Determination of leisure time orientations in university students, the relationship between leisure time boredom perceptions and social network sites usage purposes

Metin ÖZLU, Erdal TASGIN, Nazlı Deniz ÖZ

Selcuk Universty, Faculty of Sport Science, Konya, Turkey
Address Correspondence to ND, Öz, e-mail:denizyilmaz@selcuk.edu.tr

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the leisure time preferences of the university students and to examine the relationship between leisure time perception and usage of social network sites. The research was conducted in accordance with the relational screening model. The study group consists of 230 female (65.7%), 120 male (34.3%), total 350 students studying at Konya Selçuk University. As a means of data collection in the study that personal information form, activity preference form and "Social Network Sites Usage Scale" developed by Karal and Kokoç (2010) and "Leisure Time Boredom Perception Scale" (LTBPS) developed by Iso-Ahola and Weissinger and adapted to Turkish by Kara et al. (2014) was used. SPSS 16.0 statistical package program was used to evaluate the data and to find the calculated values. The data are summarized by giving percent, mean and standard deviations. Independent group t test was used for binary cluster comparisons and One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) was used for multiple cluster comparisons due to the data showed normal distribution. Significance level in the study was taken as (p <0.05). As a result of the study, in favour of male participants in the sub-dimension of boredom from LTBPS sub-dimensions according to gender variable, in favour of male participants in all SNSUPS sub-dimensions; for 1-3 hours according to the weekly leisure time variable in the case of two of the LTBPS sub-dimensions, and SNSUPS sub-dimensions for 1-3 hours and 4-6 hours in sub-dimension for identification and recognition; there was no significant difference in the LTBPS sub-dimension according to the activity preference variable, but significant results were observed in all SNSUPS sub-dimension. According to the relationship test between SNSUPS and LTBPS, low and moderate positive correlations were found in all sub-dimensions of the two dimensions.

Key words: Leisure boredom, Social network usage purpose, University student

INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that the concept of leisure time does not collect in a common definition researchers have shaped their research by "expressing a time that is freely chosen, out of the compulsory times of individuals, with a desired activity" (14). Current studies show that the concept of boredom and perception is a problem in participating in leisure time activities. Boredom is seen as an issue that is thought to reduce participation and sustainability of the individual in various ways in the process of preferring leisure time activity (12). At this point, Iso-Ahola and Weissinger (1990) defined leisure time boredom perception as a "low stimulation against the current free-time experiences, not being motivated, or subjective perception of their inadequacy ". In other words, it is the state of dissatisfaction that is the result of not being able to find anything to attract the attention of the person or not being able to find something to do (12).

Nowadays, it is a fact that technology and its social network sites become widespread and people use these networks in their free time because of the mobile communication network, and in some people this situation reaches to the extent of addiction. In this context, it is envisaged that individuals with high boredom perception during their leisure time prefer that they spend time in social dimension with various social purposes or social size in interactive dimension against participating in active leisure time activities. It is certain that university students actively use social network sites when they are thought to be influenced by their generational characteristics and popular culture documents. As a matter of fact, social media addiction or internet addiction is now a disease in the medical literature. In this context, it is obvious that they spend their time in internet environment which can be defined as passive environment from the concept of "active life" which is mentioned in state policies and which is the interest of many researchers. One of the reasons for this is thought to be the leisure time

boredom perception which has led university students prompt to use social networking sites more.

The internet has shown rapid growth in the short term and the access opportunities have increased. While access to the internet is only possible from computers, today's access to mobile phones or tablet computers has become more and more accessible, and mobile communication technologies have made it possible to access the internet from anywhere at any time. The widespread use of the Internet has led to many changes in the field, from education to social life, from economy to bureaucracy. Access to information has become easier, communication has become independent of time and space (25).

With the dynamic structure provided by Web 2.0 technologies, Internet users can not only consume content but also produce content at the same time. Thus, internet users can easily produce and share content without any programming knowledge (18). Especially, many web environments such as blog, wiki, podcast and social networks have started to be widely used. The most common use among these environments is social networks.

Social networks are defined as a web-based service that allows users to share their profile in the system to connect with others, allows other users to add their own lists, and at the same time allows everyone in the system to see the information (26).

