]
47. Bernard, J. Families and local opportunities in rural peripheries: Intersections between resources, ambitions and the residential environment. *J. Rural. Stud.* **2019**, *66*, 43–51. [CrossRef]
48. Hodge, C.J.; Zabriskie, R.B.; Townsend, J.A.; Eggett, D.L.; Poff, R. Family leisure functioning: A cross-national study. *Leis. Sci.* **2018**, *40*, 194–215. [CrossRef]
49. Cívico Ariza, A.; Cuevas Monzonís, N.; Colomo Magaña, E.; Gabarda Méndez, V. Jóvenes y uso problemático de las tecnologías durante la pandemia: Una preocupación familiar. *Hachetepé. Rev. Científica De Educ. Y Comun.* **2021**, *22*, 1204. [CrossRef]
50. Joelsson, T. ‘So that we don’t spoil them’: Understanding children’s everyday mobility through parents’ affective practices. *Child. Geogr.* **2019**, *17*, 591–602. [CrossRef]
51. Chen, C.Y.; Lin, Y.H.; Lee, C.Y.; Lin, Y.K.; Chen, W.I.; Shih, J.R. Family leisure and subjective well-being: Do patterns and timing matter? *Soc. Behav. Personal. Int. J.* **2019**, *47*, 1–7. [CrossRef]
52. Lepp, A. Correlating leisure and happiness: The relationship between the leisure experience battery and the Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Ann. Leis. Res.* **2018**, *21*, 246–252. [CrossRef]
53. Williamson, M.; Zabriskie, R.; Townsend, J.; Ward, P.; Fellingham, G.; Kuznetsova, I. The contribution of family leisure to family functioning and family satisfaction among urban Russian families. *Ann. Leis. Res.* **2019**, *22*, 607–628. [CrossRef]
54. Álvarez-Muñoz, J.S.; Hernández-Prados, M.Á. Validation of a questionnaire about family leisure practices. *Religación. Rev. Cienc. Soc. Humanid.* **2022**, *32*, e210909. [CrossRef]
55. González Alonso, J.; Pazmiño Santacruz, M. Cálculo e interpretación del Alfa de Cronbach para el caso de validación de la consistencia interna de un cuestionario, con dos posibles escalas tipo Likert. *Rev. Publicando* **2015**, *2*, 62–67. Available online: <http://bit.ly/3XrynRU> (accessed on 1 November 2022).
56. Siegel, S. *Estadísticos No Paramétricos Aplicada a Las Ciencias De La Conducta*; Editorial Trillas: Ciudad de México, México, 1991.
57. Cohen, J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*; Hillsdale: New York, NY, USA, 1988.

58. Huntsinger, C.S.; Shaboyan, T.; Karapetyan, A.M. The influence of globaliza-tion on adolescents' conceptions of self and future self in rural and urban Armenia. *Spec. Issue Glob. A Context Youth Dev.* **2019**, *164*, 67–82. [CrossRef]
59. Zenic, N.; Taiar, R.; Gilic, B.; Blazevic, M.; Maric, D.; Pojskic, H.; Sekulic, D. Levels and changes of physical activity in adolescents during the COVID-19 pandemic: Contextualizing urban vs. rural living environment. *Appl. Sci.* **2020**, *10*, 3997. [CrossRef]
60. Magezi, V. Changing family patterns from rural to urban and living in the in-between: A public practical theological responsive ministerial approach in Africa. *HTS Teol. Stud. Theol. Stud.* **2018**, *74*, 5036. [CrossRef]
61. Surdu, I. Social Perspectives Over Leisure-Time Capital: Individual And Family Leisure Activities. *Cross-Cult. Manag. J.* **2018**, *20*, 91–107. Available online: <http://bit.ly/3WFcjIT> (accessed on 1 November 2022).
62. Chen, N.; Tsai, C.T.L. Rural-urban divide and the social stratification in leisure participation in China: Application of multiple hierarchy stratification perspective. *Appl. Res. Qual. Life* **2020**, *15*, 1535–1548. [CrossRef]
63. Mullenbach, L.E.; Baker, B.L. Environmental justice, gentrification, and leisure: A systematic review and opportunities for the future. *Leis. Sci.* **2020**, *42*, 430–447. [CrossRef]
64. Alario, M.E.; Molinero, F.; Morales, E. La persistencia de la dualidad rural y el valor de la nueva ruralidad en Castilla y León (España). *Investig. Geográficas* **2018**, *70*, 9–30. [CrossRef]
65. Lee, K.J.; Scott, D. Participation in wildlife watching: A multiple hierarchy stratification perspective. *Hum. Dimens. Wildl.* **2011**, *16*, 330–344. [CrossRef]
66. Montoya-Soto, D.; Muñoz-Gaviria, D.A. Entre la nueva ruralidad y la nueva educación: Hacia un contexto reflexivo desde un enfoque pedagógico crítico. *Mem. Forenses* **2022**, *5*, 67–74. [CrossRef]
67. Lazo, C.M. Los jóvenes en la cultura digital. *Rev. Int. De Comun. Y Desarro. (RICD)* **2017**, *2*, 23–28. [CrossRef]
68. De La Fuente, I.G.; Quintanal, H.S. La consumidad: Vida cotidiana, consumo y espacio rural. *Rev. Euroam. De Antropol.* **2019**, *7*, 13–26. [CrossRef]
69. Karsten, L.; Kamphuis, A.; Remeijnse, C. 'Time-out'with the family: The shaping of family leisure in the new urban consumption spaces of cafes, bars and restaurants. *Leis. Stud.* **2015**, *34*, 166–181. [CrossRef]
70. Machado-Rodrigues, A.M.; Coelho, E.S.M.J.; Mota, J.; Padez, C.; Martins, R.A.; Cumming, S.P.; Riddoch, C.; Malina, R.M. Urban-rural contrasts in fitness, physical activity, and sedentary behaviour in adolescents. *Health Promot. Int.* **2014**, *29*, 118–129. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
71. Mas' Udah, S.; Budirahayu, T. Early Marriage and Women's Empowerment in Rural Areas. *Lnnovation Creat. Change* **2020**, *13*, 896–912. Available online: <https://bit.ly/3D1Iu86> (accessed on 4 November 2022).

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.