



www.ijte.net

The Relationship between the Leisure Boredom, Leisure Satisfaction, and Smartphone Addiction: A Study on University Students

Emrah Serdar 
İstanbul University-Cerrahpaşa, Turkey

Mehmet Demirel 
Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey

Duygu Harmandar Demirel 
Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey

To cite this article:

Serdar, E., Demirel, M., & Harmandar Demirel, D. (2022). The relationship between the leisure boredom, leisure satisfaction, and smartphone addiction: A study on university students. *International Journal of Technology in Education (IJTE)*, 5(1), 30-42. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.235>

The International Journal of Technology in Education (IJTE) is a peer-reviewed scholarly online journal. This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Authors alone are responsible for the contents of their articles. The journal owns the copyright of the articles. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of the research material. All authors are requested to disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest including any financial, personal or other relationships with other people or organizations regarding the submitted work.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

The Relationship between the Leisure Boredom, Leisure Satisfaction, and Smartphone Addiction: A Study on University Students

Emrah Serdar, Mehmet Demirel, Duygu Harmandar Demirel

Article Info

Article History

Received:

20 June 2021

Accepted:

29 November 2021

Keywords

Leisure boredom

Leisure satisfaction

Smartphone addiction

Abstract

This study aimed to describe the relationships between leisure boredom, leisure satisfaction, and smartphone addictions among university students. The study sample consisted of 258 participants, 143 males and 115 females, studying at Istanbul University-Cerrahpaşa Faculty of Sports Sciences. The participants were selected using the purposeful sampling method. Data collection tools involved a personal information form, the "Leisure Boredom Scale (LBS)", the "Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS)" and "Smartphone Addiction Scale-Short Version (SAS-SV)". Independent t-Test results revealed a significant difference in SAS-SV by gender. The MANOVA results indicated a significant difference between the "Satisfaction" sub-dimension of LBS and the "Educational," "Social," "Physical," and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions of LSS by gender. A significant difference was found between LBS's "Satisfaction" sub-dimension and all sub-dimensions of LSS by income status. According to the ANOVA results, there was no significant relationship between the SAS-SV scores by income status of the participants. Besides, there was a negative and low-level correlation between age and the "Satisfaction" sub-dimension of LBS, the "Physical" and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions of LSS and SAS-SV. There was a negative and low correlation between "Boredom" of LBS and "Psychological," "Social," and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions of LSS, and there was a positive and low correlation between LBS and SAS-SV. Similarly, a positive and low-level relationship was determined between all sub-dimensions of LSS and SAS-SV. In this sense, it was concluded that the LBS, LSS, and SAS-SV scores differed according to the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. As leisure boredom increased, leisure satisfaction decreased, and smartphone addiction increased. It was also found that as leisure satisfaction improved, smartphone addiction increased.

Introduction

Due to the many conveniences provided by modern technology to people, it is known that individuals all over the world increasingly have leisure (Roberts, 2018; Samuel, 2011; Gürbüz et al., 2018). Besides, the increase in leisure in the 20th century also led to an increase in academic studies on leisure activities and the efficient use

and evaluation of leisure (Jackson, 1991; Çerez et al., 2021). In this context, leisure refers to the time when individuals are not subject to any obligations for themselves or others and engage in an activity of their choice (Soyer et al., 2017; Er et al., 2019). In other words, leisure is associated with pleasing, enjoyable, and rewarding experiences that take people out of their routines and the tensions of daily life (Íglesias & Bello, 2019). Briefly, leisure is expressed as the time period in which individuals can evaluate the remaining time from their private life and daily work (Williams, 2003; Tükel and Temel, 2020).

Leisure activities play a vital role in improving social relations and reducing stress and tension stemming from intense workload (Mahoney & Stattin, 2000; Soyer et al., 2019). From this point of view, leisure activities are defined as activities that people want to do, do in their free time, satisfactorily and willingly (Lazar & Nguyen, 2017; Stebbins, 2008). Leisure activities usually occur at discretionary times when individuals have the freedom to choose activities that are intrinsically satisfying, enjoyable, and provide experiences and are pursued by their own rewards (Lobo, 2006; Tsaur et al., 2012). In addition, it has stated that leisure activities contribute to supporting social cohesion, strengthening the immune system, reducing stress and renewing attention, thus providing many health benefits (Brajša-Zganec et al., 2011; Newman et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2020).

Although leisure activities have such positive benefits, Wang et al., (2012) have stated that individuals can get bored when they do not have enjoyable things to do in their leisure. The perception of leisure boredom has become the focus of attention as a potential element reflecting a qualitative attitude or tendency towards leisure (Barnett, 2005). In this sense, the concept of leisure boredom refers to the lack of leisure activities that help individuals spend meaningful and quality time, the inability to participate in engaging activities or to create alternatives despite having excessive leisure time (Iso-Ahola & Wessinger, 1987; Russell, 1996; Shaw et al., 1996; Kara and Özdedeoğlu, 2017).

