

# A Correlational Study of Life Satisfaction and Smartphone Addiction among Prospective Teachers

Jasbeer Kaur Saluja<sup>1</sup>, Satish Chandra<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>TGT, Atam Devki Niketan, Near Kidwai Nagar, Ludhiana, India

<sup>2</sup>Independent Researcher, Ph.D. (Education), Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India

## Abstract

This study aims to compare the Life Satisfaction across gender, academic streams, locality, family type and marital status, and to determine the correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction. A sample of 100 prospective teachers were selected from five Teacher Training Institutes (TTIs) located in Bareilly city and affiliated with MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, India, using a simple random sampling method. Data were collected using the Smartphone Addiction Scale (SAS) by Vijayshri and Ansari and the Life Satisfaction Scale (LSS) by Hardeo Ojha. After excluding incomplete responses, a final sample of 96 participants was analyzed. The results indicated that gender, academic streams (Arts, Science, and Commerce), and marital status had no significant differences in prospective teachers' Life Satisfaction ( $p > .05$ ). However, statistically a significant difference in Life Satisfaction was observed based on their locality ( $p < .01$ ). Further, no significant correlation was reported in Smartphone Addiction and prospective teachers' demographic characteristics gender, locality, academic streams (Arts, Science, and Commerce), and type of family ( $p > .05$ ). Similarly, no significant correlation was found in Life Satisfaction and prospective teachers' demographic characteristics gender, academic streams (Arts, Science & Commerce) and marital status ( $p > .05$ ), but there was a significant correlation between Life Satisfaction and their locality ( $p < .01$ ). Finally, no significant correlation was indicated between prospective teachers' Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction ( $r = .009, p = .932 > .05$ ). The study concludes that smartphone usage constitutes a neutral variable and does not inherently undermine personal well-being. The findings further indicate that environmental or residential determinants exert a more substantial influence on life satisfaction than digital consumption patterns.

**Keywords:** Life Satisfaction, Smartphone Addiction, Prospective Teachers.

## Introduction

Life satisfaction is one of the prominent issues of humanity throughout the ages according to its taste, perception, desires, happiness & preferences. Social relationship represents an important living space associated with life satisfaction. The reason being relatives, spouse, children, friends provide social support, give financial support, share leisure time & accompany. Relationships with teachers are as important as friends & family. The Smartphone is now offering a gateway to connection, information, and entertainment, excessive use can morph into a sinister dance partner, impacting life satisfaction in complex and multifaceted ways. Smartphone entices with constant dopamine hits from notifications,

likes, and games, triggering cravings and fueling compulsive checking. This dopamine loop disrupts natural reward systems, making real-world interactions and delayed gratification less appealing.

Nowadays, Smartphone is considered more convenient to students rather than laptop or desktop computer. Excessive use of Smartphone leads to health risk (Alhazmi, Alzahrani, Baig, Salawati, and Alkatheri, 2018). The relationship between Smartphone Addiction and life satisfaction is characterized by a significant negative correlation, wherein psychological distress and the depletion of social capital frequently act as mediating factors. When smartphone usage transitions from being a useful tool to a compulsive behavior, it begins to trigger various health-related issues, while simultaneously fostering "techno-stress" and an intensified "Fear of Missing Out" (FOMO) in the individual. Smartphone users often compare their own real-life circumstances against the exceptional successes of others, a practice that subsequently diminishes their sense of life satisfaction. Research findings further suggest that this addiction functions as a maladaptive coping mechanism; individuals are driven to use devices like smartphones as a means to escape anxiety, yet over time, they begin to experience heightened feelings of loneliness and a decline in their personal well-being (Kurniawan et al., 2024).

The 'World Happiness Report' (2026) also highlights that while technologies such as smartphones can facilitate interpersonal connectivity, addiction to these devices ultimately leads to increased anxiety and a reduction in social capital (Helliwell et al., 2026; Kurniawan et al., 2025). But, Smartphone gaming and frequent Smartphone usage are associated with Smartphone Addiction. Duration of owning a Smartphone, gender, and substance use is not associated with Smartphone Addiction. Certain patterns should be part of specific measures to prevent and interfere in excessive usage of Smartphone cases (Liu, Lin, Pan and Lin, 2016).

