

1 **Smart youth: sociodemographic factors, usage patterns,**
2 **and self-reported vs. actual smartphone addiction among**
3 **secondary school students**

4 Magdalena Rękas^{1¶}, Joanna Burzyńska^{1*¶}

5 ¹Department of Nursing and Public health, Institute of Health Sciences, College of Medical
6 Sciences, University of Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland

7

8 *Corresponding author

9 E-mail: jburzynska@ur.edu.pl (JB)

10 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

11 **Abstract**

12 **Background**

13 Smartphone addiction is a growing social problem especially in young mobile users. This study
14 investigated indicators of smartphone use, smartphone addiction, and their associations with
15 demographic and behavior-related variables in young people.

16 **Methods**

17 460 participants were secondary school students ($M_{age} = 17,10$, $SD_{age} = 0.92$, 51.1% males,
18 52.4% high school students), took part in an anonymous questionnaire consisting of the
19 following elements: the Mobile Phone Addiction Assessment Questionnaire (KBUTK),
20 original questions regarding problematic smartphones usage, along with a subjective
21 assessment of the use of such devices. Logistic regression model using forward stepwise
22 method was used to characterize a typical smartphone user. Smartphone addiction was
23 measured using KBUTK. Multiple logistic regression analysis was performed to determine
24 factors associated with smartphone addiction.

25 **Results**

26 A total of 460 participants admitted to using a smartphone. Gender, age, type of school, place
27 of living influenced the ways respondents used their smartphones. Being female (OR = 5.80; p
28 < 0.0001), sixteen-year-old (OR = 0,41; $p = 0.0456$), and student of technical school (OR =
29 2.66; $p = 0.0025$) turned out to be the characteristics of a typical smartphone user. 21.7% of
30 adolescents considered themselves addicted to smartphones, 22.2% admitted that they had
31 problems with face-to-face relationships and girls significantly more often than boys (61.8%
32 vs. 51.5%) neglected home or school duties as a result of using a smartphone. The overall rate

33 of smartphone addiction was significantly higher ($p < 0.0001$) among girls (2.31 pts) than boys
34 (2.03 pts), and correlated positively with the perception of being a smartphone addict ($rho =$
35 0.223 ; $p < 0.0001$). Addiction to smartphones was also significantly more common among
36 students of technical schools, and respondents living in blocks of flats.

37 **Conclusions**

38 The way adolescents used smartphones differed depending on gender, age and type of school.
39 Interventions for reducing the negative effects of smartphone use should take into account
40 these context, as well as education both adolescents and their parents.

41 **Introduction**

42 In an era where digital devices have become ubiquitous, adolescents are at the forefront
43 of embracing smartphone technology. These pocket-sized gadgets serve as portals to a vast
44 digital universe, offering connectivity, entertainment, and information at the swipe of a finger.
45 While smartphones undoubtedly bring numerous benefits, concerns have arisen regarding their
46 potential impact on adolescent development, particularly concerning excessive use and its
47 consequences.

48 There is growing evidence that smartphones are being overused in ways that are forcing
49 changes in their users' daily lives and health [1, 2]. It has been shown that the frequency of
50 smartphone use, especially by adolescents, may be associated with negative effects on mental
51 health, such as depression [2 - 5], anxiety [2 - 4], and addiction [6 - 8]. In literature and
52 colloquial discourse, smartphone addiction is defined by various terms, and might generate
53 completely new dangers for users. According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental
54 Disorders - DSM IV addiction is "a mental or physical compulsion to perform certain activities
55 or take certain substances in anticipation of their effects or to avoid the unpleasant symptoms
56 of their absence" [9]. The phenomenon associated with smartphone addiction is phonoholism,
57 defined as an excessive and uncontrolled use of mobile phone/smartphone functions.
58 Phonoholic has a strong need to keep the device close and has problems with turning it off or
59 not using it in situations where it is not necessary. It might be the reason of various ailments,
60 such as dizziness, shortness of breath, accelerated heartbeat, nausea, abdominal pain or
61 headaches [10].

62 Before addiction occurs, overuse and problematic smartphone use is common.
63 Problematic usage has been linked to “fear of missing out” syndrome (FoMo), described as a
64 state of mind in which smartphone users experience anxiety associated with separation from

65 their device [11 - 13]. It has been shown that the reactions of FoMo and anxiety related to the
66 frequency of smartphone use are characteristic of attachment theory, known as: motivation to
67 be with the attachment figure/object and anxiety when it is absent [14]. It has also been shown
68 that smartphone use can affect sleep patterns and reduce sleep quality [10, 15, 16]. In a 14-day,
69 randomized, crossover experimental study under well-controlled conditions, the use of
70 electronic screens before sleep was shown to disrupt sleep in many ways: it increases the time
71 to fall asleep and reduces evening sleepiness, reduces melatonin secretion, delays the circadian
72 clock, and reduces next-day alertness [15]. In turn, a study of American teenagers found that
73 spending more than a few hours a week using electronic media was negatively correlated with
74 feelings of happiness, life satisfaction and self-esteem, while time spent on non-screen activities
75 (personal interactions, sports or exercise, etc.) positively correlated with the mental well-being
76 of the surveyed youth [16]. Apart from communication and entertainment functions,
77 smartphones also serve as identity functions which manifests itself in setting an individual
78 wallpaper or selecting a case or the type of ringtone. This mobile personalization refers to the
79 degree to which users customize the device to express themselves through both the appearance
80 of the device and its settings [17]. Modern mobile devices allow not only to establish or
81 maintain contacts thanks to voice and video calls, but also constitute personal elements, often
82 being an expression of prestige and personality [18]. The above features are particularly
83 important during adolescence.

84 Based on these considerations, the objectives of the study were to evaluate the
85 sociodemographic factors and usage patterns of smartphones while identifying the differences
86 between self-assessments of the use of this type of devices with objectively measured data
87 among adolescents. By examining the disparities between self-perception and actual usage, we
88 can shed light on the reliability of self-reports in assessing smartphone usage accurately.

89 Additionally, exploring factors influencing these disparities can provide valuable insights into
90 adolescents' perceptions and behaviors regarding smartphone use.

91 **Characteristics of the smartphone market**

92 In 2012, 9% of Poles were aware that they used a smartphone, while in fact every fourth
93 person had one [19]. At that time, users did not realize the difference between a regular mobile
94 phone and a smartphone. A smartphone combines the functions of a mobile phone and a
95 portable computer, and the development of new technologies forces consumers to search for
96 better and more functional devices [20]. In Poland, smartphone use is progressing at a dynamic
97 pace. According to "Poland in numbers 2019" report, smartphone is a dominant tool for
98 accessing Internet in each age group [19]. One fourth of respondents declare that they send and
99 receive e-mails using the device and 23% of respondents make mobile shopping, and 13% of
100 respondents make payments by phone [19].

101 According to the Global Digital 2023 report, over two-thirds (68%) of the world's
102 population now use a mobile phone, and the number of unique mobile users has increased year-
103 on-year by just over 3 percent, reaching 168 million new users in the last 12 months [21]. There
104 are 851 million smartphone owners in China, which is the largest number of users and translates
105 into 59.9% of the population living in this country, while in Switzerland there are 6.2 million
106 smartphone users, which is 72.9% of the population [21]. The United Kingdom has the highest
107 ratio of smartphone users to population in a given country. As many as 82.9% of English
108 citizens have a smartphone, which is 55.5 million users [21]. There are also clear global
109 disproportions, e.g. the population of smartphone owners in Nigeria is less than 15% [21]. In
110 the United States, the percentage of 13- to 17-year-olds who own a smartphone has reached
111 89%, more than doubling in 6 years [21]. According to the findings of the Office of Electronic
112 Communications, over 80% of Polish children aged 7 to 15 have a mobile phone, while in the

113 age group 13 to 15, each child has their own phone [22]. More than 90% of it is a smartphone.
114 Over 70% of children declare that they use smartphones to play and listen to music, and in over
115 60% of cases to browse websites [22]. Unfortunately, only less than half of parents control their
116 child's use of a smartphone. Reports from research conducted among parents of children aged
117 6 months to 6.5 years showed that 64% of children use mobile devices [23]. According to
118 parents of children aged between 5 and 6, only 17% did not report such use [23]. Polish
119 nationwide research conducted among high school students confirmed that 18% of respondents
120 believe that they spend too much time using a smartphone, and 17% believe that they do not
121 use a smartphone very often, even though others point this out [24]. 32% of young respondents
122 admitted that they spend 4 to 5 hours a day with their smartphone. Boys use handheld devices
123 longer than girls by about 15 minutes [24].

124 **Materials and methods**

125 **Ethic statement**

126 The study was approved by the institutional Bioethics Committee of the Rzeszow
127 University – Resolution No. 28/02/2019. Moreover, consent from the management to conduct
128 the research was obtained from the secondary schools participating in the project. During
129 meetings with parents/legal guardians, written consent was obtained. The respondents
130 themselves gave verbal consent to participate in the study.

131 **Participants**

132 The sample consisted of secondary school students (N = 460) from the south-eastern
133 region of Poland (Podkarpackie Voivodeship) aged 16-19 years old, recruited from September
134 to December 2019. There were: 235 (51.1%) boys and 225 (48.9%) girls. The average age of

135 the respondents was 17.10 ± 0.92 years. More than half of the youth (N = 241, 52.4%) attended
136 high school.