In other words, leisure boredom is a common and undesirable outcome that individuals who do not know how to spend their leisure time beneficially are more likely to experience (Iso-Ahola & Weissinger, 1990; İskender & Güçer, 2018). Leisure boredom generally stem from the monotonous assessment of activities in time (Shaw et al., 1996; Yaşartürk et al., 2017). Participating in activities, which can create awareness for individuals in evaluating their leisure and provide more satisfaction with varying activities, can minimize the perception of boredom (Doğan et al., 2019). In other words, Iso-Ahola and Weissinger (1990) have emphasized that the perception of leisure boredom arises when leisure experiences do not meet people's expectations and needs, and it is important to experience satisfaction in leisure occupation to minimize feelings of boredom (Kil et al., 2021).

Leisure satisfaction is important for individuals as it reflects the degree of experiences in their lives that meet their needs or desires for expression, rest and relaxation, entertainment and other personal attention (Chick et al., 2021). In this context, leisure satisfaction is acknowledged as a positive outcome of participating in leisure activities and refers to individuals' satisfaction with their overall experience (Needham et al., 2018; Rosa et al., 2019). Similarly, Lepp (2018) states that leisure satisfaction shows people's satisfaction with leisure routines (Serdar & Demirel, 2020). Leisure satisfaction is widely accepted as the evaluation of someone's experiences while participating in leisure activities (Zhou et al., 2021). Besides, relative satisfaction is the difference

between the expectations from leisure activities and the existing situation (Yurcu et al., 2018). According to Beard and Ragheb (1980), there are six dimensions of leisure satisfaction: psychological, educational, social, relaxation, physical, and aesthetics. The psychological dimension focuses on the mental benefits of leisure participation. The education dimension refers to the perceptions of what individuals gain from participating in leisure activities. The social dimension involves meeting new people and building a personal network. The relaxational dimension refers to relieving stress. The physiological dimension is related to contentment with physical health that improves due to participating in leisure activities. The aesthetics dimension includes the sanitation and design of recreational areas where individuals engage in leisure activities (Beard & Ragheb, 1980; Choi & Yoo, 2017).

Although smartphones are essential daily life devices today, they lead to specific problems, one of the most critical is smartphone addiction (Göldağ, 2019). Smartphone addiction is a type of obsession that damages social relations due to excessive and uncontrolled use of smartphones (Fidan, 2016; Daysal and Yılmazel, 2020). In other words, smartphone addiction is characterized by excessive smartphone use (Jeong et al., 2020). According to Lin et al., (2014), smartphone addiction is a type of technological addiction that is non-chiral and includes human-machine interaction (Rahim et al., 2021).

Although smartphone addiction is similar to other technological addictions, it can be much more dangerous than the others due to its unique features such as portability and ease of connection (Demirci et al., 2014; Kaya and Kaya, 2020). Smartphone users can browse the Web and take advantage of the many applications they download from the Internet. Smartphone addicts may have withdrawal and dependence symptoms and functional impairments (Lin et al., 2014; Sigerson et al., 2017). Smartphone addiction also leads to stress, reduces life satisfaction, and negatively affects academic performance (Samaha & Hawi, 2016; Joseph & Andrew, 2012; Chaudhury & Tripathy, 2018). Therefore, the study aimed to determine the relationships between leisure boredom, leisure satisfaction, and smartphone addiction of university students.

Method

Research Design

Following the aim of the study, the relational screening model was used in the research. The relational screening model was defined as trying to determine the existence, direction and severity of change of two or more variables together (Karasar, 2014).

Research Sample

The sample consisted of 258 participants selected using the purposeful sampling method from Istanbul University-Cerrahpaşa Faculty of Sport Sciences. There were 143 males ($\text{Mean}_{\text{age}}=23.08\pm5.10$) and 115 females ($\text{Mean}_{\text{age}}= 22.11\pm4.31$) in the sample. Among the participants, 42.2% had "6-10 hours" of weekly leisure, and 62.8% had " medium" income.

Research Instruments and Procedures

Personal Information Form: The researcher developed the form to collect information about the participants. It included questions such as gender, age, income status, and weekly leisure.