Social network concept; people share their thoughts in the direction of a common goal and point to a community formation on the internet that facilitates interaction with each other (16). Social network sites (Facebook, MySpace, Friendster etc.); based internet communities that allow users to send profile information such as user names and photos, to communicate with others using innovative ways such as sending public or private online messages, or online photos, video sharing (21). Tredinnick (2006) defines social network sites as sites that continue to lead by user participants and content created by users. There are different qualifications in the literature for social network sites; social network (5), informal learning environment (17), online community type (3), advertising and public relations environment (19), the market environment and the new phenomena of the internet that stamped on the years 2000. Social network sites emerging with Classmates (1995) and SixDegrees (1997); It continues to develop with new and different look

and functions (2, 15) such as Ryze (2001), Friendster (2002), Hi5 and MySpace (2003), Bebo (2005), Facebook (2006) and Twitter (2008).

Social network sites, to users; introducing themselves in a social environment, setting up a social networking environment, communicating and maintaining other users (6), sharing their contents (photos, videos, blogs, etc.) (15) creating a profile page that includes personal information, photos and videos, and setting up relationships with people they do not know, discover new friendships (27). The availability of the offered opportunities ensures and the availability of applications to meet the diverse needs of individuals ensures that more and more individuals become members of social network sites. Existence of opportunities offered and the existence of implementations aimed at meeting the different needs of individuals, more and more individuals become members of social networking sites every day. The world's largest social network site, described as active users of Facebook worldwide is over 580 million, whereas Turkey is known to 2414398 active users located in the ranks 4th worldwide in terms of number of users (Facebook, n.d.; Socialbakers, n.d.). When last month in Turkey, considering that over 800 thousand individual members of Facebook, it can be said that interest towards social network sites has increased rapidly. 37% of Facebook users in Turkey are young people including university students in the 18-24 age range. (13) Facebook is characterized the most popular platform for university students have chosen as the social networking site in which a growing number of university students have logged in (9, 6). For social network sites, when the average age of individuals using related sites is examined, it is seen that a significant number of users are young (7). In this context, it comes to mind that young people and especially university students use social network sites to find out why and for what purposes and for meeting of which their requirements are.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

The universe of the research consists of 350 students studying at Selçuk University in the academic year of 2017-2018. Personal data form, activity preference form and "Social Network Sites Usage Purposes Scale" (SNSUPS) developed by Karal and Kokoç (2010) as data collection tools in the study and "Leisure Time Boredom Perception Scale" (LTBPS) developed by Iso-Ahola and Weissinger and adapted in Turkish by Kara and colleagues

(2014) was used. SPSS 16.0 statistical package program was used to evaluate the data and to find the calculated values. The data are summarized by giving percentage, mean and standard deviations. Independent group t test was used for binary cluster comparisons since the data showed normal distribution and one way variance analysis (ANOVA) was used for multiple cluster comparisons. The Pearson correlation coefficient technique was used to reveal the relationship

FINDINGS

between SNSUPS and LTBPS, which university students perceive. The level of significance in the study was taken as 0.05 and 0.01. The correlation coefficient 'r' indicates the direction and degree of the relationship between the two properties. Correlation coefficient, as an absolute value is between 0.70 and 1.00, high; 0.70-0.30, the middle; and if it is between 0.30-0.00, it can be defined as a low level relationship (4).

Table1. Demographic Information of the Students Participating to the Research

Variables		f	%
Gender	Female	230	65,7
	Male	120	34,3
	Total	350	100,0
Age	18-19 age	81	23,1
	20-21 age	171	48,9
	22 and above	98	28,0
	Total	350	100,0
Weekly Leisure Time	1-3 hours	44	12,6
	4-6 hours	78	22,3
	7-9 hours	91	26,0
	10 hours and above	137	39,1
	Total	350	100,0
How do you evaluate your leisure time?	Activities that can be done in the home	91	26,0
	Participating in physical activities	63	18,0
	Participating in social activities	61	17,4
	Participating in cultural-art activities	54	15,4
	Participating in open area activities	81	23,1
	Total	350	100,0

The demographic information of the participants is given in Table 1. As can be seen, most of the participants are female students, representation constitutes the dominant majority between the ages of 20-21, the weekly leisure time distributions are concentrated in the categories of 7 hours and above, and the leisure time preference distribution values of university students are close to each other.