Generally Smartphone users are unable lessen their time usage of Smartphone to control it due to addiction. It even creates disturbance in their personal life due to not giving proper time to their families and also their daily life activities just because of overuse of Smartphone. In their research work Arefin, Islam, Mustafî, Afrin, and Islam N. (2017) identified five factors i.e., positive anticipation, impatience, withdrawal, daily- life disturbance and cyber friendship which are responsible for Smartphone Addiction.

Excessive Smartphone use often supplants face-to-face interactions, leading to social isolation and loneliness. The nuances of nonverbal communication are lost in text-based exchanges, hindering genuine connection and emotional intimacy. Replacing real-world interactions with online substitutes weakens crucial social skills and can even contribute to social anxiety. Furthermore studies are reviewed related to Smartphone Addiction and life satisfaction.

## Review of Literature

Sometimes people are so much attached to smartphone use that they feel they are unable to function without it and are unable to complete any task given to them. Smartphone addicted individuals live in isolation which affects them economically and psychologically (Aljomaa, Al Qudah, Albursan, Bakhiet and Abduljabbar, 2016). Excessive use of Smartphone positively correlated with depression, aggression and impulsion (Kim, Kim, Kim, Ju,Choi and Yu, 2015). Similarly, a research found that Smartphone Addiction & interaction anxiety were positively correlated (Konan, Durmus, Turkoglu, Bakir, 2018). Again, Bagci and Peksen (2018) found that female students are more addicted to Smartphone than male students and students grow up with use of Technology at an early age and so are away from student's achievements, social gathering and environment.

Smartphones are associated with desire of users to maintain and increase their support relationship. While the addiction decreases as the social support increases. Users end up isolating themselves from social support hence increasing their level of addiction (Herrero, Torres, Vivas and Uruena, 2019). Further, Kula, Ayhan, Kacay and Soyer (2020) noted that Smartphone Addiction and life satisfaction parameters had a significant difference according to the variables and they found significant negative correlation between life satisfaction and Smartphone Addiction and increase in life satisfaction decreases Smartphone Addiction. Similarly, Basti, Udayar, Shashidharan, Pichandi, and Boyapati (2021) revealed significant fair positive relation between stress, anxiety, depression and Smartphone Addiction and it is found that stress was the most significant factor which possibly predicted the development of addiction. Ayandele, Popoola and Oladiji (2020) reported that 18.35% of respondents are addicted to Smartphone while 81.66% are non-addicted to Smartphone usage. The study reveals the more the usage of Smartphone by a student the more level of anxiety and depression level is found in a student. Cao, Lim, Kodama, (2021) also found that Smartphone Addiction directly affects sleep quality & can affect self-health directly or indirectly through sleep quality. Similarly, Sohn, Krasnoff, Rees, Kalk, Carter (2021) concluded that large proportion of participants disclosed poor sleep quality; who are addicted rather than the ones who are not. This could also relate that younger participants have more time for such endeavors. Sunday, Adesope and Maarhuis (2021) in a comprehensive literature review of existing research revealed that greater use of phone while studying will impact negatively on learning & academic achievements of their cognitive abilities & skills.

Further, Pradeep et al. (2022) reported that younger individuals lack self-control and prudence for proper utilization of cell phone. Results also show that increasing number of peers increases the risk of cell phone addiction and better social life quality also increases the risk of cell phone addiction.

But, very few studies are conducted on prospective teachers to examine their correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction. A research shows reported a significant level of Smartphone Addiction among prospective teachers and significant differences were also found in prospective teachers' Smartphone Addiction and level of life satisfaction (Catherine, 2018). Further, Vujic and Szabo, (2022) stated that perceived stress and hedonic use proved positive prediction of addiction of Smartphone and life satisfaction did not direct predict addiction of Smartphone but indirect effect via perceived stress was statistically significant. Above review of literature shows the gaps in existing knowledge with reference to the correlation between Smartphone Addiction and life satisfaction among prospective teachers.

### **Research Questions:**

- Q.1** What is the level of Life Satisfaction of prospective teachers?
- Q.2** Is there any difference in level of Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers?
- Q.3** Is there any relationship between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers?

### **Objectives:**

Keeping in view the above research questions following objectives have been framed–

1. To examine the level of Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers according to their gender, academic streams, locality and marital status.
2. To compare Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers according to their demography.