Leisure Boredom Scale (LBS): The tool was developed by Iso-Ahola and Weissinger (1990) and adapted into Turkish by Kara et al. (2014) to evaluate the individual differences in leisure boredom. There were ten items and two sub-dimensions on the scale: "Boredom" and "Satisfaction". In the original scale, the internal consistency coefficients of the sub-dimensions were .72 and .77, respectively. Moreover, they were .80 and .78 in this study. The 5-point Likert scale was scored from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Leisure Satisfaction Scale (LSS): The scale was developed by Beard and Ragheb (1980) to assess leisure satisfaction and adapted into Turkish by Gökçe and Orhan (2011). The 5-point Likert type scale included 24 items and six sub-scales: "Psychological", "Educational", "Social", "Physiological", "Relaxation", and "Aesthetics". The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the original scale was .90. It was .77 for the psychological, .77 for the educational, .76 for the social, .79 for the physiological, .80 for the relaxation, and .79 for the aesthetic sub-scales. For the current study, it was measured .70 for psychological, .76 for educational, .70 for social, .79 for physiological, .75 for relaxational and .82 for aesthetics sub-scales. The 5-point Likert scale was scored from 1 (Rarely true) to 5 (Always True).

Smartphone Addiction Scale-Short Version (SAS-SV): The instrument was developed by Kwon et al. (2013) to measure smartphone addiction and adapted into Turkish by Noyan et al. (2015). There was one dimension and ten items on the scale. The reliability coefficient was .86 for the original scale, and it was measured .91 for the current study. The items on the scale were scored from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree).

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the SPSS 20.0 package program. The percentage and frequency methods were applied to show the distribution of personal information. The skewness and kurtosis values were examined to determine whether the data had a normal distribution. The results indicated a normal distribution. Thus, independent t-test, ANOVA, MANOVA, and Pearson correlation analysis were performed in the data analysis. Finally, Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated to ensure reliability.

Results

As seen in Table 1, the highest mean was scored in the "Satisfaction" (3.79) sub-dimension of LBS, and the lowest mean was in the "Boredom" (3.08) sub-dimension. It was determined that the highest mean was in the "Educational" (3.71) and "Physical" (3.71) sub-dimensions of LSS, and the lowest mean was in the "Psychological" (3.46) sub-dimension. The mean score of the participants in SAS-SV was (3.67).

Table 1. Distribution of Scale Scores

	Sub-Dimensions	Items	n	Mean	Sd.	Sk.	Kur.
LBS	Boring	5	258	3.08	0.98	0.03	-1.01
	Satisfaction	5	258	3.79	0.78	-0.71	0.49
LSS	Psychological	4	258	3.46	0.80	-0.23	0.56
	Educational	4	258	3.71	0.78	-0.70	0.59
	Social	4	258	3.63	0.77	-0.55	0.79
	Relaxation	4	258	3.60	0.81	-0.51	0.29
	Physical	4	258	3.71	0.84	-0.76	0.50
	Aesthetics	4	258	3.66	0.88	-0.61	0.04
SAS-SV	Smartphone Addiction	10	258	3.67	1.00	-0.09	0.40

Table 2 shows the analysis results by gender of the participants. MANOVA analysis results revealed that the main effect of the gender on the sub-dimensions of LBS was significant [$\lambda = 0.975$, $F_{(2,255)} = 3.312$; $p < 0.05$]. There was a statistically significant difference only in the "Satisfaction" sub-dimension [$F_{(1,256)} = 6.649$; $p < 0.05$]. Females' mean scores were higher than males' scores. It was also found that the main effect of gender on the sub-dimensions of LSS was not significant [$\lambda = 0.962$, $F_{(6,251)} = 1.649$; $p > 0.05$].

Table 2. The LBS, LSS, and SAS-SV Scores by Gender

Scales	Male (n=143)		Female (n=115)		P
	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Ss.	
LBS					
Boring	3.06	0.96	3.10	1.01	0.736
Satisfaction	3.68	0.85	3.93	0.67	0.010*
LSS					
Psychological	3.38	0.83	3.55	0.75	0.097
Educational	3.58	0.85	3.86	0.66	0.004*
Social	3.53	0.77	3.75	0.74	0.019*
Physical	3.59	0.90	3.85	0.73	0.011*
Relaxation	3.51	0.81	3.71	0.78	0.044*
Aesthetics	3.58	0.91	3.76	0.83	0.103
SAS-SV	3.55	1.02	3.80	0.95	0.046*

However, there were significant differences in "Educational" [$F_{(1,256)} = 8.475$; $p < 0.05$], "Social" [$F_{(1,256)} = 5.531$; $p < 0.05$], "Physical" [$F_{(1,256)} = 6.480$; $p < 0.05$] and "Relaxation" [$F_{(1,256)} = 4.111$; $p < 0.05$] sub-dimensions. The mean scores of females were higher than the mean scores of males. According to the independent t-Test results, there was a statistically significant difference between the SAS-SV scores by gender ($t = -2.002$; $p < 0.05$). Females' scores were higher than males' scores.

Table 3 shows the analysis results by income status of the participants. To the MANOVA analysis results, the main effect of the income status on the sub-dimensions of LBS was significant [$\lambda = 0.881$, $F_{(4,508)} = 8.341$; $p < 0.05$]. There was also a statistically significant difference only in the "Satisfaction" sub-dimension [$F_{(2,255)} = 13.704$; $p < 0.05$]. The mean scores of the medium-income participants were higher than the average scores of other participants.