Table 2. Participants' Evaluation of LTBPS and SNSUPS According to Gender

	Male X±SS	Female X±SS	t
LTBP-Boredom	3,11±0,72	2,83±0,81	-3,253*
LTBP-Satisfaction	3,25±0,68	3,32±0,75	0,779
SNSU-Social Interaction and Communication Purpose	3,64±0,68	3,46±0,76	-2,133*
SNSU-Identification and Recognition Purpose	3,08±0,88	2,44±1,08	-5,611**
SNSU- Educational Purpose	3,56±0,61	3,41±0,65	-2,004*

*P<0,05 **p<0,01

The values of SNSUPS and LTBPS according to the gender of the participants are given in Table 2. As can be seen in the table, there is no significant difference in the satisfaction sub-dimension in LTBPS, but significant difference was found in favor of male university students in boredom sub-dimension. When we look at SNSUPS values, there is a significant difference in favor of male students in all sub-dimensions.

Table 3. Participants' Evaluation of LTBPS and SNSUPS According to Age

	18-19 age X±SS	20-21 age X±SS	22 and above X±SS	F
LTBP-Boredom	2,81±0,82	2,94±0,77	3,00±0,81	1,327
LTBP-Satisfaction	3,19±0,60	3,34±0,77	3,30±0,75	1,153
SNSUP-Social Interaction and Communication Purpose	3,41±0,72	3,58±0,73	3,50±0,76	1,620
SNSUP-Identification and Recognition Purpose	2,43±0,99	2,71±1,07	2,66±1,09	2,451
SNSUP- Educational Purpose	3,46±0,54	3,50±0,68	3,41±0,65	0,601

Table 4. Participants' Evaluation of LTBPS and SNSUPS According to Weekly Leisure Time.

	1-3 hours X±SS	4-6 hours X±SS	7-9 hours X±SS	10 hours and above X±SS	F
LTBP-Boredom	2,62±0,87	2,90±0,80	2,97±0,69	3,02±0,81	2,962*
LTBP-Satisfaction	3,19±0,76	3,12±0,69	3,42±0,72	3,34±0,73	2,960*
SNSUP- Social Interaction and Communication Purpose	3,37±0,81	3,49±0,71	3,53±0,76	3,59±0,71	1,385
SNSUP-Identification and Recognition Purpose	2,29±1,10	2,55±1,01	2,87±1,09	2,70±1,03	3,331*
SNSUP- Educational Purpose	3,31±0,73	3,40±0,61	3,54±0,66	3,50±0,61	1,652

*P<0,05 **p<0,01

The SNSUPS and LTBPS values for the age of participants are given in Table 3. As can be seen in the table, there was no significant difference in the sub-dimentions of both scales according to age categories.

The SNSUPS and LTBPS values are given in Table 4 according to the weekly leisure time of the participants. As can be seen in table, LTBPS has a significant result for opposed to 1-3 hours in the boredom sub-dimension, 4-6 hours in the satisfaction sub-dimension and opposed to 1-3 hours. While there is no significant difference in social interaction and communication and educational purposes sub-dimensions of SNSUPS sub-dimensions; there was a significant result for opposed to 1-3 hours in the sub-dimension for recognition and publicity.

Table 5. Participants' Evaluation of LTBPS and SNSUPS According to Types of Activity

	Activities in home X±SS	Physical activities X±SS	Social activities X±SS	Cultural-art activities X±SS	Open area activities X±SS	F
LTBP-Boredom	3,02±0,84	2,89±0,81	2,81±0,81	2,95±0,66	2,92±0,80	0,686
LTBP-Satisfaction	3,28±0,77	3,33±0,74	3,20±0,60	3,51±0,68	3,21±0,77	1,733
SNSUP- Social Interaction and Communication Purpose	3,31±0,77	3,72±0,69	3,63±0,58	3,87±0,57	3,29±0,81	8,814**
SNSUP-Identification and Recognition Purpose	2,43±0,99	3,05±1,02	2,51±0,96	3,14±1,01	2,39±1,10	8,087**
SNSUP- Educational Purpose	3,26±0,66	3,71±0,56	3,45±0,58	3,67±0,48	3,37±0,72	6,711**

*P<0,05 **p<0,01

The SNSUPS and LTBPS values are given in Table 5 according to the weekly leisure time of the participants. As it can be seen in the table, there was no significant difference according to activity type preferred by participants in LTBPS sub-dimensions. There are significant differences in the sub-dimensions of SNSUPS scale for social communication and interaction purposes and in the sub-dimension for identification and recognition purposes in favour of physical activities and cultural-arts activities, while in education sub-dimension, there are significant differences against the individuals participating in in-house activities and open area activities.