3. To study the correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction of prospective teachers.

### Hypotheses:

Following hypotheses have been formulated –

- H01** There is no significant difference in the level of Life Satisfaction between male and female prospective teachers.
- H02** No significant difference exists in the level of Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers belongs to Arts, Science and Commerce academic streams.
- H03** Significant difference does not exist in the level of Life Satisfaction between rural and urban prospective teachers.
- H04** There is no significant difference in the level of Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers according to their marital status.
- H05** Significant correlation does not exist in Smartphone Addiction and demography of prospective teachers.
- H06** No significant correlation exist in Life Satisfaction and demography of prospective teachers.
- H07** There is no significant correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers.

### Method and Participants

In this study, researcher listed the Teacher Training Institutes (TTIs) located in Bareilly affiliated to MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly Uttar Pradesh and then selected 5 TTIs using Lottery method as sample college. Further, 20 prospective teachers were selected from each sample TTI. Therefore, a total sample of 100 prospective teachers studying in two-year B.Ed. programme was selected through simple random sampling method. Investigators used Smartphone Addiction Scale (SAS) developed and standardized by Vijayshri and Masaud Ansari (2021, 2019) to measure the Smartphone Addiction among prospective teachers. Another research instrument Life Satisfaction Scale (LSS) developed and standardized by Hardeo Ojha was used to measure the level of Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers. Researcher collected back the scales from respondents and found that 4 of them were incomplete. Therefore, the data gathered from 96 respondents were analysed as per the objectives of the study.

### Analysis and Interpretation

**Objective-1:** To examine the level of Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers according to their gender, academic streams, locality and marital status.

In human society it is advocated to be satisfied with the amenities available in your life. Our education also focuses to achieve better life satisfaction by the people in their life. In present scenario, elite class and quality life styles distract individuals. Youths are also attracted by these lubricating life styles which may distract them from their goals and original vision of life. It is imperative to comprehend the Life Satisfaction of prospective teachers, as those who are contented and well-balanced in their lives are more capable of guiding future generations effectively. In case of the above objective researcher was intended to know the life satisfaction level of prospective teachers that was measured through a standardized life satisfaction scale. The intention of the researcher was to reveal the levels of life satisfaction of study population and its distribution over different level of life satisfaction given in table 1.

**Table 1: Status of Life Satisfaction among Prospective Teachers**

Life Satisfaction	Gender		Locality		Academic Streams			Marital Status		Overall I
	Male	Female	Rural	Urban	Arts	Sc.	Comm.	Ma.*	UM #	
Extremely Satisfied	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)
Highly Satisfied	00 (0.0)	02 (2.08)	00 (0.0)	02 (2.08)	00 (0.0)	01 (1.04)	01 (1.04)	00 (0.0)	02 (2.08)	02 (2.08)
Above Average Satisfied	11 (11.46)	41 (42.71)	05 (5.21)	47 (48.96)	17 (17.71)	22 (22.92)	13 (13.54)	09 (9.38)	43 (44.79)	52 (54.17)
Average Satisfied	06 (6.25)	27 (28.13)	10 (10.42)	23 (23.96)	08 (8.33)	17 (17.71)	08 (8.33)	07 (7.29)	26 (27.08)	33 (34.38)
Below Average Satisfied	00 (0.0)	02 (2.08)	00 (0.0)	02 (2.08)	00 (0.0)	02 (2.08)	00 (0.0)	01 (1.04)	01 (1.04)	02 (2.08)
Highly Dissatisfied	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)	00 (0.0)
Extremely Dissatisfied	02 (2.08)	05 (5.21)	03 (3.13)	04 (4.17)	01 (1.04)	04 (4.17)	02 (2.08)	00 (0.0)	07 (7.29)	07 (7.29)
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>96</b>

\*Ma.=Married, #UM= Unmarried

From the table 1, it can be concluded significantly that not a single prospective teacher was extremely satisfied in study population. Further, it shows that Female, Urban Area and Unmarried (2.08%) prospective teachers were highly satisfied in their life which equates to overall category. In case of above average level of life satisfaction, urban prospective teachers (48.96%) were satisfied followed by Unmarried (44.79%) and Female (42.71%) prospective teachers. Overall 54.17% prospective teachers indicated above average level of life satisfaction.