137 **Smartphone use**

138 Respondents were asked about the following issues related to the use of a smartphone:

139 a) owning a smartphone; b) age of receiving the first smartphone; c) features that determine the
140 purchase of the device; and d) ways of using the smartphone.

141 **Subjective variables associated with problematic smartphone use**

142 Participants were also asked about subjective variables associated with problematic
143 smartphone such as: a) respondents' opinion about the possible addiction; b) problems with
144 establishing face-to-face contacts; c) neglecting home/school duties; d) inability to spend time
145 without a smartphone; e) returning home in case forgetting the device; f) situations when the
146 smartphone is not used, and g) respondents' opinion about smartphone usage and health status.

147 **The degree of smartphone addiction**

148 The degree of smartphone addiction was assessed using the Mobile Phone Addiction
149 Assessment Questionnaire (KBUTK) by Pawłowska and Potembska [25]. Written consent from
150 the authors was obtained to use the tool. KBUTK consists of 33 items that are rated on a five-
151 point Likert scale, where zero (0) means "never" and four (4) means "always". The
152 questionnaire is applied to examine addiction to mobile phone in the four dimensions: 1) "Need
153 of acceptance and closeness", 2) "Addiction to camera function", 3) "Addiction to phone calls
154 and text messages", and 4) "Intermediary communication". The results may range from 0 to
155 132 points. Respondents who obtained a score from 31 to 69 were considered to be at risk of
156 smartphone addiction, and those who scored 70 or more points were considered addicted [25].

157 **Statistical analyses**

158 Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations) were
159 used to examine the gender and age of each participant, place of residence, type of school, living
160 conditions, and family economic condition. When assessing the differences between two
161 nominal variables the χ^2 test of independence was used, taking into account the Yates
162 correction. The selection of tests to assess differences between quantitative and nominal
163 variables was made after previously assessing the normality of variable distributions using the
164 Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The lack of normality of variable distributions suggested the use of
165 Spearman's ρ correlation coefficient. Cronbach's α coefficient was used to assess the
166 reliability of KBUTK scale. Logistic regression model using forward stepwise method
167 (likelihood ratio) was used to characterize a typical smartphone user in this study. Logistic
168 regression models using input method or forward selection method were used to assess the
169 significance of selected correlates of the dependent variable "smartphone addiction". P -values
170 lower than 0.05 were considered significant. All the statistical analyses were performed using
171 SPSS Statistics (version 20.0, IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Adjusted ORs (ORs) and 95%
172 confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated.

173 **Results**

174 **Smartphone use**

175 **Owning the device**

176 All respondents admitted that they use a smartphone. Almost all participants ($N = 445$;
177 96.7%) have such a device for they own. Table 1 shows that these were more often girls than

178 boys (98.7% vs. 94.9%; $\chi^2 = 4.060$; $p = 0.0439$). Age of the respondents did not significantly
 179 affect this issue ($\chi^2 = 4.729$; $p = 0.0940$).

180 **Table 1. Owning a smartphone and gender and age.**

			Gender		Age			Total
			Female	Male	16 yrs.	17 yrs.	18-20 yrs.	
Owning the smartphone	yes	N	222	223	126	196	123	445
		%	98.7	94.9	97.7	98.0	93.9	96.7
	no	N	3	12	3	4	8	15
		%	1.3	5.1	2.3	2.0	6.1	3.3
Total		N	225	235	129	200	131	460
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Independence test			$\chi^2 = 4.060$; $p = 0.0439$		$\chi^2 = 4.729$; $p = 0.0940$			

181

182 **Age of receiving the first smartphone**

183 We have asked participants when they received their first device. 18.3% (N = 84) of
 184 students admitted they were under 10 years old when they received their first smartphone. Most
 185 often, respondents received their first mobile device at the age of 10-13 (N = 283; 61.5%).
 186 Every fifth person (N = 93; 20.2%) received their first smartphone when they were between 14
 187 and 16 years old. Girls were more likely than boys (24.0% vs. 12.8%) to receive their first
 188 smartphone under the age of 10; boys, however, were more likely to receive their first device
 189 at the age of 14-16 (24.7% vs. 15.6%). Gender influence significantly the age of receiving the
 190 first smartphone ($\chi^2 = 12.762$; $p = 0.0017$). It was noticed that the age of the respondents also
 191 significantly influenced the stage of life in which they received first mobile device ($\chi^2 = 19.029$;
 192 $p = 0.0008$). At the age of 10-13, current 16-year-olds (N = 147; 69.8%) or 17-year-olds (N =
 193 90; 62.0%) received their first smartphone more often. Less often respondents who were or had
 194 reached the age of majority (N = 69; 52.7%). The analysis also showed that high school students

195 received their first smartphone more often under the age of 10 (N = 60; 24.9%) or at the age of
 196 10-13 (N = 157; 65.1%), and this differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 39.637$; $p <$
 197 0.0001). Family financial situation of the respondents had a statistically significant relationship
 198 ($\chi^2 = 19.998$; $p < 0.0001$) with the age of receiving first smartphone. According to the analyses,
 199 under the age of 10, such a device was more often received by respondents whose family
 200 financial situation was good (N = 65; 25.1%) compared to those with an average financial
 201 situation (25.1% vs. 9.5%). Later in life, the first smartphone was received by adolescents with
 202 an average financial situation in their family (24.9% vs. 16.6%). Living conditions and place of
 203 residence did not significantly affect the age at which young people received their first smart
 204 phone – Table 2.

205 **Table 2. Respondents’ age of receiving the first smartphone and sociodemographic**
 206 **variables.**

		Age of receiving the first smartphone						Independence test
		under 10 yrs.		10-13 yrs.		14-16 yrs.		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
Gender	Female	54	24.0	136	60.4	35	15.6	$\chi^2 = 12.762$; $p = 0.0017$
	Male	30	12.8	147	62.6	58	24.7	
Age	16 yrs	17	13.2	90	69.8	22	17.1	$\chi^2 = 19.029$; $p = 0.0008$
	17 yrs	46	23.0	124	62.0	30	15.0	
	18-20 yrs	21	16.0	69	52.7	41	31.3	
Type of school	High school	60	24.9	157	65.1	24	10.0	$\chi^2 = 39.637$; $p < 0.0001$
	Technical school	24	11.0	126	57.5	69	31.5	
Place of residence	City	30	24.6	70	57.4	22	18.0	$\chi^2 = 4.498$; $p = 0.1055$
	Village	54	16.0	213	63.0	71	21.0	
Living conditions	House	74	18.4	250	62.2	78	19.4	$\chi^2 = 1.315$; $p = 0.5183$
	Flat	10	17.2	33	56.9	15	25.9	
Family economic	Average	19	9.5	132	65.7	50	24.9	$\chi^2 = 19.998$;

condition	Good	65	25.1	151	58.3	43	16.6	$p < 0.0001$
------------------	------	----	------	-----	------	----	------	--------------

207 **The main features that determine the purchase of a smartphone**

208 When deciding to buy a smartphone, the surveyed youth were most often guided by
 209 battery life (N = 280; 60.9%), technical parameters (N = 273; 59.3%), price (N = 272; 59.1%),
 210 and having a good camera on the smartphone (N = 269; 58.5%). 44.8% of students (N = 206)
 211 paid attention to the brand. More than every third respondent (N = 161; 35.0%) paid attention
 212 to the size of the device, and every third (N = 153; 33.3%) was interested in the possibility of
 213 installing various applications. Every fourth student was guided by its colour (N = 117; 25.4%).
 214 Examined youth rarely took into account that the device was fashionable (N = 53; 11.5%), easy
 215 to use (N = 31; 6.7%), and that a friend had such an equipment (N = 20; 4.3%) or other
 216 arguments (N = 4; 0.9%) – Fig 1.

217 **Fig. 1. Features that determine the purchase of a new smartphone.** The results did not sum
 218 up to 100% - multiple choice question.

219 Table 3 showed that when deciding to buy a new smartphone, girls were significantly more
 220 likely than boys to be guided by the price of the product (66.7% vs. 51.9%; $\chi^2 = 10.351$; $p =$
 221 0.0013), having a good camera (74.7% vs. 43.0%; $\chi^2 = 47.535$; $p < 0.0001$), colour (33.3% vs.
 222 17.9%; $\chi^2 = 14.488$; $p = 0.0001$), and the possibility of installing various applications (37.3 %
 223 vs. 19.6%; $\chi^2 = 17.881$; $p < 0.0001$). Boys in turn were more likely than girls to pay attention to
 224 the device's technical parameters (69.4% vs. 48.9%; $\chi^2 = 19.969$; $p < 0.0001$). It was also noticed
 225 that 16-year-olds were more likely (10.9%) than older students to be guided by the fact that a
 226 friend had an identical device ($\chi^2 = 18.359$; $p = 0.0001$). When purchasing a smartphone among
 227 high school students price (65.1% vs. 52.5%; $\chi^2 = 7.578$; $p = 0.0059$), having a good camera
 228 (68.0% vs. 47.9%; $\chi^2 = 6.828$; $p < 0.0001$), colour (32.0% vs. 18.3%; $\chi^2 = 11.331$; $p = 0.0008$), and
 229 the ability to install various applications (32.8% vs. 23.3%; $\chi^2 = 5.099$; $p = 0.0239$) mattered.

