EJOVOC
(ELECTRONIC JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL COLLEGES)
ISSN: 2146-7684
Haziran/June, 2024
Cilt (Volume) 14, Sayı (Number) 1

A RESEARCH REGARDING THE LEVELS OF NOMOPHOBIA AMONG ACADEMICIANS

AKADEMİSYENLERİN NOMOFOBİ DÜZEYLERİNE İLİŞKİN BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Çisem YAŞAR[1]
Ferhat PERÇIN[2]
Tuğba SARAY ÇETINKAYA[3]
Adnan Kürşat TEKE[4]

Makale Geliş Tarihi/Date of Submission : 17.12.2023
Makale Kabul Tarihi/Date of Acceptance : 18.04.2024

Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article
Doi: 10.17339/ejovoc.1405916

Abstract

In parallel with the rapid advancement of technology, the increasing use of smartphones causes some problems. "Nomophobia", which refers to the state of being away from the cell phone or having connection problems, is one of these problems. The aim of this study is to examine whether the level of nomophobia of academicians teaching at a university located in the west of Türkiye differs significantly in terms of age, gender, academic title, and marital status variables. The sample of the study consisted of 205 academicians working at the university who voluntarily participated in the study. In the data collection process of the study, a questionnaire was used to determine the level of nomophobia. Data analysis of the study was carried out using independent sample t-test and analysis of variance test. The results of the analysis revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the participants' general nomophobia levels and nomophobia dimensions in terms of gender, marital status, and academic title variables, while there was a significant difference between the categories of age variable. Considering the findings of the study, it can be said that it is very important to understand how nomophobia questionnaire scores differ according to demographic characteristics in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of academicians and to develop new strategies in this direction.

Keywords: Nomophobia, Addiction, Smartphone, Mobile Technology

Öz

Teknolojinin hızla ilerlemesine paralel olarak akıllı telefon kullanımının her geçen gün artması bazı sorunlara yol açmaktadır. Cep telefonundan uzak kalma ya da bağlantı sorunu yaşama durumunu ifade eden "nomofobi" bu sorunlardan birisidir. Bu araştırmanın amacı, Türkiye'nin batısında bulunan bir üniversitede ders veren öğretim elemanlarının nomofobi düzeyinin yaş, cinsiyet, akademik unvan ve medeni durum değişkenleri açısından anlamlı farklılık gösterip göstermediğini incelemesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini üniversitede görev yapan ve çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katılan 205 öğretim elemanı oluşturmaktadır. Çalışmanın veri toplama sürecinde nomofobi düzeylerini belirleyebilmek için bir anket kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın veri analizleri bağımsız örneklem t-testi ve varyans analizi testi kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Analiz sonuçları, katılımcıların genel nomofobi düzeyleri ve nomofobi boyutları açısından cinsiyet, medeni durum ve akademik unvan değişkenlerine göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmazken, yaş değişkenine göre anlamlı bir farklılık olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Araştırmanın bulguları göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, öğretim elemanlarının verimliliğini ve etkinliğini artırabilmek ve bu doğrultuda yeni stratejiler geliştirebilmek için demografik özelliklerine göre nomofobi ölçeği puanlarının nasıl farklılaştığını anlamanın çok önemli olduğu söylenebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Nomofobi, Bağımlılık, Akıllı Telefon, Mobil Teknoloji

Atıf (Citation): Yaşar, Ç., Perçin, F., Saray Çetinkaya, T., & Teke, A. K. (2024). A research regarding the levels of nomophobia among academicians. *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges (EJOVOC), 14*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.17339/ejovoc.1405916

[1] Lecturer, Istanbul Gelisim University, Istanbul Gelisim Vocational School, cyasar@gelisim.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-0765-861X
[2] Lecturer, Igdir University, Igdir Technical Sciences Vocational School, ferhatpercin@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-7272-189X
[3] Lecturer, Istanbul Gelisim University, Istanbul Gelisim Vocational School, tsaray@gelisim.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-1639-553X
[4] Lecturer, Istanbul Gelisim University, Istanbul Gelisim Vocational School, akteke@gelisim.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3715-8509

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Giriş

Akıllı cihazların günlük hayatta kullanımının artması bu cihazlara bağlı bazı bağımlılıkların da ortaya çıkmasına neden olmaktadır (Karslı & Yavuz, 2024; Müezzin, 2023). Akıllı telefon ve internet bağımlılıkları bu problemlerden bazıları olarak ele alınmaktadır (Konca vd., 2022; Öz & Tortop, 2008). Günümüzde mobil telefonların gelişerek konuşma dışında birçok işlemi yerine getiren akıllı telefonlara dönüşmesi bireylerin telefonlara olan bağlılığını daha da artırmıştır (Avcı, 2020; Erdem vd., 2016).

Nomofobi, bir cep telefonu veya mobil bağlantıdan uzak kalma sonucunda artan korku şeklinde tanımlanan, "no mobile phone phobia (mobil telefon yoksunluğu fobisi)" cümlesinden yola çıkarak oluşmuş bir terimdir (Yildirim & Correia, 2015). Nomofobi ile ilgili yapılan araştırmaların sayısının artması ve hastalık olarak tanımlanmasına yönelik önerilere rağmen henüz hastalık tanım kitaplarında resmi bir ruhsal veya fiziksel hastalık olarak yer almamaktadır (Yılmaz & Bekaroğlu, 2022; "ICD-11 for Mortality", 2022). Nomofobinin hayata etkileri çeşitli değişkenler ile incelenmektedir. Bu araştırmaların büyük çoğunluğu öğrenciler üzerinde yapılırken incelenen değişkenlerden bazıları cinsiyet, yaş, akademik başarı, akıllı telefon kullanım süresi şeklindedir. Yetişkinler üzerinde çeşitli sektörlerde (Kukreti vd., 2021, Olcay & Esen, 2021, Türen vd., 2017) araştırmalar yapılsa da sayısı öğrencilere göre oldukça azdır. Bu alanda yapılan araştırmaların öğrenciler üzerine yoğunlaştığı, yetişkinler üzerine araştırmaların az olduğu gerçeğinden de yola çıkılarak hedef kitle olarak akademisyenler seçilmiştir.