Additionally, at average level of life satisfaction, Female prospective teachers (28.13%) showed highest percent, second highest percent was of Unmarried (27.08%) and lastly it was of urban prospective teachers (23.96%) who reflected average level of life satisfaction. Overall, 34.38% prospective teachers were having average level of life satisfaction.

Female, Urban, Science Stream (2.08%) participants showed below average level of life satisfaction comparably, prospective teachers over their marital status indicated below average level of Smartphone Addiction (1.04%). It is quite significant that no prospective teacher was found to be highly dissatisfied level in the status of their life satisfaction.

In contrast with above finding, overall and unmarried prospective teachers (7.29%) were found extremely dissatisfied in their life tracked by Female (5.21%) prospective teachers trailed by third level of extremely dissatisfied participants which share similar percentage i.e., prospective teachers of urban locality and Science stream (4.17%).

**Objective-2 To compare life satisfaction among prospective teachers according to their demography.**

**H01** There is no significant difference in the level of Life Satisfaction between male and female prospective teachers.

The verification of significant difference in level of life satisfaction between male and female prospective teachers is done in the light of statistical analysis presented in the table 2 below.

**Table 2: Comparison of Life Satisfaction between Male and Female Prospective Teachers**

Gender	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	df	t-value
Male	19	66.42	6.78	1.556	94	.297 <sup>NS</sup>
Female	77	65.84	7.76	0.883		

\* = significant at .05 level, \*\* = significant at .01 level, NS = not significant

From the table-2 revealed that scores of Life Satisfaction between male and female prospective teachers do not differ significantly ( $t = 0.297, df = 94, p > .05$ ). Therefore, above null hypothesis is accepted and it concludes that no significant difference exists between male and female prospective teachers. The difference in mean scores of male prospective teachers ( $M=66.42, SD=6.78$ ) indicates that they appear to have higher level of life satisfaction than their female counterparts ( $M=65.84, SD=7.76$ ). The difference may be because male prospective teachers are much more open to the society and they have communication and engagement activities for their happiness as compared to female prospective teachers. In our society females have dual duties and they are always engaged in family works. Therefore, it might be a cause of lower level of life satisfaction among female prospective teachers due to their less happy moments, challenges and difficulties in family and society.

**H02** No significant difference exists in the level of Life Satisfaction between prospective teachers belongs to Arts, Science and Commerce academic streams.

In the table given below statistical verification of above null hypothesis is done with the help of statistical information provided in tables 3 and 4. The received raw data was analyzed using one way ANOVA in SPSS.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Life Satisfaction of Prospective Teachers belongs to Arts, Science and Commerce academic streams**

Academic Streams	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Arts	26	68.04	5.86	1.149	65.6709	70.4060	53.00	76.00
Science	46	64.63	8.13	1.198	62.2176	67.0433	47.00	86.00
Commerce	24	65.38	7.93	1.619	62.0250	68.7250	50.00	80.00
Total	96	65.74	7.59	0.774	64.2015	67.2777	47.00	86.00

From above table-3 it is observed that mean scores of prospective teachers of Arts stream (M=68.04, SD=5.86) are higher than Commerce group (M=65.38, SD=7.93) and prospective teachers of Science stream (M=64.63, SD=8.13). Similarly, the mean scores of Commerce stream prospective teachers are slightly larger than their Science stream counterparts. Therefore, it can be concluded that life satisfaction of prospective teachers of Arts stream seems to be slightly better than their counterparts of Commerce and Science stream. The reason of this slight difference could be that prospective teachers may have less expectations from his/her life. On the other-hand they could be satisfied with amenities available in their life.

**Table 4: Summary of ANOVA (One Way) for Life Satisfaction of Prospective Teachers of Arts, Science and Commerce academic streams**

Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	197.186	2	98.593	1.737	.182
Within Groups	5277.304	93	56.745		
Total	5474.490	95			

Above table 4 presents the summary of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA-one way) used to analyse the Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers according to their academic streams. The above table provides the mean squares are between groups (98.593) and within group (56.745) respectively. The ANOVA results show that  $F(2,93)=1.737$  value is not significant ( $p > .05$ ). Thus, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among prospective teachers according to their academic streams (Arts, Science & Commerce) may be accepted. The reason behind no significant difference could be that everyone wants adequate amenities in his/her for a happy life.