230 Students of technical schools paid more attention to the size (41.1% vs. 29.5%; $\chi^2 = 6.828$; $p =$
 231 0.0090), and simplicity of use (11.0% vs. 2.9%; $\chi^2 = 11.843$; $p = 0.0006$) compared to high
 232 school students. It was also noticed that urban residents paid attention to the brand more often
 233 than rural residents when purchasing a smartphone (54.9% vs. 41.1%; $\chi^2 = 6.898$; $p = 0.0086$).

234 **Table 3. Features that determine the purchase of a new smartphone and**
 235 **sociodemographic variables.**

			price	brand	camera	size	battery life	colour	applications	simplicity of use	trendy	friend has the same	technical parameters	functions	other
Gender	Female	N	150	109	168	75	134	75	84	11	28	10	110	69	0
		%	66.7	48.4	74.7	33.3	59.6	33.3	37.3	4.9	12.4	4.4	48.9	30.7	0.0
	Male	N	122	97	101	86	146	42	46	20	25	10	163	84	4
		%	51.9	41.3	43.0	36.6	62.1	17.9	19.6	8.5	10.6	4.3	69.4	35.7	1.7
p value			$\chi^2=10.351$; $p=0.0013$	$\chi^2=2.388$; $p=0.1222$	$\chi^2=47.535$; $p<0.0001$	$\chi^2=0.538$; $p=0.4634$	$\chi^2=0.319$; $p=0.5720$	$\chi^2=14.488$; $p=0.0001$	$\chi^2=17.881$; $p<0.0001$	$\chi^2=2.399$; $p=0.1214$	$\chi^2=0.368$; $p=0.5442$	$\chi^2=0.010$; $p=0.9208$	$\chi^2=19.969$; $p<0.0001$	$\chi^2=1.335$; $p=0.2479$	$\chi^2=2.141$; $p=0.1434$
Age	16 yrs	N	65	54	68	39	71	31	27	11	14	14	73	37	1
		%	50.4	41.9	52.7	30.2	55.0	24.0	20.9	8.5	10.9	10.9	56.6	28.7	0.8
	17 yrs	N	124	92	128	69	127	56	65	10	22	3	122	78	3
		%	62.0	46.0	64.0	34.5	63.5	28.0	32.5	5.0	11.0	1.5	61.0	39.0	1.5
	18-20 yrs	N	83	60	73	53	82	30	38	10	17	3	78	38	0
		%	63.4	45.8	55.7	40.5	62.6	22.9	29.0	7.6	13.0	2.3	59.5	29.0	0.0
p value			$\chi^2=5.731$; $p=0.0570$	$\chi^2=0.620$; $p=0.7333$	$\chi^2=4.686$; $p=0.0960$	$\chi^2=3.026$; $p=0.2202$	$\chi^2=2.586$; $p=0.2744$	$\chi^2=1.271$; $p=0.5295$	$\chi^2=5.228$; $p=0.0732$	$\chi^2=1.785$; $p=0.4095$	$\chi^2=0.382$; $p=0.8260$	$\chi^2=18.359$; $p=0.0001$	$\chi^2=0.635$; $p=0.7279$	$\chi^2=5.254$; $p=0.0723$	$\chi^2=2.085$; $p=0.3526$
School	High school	N	157	103	164	71	147	77	79	7	25	9	136	86	3
		%	65.1	42.7	68.0	29.5	61.0	32.0	32.8	2.9	10.4	3.7	56.4	35.7	1.2
	Tech school	N	115	103	105	90	133	40	51	24	28	11	137	67	1
		%	52.5	47.0	47.9	41.1	60.7	18.3	23.3	11.0	12.8	5.0	62.6	30.6	0.5
p value			$\chi^2=7.578$; $p=0.0059$	$\chi^2=0.855$; $p=0.3551$	$\chi^2=19.100$; $p<0.0001$	$\chi^2=6.828$; $p=0.0090$	$\chi^2=0.003$; $p=0.9536$	$\chi^2=11.331$; $p=0.0008$	$\chi^2=5.099$; $p=0.0239$	$\chi^2=11.843$; $p=0.0006$	$\chi^2=0.655$; $p=0.4184$	$\chi^2=0.458$; $p=0.4986$	$\chi^2=1.784$; $p=0.1816$	$\chi^2=1.340$; $p=0.2471$	$\chi^2=0.827$; $p=0.3632$
Place of residence	City	N	67	67	74	49	77	38	36	8	15	4	65	38	0
		%	54.9	54.9	60.7	40.2	63.1	31.1	29.5	6.6	12.3	3.3	53.3	31.1	0.0
	Village	N	205	139	195	112	203	79	94	23	38	16	208	115	4
		%	60.7	41.1	57.7	33.1	60.1	23.4	27.8	6.8	11.2	4.7	61.5	34.0	1.2
p value			$\chi^2=1.219$; $p=0.2695$	$\chi^2=6.898$; $p=0.0086$	$\chi^2=0.324$; $p=0.5691$	$\chi^2=1.946$; $p=0.1630$	$\chi^2=0.351$; $p=0.5533$	$\chi^2=2.857$; $p=0.0910$	$\chi^2=0.127$; $p=0.7211$	$\chi^2=0.009$; $p=0.9256$	$\chi^2=0.097$; $p=0.7550$	$\chi^2=0.456$; $p=0.4993$	$\chi^2=2.535$; $p=0.1114$	$\chi^2=0.334$; $p=0.5633$	$\chi^2=1.456$; $p=0.2275$

236 **Ways of using a smartphone**

237 Young people most often used the smartphone to send messages (N = 354; 77.0%),
238 receive and make calls (N = 339; 73.7%), and for social media (N = 322; 70, 0%). 55.0% of
239 students (N = 253) listened to music, 49.8% (N = 229) sent and received text messages, and
240 46.1% of participants (N = 212) used a calculator, watch or alarm clock. 41.1% of young people
241 (N = 189) used the smartphone for taking photos and video recordings. Adolescents used the
242 smartphone less often to browse websites (N = 128; 27.8%), use the calendar, planner (N = 72;
243 15.7%), play games (N = 60; 13.0 %) or receive e-mails (N = 44; 9.6%). Very rarely, the device
244 was used for navigation, maps (N = 21; 4.6%), reading e-books (N = 14; 3.0%) or for other
245 purposes (N = 4; 0.9%).

246 Table 4 shows that girls took significantly more photos and video recordings (47.6% vs.
247 34.9%; $\chi^2 = 7.613$; $p = 0.0058$) and used a calculator, watch and alarm clock significantly more
248 often (51.6% vs. 40.9%; $\chi^2 = 5.301$; $p = 0.0213$) than boys. Boys in turn were significantly more
249 likely than girls to use their smartphones for playing games (18.3% vs. 7.6%; $\chi^2 = 11.695$; $p =$
250 0.0006). Respondents aged 18-20 used a calendar more often than others (22.1%; $\chi^2 = 6.277$; $p =$
251 0.0433). At the same time, the same age group used a smartphone less often than others to
252 browse websites (19.8%; $\chi^2 = 10.956$; $p = 0.0042$) or listen to music (41.2%; $\chi^2 = 14.104$; $p =$
253 0.0009). It was noticed that the youngest group of respondents used messengers the least often
254 among all respondents (69.8%; $\chi^2 = 6.657$; $p = 0.0358$). The analysis showed that students of
255 technical schools paid attention to the use of calendars (21.0% vs, 10.8%; $\chi^2 = 9.071$; $p =$
256 0.0026), and navigation and maps (6.8% vs. 2.5%; $\chi^2 = 5.005$; $p = 0.0253$) more often than high
257 school students. High school students in turn paid more attention to using social media (75.1%
258 vs. 64.4%; $\chi^2 = 6.279$; $p = 0.0122$), taking photos and videos (12.3% vs. 7.1%; $\chi^2 = 5.168$; $p =$
259 0.0230), and listening to music (59.3% vs. 50.2%; $\chi^2 = 3.846$; $p = 0.0499$). Analyses also
260 showed that the possibility of using social media via smartphones was more popular among
261 rural residents (73.1%; $\chi^2 = 5.746$; $p = 0.0165$).