Yöntem

Bu araştırmada nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden ilişkisel araştırma tercih edilmiştir. İlişkisel araştırma yöntemi çeşitli değişkenler arasında anlam çıkartmak için kullanılan bir araştırma yöntemidir (Büyüköztürk vd., 2021). Yaş, cinsiyet, akademik unvan ve medeni hallerinin nomofobi durumuna olan etkileri incelenmiştir. Hedef kitle olarak akademisyenler kolayda örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilmiş ve gönüllülük esasına göre katılım sağlamışlardır.

Veri toplama aracı olarak demografik bilgi formu ile Yildirim ve Correia (2015) tarafından hazırlanan, Yildirim ve arkadaşları (2016) tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanan Nomofobi Ölçeği (NMP – Q) kullanılmıştır. Ölçek 20 sorudan oluşmakta ve kesinlikle katılmıyorum (1) – kesinlikle katılıyorum (7) arası yedili likert tipi ölçekten oluşmaktadır. Veriler 2022-2023 güz döneminde toplanmıştır, veri analizi için ise SPSS Versiyon 26 ve Microsoft Office Excel programları kullanılmıştır.

Ölçeğin genel iç tutarlılık katsayısı 0,952, alt boyutlarında ise iletişim kuramama tutarlılık katsayısı 0,897, çevrimiçi bağlantıyı kaybetme tutarlılık katsayısı 0,908, bilgiye erişememe tutarlılık katsayısı 0,96 ve rahatlıktan feragat etme tutarlılık katsayısı 0,868 olarak bulunmuştur. Bu sonuçlara göre ölçek güvenilir kabul edilebilir.

Bulgular

Ölçek sonuçlarına göre hedef kitlenin %2'si nomofobik değilken, %30,2'sinde hafif düzey nomofobi, %50,7'sinde orta düzey nomofobi ve %17,1'inde ise yüksek nomofobi görülmektedir. Cinsiyete göre nomofobi durumuna bakıldığında erkekler ve kadınlar arasında genel veya alt boyutlar arasında anlamlı bir fark görülmemiştir. Yaş durumuna göre bakıldığında ise yalnızca bilgiye erişememe boyutunda 30 yaş ve altında bulunan kişilerin 43–49 yaş gurubuna göre anlamlı bir şekilde nomofobik olduklarına dair bulguya erişilmiştir. Medeni duruma göre nomofobi ve alt boyutları incelendiğinde ise medeni durumun nomofobik olma durumunu veya alt boyutlarını anlamlı bir şekilde etkilemediği görülmüştür. Akademik unvana göre nomofobi ve alt boyutları incelendiğinde ise akademik unvanın nomofobik olma durumunu veya alt boyutlarını anlamlı bir şekilde etkilemediği görülmüştür.

Tartışma ve Sonuç

Cinsiyet açısından nomofobi durumuna bakıldığında sonuçlar cinsiyetin ölçüldüğü araştırmalarda elde edilen cinsiyetin nomofobi durumuna etki etmediği yaygın sonucu ile tutarlılık göstermektedir (Adnan & Gezgin, 2016; Kocabaş & Korucu, 2018; Ramazanoğlu, 2020; Yorulmaz vd., 2018); fakat yaş ile ilgili aksi yönde bulgular bulunduğu için (Arslan vd., 2019; Gezgin vd., 2020) cinsiyet durumu hakkında tutarlı yorum yapabilmek için farklı kitleler ile araştırma yapılması gereklidir. Medeni durum ile ilgili sonuçlara bakıldığında medeni durumun nomofobik olma durumunu veya alt boyutlarını anlamlı bir şekilde etkilemediği görülmüştür, bu durum İdil ve arkadaşları (2022) sonuçları ile tutarlılık göstermektedir. Bu sonuç medeni durumun akademisyenlerin kişisel iletişimini veya mobil telefonlara erişimini değiştirmediğine yönelik bir görüş oluşturabilir. Yaş ile ilgili elde edilen sonuç ise yaygın elde edilen sonucun (Erdem vd., 2016; Gurbuz & Ozkan, 2020; León-Mejía vd., 2021; Olcay & Esen, 2021) aksine yaşın nomofobik olma durumunu etkilediği yönünde (Arslan vd., 2019; Gezgin vd., 2020) az sayıdaki araştırma ile tutarlıdır. Ölçek

sonuçlarına göre 30 yaş ve altı akademisyenler iletişime erişememe boyutunda 43–49 yaş grubuna göre anlamlı bir şekilde nomofobik davranış göstermektedirler. Bu farkın sebebi yapılan araştırmadaki yaş farkının çok olmasının yanı sıra akademide genç bireylerin teknolojiyi iletişim için daha yoğun kullanmasından da kaynaklanması mümkündür. Fakat akademik unvan durumu incelendiğinde nomofobi veya alt boyutları hakkında anlamlı herhangi bir fark bulunamamıştır. Akademide yapılacak araştırma sayısının artması yaş ve akademik unvan sonuçları arasındaki bu farklılığa açıklık getirecektir. Bu araştırma nomofobi açısından daha farklı bir hedef kitle durumumuzu inceleme açısından önemlidir. Gelecekteki araştırmaların nicel sonuçlar ile nitel sonuçları da katması nomofobinin nedenlerini öğrenme konusunda fayda sağlayacaktır. Ayrıca COVID-19 pandemisinde teknolojinin yoğun kullanımı göz önüne alındığında pandemi sonrasında nomofobi ile ilgili yapılan klinik araştırmalar henüz hastalık açısından netlik kazanmamış bu terimin tanımlanmasında önemli bir rol oynayacaktır.

INTRODUCTION

The spread of smart devices and applications in daily life due to the developing technology leads to the emergence of some addiction problems related to these devices (Karslı & Yavuz, 2024; Müezzin, 2023). Smartphone and internet addictions can be shown among these addiction problems (Konca et al., 2022; Öz & Tortop, 2008). As a concept, addiction can be defined as the lack of ability to stop or manage an activity or the usage of a substance (Egger & Rauterberg, 1996). Recently, it is observed in both developed and developing countries that because of opportunities that smartphones provide, such as quickly sending or receiving e-mails, banking transactions, messaging, taking photos or videos, and making calls almost anywhere, the addiction to smartphones has increased rapidly, especially among individuals working in areas affected by technological developments (Avcı, 2020; Erdem et al., 2016). Data of the “we are social” conducting research on the place of technology in our lives shows that more than two thirds of the world’s population are smartphone users (We are social, 2023). In addition, there are also 78 million smartphone users in Turkey (We are social, 2023). This situation observed in smartphone usage has been encouraging scientists to conduct studies on nomophobia.