**H<sub>03</sub>** The significant difference does not exist in the level of Life Satisfaction between rural and urban prospective teachers.

The level life satisfaction was tested between rural and urban prospective teachers and statistical details are presented in table 5.

**Table 5: Comparison of Life Satisfaction between Urban and Rural Prospective Teachers**

Locality	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	df	t-value
Urban	78	66.71	7.47	0.84557	94	2.655**
Rural	18	61.61	6.71	1.58246		

From the table 5 it can be said that scores of Life Satisfaction between urban and rural prospective teachers are highly significant ( $t=2.655^{**}$ ,  $df=94$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Thus, above null hypothesis may be rejected and it concludes that there is a significant difference in level of Life Satisfaction between urban and rural prospective teachers. Because the difference in mean scores of urban prospective teachers (M=66.71, SD=7.47) indicate that urban area prospective teachers appear to have higher level of Life Satisfaction than their rural counterparts (M=61.61, SD=6.71). The difference may be because urban area prospective teachers are getting more facilities and resources to satisfy their life needs as compared to

rural prospective teachers. Therefore, it might be a cause of lower level of Life Satisfaction among rural prospective teachers.

**H<sub>04</sub>** The significant difference does not exist in the level of Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers according to their marital status.

Further, the Life Satisfaction level was tested analyzing the raw scores of prospective teachers according to their marital status. The statistical information including Mean, SD and t-value is given in table 6 below.

**Table 6: Comparison of Life Satisfaction between Married and Unmarried Prospective Teachers**

Marital Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	df	t-value
Married	17	65.24	7.85	1.903	94	.308 <sup>NS</sup>
Unmarried	79	65.86	7.55	.850		

From the table 6 it can be observed that scores of Life Satisfaction between married and unmarried prospective teachers do not differ significantly ( $t=0.308$ ,  $df=94$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Therefore, above null hypothesis may not be rejected and it concludes that no significant difference exists between married and unmarried prospective teachers. Because the difference in mean scores of unmarried prospective teachers ( $M=65.86$ ,  $SD=7.55$ ) indicates that they appear to have marginally higher level of Life Satisfaction than their married counterparts ( $M=65.24$ ,  $SD=7.85$ ). The difference may be because unmarried prospective teachers are not much pressurized by their family and can act according to their wish as compared to married prospective teachers who have to take care of his as well as his future generation needs and satisfaction. Therefore, it might be a cause of lower level of Life Satisfaction among married prospective teachers.

**Objective-3 To study the correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction of prospective teachers.**

**H<sub>05</sub>** There is no significant correlation between Smartphone Addiction and demographic characteristics (gender, locality, academic streams and family type) of prospective teachers.

In the table 7 given below the correlation between Smartphone Addiction and demographic characteristics of prospective teachers was calculated using Pearson correlation coefficient.

**Table 7: Correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Demographic Characteristics of Prospective Teachers**

Variables (N=96)	R	p-value
Smartphone Addiction –Gender	-.109	.291
Smartphone Addiction – Locality	.078	.449
Smartphone Addiction – Academic Streams	-.089	.389
Smartphone Addiction - Family Type	.096	.354

From the above table 7 it can be observed that a weak negative correlation was found between Smartphone Addiction and gender ( $r = -0.109$ ,  $p = .291 > .05$ ), a negligible positive correlation with

locality ( $r = .078, p = .449 > .05$ ), weak negative correlation with academic streams i.e. Arts, Science & Commerce ( $r = -.089, p = .389 > .05$ ) and negligible positive correlation with family type of prospective teachers ( $r = .096, p = .354 > .05$ ). While above results were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the above null hypothesis may be accepted that there is no significant correlation in Smartphone Addiction and the demographic characteristics (gender, locality, streams and family type) of prospective teachers. The reason of no significant correlation could be that Smartphone usage is quietly similar among people of different demographic features.

**H<sub>06</sub>** There is no significant correlation between Life Satisfaction and demographic characteristics of prospective teachers.

In the table 8 given below the correlation between Life Satisfaction and demographic characteristics of prospective teachers was calculated using Pearson correlation coefficient.