Table 3. The LBS, LSS, and SAS-SV Scores by Income Status

Scales	Low (n=41)		Medium (n=162)		High (n=55)		P
	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.	Mean	Sd.	
LBS							
Boring	3.24	0.92	3.00	0.99	3.20	1.00	0.211
Satisfaction	3.25	0.97	3.94	0.64	3.76	0.84	0.000*
LSS							
Psychological	3.04	0.93	3.58	0.68	3.42	0.92	0.001*
Educational	3.08	0.93	3.91	0.60	3.56	0.88	0.000*
Social	3.23	0.88	3.78	0.63	3.47	0.91	0.000*
Physical	3.11	1.00	3.87	0.66	3.67	0.99	0.000*
Relaxation	3.06	0.82	3.77	0.68	3.48	0.95	0.000*
Aesthetics	3.09	0.97	3.81	0.73	3.67	1.04	0.000*
SAS-SV	3.37	1.21	3.76	0.88	3.61	1.13	0.080

According to MANOVA analysis the results, the main effect of income status on the sub-dimensions of LSS was significant [$\lambda = 0.815$, $F_{(12,500)} = 4.488$; $p < 0.05$]. It was also statistically meaningful in "Psychological" [$F_{(2,255)} = 7.677$; $p < 0.05$], "Educational" [$F_{(2,255)} = 22.700$; $p < 0.05$], "Social" [$F_{(2,255)} = 10.318$; $p < 0.05$], "Physical" [$F_{(2,255)} = 14.760$; $p < 0.05$], "Relaxation" [$F_{(2,255)} = 14.954$; $p < 0.05$] and "Aesthetics" [$F_{(2,255)} = 11.645$; $p < 0.05$] sub-dimensions. The sub-dimension mean scores of the participants with medium income were higher than the mean scores of other participants. According to the ANOVA analysis results, there was no statistically significant difference in SAS-SV scores by income status of the participants ($f = 2.549$; $p > 0.05$).

Table 4 shows the analysis results of the LBS, LSS, and SAS-SV scores by age. According to the analysis results, there was a negative and low-level relationship between age and the "Satisfaction" sub-dimension of the LBS. Similarly, there was a negative and low-level relationship between age and the "Physical" and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions of the LSS.

A negative and low-level correlation was found in SAS-SV by age. There was also a negative and low-level correlation between the "Boredom" sub-dimension of the LBS and the "Psychological," "Social," and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions of the LSS. There was a positive and low-level correlation between the sub-dimensions of LBS and SAS-SV and a positive and low-level correlation between all sub-dimensions of LSS and SAS-SV.

Table 4. Correlation Analysis Results of LBS, LSS and SAS-SV Scores by Age

Age	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	
Age	1									
F1	-.058	1								
F2	-.177*	.141*	1							
F3	-.044	-.329*	.531*	1						
F4	-.117	-.084	.578*	.672*	1					
F5	-.079	-.196*	.551*	.686*	.711*	1				
F6	-.116*	-.227*	.546*	.663*	.707*	.679*	1			
F7	-.153*	-.086	.607*	.658*	.781*	.697*	.671*	1		
F8	-.065	-.121	.606*	.660*	.719*	.691*	.724*	.724*	1	
F9	-.186*	.371*	.383*	.321*	.205*	.312*	.272*	.311*	.300*	1

($p < 0.05$) * F1=Boredom, F2=Satisfaction, F3= Psychological, F4=Educational, F5=Social, F6=Relaxation, F7=Physical, F8=Aesthetics, F9=SAS-SV

Discussion

This study aimed to determine the relationships between university students' leisure boredom, leisure satisfaction, and smartphone addiction. The results were discussed. The main effect of gender on the sub-dimensions of LBS was significant, and the satisfaction mean scores of female participants were higher than the mean scores of male participants, which overlaps with the findings of Kaas and Uğur (2017) and Kara (2019). However, the main effect of genders on the sub-dimensions of the LSS was not significant, except for the significant differences in the "Educational," "Social," "Physical," and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions, which suggests that women were more satisfied than men in educational, social, physical, and relaxation aspects of leisure activities. In the literature, Doğan et al. (2019), Sönmezoğlu et al. (2014), Serdar and Demirel (2020), Serdar and Ay (2016) and Serdar et al. (2018) reaches similar results. When the SAS-SV scores were according to the gender variable, it was determined that females were more addicted to smartphones than males. As a result, it can be inferred that participant women used smartphones more frequently than men, and they were likely to be addicted. When the studies in the literature were reviewed, Soyer et al. (2019), Güngör and Koçak (2020), Yalçın et al., (2017) and Onuoha and Bada (2018) reached different results that did not overlap with the current findings. However, the findings of Aljomaa et al. (2016) and Gümüşgöl (2018) showed parallelism with this study.