As a term, nomophobia, which is comprised of the abbreviations of the words taking place in the expression of "no mobile phone phobia", describes the fear that arises as a result of the increased feeling of being without a cellphone or a mobile phone connection. In other words, it is the involuntary fear and anxiety state occurring due to not being able to communicate online or offline via mobile phones (Yildirim & Correia, 2015).

While examining the subject of nomophobia, different concepts that technology has added to our lives are also faced. Exploring these concepts will make it easier to understand the causes and effects of nomophobia. It is seen that some studies have been conducted on solitude, which is the act of consciously being alone. In a study related to this issue, it was reported that solitude not only causes loneliness but also creates an opportunity for individuals to get to know themselves. In addition, it was emphasized that the reasons such as the fact that technology is with us at every moment of the day, it is used in almost every area of life, and technological devices are preferred to spend time in spare time reduces the desire for solitude (Gordon, 2022). In another study, where the hidden factors of technophobia were examined, it was determined that, unlike individuals with nomophobia, individuals with technophobia were aware of the health problems that might occur due to mobile phone use (Khasawneh, 2018). Kara et al. (2021) examined the association between smart phone usage, anxiety, loneliness, and the levels of nomophobia in young individuals.

Examining the literature, it is seen that studies usually focus on students who have a high rate of access to technology, and young individuals between the ages of 17-29 are used as samples (Adnan & Gezgin, 2016; Akman, 2019; Anshari et al., 2019; Baykan et al., 2021; Bhattathirippad & Patel, 2021; Burucuoğlu, 2017; Çırak & Tuzgöl Dost, 2022; Erdem et al., 2016; Gurbuz & Ozkan, 2020; Güler & Veysikarani, 2019; Güneş & Gücük, 2020; Ramazanoğlu, 2020; Taşhan & Ünver, 2021). On the other hand, public transport sector employees (Türen et al., 2017), travel agency employees (Olcay & Esen, 2021), and teachers (Kukreti et al., 2021) have also been used as samples in some other research.

Regarding variables that may have a relationship with nomophobia, some studies have not able to determine significant difference between females and males (Adnan & Gezgin, 2016; Bhattathirippad & Patel, 2021; Burucuoğlu, 2017; Göktaş & Demirer, 2023; Gurbuz & Ozkan, 2020; Olcay & Esen, 2021; Ramazanoğlu, 2020; Taşhan & Ünver, 2021). However, some research has revealed that nomophobia levels of females are higher (Aygün et al., 2023; Türen et al., 2017), while some other research has revealed that males’ nomophobia levels are higher (Bahl & Deluliis, 2015).

In terms of the age variable, whereas there are studies finding a significant relationship between age and nomophobia levels (Ramazanoğlu, 2020; Taşhan & Ünver, 2021), there are also studies that could not identify any significant relationship between these two variables (Erdem et al., 2016; Gurbuz & Ozkan, 2020; León-Mejía et al., 2021; Olcay &

Esen, 2021). In terms of the association between the duration of smart phone usage and the nomophobia level, some studies have revealed a statistically significant association between these two variables (Erdem et al., 2016; Kara,2021; Kukreti et al., 2021; Olcay & Esen, 2021; Taşhan & Ünver, 2021), while some have not been able to determine any significant relationship (Adnan & Gezgin, 2016). In addition, the association between academic success and the nomophobia levels has been also examined by some research and their results have revealed that there was a significant association between these two factors (Akman, 2019; Baykan et al., 2021; Erdem et al., 2016; Güneş & Gücük, 2020). In the literature, it is seen that most of the research pertaining to nomophobia has been centered around students. This underlines the necessity for studies to be extended to the adult population. Examining the literature, it is seen that although there is an extensive amount of research on nomophobia as a psychological problem (Adnan & Gezgin, 2016; Akman, 2019; Erdem et al., 2016; Gurbuz & Ozkan, 2020; Güler & Veysikarani, 2019; Kukreti et al., 2021; León-Mejía et al., 2021; Olcay & Esen, 2021; Türen et al., 2017), there is no definite information about whether nomophobia is a psychological problem or a natural result of modernization. Moreover, nomophobia still has no official place in disease definition books today (Yılmaz & Bekaroğlu, 2022; "ICD-11 for Mortality", 2022). It is also stated that to be able to make a healthier interpretation of nomophobia, why individuals do not want to stay away from their smartphones should also be questioned (Sui & Sui, 2021). Research has been conducted on academicians after Covid-19 (Durak & Çankaya, 2020; Karamete & Öztürk, 2021; Kurnaz & Serçemeli, 2020; Tog et al., 2023); however, there is a lack of research on the nomophobia levels of academicians who intensively use technology after this pandemic.

One of the main problems related to nomophobia research is that no factors other than age and gender have been measured in those studies. In addition, the target populations of most of the research are students. Since teachers can have a role in shaping students' lives, it is thought that expanding the target population of nomophobia will shed new light on nomophobia research.

Therefore, the aim of this research study was to examine if the age, gender, academic title, and marital status variables of the academicians of a university located in the west of Türkiye have a significant effect on nomophobia's dimensions by using the nomophobia questionnaire. The research questions required for the achievement of research aim are as follows:

- What is the academicians' NMP-Q and its dimensions' score?
- Do the NMP-Q and its dimensions' score vary according to the gender variable?
- Do the NMP-Q and its dimensions' score vary according to the age variable?
- Do the NMP-Q and its dimensions' score vary according to the marital status variable?
- Do the NMP-Q and its dimensions' score vary according to the academic title variable?

METHOD

Research Design

The research employed the exploratory correlational research model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. Exploratory correlational research is a research model used by researchers to make sense of relationships between variables (Büyüköztürk et al., 2021). In the study, age, gender, academic title, and marital status were used as independent variables. The dependent variables, on the other hand, are the participants' situations of not being able to access the mobile phone or not being able to connect.