262 **Table 4. Ways of using the smartphone and sociodemographic variables.**

			receiving and making calls	sending and receiving text messages	using a calendar	using a calculator, watch, alarm	using messengers	social media	taking photos, videos	receiving e-mail	web browsing	reading e-books	listening to music	navigation, maps	games	other
Gender	Female	N	163	122	39	116	173	159	107	17	59	8	122	6	17	1
		%	72.4	54.2	17.3	51.6	76.9	70.7	47.6	7.6	26.2	3.6	54.2	2.7	7.6	0.4
	Male	N	176	107	33	96	181	163	82	27	69	6	131	15	43	2
		%	74.9	45.5	14.0	40.9	77.0	69.4	34.9	11.5	29.4	2.6	55.7	6.4	18.3	0.9
p value			$\chi^2=0.356$; $p=0.5509$	$\chi^2=3.472$; $p=0.0624$	$\chi^2=0.943$; $p=0.3315$	$\chi^2=5.301$; $p=0.0213$	$\chi^2=0.001$; $p=0.9731$	$\chi^2=0.093$; $p=0.7601$	$\chi^2=7.613$; $p=0.0058$	$\chi^2=2.056$; $p=0.1516$	$\chi^2=0.564$; $p=0.4526$	$\chi^2=0.391$; $p=0.5316$	$\chi^2=0.108$; $p=0.7428$	$\chi^2=3.644$; $p=0.0563$	$\chi^2=11.695$; $p=0.0006$	$\chi^2=0.000$; $p=1.0000$
Age	16 yrs	N	95	62	19	57	90	85	52	13	49	6	77	2	17	2
		%	73.6	48.1	14.7	44.2	69.8	65.9	40.3	10.1	38.0	4.7	59.7	1.6	13.2	1.6
	17 yrs	N	150	99	24	90	164	148	76	14	53	4	122	11	27	0
		%	75.0	49.5	12.0	45.0	82.0	74.0	38.0	7.0	26.5	2.0	61.0	5.5	13.5	0.0
	18-20 yrs	N	94	68	29	65	100	89	61	17	26	4	54	8	16	1
		%	71.8	51.9	22.1	49.6	76.3	67.9	46.6	13.0	19.8	3.1	41.2	6.1	12.2	0.8
p value			$\chi^2=0.430$; $p=0.8065$	$\chi^2=0.396$; $p=0.8204$	$\chi^2=6.277$; $p=0.0433$	$\chi^2=0.940$; $p=0.6249$	$\chi^2=6.657$; $p=0.0358$	$\chi^2=2.826$; $p=0.2434$	$\chi^2=2.444$; $p=0.2947$	$\chi^2=3.323$; $p=0.1898$	$\chi^2=10.956$; $p=0.0042$	$\chi^2=1.868$; $p=0.3930$	$\chi^2=14.104$; $p=0.0009$	$\chi^2=3.807$; $p=0.1490$	$\chi^2=0.118$; $p=0.9425$	$\chi^2=2.944$; $p=0.2294$
School	High school	N	178	114	26	110	190	181	111	27	74	6	143	6	27	3
		%	73.9	47.3	10.8	45.6	78.8	75.1	46.1	12.3	30.7	2.5	59.3	2.5	11.2	1.2
	Tech school	N	161	115	46	102	164	141	78	17	54	8	110	15	33	0
		%	73.5	52.5	21.0	46.6	74.9	64.4	35.6	7.1	24.7	3.7	50.2	6.8	15.1	0.0
p value			$\chi^2=0.007$; $p=0.9335$	$\chi^2=1.245$; $p=0.2645$	$\chi^2=9.071$; $p=0.0026$	$\chi^2=0.04$; $p=0.8412$	$\chi^2=1.011$; $p=0.3147$	$\chi^2=6.279$; $p=0.0122$	$\chi^2=5.168$; $p=0.023$	$\chi^2=3.691$; $p=0.0547$	$\chi^2=2.09$; $p=0.1483$	$\chi^2=0.526$; $p=0.4682$	$\chi^2=3.846$; $p=0.0499$	$\chi^2=5.005$; $p=0.0253$	$\chi^2=1.511$; $p=0.2189$	$\chi^2=2.744$; $p=0.0976$
Place of residence	City	N	85	60	20	56	87	75	50	15	36	4	68	8	15	2
		%	69.7	49.2	16.4	45.9	71.3	61.5	41.0	12.3	29.5	3.3	55.7	6.6	12.3	1.6
	Village	N	254	169	52	156	267	247	139	29	92	10	185	13	45	1
		%	75.1	50.0	15.4	46.2	79.0	73.1	41.1	8.6	27.2	3.0	54.7	3.8	13.3	0.3
p value			$\chi^2=1.387$; $p=0.239$	$\chi^2=0.024$; $p=0.8767$	$\chi^2=0.069$; $p=0.7926$	$\chi^2=0.002$; $p=0.9618$	$\chi^2=2.984$; $p=0.0841$	$\chi^2=5.746$; $p=0.0165$	$\chi^2=0.001$; $p=0.9784$	$\chi^2=1.43$; $p=0.2317$	$\chi^2=0.234$; $p=0.6286$	$\chi^2=0.031$; $p=0.86$	$\chi^2=0.037$; $p=0.8485$	$\chi^2=1.512$; $p=0.2188$	$\chi^2=0.082$; $p=0.7746$	$\chi^2=2.497$; $p=0.114$

263 **Model of smartphone user**

264 Logistic regression model using forward stepwise method (likelihood ratio) was used to
 265 characterise a typical smartphone user in this study. It was shown that smartphone users were
 266 more than 5 times more likely to be girls (OR = 5.80; $p < 0.0001$), sixteen-year-olds (OR =
 267 0.41; $p = 0.0456$), and almost 3 times more likely to be students of technical schools (OR =
 268 2.66; $p = 0.0025$) – Table 5.

269 **Table 5. Logistic regression model characterising a smartphone user.**

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	OR (95% CI)
Gender (1-M; 2-F)	-1.76	0.37	22.71	1	< 0.0001	5.80 (2.81-11.95)
Age (1-16 yrs; 2-17 yrs)	-0.88	0.44	4.00	1	0.0456	0.41 (0.17-0.98)
Type of school (1-High; 2-Technical)	0.98	0.32	9.16	1	0.0025	2.66 (1.41-5.02)
Place of residence	-0.12	0.40	0.09	1	0.7693	0.89 (0.41-1.95)
Living conditions	-0.53	0.51	1.12	1	0.2908	0.59 (0.22-1.58)
Financial situation	0.56	0.31	3.32	1	0.0686	1.75 (0.96-3.21)

270 **Smartphone addiction**

271 **Perceiving yourself as a smartphone addict**

272 Table 6 shows that 9.8% of students (N = 45) definitely did not perceive themselves as
 273 addicted to smartphones, and 38.3% of respondents (N = 176) were not addicted. A group of
 274 30.2% of surveyed youth (N = 139) could not assess whether they were addicted to using a
 275 smartphone. 16.7% of respondents (N = 77) were addicted, and 5.0% of students (N = 23) were
 276 definitely addicted to using a smartphone. Girls and boys ($p = 0.1171$) and different age groups
 277 ($p = 0.2280$) perceived themselves as addicted to a smartphone equally often.

278 **Table 6. Perceiving yourself as a person addicted to a smartphone and gender and age.**

			Gender		Age			Total
			Female	Male	16 yrs	17 yrs	18-20 yrs	
Perceiving yourself as a person addicted to a smartphone	definitely no	N	15	30	10	20	15	45
		%	6.7	12.8	7.8	10.0	11.5	9.8
	no	N	83	93	51	82	43	176
		%	36.9	39.6	39.5	41.0	32.8	38.3
	no opinion	N	74	65	46	59	34	139
		%						

		%	32.9	27.7	35.7	29.5	26.0	30.2
	yes	N	43	34	18	30	29	77
		%	19.1	14.5	14.0	15.0	22.1	16.7
	definitely yes	N	10	13	4	9	10	23
		%	4.4	5.5	3.1	4.5	7.6	5.0
Total		N	225	235	129	200	131	460
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Test of independence			$\chi^2 = 7.380; p = 0.1171$			$\chi^2 = 10.559; p = 0.2280$		

279 Problems with establishing face-to-face contacts

280 22.2% of young people (N = 102) had problems with face-to-face relationships. 77.8%
 281 of respondents (N = 358) did not think they had this type of problem. Table 7 shows that
 282 problems with establishing social relationships more often affected students of technical
 283 schools than students of high schools (27.4% vs. 17.4%; $\chi^2 = 6.609; p = 0.0101$). Place of
 284 residence did not significantly affect this issue.

285 **Table 7. Problems with establishing face-to-face social relationships and type of school**
 286 **and place of residence.**

			Type of school		Place of residence		Total
			High school	Tech school	City	Village	
Problems with establishing face-to-face social relationships	yes	N	42	60	29	73	102
		%	17.4	27.4	23.8	21.6	22.2
	no	N	199	159	93	265	358
		%	82.6	72.6	76.2	78.4	77.8
Total		N	241	219	122	338	460
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Test of independence			$\chi^2 = 6.609; p = 0.0101$		$\chi^2 = 0.245; p = 0.6204$		

287 Neglecting home/school duties

288 Table 8 shows that girls significantly more often than boys admitted to neglecting
 289 household or school duties as a result of using a smartphone (61.8% vs. 51.5%; $\chi^2 = 4.951$; p
 290 = 0.0261). More frequent cases of neglect of home/school duties also concerned respondents
 291 aged 18-20 (62.6%; $\chi^2 = 4.748$; $p = 0.0931$) compared to 16-year-olds or 17-year-olds however,
 292 this relationship was not statistically significant

293 **Table 8. Neglecting home/school duties as a result of smartphone use and gender and age.**

			Gender		Age			Total
			Female	Male	16 yrs	17 yrs	18-20 yrs	
Neglecting home/school duties as a result of smartphone use	yes	N	139	121	76	102	82	260
		%	61.8	51.5	58.9	51.0	62.6	56.5
	no	N	86	114	53	98	49	200
		%	38.2	48.5	41.1	49.0	37.4	43.5
Total		N	225	235	129	200	131	460
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Test of independence			$\chi^2 = 4.951$; $p = 0.0261$		$\chi^2 = 4.748$; $p = 0.0931$			

294 **Inability to spend time without a smartphone**

295 Table 9 shows that in the opinion of 67.8% of respondents (N = 312) using a smartphone
 296 increases the standard of living. 32.2% of youth (N = 148) did not share this opinion. Most
 297 often, young people claimed that they could not spend a month without a smartphone because
 298 it is necessary to communicate with others (N = 245; 53.3%). The device was necessary to use
 299 the Internet for 11.5% of respondents (N = 53), and 7.6% of respondents (N = 35) believed that
 300 it made them more mobile. 6.7% of students (N = 31) could not spend a month without a
 301 smartphone due to lack of access to entertainment. Rarely did young people say that they would
 302 not spend a month without a smartphone because it helps them with their homework (N = 17;
 303 3.7%), provides them with rest (N = 15; 3.3%), or for some other reason (N = 3; 0.7%). 13.3%

304 of students (N = 61) would be able to spend a month without using a smartphone. Girls were
 305 more likely than boys (58.2% vs. 48.5%; $p = 0.0028\%$) to be unable to spend a month without
 306 a smartphone because they considered it necessary in communicating with others. Age did not
 307 play a significant role in this aspect. High school students more often (59.3%; $p = 0.0017$)
 308 believed that they could not spend a month without a smartphone, because they needed it to
 309 communicate with others. Place of residence did not significantly differentiate this aspect.