The main effect of the participants' income status on the sub-dimensions of LBS was significant, and there was a significant difference only in the satisfaction sub-dimensions. In other words, the satisfaction mean scores of participants with regular income were higher than the mean scores of others. In the literature, the findings of Kara et al. (2018) and Çakır (2019) did not overlap with the current results. Similarly, the main effect of income status on the sub-dimensions of the LSS was statistically significant. The mean scores of the participants with normal income status in all sub-dimensions of the LSS were higher than the mean scores of the others. Nevertheless, in the literature Ngai (2005) and Tian et al. (2020) reached different results. Despite the high level

of smartphone addiction of people with regular income, there was no statistically significant difference. The study results of Kumcağız and Gündüz (2016) align with the results of this study.

There was a negative and low-level relationship between age and the "Satisfaction" sub-dimension of LBS. In other words, as people get old, their satisfaction levels decreased. Therefore, it can be inferred that people get bored in leisure as they get old. There was a negative and low-level relationship between age and the "Physical" and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions of the LSS, which can be explained that as age increases, leisure satisfaction levels in physical and relaxation aspects decrease. In the light of the literature findings, Kılıç et al. (2016), Ngai (2005) and Yaşartürk et al. (2019) found different results while Cheng et al. (2010), Tian et al. (2020), Muzindutsi and Masango (2015) and Soyer et al., (2019) reached similar findings. There was a negative and low-level relationship between age and SAS-SV. In other words, as people get old, smartphone addiction decreases. In a study by Yalçın et al., (2017), a significant difference was found in the smartphone addiction levels of individuals between 21-25. That is, as age increases, so does smartphone addiction. The results of Yalçın et al. (2017) were not similar to the results of this study. There was a negative and low-level relationship between the "Boredom" sub-dimension of the LBS and the "Psychological," "Social," and "Relaxation" sub-dimensions of the LSS. In other words, as leisure boredom levels increase, leisure satisfaction in terms of psychological, social, and relaxation aspects decrease. There was a positive and low-level relationship between the sub-dimensions of LBS and SAS-SV. As the leisure boredom levels increased, smartphone addiction increased. In the study conducted by Khang et al., (2013), it was stated that frequent or excessive use of smartphones in leisure was associated with escaping from leisure boredom and experience (Kil et al., 2021). There was a positive and low-level correlation between all sub-dimensions of LSS and SAS-SV. In other words, as leisure satisfaction increases, smartphone addiction also increases.

Conclusion

When the results of the study conducted in this direction are examined, it was determined that females' leisure boredom, leisure satisfaction, and smartphone addiction were higher than males. Although the smartphone addiction of the participants with regular income was high, there was no difference in smartphone addictions between participants. Similarly, the participants with a regular income had higher leisure boredom and leisure satisfaction levels than others. As age increases, leisure boredom, leisure satisfaction levels, and smartphone addiction decrease. Finally, there was a negative relationship between leisure boredom and leisure satisfaction, a positive relationship between leisure boredom and smartphone addiction, and leisure satisfaction and smartphone addiction.

References

- Aljomaa, S.S., Qudah, M.F.A., Albursan, I.S., Bakhiet, S.F., & Abduljabbar, A.S. (2016). Smartphone addiction among university students in the light of some variables. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 61, 155-164.
- Barnett, L.A. (2005). Measuring the ABCs of leisure experience: awareness, boredom, challenge, distress. *Leisure Sciences*, 27, 131-155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400590912051>