Participants

The population of this research consisted of academicians working at a university located in the west of Türkiye. Therefore, the research sample consisted of 205 academicians working in the university and participating in the research willingly.

In the selection of the sample, academics were determined through convenience sampling method, which is one of the nonrandom sampling methods. The purpose here is to ensure that participants are readily accessible to the researcher (Fraenkel et al., 2003).

Table 1. Demographic Attributes of the Academicians

		Gender		Total	
		Female	Male		
		Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	%
Age	30 and less	42	23	65	31.7
	31-36	39	27	66	32.2
	37-42	15	15	30	14.6
	43-49	9	8	17	8.3
	50 and above	7	20	27	13.2
Marital Status	Single	64	41	105	51.2
	Married	48	52	100	48.8
Academic Title	Research Assistant	24	12	36	17.6
	Lecturer	56	41	97	47.3
	Assistant Professor	29	24	53	25.9
	Associate Professor - Professor	3	16	19	9.3
	Total	**112**	**93**	**205**	**100**

When the demographic attributes of the academicians participating in this research was examined (Table 1), it was determined that 112 (54.6%) of the academicians were female and 93 (45.4%) were male. The age ranges of them were as follows; 65 (31.7%) of the participants were aged 30 and younger, 66 (32.2%) of them were between 31-36, 30 (14.6%) of them were between 37-42, 17 (8.3%) of them were between 43-49, and 27 (13.2%) of them were aged 50 and older. Considering the marital status of the participants, 105 (51.2%) of the participants were single and 100 (48.8%) of them were married. Lastly, when the academic titles of the participants were examined, it was observed that 36 (17.6%) of the participants were research assistants, 97 (47.3%) of them were lecturers, 53 (25.9%) of them were associate professors and 19 (9.3%) of them were professors.

Data Collection Tools

During the fall semester of the 2022-2023 academic year, academicians teaching at a university located in the west of Türkiye were voluntarily surveyed online through online form. The research employed the "Nomophobia Questionnaire" along with "Demographic Information Form" as data collection instruments.

The questionnaire form utilized in the study consisted of two sections. Questions related to the attributes of the participants' gender, age, marital status, academic title, and academic department were included in the first section of it. In the second section, the Nomophobia Questionnaire (NMP-Q) was utilized to identify the nomophobia levels of the academicians. This questionnaire was first used by Yildirim and Correia (2015), and then it was converted into Turkish by Yildirim et al. (2016). This questionnaire is made of 20 items. Scoring of each of these items was designed based on the 7-point Likert scale including answers from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).

Table 2. Levels of Nomophobia According to NMP-Q Score

Score	Nomophobia Level
NMP-Q Score = 20	None
21 ≤ NMP-Q Score < 60	Mild
60 ≤ NMP-Q Score < 100	Moderate
100 ≤ NMP-Q Score < 140	Severe

(Yildirim and Correia, 2015)

This scale measures four dimensions of nomophobia. These dimensions, their abbreviations to be used in this article, and the number of items related to them in the scale are as follows:

Table 3. Dimensions of NMP-Q

Dimension	Related Items
Not Being Able to Access Information (NBAAI)	Items 1 - 4
Losing Connectedness (LC)	Items 5 - 9
Not Being Able to Communicate (NBAC)	Items 10 - 15
Giving Up Convenience (GUC)	Items 16 - 20

Furthermore, the internal consistency of the scale used is at a sufficient level (Cronbach's alpha measures for the Turkish and original versions of the scale are .92 and .95, respectively).

Data Analysis

In the context the study, the questionnaire form was sent to the academicians in the universe of the research via the electronic environment, and maximum care was taken to fill it out voluntarily. To carry out data analyses, SPSS statistical software (version 26) and Microsoft Office Excel were used.

The conducted research is limited to the faculty members of the university during the fall semester of the 2022-2023 academic year. Therefore, the findings derived from it can only be generalized to individuals with similar characteristics. In this study, it is assumed that responses provided to the data collection instruments as realistic answers. Furthermore, the study is confined only to the criteria assessed by the data collection instruments.

When the results related to the internal consistency of the scale utilized in this study were examined, it was seen that for the whole scale, the Cronbach alpha value was .952. On the other hand, for the 4 dimensions of NMP-Q mentioned above, Cronbach's alpha values were determined as .897, .904, .960, and .868, respectively. Considering these results, it can be said that the NMP-Q and its dimensions are quite reliable (a>0.7).

Table 4. Reliability Results for the NMP-Q and its Dimensions for Nomophobia

NMP-Q and dimensions of nomophobia	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	α for Standardized Items	n
NMP-Q	.952	.952	20
NBAAI	.897	.897	4
LC	.904	.908	5
NBAC	.960	.960	6
GUC	.868	.868	5

Normality of data was tested by using Skewness and Kurtosis test for the whole questionnaire and all of the dimensions (Table 5). Both Kurtosis and Skewness values are between -2 and +2, which means data is distributed normally (George & Mallery, 2012).

Table 5. Skewness and Kurtosis Results of Normality Test

NMP-Q and dimensions of nomophobia	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
NMP-Q	.073	.170	-.604	.338
BE	-.020	.170	-1.118	.338
RFE	.191	.170	-.992	.338
IK	-.307	.170	-.960	.338
CBK	.903	.170	.267	.338

Normality of data was tested by using Skewness and Kurtosis test for all of the independent variables (Table 6).

Table 6. Skewness and Kurtosis Results of Normality Test Values of Independent Variables

Variables		Skewness		Kurtosis	
		Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Gender	Female	.041	.228	-.668	.453
	Male	.116	.250	-.493	.495
Age	30 and younger	-.208	.297	-.350	.586
	31-36	.170	.295	-.836	.582
	37-42	.517	.427	.090	.833
	43-49	-.440	.550	-.975	1.063
	50 and older	-.034	.448	-.505	.872
Marital Status	Single	.067	.236	-.118	.467
	Married	.112	.241	-.938	.478
Academic Title	Research Assistant	-.346	.393	-.235	.768
	Lecturer	-.002	.245	-.830	.485
	Assistant Professor	.476	.327	-.147	.644
	Associate Professor - Professor	-.222	.524	.250	1.014

Ethical Statement

This study was prepared with the permission of Istanbul Gelisim University Rectorate Ethics Committee dated 03.12.2021 and numbered 2021-37.