Table 6. Correlation Values between SNSUPS and LTBPS

	LTBPS-Boredom	LTBPS-Satisfaction
SNSUPS-Social Interaction and Communication Purpose	0,156**	0,414**
SNSUPS-Identification and Recognition Purpose	0,210**	0,363**
SNSUPS- Educational Purpose	0,145**	0,667**

**p<0,01

Correlation Values between SNSUPS and LTBPS subscales are given in table 6. According to this, SNSUPS has a low level of positive relationship between social communication and education subscale and LTBPS boredom (r = 0,156; p <0,01) sub-dimension; moderate positive direction between satisfaction (r = 0,414; p <0,01) sub-dimension; There was a low positive correlation between the sub-dimension for identification and recognition of SNSUPS and the subscale of LTBPS (r = 0,210; p <0,01) sub-dimension; moderate positive between satisfaction (r = 0.363, p <0.01); There was a low positive correlation between the SNSUPS education subscale and the LTBPS sub-dimension (r = 0,145; p <0,01); and between satisfaction (r = 0,667; p <0,01) sub-dimension was found to be moderately positively related.

DISCUSSION

This section includes comments, discussions, and conclusions about the relationship between leisure time orientations of university students participating in the study and the usage of leisure time boredom perception and social network sites usage purpose.

According to the data of the study, when the preference intensities of how university students evaluate their leisure time frequency values are even close to each other, it is seen that the majority prefer in-home activities or open area activities. For this reason, the university student profile is assumed to have a low income level and it is possible to benefit from social, physical or cultural arts services for a certain amount. And therefore, it is possible to achieve the result that they chose the inexpensive activities and the means of socialization. Therefore, it can be predicted that the rate of social network spending on the group preferring in-house activities will increase accordingly.

In recent years, social media sites like Facebook and Twitter have become a popular leisure time activity for millions of users worldwide (25). Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) describe social media services that internet based software programs that facilitate communication between individuals, communities, and companies, and allow the creation and modification of "user-generated content." Members of the site use to exchange information, share interests, develop friendships for recreational purposes, and seeking social support. Information and communication technologies such as digital social networks (Facebook, Twitter, Wikipedia etc.)

are increasingly being used as methods for developing and maintaining social connections (8).

The use of the internet increases as the frequency of boredom is increased when the role of boredom perception in the use of internet is examined in Öner and Lapa (2017) research, which also explains the relational situation mentioned in Table-6. Particularly, there are moderately positive associations between SNSUPS values and LTBPS satisfaction sub-dimension, which are related to the level of satisfaction of individuals and social media usage intentions. Relevance between educational usage purpose and satisfaction, which show values close to high, shows that the internet based researches of university students are intense.

In addition, when social media usage is considered as an example of anti-social behaviour in the dimension of internet addiction, when the evaluation of the role of boredom perception on alcohol usage in Kara and Ayverdi's (2010) research and alcohol usage is taken for anti-social behaviour group, the results of using social networks for satisfaction are in parallel with the results of our study.

Another perspective is the relationship between life satisfaction and social media usage created by participation in leisure time activities. Balcı and Koçak (2017) show that as the level of life satisfaction of university students increases, a decrease in daily social media usage time draws attention. Those with low life satisfaction use social media more often because they are habitual. As the life satisfaction levels of those who respond to the research questions increase, there is a decrease in the frequency of usage of social media in order to evaluate leisure time.

When these results are taken into consideration, it can be said that social network sites are related to the usage purpose and the leisure time perception. So it can be said that university students' perceptions of leisure time boredom should be explored in depth, taking into account the diversity of other addiction types and digital media social networks, and in particular, leisure time assessment tools for university students should be supported and developed by higher education institutions and associations with feasibility studies on a qualitative basis.

REFERENCES

1. Balcı Ş, Koçak MC. Sosyal Medya Kullanımı ile Yaşam Doyumu Arasındaki İlişki: Üniversite Öğrencileri Üzerinde

Bir Araştırma. 1. Uluslararası İletişimde Yeni Yönelimler Konferansı, İstanbul, 2017, 1, 34-45.

2. Boyd DM, Ellison NB. Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, Brand On The Web. USA: New Riders Press. 2007, 13(1), 11, 210-230.