**Table 8: Correlation between Life Satisfaction and Demographic Characteristics of Prospective Teachers**

Variables (N=96)	R	p-value
Life Satisfaction – Gender	-0.031	.767
Life Satisfaction – Locality	-0.264**	.009
Life Satisfaction - Marital Status	0.032	.759
Life Satisfaction – Academic Streams	-0.131	.203

From the above table 8 can be determined that a significant negative correlation was found between Life Satisfaction and locality ( $r = -0.264, p = .009 < .01$ ), weak negative correlation with gender ( $r = -0.031, p = .767 > .05$ ), negligible positive correlation with marital status ( $r = 0.032, p = .759 > .05$ ) and negative correlation with study academic streams i.e. Arts, Science & Commerce ( $r = -0.131, p = .203 > .05$ ) using Pearson’s correlation. While above results were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the above null hypothesis may be partially accepted and partially may be rejected because there is no significant correlation in Life Satisfaction and prospective teachers’ gender, academic streams and their marital status.

But a significant correlation is found between Life Satisfaction and locality of prospective teachers ( $r = -0.264, p = .009^{**} < .01$ ). A negative correlation between Life Satisfaction and locality of sample indicates that as the level of satisfaction with one's life decreases, the level of satisfaction with their locality also decreases. This is often associated with factors such as dissatisfactory conditions in locality, high crime rates, poor living conditions, and limited access to resources etc. It can be concluded that people feel less happy with their lives in their areas of residence with a lower quality of life. This correlation can help policymakers and community leaders take actions to improve both Life Satisfaction and the overall well-being of the community.

**H<sub>07</sub>** There is no significant correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers.

The correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction scores for prospective teachers was calculated using Pearson correlation with the help of SPSS software. The statistical information is presented in table 9.

**Table 9: Correlation between Prospective Teachers’ Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction**

Variables (N=96)	R	p-value
Smartphone Addiction - Life Satisfaction	.009	0.932 NS

While examining the results presented in above table 9, it can be concluded that there is no significant correlation found between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction of the sample ( $r = .009$ ,  $p = .932 > .05$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis ‘there is no significant correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction among prospective teachers’ is accepted. The result of negligible correlation ( $r = .009$ ) suggests that smartphone usage patterns exist independently of the participants' overall Life Satisfaction. The digital engagement for prospective teachers is likely a functional component of their professional and social lives that does not detrimentally impact their Life Satisfaction.

### Results

Following results are drawn from above findings -

1. Prospective teachers’ gender, academic streams (Arts, Science, and Commerce), and marital status had no significant differences in prospective teachers’ Life Satisfaction ( $p > .05$ ). However, statistically significant difference was observed in Life Satisfaction based on their locality ( $p < .01$ )
2. No significant correlation was reported in Smartphone Addiction and prospective teachers’ demographic characteristics gender, locality, academic streams (Arts, Science, and Commerce), and type of family ( $p > .05$ ).
3. Similarly, no significant correlation was found in Life Satisfaction and prospective teachers’ demographic characteristics gender, academic streams (Arts, Science & Commerce) and marital status ( $p > .05$ ), but there was a significant correlation between Life Satisfaction and their locality ( $p < .01$ ).
4. Finally, no significant correlation was indicated between prospective teachers’ Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction ( $r = .009$ ,  $p = .932 > .05$ )

### Conclusions

This study clearly indicates that Life Satisfaction and Smartphone Addiction among trainee teachers are independent of their individual demographic backgrounds. Factors such as gender, marital status, academic stream, and family type do not play a significant role in determining these psychological states. The study found no correlation between Smartphone Addiction and Life Satisfaction, suggesting that it is not inevitable for digital habits to compromise the well-being of trainee teachers.

However, among the variables examined in this research, place of residence emerged as the sole significant factor, indicating meaningful differences and associations regarding the Life Satisfaction of trainee teachers based on their residential location. These findings suggest that the geographical environment (urban or rural) serves as a significant predictor of Life Satisfaction, as environmental stressors and available resources vary considerably between these regions. To safeguard trainee teachers against Smartphone Addiction and enhance their Life Satisfaction, training in self-control and awareness programs—focused on identifying factors that promote well-being—would be appropriate. Additionally, efforts should be made to encourage increased engagement in real-world social activities.