FINDINGS

Academicians' General NMP-Q Level

When examining the levels of nomophobia among academicians using the NMP-Q, it was found that 2% (n=4) reported no nomophobia, 30.2% (n=62) reported mild nomophobia, 50.7% (n=104) reported moderate nomophobia, and 17.1% reported severe levels of nomophobia.

Examination of the Participants' NMP-Q Scores and Dimensions of Nomophobia Regarding Gender Variable

In the study, the independent sample t-test was applied to examine the association between male and female participants by considering NMP-Q Scores and dimensions of nomophobia. The findings are presented in the table below.

Table 7. Examination of the Participants' NMP-Q Scores and Dimensions of Nomophobia in terms of Gender

Variable	Gender	N	x̄	S	df	t	p
NMP-Q Scores	Female	112	72.330	27.640	203	0.850	.816
	Male	93	73.060	26.970			
NBAAI	Female	112	3.820	1.680	203	1.030	.302
	Male	93	4.050	1.580			
GUC	Female	112	3.510	1.600	203	.648	.518
	Male	93	3.360	1.640			
NBAC	Female	112	4.370	1.740	203	.717	.474
	Male	93	4.190	1.770			
LC	Female	112	2.600	1.410	203	1.474	.142
	Male	93	2.91	1.57			

Note. N: Frequency, x̄: Mean, S: Standard Deviation, p: Sign (2-tailed), df: Degree of Freedom

As seen in Table 7, the difference between the NMP-Q scores of male academicians (X=3.65) and female academicians (X=3.61) could not be determined as significant at the end of the t-test (p>.05). Regarding dimensions, levels revealed that the mean scores of the female and male participants were 3.82 and 4.05 for the NBAAI dimension; 3.51 and 3.36 for the GUC dimension, 4.37 and 4.19 for the NBAC dimension, and 2.60 and 2.91 for the LC dimension, respectively.

However, for these four dimensions, none of these differences between females and males was statistically significant (p>.05).

Examination of the Participants' NMP-Q Scores and Nomophobia Dimensions Regarding Age Variable

Because the age variable had been converted into an ordinal categorical variable (30 and younger, 31-36, 37-42, 43-49, and 50 and older) for the analysis, the ANOVA test was used to figure out whether the participants' NMP-Q and dimension scores were significantly different by the age variable. ANOVA test results showed that the differences among the age groups were not significant in all dimensions, except NBAAI. The ANOVA Levene's test results also showed that the distribution of the data was homogeneous (p>.05). Based on this result, the determination of the differences between the age groups was carried out by using the Post-Hoc analysis.

Table 8. Examination of the Participants' NMP-Q Scores and Dimensions of Nomophobia by the Age Variable

Variable		N	x̄	SS
NMP-Q Scores	30 and younger (1)	65	3.843	1.332
	31-36 (2)	66	3.651	1.439
	37-42 (3)	30	3.412	1.345
	43-49 (4)	17	3.222	1.144
	50 and older (5)	27	3.565	1.301
NBAAI	30 and younger (1)	65	4.470	1.600
	31-36 (2)	66	3.850	1.750
	37-42 (3)	30	3.600	1.550
	43-49 (4)	17	3.260	1.300
	50 and older (5)	27	3.570	1.390
GUC	30 and younger (1)	65	3.750	1.680
	31-36 (2)	66	3.520	1.620
	37-42 (3)	30	3.180	1.590
	43-49 (4)	17	3.130	1.410
	50 and older (5)	27	3.000	1.550
NBAC	30 and younger (1)	65	4.480	1.770
	31-36 (2)	66	4.190	1.800
	37-42 (3)	30	4.110	1.730
	43-49 (4)	17	4.150	1.630
	50 and older (5)	27	4.330	1.750
LC	30 and younger (1)	65	2.64	1.36
	31-36 (2)	66	2.93	1.52
	37-42 (3)	30	2.60	1.79
	43-49 (4)	17	2.14	1.031
	50 and older (5)	27	3.07	1.57

Note. N: Frequency, x̄: Mean, SS: Sum of Square

According to Field (2013), Gabriel analysis is used as post hoc when the number of samples between the groups is not exactly equal and close to each other. When Gabriel analysis was performed for the NBAAI dimension, a statistically significant difference between those aged 30 and younger (X=4.47) and those aged 43-49 (X=3.26) was determined (F=3.28; p<.05).

Table 9. Investigation of Participants' NMP-Q Scores and Nomophobia Dimensions According to the Results of Anova Test According to Age Variable

		SS	df	Mean Square	F	p	Sig. Diff.
NMP-Q Scores	Between Groups	7.352	4	1.838	1.004	.406	-
	Within Groups	366.005	200	1.830			
	Total	373.357	204				
NBAAI	Between Groups	33.707	4	8.427	3.282	.012	1-4
	Within Groups	513.517	200	2.568			
	Total	547.224	204				
GUC	Between Groups	15.441	4	3.860	1.478	.210	-
	Within Groups	522.469	200	2.612			
	Total	537.910	204				
NBAC	Between Groups	4.206	4	1.052	.337	.853	-
	Within Groups	623.414	200	3.117			
	Total	627.620	204				
LC	Between Groups	12.654	4	3.164	1.424	.227	-
	Within Groups	444.334	200	2.222			
	Total	456.988	204				

Note. N: Frequency, SS: Sum of Square, df: Degree of freedom, Sig. Diff.: Significant Differences (30 and younger (1), 43-49 (4)), p: Sign

Examination of the Participants' NMP-Q Scores and Nomophobia Dimensions Regarding the Marital Status Factor

In the study, to examine the differences between the single and married academicians in terms of NMP-Q Scores and dimensions of nomophobia, the independent sample t-test was applied. Table 10 presents the findings.