3. Buss A, Strauss N. Online Communities Handbook: Building Your Business And Brand On The Web. Berkeley, CA: New Riders. 2009.

4. Büyüköztürk Ş. Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı. 7. Baskı. Pagem A Yayıncılık, Ankara. 2007.

5. Çetin E. Sosyal İletişim Ağları ve Gençlik: Facebook Örneği. Uluslararası Davraz Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı, 2009, 1094-1105.

6. Ellison NB, Steinfield C, Lampe C. The benefits of Facebook "friends:"Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 2007, 12(4), 1.

7. https://royal.pingdom.com/2010/02/16/study-ages-of-social-network-users/ Erişim tarihi:01.07.2018

8. Juen J, Johnson A, Das A, Borisov N, Caesar M. Defending tor from network adversaries: A case study of network path prediction. Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies 2015; 2015 (2):171–187

9. Kabilan MK, Ahmad N, Abidin MJZ. Facebook: An Online Environment For Learning Of English In Institutions Of Higher Education?. The Internet and Higher Implications Of Visual Cues On Initiating Friendship On Facebook. Computers in Human Behaviour, 2010, 26(2), 226-234.

10. Kaplan A, Haenlein M. Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media Business Horizons, 2010, 53(1), 59—68.

11. Kara F, Ayverdi B. Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Serbest Zamanda Sıkılma Algısı Alkol Kullanma Nedenlerinin Belirleyicisi midir? Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2018, 23 (1), 35-42.

12. Kara F. Serbest Zamanda Sıkılma Algısının Yaşam Kalitesi Ve Evlilik Doyumu Üzerine Etkisinin Belirlenmesi. Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden eğitimi ve Spor Ana Bilim Dalı. 2015.

13. Karal H, Kokoç M. Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal ağ siteleri kullanım amaçlarını belirlemeye yönelik bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. Türk Bilgisayar ve Matematik Eğitimi Dergisi, 2010, 1(3). 251-263

14. Kılbaş Ş. Rekreasyon: Boş Zamanı Değerlendirme, (1. Baskı), Adana: Anaca Yayınları. 2001.

15. Kim W, Jeong OR, Lee SW. On social Web sites. Information Systems, 2010, 35(2), 215-236.

16. Mahajan P. Use of social networking in a linguistically and culturally rich India. International Information & Library Review, 2009, 41, 129–136.

17. Mitchell K. (2009). ESOL students on Facebook. Portland, Oregon: Portland State University Master's thesis.

18. O'Reilly T, Milstein S. The Twitter book Sebastopol: O'Reilly Media. 2009.

19. Onat F, Alikılıç ÖA. Sosyal Ağ Sitelerinin Reklam ve Halkla İlişkiler Ortamları Olarak Değerlendirilmesi. Journal of Yaşar University, 2008, 3(9), 1111-1143.

20. Öner B, Yerlisu Lapa T. Lise Öğrencilerinde Serbest Zamanda Sıkılma Algısının İnternet Bağımlılığı ve Akademik Başarı Üzerindeki Etkisinin İncelenmesi. 15. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi. 2017

21. Pempek TA, Yermolayeva YA, Calvert SL. College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 2009, 30(3), 227-238

22. Ridings CM, Gefen D. Virtual community attraction: Why people hang out online. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 2004, 10, 1.

23. Schmalz DL, Colistra CM. & Evans, KE. Social Media Sites as a Means of Coping with a Threatened Social Identity, Leisure Sciences, 2015, 37:1, 20-38

24. Tredinnick L. Web 2.0 And Business: A Pointer To The Intranet Soft The Future. Business Information Review, 2006, 23(4), 228–234

25. Uslu KU. Yeni iletişim araçları ve toplumsal etkileri. Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2007, 1.

26. Vural ZBA, Bat M. Yeni bir iletişim ortamı olarak sosyal medya: Ege üniversitesi iletişim fakültesine yönelik bir araştırma. Journal of Yaşar University, 2010, 20 (5), 3348-3382.

27. Wang SS, Moon SI, Kwon KH, Evans CA, Stefanone MA. Face off: Implications of visual cues on initiating friendship on Facebook. Computers in Human Behavior, 2010, 26(2), 226-234.

28. Yuen F, Johnson AJ. Leisure Spaces, Community, and Third Places, Leisure Sciences, 2017, 39:3, 295-303.