- Beard, J. G., & Ragheb, M. G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12(1), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1980.11969416>
- Brajša-Zganec, A., Merkas, M., & Sverko, I. (2011). Quality of life and leisure activities: How do leisure activities contribute to subjective well-being?. *Social Indicators Research*, 102(1), 81-91.
- Chaudhury, P., & Tripathy, H.K. (2018). A study on impact of smartphone addiction on academic performance. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*. 7(2.6), 50-53.
- Cheng, E.H.P., Patterson, I., Packer, J., & Pegg, S. (2010). Identifying the satisfactions derived from leisure gardening by older adults. *Annals of Leisure Research*. 13(3), 395-419.
- Chick, G., Dong, E., Yeh, C.K., & Hsieh, C.M. (2021). Cultural consonance predicts leisure satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leisure Studies*, 40(2), 183-198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2020.1808052>
- Choi, S.H., & Yoo, Y.J. (2017). Leisure attitude and satisfaction with leisure and life: Proposing leisure prioritization and justification. *World Leisure Journal*. 59(2), 140-155.
- Çakır, V.O. (2019). The relationship between leisure time management and perceptions of boredom. *World Journal of Education*. 9(3), 38-45. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v9n3p38>
- Çerez, M.H., Yerlisu Lapa, T., Tercan Kaas, E., & Gülşen, D.B.A. (2021). Üniversite öğrencilerinde serbest zaman yönetimi, serbest zaman egzersiz katılımı ve psikolojik iyi oluş arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi. *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15(1), 1-8.
- Daysal, B., & Yılmazel, G. (2020). Smartphone addiction and adolescence via public health view. *Turkish Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*. 14(2), 316-322. <https://doi.org/10.21763/tjfmpe.730254>
- Demirci, K., Orhan, H., Demirdaş, A., Akpınar, A., & Sert, H. (2014). Validity and reliability of the Turkish version of the smartphone addiction scale in a younger population. *Bulletin of Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 24(3), 226-234. doi:10.5455/bcp.20140710040824
- Doğan, M., Elçi, G., & Gürbüz, B. (2019). Serbest zaman doyum, serbest zamanda sıkılma algısı ve iş tatmini ilişkisi: Akademisyenler üzerine bir araştırma. *Sportmetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*. 17(1), 154-164. <https://doi.org/10.33689/sportmetre.521555>
- Er, Y., Koç, M.C., Demirel, M. & Çuhadar, A. (2019). The Meaning of leisure and life satisfaction: the sample of university students. *International Journal of Culture and History*. 6(2), 1-16.
- Fidan, H. (2016). Mobil bağımlılık ölçeği 'nin geliştirilmesi ve geçerliliği: bileşenler modeli yaklaşımı. *Addicta: The Turkish Journal on Addictions*. 3, 433-469. 10.15805/addicta.2016.3.0118
- Gökçe, H. & Orhan, K. (2011). Serbest zaman doyum ölçeğinin Türkçe geçerlilik güvenirlik çalışması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*. 22(4), 139- 145.
- Göldağ, B. (2019). Akıllı telefon bağımlılığı ile algılanan stres ve yaşam doyumunu arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies-Information Technologies and Applied Sciences*. 14(2), 193-212.
- Gümüştül, O. (2018). Investigation of smartphone addiction effect on recreational and physical activity and educational success. *World Journal of Education*. 8(4), 11-17. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v8n4p11>
- Güngör, A.B. & Koçak, O. (2020). Üniversite öğrencilerinin akıllı telefon bağımlılığı ve akademik erteleme davranışı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Journal of Research in Education and Society*. 7(2), 397-419.
- Gürbüz, B., Çimen, Z. & Aydın, İ. (2018). Serbest zaman ilgilenim ölçeği: Türkçe formu geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *SPORMETRE Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 16(4), 256-265.

- Iso-Ahola, S. E., & Weissinger, E. (1990). Perceptions of boredom in leisure: Conceptualization, reliability and validity of the leisure boredom scale. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 22(1), 1–17.
- Iso-Ahola, S.E. & Weissinger, E., (1987). Leisure and boredom. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 5(3), 356–364. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1521/jscp.1987.5.3.356>
- İglesias, T.M. & Bello, A.S. (2019). Benefits of leisure in overcoming gender violence experiences: A case study. *Leisure Studies*. 38(1), 15-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2018.1511744>
- İskender, A. & Güçer, E. (2018). Boş zamanda sıkılma algısı ile riskli davranışlar arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi: Üniversite öğrencileri üzerine bir uygulama, *Turizm Akademik Dergisi*, 5(1), 86-97.
- Jackson, E.L. (1991). Leisure constraints/constrained leisure: Special issue introduction. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 23(4), 279-285.
- Jeong, Y.L., Suh, B. & Gweon, G. (2020). Is smartphone addiction different from internet addiction? Comprasion of addiction-risk factors among adolescents. *Behaviour & Information Technology*. 39(5), 578-593. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2019.1604805>
- Joseph, M. & Andrew, L. (2012). Online communication attitudes as predictors of problematic internet use and well-being outcomes. *Southern Communication Journal*. 77(5), 403-419. [10.1080/1041794X.2012.686558](https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2012.686558)
- Kaas, E.T. & Uğur, S. (2017). Leisure participation, internet addiction and leisure boredom in university students. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*. 7(4), 38-47
- Kara, F.M. (2019). İnternet addiction: Relationship with perceived freedom in leisure, perception of boredom and sensation seeking. *Higher Education Studies*, 9(2), 131-140. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v9n2p131>
- Kara, F.M. & Özdedeoğlu, B. (2017). Examination of relationship between leisure boredom and leisure constraints. *Sport Sciences*. 12(3), 24-36. [2017.12.3.2B0109](https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2017.12.3.2B0109)
- Kara, F.M., Gürbüz, B. & Öncü, E. (2014). Leisure boredom scale: the factor structure and demographic differences. *Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise*. 16(2), 28-35. [10.15314/TJSE.201428102](https://doi.org/10.15314/TJSE.201428102)
- Kara, F.M., Gürbüz, B., Kılıç, S.K. & Öncü, E. (2018). An investigation of pre-service physical education teachers' leisure boredom, life satisfaction and social connectedness. *Journal of Computer and Education Research*. 6(12), 342-357. <https://doi.org/10.18009/jcer.466740>
- Karasar, N. (2014). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi. 27 Basım. Nobel yayıncılık: Ankara.
- Kaya, S. & Kaya, M. (2020). İnternet addiction levels among university students. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*. 7(3), 14-25.
- Khang, H., Kim, J. K., & Kim, Y. (2013). Self-traits and motivations as antecedents of digital media flow and addiction: The Internet, mobile phones, and video games. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(6), 2416–2424. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.chb.2013.05.027>
- Kılıç, S.K., Atasoy, K.L., Gürbüz, B. & Öncü, E. (2016). Rekreasyonel tatmin ve yaşam doyumu arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İÜ Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*. 6(3), 56-70.
- Kil, N., Kim, J., Park, J. & Lee, C. (2021). Leisure boredom, leisure challenge, smartphone use, and emotional distress among U.S. college students: are they interrelated?. *Leisure Studies*. 40(6), 779-792.
- Kumcağiz, H. & Gündüz, Y. (2016). Relationship between psychological well-being and smartphone addiction of university students. *International Journal of Higher Education*. 5(4), 144-156.