Table 10. NMP-Q Scores and Nomophobia Dimensions of the Participants by the Marital Status

Variable		N	x̄	S	df	t	p
NMP-Q Scores	Single	105	73.799	24.911	193.587	0.600	0.547
	Married	100	71.499	29.644			
NBAAI	Single	105	4.033	1.599	200.919	.931	.353
	Married	100	3.822	1.688			
GUC	Single	105	3.597	1.521	197.310	1.366	.174
	Married	100	3.287	1.718			
NBAC	Single	105	4.333	1.719	201.275	.346	.730
	Married	100	4.248	1.796			
LC	Single	105	2.706	1.375	203	-.379	.705
	Married	100	2.786	1.620			

Note. N: Frequency, x̄: Mean, S: Standard Deviation, p: Sign, df: Degree of Freedom

Levene's test findings of the t-test revealed that while the variances for the NBAAI, GUC, and NBAC dimensions were homogeneous (sig>0.05), the variances for the LC dimension and NMP-Q scores were not homogeneous (sig<0.05). For this reason, in cases where variances were not equal in terms of NMP-Q scores and LC dimension and in cases where variances were equal in terms of other dimensions, t-test results were considered. Accordingly, as seen in Table 10, any statistically significant difference could not be determined between single and married academicians in terms of NMP-Q scores and dimensions of nomophobia (p>.05).

Although the differences were not statistically significant, we can still talk about the mean values of each group of marital status in terms of the dependent variables. It was seen that in terms of NMP-Q values, the mean values of the married and single participants were 3.57 and 3.68, respectively. That is, single individuals had higher NMP-Q values. On the other hand, in terms of NBAAI dimension, the mean score of the married participants was 3.82 and it was 4.03 for the single participants. Regarding GUC dimension, the mean scores of the married and single participants were 3.28

and 3.59, respectively. In terms of the NBAC dimension, the mean scores of the married and single participants were 4.24 and 4.33, respectively. Finally, regarding the LC dimension, the mean scores of married and single participants were 2.78 and 2.70, respectively. It is seen that despite it is not significant statistically, married individuals had higher scores in the dimension of LC.

Examination of the Participants' NMP-Q Scores and Nomophobia Dimensions in terms of the Academic Title Variable

To examine whether the participants' nomophobia dimensions differ by their academic titles, the ANOVA test was performed. The descriptive statistics of NMP-Q results are provided in Table 11, while the results of the ANOVA test are provided in Table 12.

Table 11. NMP-Q Scores and Nomophobia Dimensions of the Participants by the Academic Title Variable

Variable		N	x̄	SS
NMP-Q Scores	Research Assistant	36	74.000	24.636
	Lecturer	97	74.610	28.548
	Assistant Professor	53	68.500	27.953
	Associate Professor - Professor	19	71.780	23.959
NBAAI	Research Assistant	36	4.260	1.620
	Lecturer	97	3.960	1.656
	Assistant Professor	53	3.690	1.707
	Associate Professor - Professor	19	3.770	1.356
GUC	Research Assistant	36	3.570	1.523
	Lecturer	97	3.670	1.670
	Assistant Professor	53	3.130	1.580
	Associate Professor - Professor	19	2.890	1.530
NBAC	Research Assistant	36	4.290	1.824
	Lecturer	97	4.330	1.762
	Assistant Professor	53	4.160	1.705
	Associate Professor - Professor	19	4.300	1.833
LC	Research Assistant	36	2.620	1.479
	Lecturer	97	2.840	1.437
	Assistant Professor	53	2.550	1.596
	Associate Professor - Professor	19	2.980	1.583

Note. N: Frequency, SS: Sum of Square, x̄: Mean

When the nomophobia levels of participants are examined, it is observed that they are at a moderate level (x̄: 72,6683, SD: 27,27955). Despite the scores being quite close to each other based on academic titles, firstly ANOVA test was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference in nomophobia dimensions.

Table 12. Anova Test Results of Participants' NMP-Q Scores and Nomophobia Dimensions According to Academic Title Variable

		SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sig. Diff.
NMP-Q Scores	Between Groups	1364.154	3	454.718	.608	.611	-
	Within Groups	150447.290	201	748.494			
	Total	151811.444	204				
NBAAI	Between Groups	7.407	3	2.469	.919	.432	-
	Within Groups	539.817	201	2.686			
	Total	547.224	204				
GUC	Between Groups	16.823	3	5.608	2.163	.094	-
	Within Groups	521.087	201	2.592			
	Total	537.910	204				
NBAC	Between Groups	1.208	3	.403	.129	.943	-
	Within Groups	626.412	201	3.116			
	Total	627.620	204				
LC	Between Groups	4.411	3	1.470	.653	.582	-
	Within Groups	452.577	201	2.252			
	Total	456.988	204				

Note. N: Frequency, SS: Sum of Square, df: Degree of freedom, Sig. Diff.: Significant Differences, p: Sign

When the nomophobia levels of participants are examined, it is observed that they are at a moderate level ($\bar{x}$: 72,6683, SD: 27,27955).

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Upon review of the literature, it is evident that the majority of the studies on nomophobia have been focused on student samples. While a limited number of studies have investigated nomophobia levels among individuals in the working environment (Arslan et al., 2019; Avcı, S., 2020; Idil et al., 2022; Kukreti et al., 2021; Olcay & Esen 2021), there is a notable absence of studies focusing on academicians. Considering the potential impact of nomophobia on work life, we think that investigating the nomophobia levels of academicians and exploring the associated factors in this study will contribute to the literature.

The results of this study did not reveal any statistically significant differences between males and females regarding both NMP-Q scores and nomophobia dimensions. In other words, we could not obtain a statistically significant finding that gender effects nomophobia. This finding aligns with some previous studies which have also failed to identify significant differences between genders in relation to NMP-Q scores and nomophobia dimensions (Adnan & Gezgin, 2016; Kocabaş & Korucu, 2018; Ramazanoğlu, 2020; Yorulmaz et al., 2018). However, it is noteworthy that some studies have reported significant differences between males and females in terms of nomophobia levels (Arslan et al., 2019; Gezgin et al., 2020). Upon reviewing the relevant literature, it is evident that the findings regarding gender differences in nomophobia levels are inconsistent. While it can be said that both genders exhibit smartphone dependencies, further research is required to explore the complex relationship between gender and nomophobia among different populations and contexts.

Findings of this study also revealed that there was a significant difference between some of the age groups in terms of overall NMP-Q scores and the NBAAI dimension scores. Using the Gabriel analysis, it was shown that the significant difference was between the age group of 43-49 and those aged 30 and younger. In the literature, many studies have also revealed that there are significant differences between age groups in terms of nomophobia levels (Arslan et al., 2019; Gezgin et al., 2020). In conclusion, it can be stated that individuals aged 30 and below, due to their high tendencies to monitor real-time developments and their engagement in fewer interpersonal interactions, exhibit a higher level of fear of being separated from their mobile phones compared to individuals within the 43-49 age group.