310 **Table 9. Associations between arguments for the impossibility of spending a month**
 311 **without a smartphone and sociodemographic variables.**

		Arguments for the impossibility of spending a month without a smartphone																<i>p</i> value
		I need it to communicate with others		I need it to use the Internet		keeps me entertained		it gives me rest		helps me with my homework		I'm more mobile		others		I can spend a month without using smartphone		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Gender	Female	131	58.2	26	11.6	9	4.0	7	3.1	14	6.2	10	4.4	2	0.9	26	11.6	$\chi^2 = 21.717;$ $p = 0.0028$
	Male	114	48.5	27	11.5	22	9.4	8	3.4	3	1.3	25	10.6	1	0.4	35	14.9	
Age	16 yrs	71	55.0	15	11.6	9	7.0	3	2.3	5	3.9	6	4.7	1	0.8	19	14.7	$\chi^2 = 9.707;$ $p = 0.7832$
	17 yrs	112	56.0	24	12.0	10	5.0	6	3.0	6	3.0	15	7.5	2	1.0	25	12.5	
	18-20 yrs	62	47.3	14	10.7	12	9.2	6	4.6	6	4.6	14	10.7	0	0.0	17	13.0	
Type of school	High school	143	59.3	21	8.7	12	5.0	4	1.7	12	5.0	11	4.6	2	0.8	36	14.9	$\chi^2 = 23.02;$ $p = 0.0017$
	Tech school	102	46.6	32	14.6	19	8.7	11	5.0	5	2.3	24	11.0	1	0.5	25	11.4	
Place of residence	City	70	57.4	16	13.1	12	9.8	6	4.9	3	2.5	6	4.9	0	0.0	9	7.4	$\chi^2 = 12.339;$ $p = 0.0899$
	Village	175	51.8	37	10.9	19	5.6	9	2.7	14	4.1	29	8.6	3	0.9	52	15.4	

312 **Returning home in case forgetting the smartphone**

313 Table 10 shows that 37.6% of youth (N = 173) would definitely come back home if they
 314 forgot to take their smartphone. Almost the same number of respondents (N = 159; 34.6%)
 315 would not return. 27.8% of respondents (N = 128) never forgot their smartphone and always
 316 had it with them. It was noticed that as the age of the respondents increased, the percentage of
 317 those who would definitely return home for their smartphone increased. However, the

318 differences were not significant ($p = 0.0694$). There was no relationship between the discussed
 319 situation and the gender, type of school or place of residence of the respondents.

320 **Table 10. Associations between perceiving yourself as a person who would come back**
 321 **home to get a smartphone in case of forgetting it and sociodemographic variables.**

		Perceiving yourself as someone who would come back home to get your smartphone in case of forgetting it						p value
		definitely yes		definitely no		I have never forgotten my smartphone - I always have it with me		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
Gender	Female	86	38.2	76	33.8	63	28.0	$\chi^2 = 0.128$; $p = 0.9381$
	Male	87	37.0	83	35.3	65	27.7	
Age	16 yrs.	43	33.3	57	44.2	29	22.5	$\chi^2 = 8.686$; $p = 0.0694$
	17 yrs.	74	37.0	65	32.5	61	30.5	
	18-20 yrs .	56	42.7	37	28.2	38	29.0	
Type of school	High school	98	40.7	75	31.1	68	28.2	$\chi^2 = 3.022$; $p = 0.2207$
	Tech school	75	34.2	84	38.4	60	27.4	
Place of residence	City	54	44.3	39	32.0	29	23.8	$\chi^2 = 3.26$; $p = 0.1959$
	Village	119	35.2	120	35.5	99	29.3	

322 **Situations of not using the smartphone**

323 Table 11 illustrates that respondents most often did not use a smartphone during meals
 324 with their families at home (N = 277; 60.2%). Almost half of the students (N = 221; 48.0%) did
 325 not use a smartphone while riding a motorcycle or bicycle, and 46.3% of respondents (N = 213)
 326 did not use the device in the cinema, theatre or at a concert. A group of 40.9% of young people
 327 (N = 188) admitted that they did not use a smartphone while dining in a restaurant with family
 328 or friends, while 37.0% of respondents (N = 170) did not use it while crossing the street. 23.3%

329 of respondents (N = 107) did not use a smartphone during social events, and 20.4% of students
 330 (N = 94) did not use it during lessons or extracurricular activities. A group of 7.8% of the
 331 surveyed youth (N = 36) admitted that there are no situations in which they would not use a
 332 smartphone. The analysis of the collected research material allowed us to conclude that young
 333 people did not use a smartphone regardless of gender, but only in one situation depending on
 334 age ($p < 0.0001$). It turned out that respondents aged 16 (36.4%) did not use a smartphone more
 335 often during lessons or extracurricular activities compared to 17-year-olds (15.0%) or the age
 336 group 18-20 (13.0%). High school students did not use a smartphone while riding a
 337 motorcycle or cycling more often than students of a technical school (53.9% vs. 41.6%; $p =$
 338 0.0079). It was also found that rural residents were more likely than urban residents (63.0% vs.
 339 52.5%; $p = 0.0411$) not to use a smartphone during meals with their family at home.

340 **Table 11. Associations between situations of not using a smartphone and**
 341 **sociodemographic variables.**

			during meals with family at home	during meals in a restaurant with family or friends	at the cinema, theatre, concert	during social events	while riding a motorcycle, riding a bicycle	during lessons, extracurricular activities	when crossing the street	There are no situations when I wouldn't use my smartphone
Gender	Female	N	129	89	98	49	115	44	80	17
		%	57.3	39.6	43.6	21.8	51.1	19.6	35.6	7.6
	Male	N	148	99	115	58	106	50	90	19
		%	63.0	42.1	48.9	24.7	45.1	21.3	38.3	8.1
p value			$\chi^2 = 1.529$; $p = 0.2162$	$\chi^2 = 0.315$; $p = 0.5748$	$\chi^2 = 1.338$; $p = 0.2473$	$\chi^2 = 0.543$; $p = 0.4613$	$\chi^2 = 1.660$; $p = 0.1976$	$\chi^2 = 0.209$; $p = 0.6472$	$\chi^2 = 0.371$; $p = 0.5424$	$\chi^2 = 0.045$; $p = 0.8326$
Age	16 yrs.	N	77	49	67	27	67	47	50	6
		%	59.7	38.0	51.9	20.9	51.9	36.4	38.8	4.7
	17 yrs.	N	122	84	89	48	91	30	73	16
		%	61.0	42.0	44.5	24.0	45.5	15.0	36.5	8.0
	18-20 yrs.	N	78	55	57	32	63	17	47	14
		%								

		%	59.5	42.0	43.5	24.4	48.1	13.0	35.9	10.7
p value			$\chi^2 = 0.091$; $p = 0.9555$	$\chi^2 = 0.617$; $p = 0.7344$	$\chi^2 = 2.320$; $p = 0.3136$	$\chi^2 = 0.554$; $p = 0.7582$	$\chi^2 = 1.302$; $p = 0.5214$	$\chi^2 = 28.424$; $p < 0.0001$	$\chi^2 = 0.263$; $p = 0.8766$	$\chi^2 = 3.297$; $p = 0.1923$
Type of school	High school	N	149	107	120	58	130	53	99	23
		%	61.8	44.4	49.8	24.1	53.9	22.0	41.1	9.5
	Tech school	N	128	81	93	49	91	41	71	13
		%	58.4	37.0	42.5	22.4	41.6	18.7	32.4	5.9
p value			$\chi^2 = 0.547$; $p = 0.4597$	$\chi^2 = 2.608$; $p = 0.1063$	$\chi^2 = 2.477$; $p = 0.1155$	$\chi^2 = 0.184$; $p = 0.6679$	$\chi^2 = 7.056$; $p = 0.0079$	$\chi^2 = 0.755$; $p = 0.385$	$\chi^2 = 3.692$; $p = 0.0547$	$\chi^2 = 2.07$; $p = 0.1502$
Place of residence	City	N	64	55	62	31	62	21	46	12
		%	52.5	45.1	50.8	25.4	50.8	17.2	37.7	9.8
	Village	N	213	133	151	76	159	73	124	24
		%	63.0	39.3	44.7	22.5	47.0	21.6	36.7	7.1
p value			$\chi^2 = 4.172$; $p = 0.0411$	$\chi^2 = 1.219$; $p = 0.2695$	$\chi^2 = 1.362$; $p = 0.2433$	$\chi^2 = 0.43$; $p = 0.5122$	$\chi^2 = 0.513$; $p = 0.474$	$\chi^2 = 1.06$; $p = 0.3032$	$\chi^2 = 0.04$; $p = 0.8416$	$\chi^2 = 0.93$; $p = 0.3349$

342 Smartphone use and health effects

343 Table 12 shows that most students were aware and shared the opinion that using a
 344 smartphone may negatively affect their health (N = 324; 70.4%). 10.4% of respondents (N =
 345 48) did not notice any negative aspects of using a smartphone on health, and 19.1% of
 346 participants (N = 88) had no opinion on this subject. It was noticed that 16-year-olds more often
 347 (16.3%) than 17-year-olds (6.5%) believed that a smartphone could not negatively affect their
 348 health ($\chi^2 = 10.890$; $p = 0.0278$). Gender did not play a significant role here ($\chi^2 = 2.879$; $p =$
 349 0.2371).