- Kwon, M., Lee, J.Y., Won, W.Y., Park, J.W., Min, J.A., Hahn, C., Gu, X., Choi, J.H. & Kim, D.J. (2013). Development and validation of a smartphone addiction scale (SAS). *PLoSone*. 8(2), e56936.
- Lazar, A. & Nguyen, D.H. (2017). Successful leisure in independent living communities: understanding older adults' motivations to engage in leisure activities. CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. 6-11 May 2017, Denver, CO, USA. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3025453.3025802>
- Lepp, A. (2018). Correlating Leisure and Happiness: The relationship between the leisure experience battery and the satisfaction with life scale. *Annals of Leisure Research*. 21(2), 246-252.
- Lin, Y. H., Chang, L. R., Lee, Y. H., Tseng, H. W., Kuo, T. B., & Chen, S. H. (2014). Development and validation of the smartphone addiction inventory (SPAI). *PLoS One*, 9(6), 1-5.
- Liu, Y., Zhang, Y., Jin, S.T., & Liu, Y. (2020). Spatial pattern of leisure activities among residents in Beijing, China: Exploring the impacts of urban environment. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 52, 1-12.
- Lobo, F. (2006). The Work-Leisure Paradigm: The stresses and strains of maintaining a balanced lifestyle. *World Leisure*, 48(3), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04419057.2006.9674451>
- Mahoney, J., & Stattin, H. (2000). Leisure activities and adolescent antisocial behavior: the role of structure and social context. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(2), 113-127. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2000.0302>
- Muzindutsi, P.F., & Masango (2015). Determinants of leisure satisfaction among undergraduate students at a South African university. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*. 7(2), 1-15.
- Needham, M.D., Szuster, B.W., Lesar, L., Mora, C., & Knecht, D.P. (2018). Snorkeling and scuba diving with manta rays: encounters, norms, crowding, satisfaction and displacement. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*. 23(5), 461-473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10871209.2018.1461962>
- Newman, D.B., Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2014). Leisure and subjective well-being: a model of psychological mechanisms as mediating factors. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(3), 555-578.
- Ngai, V.T. (2005). Leisure satisfaction and quality of life in Macao, China. *Leisure Studies*. 24(2), 195-207.
- Noyan, C.O., Darçın, A.E., Nurmedov, S., Yılmaz, O., & Dilbaz, N. (2015). Akıllı telefon bağımlılığı ölçeğinin kısa formunun üniversite öğrencilerinde Türkçe geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*. 16(Özel Sayı:1), 73-81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5455/apd.176101>
- Onuoha, U.C., & Bada, B.V. (2018). Linking psychological attributes and gender to smartphone addiction among university undergraduates: A Nigerian study. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*. 27(3), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jesbs/2018/v27i315905>
- Rahim, N.A.A., Siah, Y.H., Tee, X.Y., & Siah, P.C. (2021). Smartphone addiction: Its relationships to personality traits and types of smartphone use. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 5(1), 128-140. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijtes.165>
- Roberts, K. (2018). Writing about leisure. *World Leisure Journal*, 60(1), 3-13.
- Rosa, C.D., Collado, S., Profice, C.C., & Larson, L.R. (2019). Nature-based recreation associated with connectedness to nature and leisure satisfaction among students in Brazil. *Leisure Studies*. 38(5), 682-691. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2019.1620842>
- Russell, R.V. (1996). Pastimes: The context of contemporary leisure. Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark.
- Samaha, M., & Hawi, N. (2016). Relationships among Smartphone Addiction, Stress, Academic Performance and Satisfaction with Life. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 57(1), 321-325.