The results of this research did not reveal any statistically significant differences between single and married academicians in terms of NMP-Q scores and nomophobia dimensions. This finding is consistent with the study by Idil et al. (2022), which similarly found no significant differences in nomophobia scores between married and single

individuals. Based on this result, it may be suggested that the daily interactions of married individuals do not express a significant difference in their nomophobia among academicians. However, the scarcity of research concerning this particular status makes harder to state definitive conclusion. Similarly, when the academic title variable was examined in terms of NMP-Q and nomophobia dimension scores, no significant differences were found between the academic title groups. While there is a significant difference according to age, it is possible that high levels of interpersonal communication inherit in academia may be a contributing factor to the absence of a significant difference in terms of nomophobia.

Based on findings of this research, we think that understanding the differences in NMP-Q scores among academicians based on their demographic characteristics is crucial for enhancing their efficiency and effectiveness, and for developing targeted strategies. Furthermore, the significance of young academicians' difference with the NBAAI dimension highlights a new situation. They are constantly engaged with both the technology and the students while also generating new knowledge.

This study aimed to provide a contribution to the literature by trying to determine whether the NMP-Q scores of the academicians differ significantly by gender, age, marital status, and academic title variables. By shedding light on these aspects, this research not only adds to our understanding of nomophobia among academicians but also provides valuable insights for developing targeted solutions and support systems in academic settings.

This study was carried out with the teaching staff of a single university. Future research could replicate this study with teaching staff from diverse universities, thus broadening the scope of this matter. Increasing the sample size in future studies also enhances the generalization of the findings. While in this study, data were collected exclusively through a questionnaire, in future studies, data can be collected by combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods. Qualitative approaches, such as interviews or focus groups, could provide deeper insights into the past experiences and perceptions of academicians regarding nomophobia. It is noteworthy that research on nomophobia among adults, particularly within academia, remains limited. Future studies could delve deeper into this area, exploring clinical cases of diagnosed nomophobia patients among adults with the guidance of psychologists.

REFERENCES

Adnan, M., & Gezgin, D. M. A. (2011). Modern phobia: Prevalence of nomophobia among college students. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences (JFES), 49*(1), 141-158. https://doi.org/10.1501/Egifak_0000001378

Akman, E. (2019). The effect of the nomophobia on academic success: An evaluation on the political science and public administration students of Suleyman Demirel University. *International Journal of Eurasian Research*, *7*(16), 256-275. https://doi.org/10.33692/avrasyad.543756

Anshari, M., Alas, Y., & Sulaiman, E. (2019). Smartphone addictions and nomophobia among youth. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies, 14*(3), 242-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/17450128.2019.1614709

Arslan, H., Tozkoporan, S. B., & Kurt, A. A. (2019). Examination of nomophobia and fear of missing out among teachers. *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty, 21*(3), 237-256. https://doi.org/10.17556/erziefd.512074

Avcı, S. (2020). *Examining the nomophobia levels of teachers with sociodemographic variables* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Çağ University.

Aygün, A., Ulu, E., & Akça, R. P. (2023). A research on nomophobia: high school students example. *Social Sciences Studies Journal (Sssjournal), 9*(116), 8649-8656. https://doi.org/10.29228/sssj.72778

Bahl, R. R., & Deluliis, D. (2015). Nomophobia. In Z. Yan (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of mobile phone behavior* (pp. 745-754). IGI Global.

Baykan, Z., Güneş, H., & Seyfeli Y. (2021). The relationship between smart phone addiction and academic procrastination and academic success in Erciyes University Medical Faculty students. *World of Medical Education, 20*(61), 119-134. https://doi.org/10.25215/0904.055

Bhattathirippad, S., & Patel, N. M. (2021). Social networking usage, nomophobia and depression symptoms among young adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *9*(4), 570-584. https://doi.org/10.25215/0904.055

Burucuoğlu, M. (2017). A Research on nomophobia levels of vocational college students. *Karabuk University Journal of Institute of Social Science*, *7*(2), 482-489.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz Ş., & Demirel, F. (2021). Eğitimde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. Pegem Yayıncılık.

Çırak, M., & Tuzgöl Dost, M. (2022). Nomophobia in university students: The roles of digital addiction, social connectedness, and life satisfaction. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, *12*(64), 35-52. https://doi.org/10.17066/tpdrd.1095905

Durak, G., & Çankaya, S. (2020). Emergency Distance Education Process from the Perspectives of Academicians. *Asian Journal of Distance Education, 15*(2), 159-174.

Egger, O., & Rauterberg, M. (1996). Internet behaviour and addiction.

Erdem, H., Kalkın, G., Türen, U., & Deniz, M. (2016). The effects of no mobile phone phobia (nomofobi) on academic performance among undergraduate students. *Suleyman Demirel University the Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 21*(3), 923-936.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics.* SAGE.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* McGraw-Hill.

George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference.* Pearson.

Gezgin, D. M., Hamutoğlu, N.B., Başarmak, U., & Dağlı, E. S. (2020). Investigation of nomophobia levels of preschool teachers in terms of different variables. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Research, 14*(32), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.29329/mjer.2020.258.1

Gordon, M. (2022). Solitude and privacy: How technology is destroying our aloneness and why it matters. *Technology in Society*, 68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101858

Göktaş, H., & Demirer, V. (2023). The relationship between high school students' nomophobia, smartphone addiction and academic achievement level. Educational Technology Theory and Practice, *13*(1), 209-232. https://doi.org/10.17943/etku.1130214

Gurbuz, I. B., & Ozkan G. (2020). What is your level of nomophobia? An investigation of prevalence and level of nomophobia among young people in Turkey. Community Mental Health Journal, *56*(5), 814-822. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-019-00541-2

Güler, E. Ö., & Veysikarani, D. (2019). A research on nomophobia: example of university students. *Journal of Beykoz Academy*, *7*(1), 75-88. https://doi.org/10.14514/BYK.m.26515393.2019.7/1.75-88

Güneş, N. A., & Gücük, S. (2020). The relationship between nomophobia levels and academic successes in medical faculty students. *Turkish Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, *14*(3), 396-402. https://doi.org/10.21763/tjfmpc.691384