350 **Table 12. Associations between opinion on the possible negative impact of a smartphone**
 351 **on health and gender and age.**

			Gender		Age			Overall
			Female	Male	16 yrs.	17 yrs.	18-20 yrs.	
Opinion on the	yes	N	164	160	91	145	88	324

possible negative impact of a smartphone on health		%	72.9	68.1	70.5	72.5	67.2	70.4
	no	N	18	30	21	13	14	48
		%	8.0	12.8	16.3	6.5	10.7	10.4
	no opinion	N	43	45	17	42	29	88
%		19.1	19.1	13.2	21.0	22.1	19.1	
Overall		N	225	235	129	200	131	460
		%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Test of independence			$\chi^2 = 2.879; p = 0.2371$			$\chi^2 = 10.890; p = 0.0278$		

352

353 **The level of smartphone addiction**

354 The level of smartphone addiction was assessed using the KBUTK scale, in 4
 355 dimensions and the overall score. Each dimension and the overall result included a scale of 1-
 356 5 points, with higher scores corresponding to greater addiction.

357 Table 13 shows that the highest level of smartphone addiction was related to “Addiction to
 358 camera functions” (3.16±0.66). The second indicator in which young people obtained the
 359 highest results was the “Need of acceptance and closeness” dimension (2.12±0.84). There was
 360 little dependence on “Indirect communication” (1.89±0.81) and “Addiction to phone calls and
 361 text messages” (1.61±0.66). The overall level of smartphone addiction was 2.17±0.58 points on
 362 a scale of 1-5 points.

363 **Table 13. Smartphone addiction scale (KBUTK).**

		Need of acceptance and closeness	Addiction to camera functions	Addiction to phone calls and text messages	Indirect communication	Overall
Mean		2.12	3.16	1.61	1.89	2.17
SD		0.84	0.66	0.66	0.81	0.58
Min.		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maks.		5.00	4.75	4.30	4.29	4.21
Percentiles	25	1.38	2.75	1.20	1.29	1.76

	50	2.00	3.13	1.40	1.71	2.06
	75	2.63	3.50	1.80	2.43	2.45

364

365 It was shown that the overall rate of smartphone addiction was significantly higher ($p < 0.0001$)

366 among girls (2.31 pts) than boys (2.03 pts). This difference has been also manifested in four

367 aspects of KBUTK: “Need of acceptance and closeness” ($p < 0.0001$), “Addiction to camera

368 functions” ($p < 0.0001$), “Addiction to phone calls and text messages” ($p = 0.0014$), and

369 “Indirect communication” ($p < 0.0001$). The level of smartphone addiction was not found to be

370 significantly related to the age of the respondents. However, it was shown that high school

371 students were more often addicted to the camera functions (3.26 vs. 3.04; $p = 0.0005$), and

372 students of technical schools were more often addicted to calls and text messages (1.76 vs. 1.47;

373 $p = 0.0013$). The place of residence of young people did not significantly affect the level of

374 smartphone addiction, both in general and in individual aspects – Table 14.

375 **Table 14. Associations between smartphone addiction scale and sociodemographic**

376 **variables.**

Gender							
	Female		Male		p value		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Need of acceptance and closeness	2.32	0.81	1.93	0.82	<0.0001		
Addiction to camera functions	3.34	0.62	2.98	0.65	< 0.0001		
Addiction to phone calls and text messages	1.67	0.66	1.55	0.66	0.0014		
Indirect communication	2.03	0.81	1.75	0.79	<0.0001		
Overall	2.31	0.56	2.03	0.58	< 0.0001		
Age							
	16 yrs.		17 yrs.		18-20 yrs.		p value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	

Need of acceptance and closeness	2.25	0.87	2.04	0.78	2.13	0.88	0.0920
Addiction to camera functions	3.18	0.65	3.19	0.64	3.09	0.69	0.1758
Addiction to phone calls and text messages	1.73	0.77	1.52	0.58	1.64	0.65	0.0501
Indirect communication	2.00	0.86	1.84	0.78	1.85	0.81	0.1989
Overall	2.27	0.63	2.12	0.55	2.15	0.57	0.0765
Type of school							
	High school		Tech school		p value		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Need of acceptance and closeness	2.10	0.83	2.15	0.85	0.4945		
Addiction to camera functions	3.26	0.66	3.04	0.64	0.0005		
Addiction to phone calls and text messages	1.47	0.51	1.76	0.77	0.0013		
Indirect communication	1.83	0.76	1.95	0.86	0.3591		
Overall	2.13	0.54	2.21	0.62	0.4824		
Place of residence							
	City		Village		p value		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Need of acceptance and closeness	2.16	0.84	2.11	0.84	0.5224		
Addiction to camera functions	3.19	0.69	3.14	0.65	0.4360		
Addiction to phone calls and text messages	1.65	0.72	1.59	0.64	0.6718		
Indirect communication	1.89	0.88	1.89	0.79	0.4877		
Overall	2.20	0.60	2.16	0.57	0.5506		

377 **Perceiving oneself as a person addicted to a smartphone and**

378 **KBUTK results**

379 Table 15 shows that perceiving oneself as a smartphone addict was significantly related
 380 to the results of KBUTK scale. It was found that higher scores on “Need of acceptance and
 381 closeness” were obtained by students who perceived themselves as definitely addicted to the

382 smartphone (2.57 pts; $p = 0.0002$). Similarly, respondents who perceive themselves as
 383 definitely addicted to a smartphone obtained significantly higher scores on the scale: “Addiction
 384 to camera functions” (3.42 pts; $p = 0.0001$) and “Addiction to phone calls and text messages”
 385 (1.82 pts; $p < 0, 0001$). Respondents who negatively assessed the possibility of smartphone
 386 addiction had a significantly lower actual level of addiction in the field of “Indirect
 387 communication” (1.75 pts; $p = 0.0070$). The general level of phone addiction correlated
 388 positively with the perception of oneself as a smartphone addict ($\rho = 0.223$; $p < 0.0001$). The
 389 results indicate that smartphone addiction is objective.

390 **Table 15. Perceiving yourself as a person addicted to a smartphone and actual addiction**
 391 **(KBUKT).**

Perceiving yourself as a person addicted to a smartphone		Need of acceptance and closeness	Addiction to camera functions	Addiction to phone calls and text messages	Indirect communication	Overall
definitely no	Mean	1.80	2.79	1.56	1.75	1.96
	SD	0.81	0.66	0.88	0.85	0.69
no	Mean	1.98	3.08	1.51	1.75	2.05
	SD	0.71	0.60	0.60	0.70	0.46
no opinion	Mean	2.29	3.28	1.70	2.09	2.31
	SD	0.88	0.68	0.70	0.90	0.65
yes	Mean	2.21	3.26	1.64	1.90	2.23
	SD	0.85	0.64	0.53	0.80	0.51
definitely yes	Mean	2.57	3.42	1.82	1.96	2.42
	SD	1.08	0.69	0.72	0.82	0.65
Overall	Mean	2.12	3.16	1.61	1.89	2.17
	SD	0.84	0.66	0.66	0.81	0.58
ρ		0.198	0.205	0.233	0.132	0.223
p value		0.0002	0.0001	<0.0001	0.0070	<0.0001

392 **General level of smartphone addiction and sociodemographic** 393 **variables**

394 We examined how all sociodemographic variables (gender, age, type of school, place
 395 of residence, living conditions, financial situation, parents' education) had an impact on the
 396 overall level of smartphone addiction. For this purpose, the general level of smartphone
 397 addiction was divided into two groups: no addiction (coded: 0), and risk of addiction/addiction
 398 (coded: 1). The impact of selected variables on smartphone addiction was checked using a
 399 multiple logistic regression analysis.

400 Logistic regression model using input method shows that smartphone addiction was
 401 significantly influenced by: gender ($p < 0.0001$), living conditions ($p = 0.0049$), and type of
 402 school ($p = 0.0021$). Smartphone addiction was found more often among respondents living in
 403 apartment blocks (OR = 2.63; 1.34-5.16), students of technical schools (OR = 2.05; 1.30-3.23),
 404 and almost 3 times less frequently (OR=0.36; 0.23-0.56) in boys than in girls. The forward
 405 selection model confirmed the significant impact of the three previously indicated variables on
 406 the occurrence of smartphone addiction: gender (OR = 0.35; 0.22-0.55), living conditions (OR
 407 = 2.08; 1.17-3.70), and school type (OR = 2.00; 1.28-3.13). Smartphone addiction was
 408 significantly more common among girls, students of technical schools, and respondents living
 409 in blocks of flats - Table 16.