## References

1. Alhazmi, A. A., Alzahrani, S. H., Baig, M., Salawati, E. M., & Alkatheri, A. (2018). Prevalence and factors associated with smartphone addiction among medical students at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 34(4), 984–988. <https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.344.15294>
2. Aljomaa et al. (2016). Smartphone addiction among university students in the light of some variables. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 61, 155–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.041>
3. Arefin, M. S., Islam, M. R., Mustafi, M. A. A., Afrin, S., & Islam, N. (2017). Impact of smartphone addiction on academic performance of business students: A case study. *Independent Business Review*, 10(1/2), 1–15. (No DOI available; stable URL: <https://ibr-mgt.com/>)
4. Ayandele, O., Popoola, S. T., & Oladiji, J. O. (2020). Assessment of smartphone addiction and its association with anxiety and depression among university students in Nigeria. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 18, 1381–1392. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-018-0038-y>
5. Bagci, H., & Peksen, S. (2018). Investigation of smartphone addiction of university students in terms of different variables. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(12), 154–161. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i12.3681>
6. Basti, R., Udayar, S. E., Shashidharan, S., Pichandi, J., & Boyapati, R. (2021). Smartphone addiction and its association with depression, anxiety and stress among medical students. *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*, 8(10), 4875–4881. <https://doi.org/10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20213785>
7. Cao, X., Lim, Y., & Kodama, H. (2021). Smartphone addiction, sleep quality, and self-health among Japanese university students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(13), 6800. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18136800>
8. Catherene, N. S. (2018). Smartphone addiction and life satisfaction among prospective teachers. *Journal of Education and Psychological Research*, 5(2), 45–52.
9. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., De Neve, J.-E., Aknin, L. B., & Wang, S. (Eds.). (2026). *World Happiness Report 2026*. Sustainable Development Solutions Network. (ISBN: 979-8-9900224-0-9; stable URL: <https://worldhappiness.report/>)
10. Herrero, J., Torres, A., Vivas, P., & Urueña, A. (2019). Smartphone addiction: The interplay between social support, self-esteem, and social anxiety. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 8(3), 273–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000187>
11. Kim, S. E., Kim, J. W., & Kim, S. G. (2015). The association between smartphone addiction and symptoms of depression, anxiety, and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in adolescents. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 14(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12991-015-0056-z>
12. Konan, N., Durmuş, E., Türkoğlu, D., & Bakır, A. (2018). The relationship between smartphone addiction and interaction anxiety among university students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(11), 2413–2420. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.061104>
13. Kula, S., Ayhan, B., Kacay, Z., & Soyer, F. (2020). Investigation of the relationship between smartphone addiction and life satisfaction in university students. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 17(4), 1152–1163. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v17i4.6083>
14. Kula, S., Ayhan, B., Kacay, Z., & Soyer, F. (2020). Investigation of the relationship between smartphone addiction and life satisfaction in university students. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 17(4), 1152–1163.

15. Kurniawan, A., et al. (2024). The impact of techno-stress and fear of missing out (FOMO) on life satisfaction: A study on digital health issues. *Journal of Psychological Research*, 12(2), 145–160.
16. Kurniawan, A., et al. (2025). Digital connectivity and social capital: The paradox of smartphone addiction. *Technology in Society*, 76, 102–118.
17. Liu, C. H., Lin, S. H., Pan, Y. C., & Lin, S. H. (2016). Smartphone addiction and its associated factors of social-psychological characteristics among university students. *PLOS ONE*, 11(3), e0150359. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0150359>
18. Pradeep, R., et al. (2022). Risk factors associated with mobile phone addiction among undergraduate students: A cross-sectional study. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 47(2), 231–235. [https://doi.org/10.4103/ijcm.ijcm\\_1003\\_21](https://doi.org/10.4103/ijcm.ijcm_1003_21)
19. Sohn, S., Krasnoff, L., Rees, P., Kalk, N. J., & Carter, B. (2021). The association between smartphone addiction and sleep: A longitudinal study of young adults in the UK. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12, 629407. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.629407>
20. Sunday, O. J., Adesope, O. O., & Maarhuis, P. L. (2021). The effects of smartphone addiction on learning: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 4, 100114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2021.100114>
21. Vujic, A., & Szabo, A. (2022). Perceived stress and smartphone addiction: The mediating role of life satisfaction. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 20, 3369–3381. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-021-00569-w>