ICD-11 for Mortality and Morbidity Statistics (2022). *ICD World Health Organization.* World Health Organization. Retrieved July 17, 2022, from https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en

Idil, Ö., Çakır, R., & Akman, E. (2022). An examination of the relation between in-service preschool teachers and preschool teacher candidates' levels of nomophobia and FoMO. *Participatory Educational Research*, *9*(5), 59-75. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.104.9.5

Kara, M. (2021). High schoolers' usage intensity of mobile social media and nomophobia: investigating the mediating role of flow experience. *Participatory Educational Research*, *8*(1), 409-422. http://dx.doi.org/10.17275/per.21.24.8.1

Kara, M., Baytemir, K., & Inceman-Kara, F. (2021). Duration of daily smartphone usage as an antecedent of nomophobia: Exploring multiple mediation of loneliness and anxiety. Behaviour & Information Technology, *40*(1), 85-98. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2019.1673485

Karamete, A., & Öztürk, G. (2021). Views of academic staff about the assessment processes of online courses during the COVID-19 pandemic. In G. Durak ve S. Cankaya (Eds.) *Handbook of research on managing and designing online courses in synchronous and asynchronous environments* (pp. 522-546). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8701-0.ch026

Karslı, F., & Yavuz, B. A. (2024). Relationship of phubbing with depression, anxiety, selfesteem and other mental variables. Journal of Dependence, *25*(2), 122-132. https://doi.org/10.51982/bagimli.1332637

Khasawneh, O. Y. (2018). Technophobia: Examining its hidden factors and defining it. *Technology in Society*, 54, 93-100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2018.03.008

Kocabaş, D., & Korucu, K. S. (2018). The disease of digital era: Nomophobia. *Eurasian Journal of Researches in Social and Economics, 5*(11), 254-268. https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_71_19

Konca, A. S., Baltaci, O., & Akbulut, O. F. (2022). Problematic Technology Use Scale for Young Children (PTUS-YC): Validity and Reliability Study. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education, 9*(2), 267-289. https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.888936

Kukreti, S., Ahorsu, D. K., Strong, C., Chen, I. H., Lin, C. Y., Ko, N. Y., Griffiths, M. D., Chen, Y. P., Kuo, Y. J., & Pakpour, A. H. (2021). Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder in Chinese teachers during COVID-19 pandemic: Roles of fear of COVID-19, nomophobia, and psychological distress. *Healthcare, 9*(10), 1288. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9101288

Kurnaz, E., & Serçemeli, M. (2020). A research on students' perspectives to distance education and distance accounting education in the covid-19 pandemia period. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Akademi Dergisi, 3*, 262-288. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/usbad/issue/55116/745914

León-Mejía, A. C., Gutiérrez-Ortega, M., Serrano-Pintado, I., & González-Cabrera, J. (2021). A systematic review on nomophobia prevalence: Surfacing results and standard guidelines for future research. *PloS One, 16*(5), https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250509

Müezzin, E. E. (2023). Investigation of the relationship between smartphone addiction and psychological symptoms. Adiyaman University Journal of Social, (45), 353-375. https://doi.org/10.14520/adyusbd.1355736

Okuyan, C., Güner, P. D., & Güneş, S. U. (2019). Determination of nomophobia levels of nursing and medical students. *Gümüşhane University Journal of Health Sciences, 8*(4), 372-382.

Olcay, A., & Esen, M. (2021). A study on determining nomophobia levels of travel agency employees. *The Journal of Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University Faculty of Tourism, 24*(1), 72-98. https://doi.org/10.34189/tfd.24.01.004

Öz, H., & Tortop, H. S. (2018). Investigation of university students' nomophobia levels between personality types. *e-Journal of New Media, 2*(3), 146-159.

Özduman, A., Gök. B., & Hadi, G. (2020). Mobile addiction status of mobile phone users and development of 5g technology acceptance intention models. *The Journal of Information Technologies (JIT), 13*(3), 269-288. https://doi.org/10.17671/gazibtd.551198

Ramazanoğlu, M. (2020). Determining the nomophobia levels of teacher candidates. *Ekev Academy Journal*, 81, 247-264.

Sui, A., & Sui, W. (2021). Not getting the message: Critiquing current conceptualizations of nomophobia. *Technol. Soc.*, 67, 101719. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101719

Taşhan, A., & Ünver, Z. (2021). The Relationship of Social Network Use with the Fear of Being without the Mobile Phone (Nomophobia): A research on university students of graphic design and its possible future role. *Ordu University Social Sciences Institute Journal of Social Sciences Research, 11*(1), 41-63. https://doi.org/10.48146/odusobiad.727647

Toh, S. Y., Ng, S. A., & Phoon, S. T. (2023). Accentuating technology acceptance among academicians: A conservation of resource perspective in the Malaysian context. *Education and Information Technologies,* 28, 2529–2545. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11288-x

Türen, U., Erdem, H., & Kalkın, G. (2017). No mobile phone phobia (Nomophobia) prevalence: Samples of undergraduate students and public employees from Turkey. *The Journal of Information Technologies (JIT), 10*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.14514/BYK.m.26515393.2019.7/1.75-88

We are social (2023). *Digital 2023 October global statshot report*. Retrieved October 25, 2023, from https://wearesocial.com/uk/blog/2023/10/digital-2023-october-global-statshot-report/

Yılmaz, T., & Bekaroğlu, E. (2022). Does interpersonal sensitivity and paranoid ideation predict nomophobia: an analysis with a young adult sample. *Current Psychology, 41*(2), 1026-1032. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01501-4

Yildirim, C., & Correia, A. P. (2015). Exploring the dimensions of nomophobia: Development and validation of a self-reported questionnaire. *Computers in Human Behavior, 49*, 130-137.

Yildirim, C., Sumuer, E., Adnan, M., & Yildirim, S. (2016). A growing fear: Prevalence of nomophobia among Turkish college students. *Information Development, 32*(5), 1322-1331. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666915599025

Yorulmaz, M., Kıraç, R., & Sabırlı, H. (2018). Effects of nomofobi in sleeping at university students. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research (JSHSR), 5*(27), 2988-2996. https://doi.org/10.26450/jshsr.598