410 **Table 16. Association between smartphone addiction and sociodemographic variables.**

Logistic regression model		B	SE	p	OR	95% CI (OR)	
						lower	upper
input	Gender	-1.03	0.23	< 0.0001	0.36	0.23	0.56
	Age	-0.20	0.14	0.1408	0.82	0.63	1.07
	Place of residence	0.26	0.27	0.3470	1.29	0.76	2.20
	Living conditions	0.97	0.34	0.0049	2.63	1.34	5.16

	Type of school	0.72	0.23	0.0021	2.05	1.30	3.23
forward selection	Gender	-1.05	0.23	0.0000	0.35	0.22	0.55
	Living conditions	0.73	0.29	0.0130	2.08	1.17	3.70
	Type of school	0.69	0.23	0.0022	2.00	1.28	3.13

411 **Discussion**

412 The aim of this study was to examined the prevalence of smartphone addiction among
413 Polish secondary school students, and identified factors related to such phenomenon, compared
414 to the respondents' subjective opinions about the usage, and possible addiction with an objective
415 assessment of the degree of smartphone addiction. Therefore, we have carried out demographic
416 characteristics of smartphones users, as well as the main features that determine the purchase
417 of device, and ways to use it by adolescents.

418 Our study revealed that 100% of respondents use a smartphone, and over 96% of them
419 own such a device. It was also shown that as many as 94.8% of the surveyed youth connect to
420 the Internet via a smartphone. Our findings are consistent with previous research that has shown
421 high levels of smartphone ownership among high school students from wide geographical
422 regions [11, 26 - 29]. In this study, female students were more than 5 times more likely to be
423 smartphone users which is consistent with previous results [30, 31]. However, the more detailed
424 results of these studies are interesting. We have found that boys and girls use phones for
425 different reasons: girls spend more time on social media or texting, while boys are more
426 interested in video games, media sharing, and Internet searches [32].

427 We have asked participants if they perceived themselves as an smartphone addict.
428 Students were also asked to describe how mobile device affects their everyday routine,
429 including: problems with establishing face-to-face contacts, neglecting home/school duties, or
430 inability to spend time without a smartphone. Our research has shown that 5% of adolescents

431 considered themselves addicted to smartphones, while less than 17% of respondents found
432 themselves at risk of addiction. More than 30% of respondents had no opinion on this subject.
433 Our results also allowed us to determine that over 22% of the surveyed youth noticed problems
434 with face-to-face relationships. Moreover, respondents fell asleep with phone and used it at
435 night. More than half of participants addicted to and at risk of addiction neglected their home
436 or school duties. According to nationwide report conducted on 22,086 students aged 12-18,
437 almost half (49%) of teenagers try to always be "on call" [33]. Slightly fewer (45.8%) teenagers
438 try to have a phone with them at all times [33]. What may be disturbing is the fact that a high
439 percentage (76.5%) of participant in our study are teenagers carrying a smartphone with them
440 all the time. Moreover, research highlights disturbing phenomenon that may indicate
441 smartphone abuse or lead to addiction. It should be noted that having a phone close gives a
442 sense of security to over 47% of respondents [33]. Less than 46% of the surveyed youth ensures
443 that they always have their device with them, even while sleeping [33]. In our study over 59%
444 of respondents admitted that they use the phone at night, and 72% of them put the phone next
445 to the bed at night which is consistent with the discussed report. Moreover, Dębski's research
446 shows that over 37% of students cannot imagine their daily life without a mobile phone, and
447 almost 27% of respondents would return for it if they forgot to take their mobile phone with
448 them [33]. Less than 14% of students in our research declare that they would be able to spend
449 a month without a smartphone. Among the arguments for such an impossibility, respondents
450 claimed that they needed a phone to communicate with others (53.3%), and to connect to the
451 Internet (11.5%). As many as 27.8% of respondents in our study have never forgotten to take
452 their smartphone with them, and 37.6% of students would return for it if it happened. Research
453 conducted in Spain indicates that 20% of young people aged 13-20 use their mobile devices
454 incorrectly [34]. Similarly, research conducted in Great Britain has shown that 10% of young
455 people aged 11-18 use their phones in an improperly way [35]. A survey conducted in Italy

456 among youth aged 11 to 18 shows that teenagers unlock their phones 75 to 120 times a day.
457 Moreover, as many as 83% of Italian youth spend 4 hours a day on social media, which is two
458 months of uninterrupted use per year [36]. The results of our own research showed that over
459 44% of respondents were unable to specify how many times a day they use their phone because
460 they claimed that they use their smartphone all the time.

461 The self-assessment of addiction corresponds with the respondents' actual smartphone
462 addiction in our study, because the analysis of the KBUTK test confirmed such addiction in
463 6.1% of respondents. A large group of respondents (32.2%) were at risk of addiction. 61.7% of
464 respondents showed no addiction to smartphones. Polish reports showed that less than 3% of
465 the surveyed young people show symptoms of addictive use of smartphones [33]. Similarly,
466 research conducted among 470 secondary school students in western Poland showed that less
467 than 4% of young people are addicted to mobile phones. Unfortunately, nearly 35% of
468 respondents were at risk of addiction [37]. Our research confirmed that addiction or the risk of
469 addiction to smartphones is 3 times more common in females than in males, which is convergent
470 with the results of a systematic review amongst children and young people [6]. Moreover, such
471 addiction was correlated with communication and networking applications similarly to our
472 analyses. The above study also showed that the risk of addiction increases significantly with
473 the age of the respondents, but in our research we did not find such a relationship [6].
474 Meanwhile, similarly to Warzecha and Pawlak, living conditions and school type were found
475 to be significant predictors of mobile device addiction [37]. In turn, out of 248 junior high
476 school students, 2% were addicted to smartphones. It should be noted here that these addicted
477 respondents were girls [38]. These studies also showed that almost 30% of respondents were at
478 risk of addiction. Females were again a larger group at risk of developing addiction than males.
479 Less than 70% of respondents were not at risk of developing mobile phone addiction [38].
480 Another study using KBUTK conducted among Polish adolescents aged 13 to 19 again

481 confirmed that there are more girls than boys in the group of respondents addicted to
482 smartphones [39]. Less than 4% of girls and 0.3% of boys met the criteria for smartphone
483 addiction. The group at risk of developing addiction included 23.4% of girls and 12% of boys
484 [39].

485 **Conclusion**

486 This study concluded that a typical Polish smartphone user during adolescence was
487 more than 5 times more likely to be a girl and almost 3 times more likely to be a student of
488 technical secondary school. Females were also more likely than males to have a smartphone
489 addiction. What is symptomatic, the general level of smartphone addiction correlated positively
490 with the perception of being a smartphone addict. It was also found that the overuse of
491 smartphones leads to problematic behaviors resulting in: problems with face-to-face contacts,
492 avoiding school or home duties, or carrying the device all the time even at night. This study
493 demonstrated that smartphone usage contains potential risk in a group of adolescents and its
494 negative effects should attract the attention of parents, teachers and students alike.

495 **Acknowledgments**

496 Authors would like to thank the school authorities and the anonymous participants of
497 this study.

498

499 **References**


- 500 1. Twenge JM. *iGen: Why Today's Super-Connected Kids Are Growing Up Less Rebellious,*
501 *More Tolerant, Less Happy—and Completely Unprepared for Adulthood—and What That*
502 *Means for the Rest of Us.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 2017.
- 503 2. Elhai JD, Dvorak RD, Levine JC, Hall BJ. Problematic smartphone use: A conceptual
504 overview and systematic review of relations with anxiety and depression psychopathology.
505 *Journal of affective disorders.* 2017;207, 251-259.
- 506 3. Yang J, Fu X, Liao X, Li Y. Association of problematic smartphone use with poor sleep
507 quality, depression, and anxiety: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychiatry*
508 *research.* 2020;284, 112686.
- 509 4. Fischer-Grote L, Kothgassner OD, Felnhofer A. Risk factors for problematic smartphone
510 use in children and adolescents: a review of existing literature. *Neuropsychiatrie.*
511 2019;33:179–90. pmid:31493233
- 512 5. Elhai JD, Tiamiyu MF, Weeks JW, Levine JC, Picard KJ, Hall BJ. Depression and emotion
513 regulation predict objective smartphone use measured over one week. *Personality and*
514 *Individual Differences.* 2018;133, 21–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.04.051>.
- 515 6. Sohn S, Rees P, Wildridge B, Kalk NJ, Carter B. Prevalence of problematic smartphone
516 usage and associated mental health outcomes amongst children and young people: a
517 systematic review, meta-analysis and GRADE of the evidence. *BMC Psychiatry.*
518 2019;19(1):356. pmid:31779637.
- 519 7. Orben A, Prybylski A. The association between adolescent well-being and digital
520 technology use. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2019;3(2):173–82. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0506-11)
521 [0506-11](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0506-11).
- 522 8. Tangmunkongvorakul A, Musumari PM, Tsubohara Y, Ayood P, Srithanaviboonchai K,
523 Techasrivichien T, et al. Factors associated with smartphone addiction: A comparative

- 524 study between Japanese and Thai high school students. PLoS ONE. 2020;15(9): e0238459.
525 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238459>.
- 526 9. Bell CC. DSM-IV: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. JAMA.
527 1994;272(10): 828-829. doi:10.1001/jama.1994.03520100096046.
- 528 10. Höhn C, Schmid SR, Plamberger CP, Bothe K, Angerer M, Gruber G, Pletzer B,
529 Hoedlmoser K. Preliminary Results: The Impact of Smartphone Use and Short-Wavelength
530 Light during the Evening on Circadian Rhythm, Sleep and Alertness. *Clocks &*
531 *Sleep*. 2021; 3, 66-86. <https://doi.org/10.3390/clockssleep3010005>.
- 532 11. Jon D. Elhai, Jason C. Levine, Robert D. Dvorak, Brian J. Hall, Fear of missing out, need
533 for touch, anxiety and depression are related to problematic smartphone use, *Computers in*
534 *Human Behavior*. 2016; 63,509-516, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.079>.
- 535 12. Li L, Griffiths MD, Mei S, Niu Z. Fear of Missing Out and Smartphone Addiction Mediates
536 the Relationship Between Positive and Negative Affect and Sleep Quality Among Chinese
537 University Students. *Front. Psychiatry*. 2020;11:877. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00877.
- 538 13. Mannion KH, Nolan SA. The effect of smartphones on anxiety: An attachment issue or
539 fear of missing out? *Cogent Psychology*. 2020;7:1. DOI:
540 10.1080/23311908.2020.1869378.
- 541 14. Konok V, Gigler D, Bereczky BM, Miklósi Á. Humans' attachment to their mobile phones
542 and its relationship with interpersonal attachment style. *Computers in Human Behavior*,
543 2016;61, 537–547. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.062>.
- 544 15. Chang A-M, Aeschbach D, Duffy JF, et al. Evening use of light-emitting eReaders
545 negatively affects sleep, circadian timing, and next-morning alertness. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
546 *U S A* 2015;112:1232–7.