- Samuel, N. (2011). Technology invades leisure. *World Leisure and Recreation*, 38(3), 12-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10261133.1996.9674019>
- Serdar, E., & Ay, S.M. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin katıldıkları serbest zaman etkinliklerinden tatmin olma ve algılanan özgürlük düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *İÜ Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 34-44.
- Serdar, E. & Demirel, M. (2020). Algılanan stres ile serbest zaman doyum arasındaki ilişki: spor bilimleri öğrencileri örneği. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 22(3), 54-64.
- Serdar, E., Demirel, M., Demirel, D.H., Donuk, B. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zaman doyum düzeyleri ile mutluluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(28), 429-438.
- Shaw, S.M., Caldwell, L.L. & Kleiber, D.K. (1996). Boredom, stress and social control in the daily activities of adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(4), 274-292.
- Sigerson, L., Li, A.Y.L., Cheung, M.W.L. & Cheng, C. (2017). Examining common information technology addictions and their relationships with non-technology-related addictions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 520-526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.05.041>
- Soyer, F., Tolukan, E., & Dugenci, A. (2019). Investigation of the relationship between leisure satisfaction and smartphone addiction of university students. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 5(1), 229-235. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.522.2019.51.229.235>
- Soyer, F., Yıldız, N.O., Harmandar Demirel, D., Serdar, E., Demirel, M., Ayhan, C., & Demirhan, Ö. (2017). Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreatif etkinliklere katılımlarına engel teşkil eden faktörler ile katılımcıların yaşam doyumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(2), 2035-2046. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v14i2.4647>
- Sönmezoğlu, U., Polat, E., & Aycan, A. (2014). Gençlik merkezi üyeleri ve bazı değişkenlere göre serbest zaman tatmin düzeyleri. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 5(1), 219-229. <https://doi.org/10.14486/IJSCS91>
- Stebbins, R.A. (2008). Right leisure: serious, casual, or project-based? *Neuro Rehabilitation*, 23(4), 335-341. [10.3233/NRE-2008-23407](https://doi.org/10.3233/NRE-2008-23407)
- Tian, H.B., Qiu, Y.J., Lin, Y.Q., Zhou, W.T., & Fan, C.Y. (2020). The role of leisure satisfaction in serious leisure and subjective well-being: Evidence from Chinese marathon runners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 581908. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.581908>
- Tsaur, S.H., Liang, Y.W., & Hsu, H.J. (2012). A multidimensional measurement of work-leisure conflict. *Leisure Sciences*, 34(5), 395-416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2012.714701>
- Tükel, Y., & Temel, A. S. (2020). Examining the levels of freedom, life satisfaction and happiness perceived by college students in leisure time. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 6(4), 668-678. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.v6i4.1451>
- Wang, W.C., Wu, C.C., Wu, C.Y., & Huan, T.C. (2012). Exploring the relationships between free-time management and boredom in leisure. *Psychological Reports*, 110(2), 416-426. <https://doi.org/10.2466/13.17.pr0.110.2.416-426>
- Williams, S. (2003). *Tourism and recreation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Yalçın, C., Demirel, M., Demirel, D.H., & Çolakoğlu, T. (2017). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin boş zaman anlamı ile akıllı telefon bağımlılıklarına ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *İÜ Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(1), 1-11.

- Yaşartürk, F., Akyüz, H., & Karataş, İ. (2017). Rekreatif etkinliklere katılan üniversite öğrencilerinin serbest zamanda sıkılma algısı ile yaşam doyum düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *International Journal of Cultural and Social Studies*, 3 (Special Issue), 239-252.
- Yaşartürk., F., Akyüz, H., & Gönülateş, S. (2019). The investigation of the relationship between university students' levels of life quality and leisure satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(3), 739-745. 10.13189/ujer.2019.070313
- Yurcu, G., Kasalak, M.A., & Akıncı, Z. (2018). Turistlerin boş zaman motivasyonunu ve tatminini etkileyen faktörler: Beldibi örneği. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(2), 517-536.
- Zhou, B., Zhang, Y., Dong, E., Ryan, C., & Li, P. (2021). Leisure satisfaction and quality of life of residents in Ningbo, China. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 52, 469-486.

Author Information

Emrah Serdar

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2438-6748>

İstanbul University-Cerrahpaşa


Faculty of Sports Sciences

İstanbul

Turkey

Contact e-mail: serdar-emrah@hotmail.com

Mehmet Demirel

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1454-022X>


Necmettin Erbakan University

Faculty of Tourism

Konya

Turkey

Duygu Harmandar Demirel

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4090-7929>

Necmettin Erbakan University

Ahmet Keleşoğlu Education of Faculty

Konya

Turkey