- 547 16. Twenge JM, Martin GN, Campbell WK. Decreases in psychological well-being among
548 American adolescents after 2012 and links to screen time during the rise of smartphone
549 technology. *Emotion*. 2018; 18(6), 765.
- 550 17. Lou J, Han N, Wang D, Pei X. Effects of Mobile Identity on Smartphone Symbolic Use:
551 An Attachment Theory Perspective. *International Journal of Environmental Research and*
552 *Public Health*. 2022; 19(21):14036. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192114036>.
- 553 18. Blom JO, Monk AF. Theory of personalization of appearance: Why users personalize their
554 pcs and mobile phones. *Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 2003;18:193–228. doi:
555 10.1207/S15327051HCI1803_1.
- 556 19. Główny Urząd Statystyczny. Polska w liczbach 2019. Available:
557 [https://stat.gov.pl/obszary-tematyczne/inne-opracowania/inne-opracowania-](https://stat.gov.pl/obszary-tematyczne/inne-opracowania/inne-opracowania-zbiorcze/polska-w-liczbach-2019,14,12.html)
558 [zbiorcze/polska-w-liczbach-2019,14,12.html](https://stat.gov.pl/obszary-tematyczne/inne-opracowania/inne-opracowania-zbiorcze/polska-w-liczbach-2019,14,12.html). Accessed March 20 2024.
- 559 20. Hübler M, Hartje R. Are smartphones smart for economic development?. *Economics*
560 *Letters*. 2016; 141, 130-133.
- 561 21. Global Digital 2023 Report. Available: [https://datareportal.com/report-embed-](https://datareportal.com/report-embed-issues?utm_source=Global_Digital_Reports&utm_medium=Partner_Article&utm_campaign=Digital_2023)
562 [issues?utm_source=Global_Digital_Reports&utm_medium=Partner_Article&utm_campa-](https://datareportal.com/report-embed-issues?utm_source=Global_Digital_Reports&utm_medium=Partner_Article&utm_campaign=Digital_2023)
563 [ign=Digital_2023](https://datareportal.com/report-embed-issues?utm_source=Global_Digital_Reports&utm_medium=Partner_Article&utm_campaign=Digital_2023). Accessed March 20 2024.
- 564 22. Urząd Komunikacji Elektronicznej. Badanie konsumenckie dzieci i rodziców 2019.
565 Available: [https://www.uke.gov.pl/akt/badanie-konsumenckie-dzieci-i-rodzicow-](https://www.uke.gov.pl/akt/badanie-konsumenckie-dzieci-i-rodzicow-2019,277.html)
566 [2019,277.html](https://www.uke.gov.pl/akt/badanie-konsumenckie-dzieci-i-rodzicow-2019,277.html). Accessed March 22 2024.
- 567 23. A. Bąk. Korzystanie z urządzeń mobilnych przez małe dzieci w Polsce, Fundacja Dajmy
568 Dzieciom Siłę, 2015. Available: [https://fdds.pl/wp-](https://fdds.pl/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Bak_Korzystanie_z_urzadzen_mobilnych_raport.pdf)
569 [content/uploads/2016/05/Bak_Korzystanie_z_urzadzen_mobilnych_raport.pdf](https://fdds.pl/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Bak_Korzystanie_z_urzadzen_mobilnych_raport.pdf). Accessed
570 March 22 2024.

- 571 24. CBOS, Raport z badania pn. „Młodzież 2018”. Available: 03.07.2019,
572 <https://www.cinn.gov.pl/portal?id=1475772>. Accessed March 22 2024.
- 573 25. Potembska E, Pawłowska B. Właściwości psychometryczne Kwestionariusza do Badania
574 Uzależnienia od Telefonu Komórkowego. *Badania nad Schizofrenią*. 2009; X, 322 - 329.
- 575 26. Lee C, Lee S-J. Prevalence and predictors of smartphone addiction proneness among
576 Korean adolescents. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2017;77(C):10–7.
- 577 27. Haug S, Castro RP, Kwon M, Filler A, Kowatsch T, Schaub MP Smartphone use and
578 smartphone addiction among young people in Switzerland. *J Behav Addict*. 2015;4: 299–
579 307. pmid:26690625.
- 580 28. Davey S, Davey A Assessment of smartphone addiction in Indian adolescents: A mixed
581 method study by systematic-review and meta-analysis approach. *Int J Prev Med*. 2014;5:
582 1500–1511.
- 583 29. Kim DJ, Kim JY, Pyeon A PM306. Altered functional connectivity related smartphone
584 overuse in adolescent. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2016;19:
585 9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijnp/pyw041.306>;
- 586 30. Claesdotter-Knutsson E, André F, Fridh M, Delfin C, Hakansson A, Lindström M. Gender-
587 Based Differences and Associated Factors Surrounding Excessive Smartphone Use Among
588 Adolescents: Cross-sectional Study. *JMIR Pediatr Parent*. 2021 Nov 22;4(4):e30889. doi:
589 10.2196/30889. PMID: 34813492.
- 590 31. Taywade A, Khubalkar R. Gender differences in smartphone usage patterns of adolescents.
591 *International Journal of Indian Psychology*. 2019;7(4), 516-523. DOI:10.25215/0704.060.
- 592 32. Cocoradă E, Maican CI, Cazan AM, Maican M. Assessing the smartphone addiction risk
593 and its associations with personality traits among adolescents. *Children and Youth Services*
594 *Review*. 2018; 93(C), 345-354.

- 595 33. Dębski M. Nałogowe korzystanie z telefonów komórkowych. Szczegółowa
596 charakterystyka zjawiska fonoholizmu w Polsce. Raport z badań. Gdynia 2016. Available:
597 [https://dbamomojzasieg.pl/wp-](https://dbamomojzasieg.pl/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Nalogowe_korzystanie_z_telefonow_komorkowych_RAPORT_Z_BADAN.pdf)
598 [content/uploads/2021/03/Nalogowe_korzystanie_z_telefonow_komorkowych_RAPORT](https://dbamomojzasieg.pl/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Nalogowe_korzystanie_z_telefonow_komorkowych_RAPORT_Z_BADAN.pdf)
599 [_Z_BADAN.pdf](https://dbamomojzasieg.pl/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Nalogowe_korzystanie_z_telefonow_komorkowych_RAPORT_Z_BADAN.pdf). Accessed March 22 2024.
- 600 34. Sanches-Martincz M, Otero A. Factors associated with cell phone use in adolescents in
601 the community of Madrid (Spain). *Cyberpsychol Behavior*. 2009;12 (2).
- 602 35. Lopcz-Fernandcz O, Honrubia-Serrano L, Frcixa-Blanxart M, Gibson W. Prevalence of
603 Problematic Mobile Phone Use in British Adolescents. *Cyberpsychology Behavior and*
604 *Social Networking*. 2014;17 (2).
- 605 36. Wysocka S. Włoska młodzież uzależniona od Internetu. *Medycyna Praktyczna: Pediatria*.
606 Available: [https://www.mp.pl/pediatria/aktualnosci/253674,wloska-mlodziez-](https://www.mp.pl/pediatria/aktualnosci/253674,wloska-mlodziez-uzaleznioma-od-internetu)
607 [uzaleznioma-od-internetu](https://www.mp.pl/pediatria/aktualnosci/253674,wloska-mlodziez-uzaleznioma-od-internetu). Accessed March 22 2024.
- 608 37. Warzecha K, Pawlak A. Pathological use of mobile phones by secondary school students.
609 *Arch Psychiatrii Psychother*. 2017;19(1):27–36. <https://doi.org/10.12740/APP/67931>.
- 610 38. Warzecha K. Smartfon w edukacji i komunikacji młodzieży gimnazjalnej a zagrożenie
611 fonoholizmem, *Ekonomiczne Problemy Usług*. 2016, 123, 345 - 357.
- 612 39. Pawłowska P, Dziurzyńska E, Gromadzka K, Wallace BE, Zygo M. Objawy uzależnienia
613 od telefonu komórkowego a korzystanie z internetowych portali społecznościowych przez
614 młodzież. *Curr Probl Psychiatrii*. 2012;13(2), 103 - 108.



Figure