Journal of Computer Engineering
ISSN 10003428

Original Research Article
Vol 9, Issue 10, 2020 | ISSN: 1000-3428

Exploring the Paradigm Shift: Face-to-Face Communication versus Mobile Technology-Enabled Interaction

Dr. Elianore Quasar and Dr. Kaida Reyes

Department of Communication Studies, University of California, Berkeley, and Department of Digital Humanities, New York University

Abstract—With the rapid changes occurring in the last twenty five years, mobile phone technology has influenced every aspect of life. Technological developments within the Internet and mobile phone areas have not only changed communication practices; it has also changed the everyday life practices of individuals. This article has focused on understanding how people's communication practices and everyday life practices have changed with the smartphone usage. The study was conducted by using in-depth interview method and the research was conducted on twenty Turkish Cypriots who live in Northern Cyprus. According to the research results, communicating via Internet has rapidly replaced face to face communication in recent years. However, results havechanged according to generations. Younger generations can easily adapt themselves to technological changes because they are already gaining everyday life practices right now. However, the older generations practices are already present in their everyday life.

I. Introduction

FIRSTLY the transition from fixed telephony to mobile telephony has been experienced; then the transition from mobile telephony to smartphones have been experienced for the last twenty years. Fixed, mobile and smartphones are still being used these days. After Apple launched iPhone to the market in 2007 everything about mobile technology has changed. Apart from being a mobile phone, the iPhone brought together both the large and touchscreen iPod and the internet. After getting started with using the Android operating system, Samsung has made quite a sound with the phones in different models that were presented to the market. Samsung, which breaks records in smartphone sales, has a big share in this sector. Prevalence in the smartphone use have been affected almost in every area throughout the world including; business strategies, way to access information, interpersonal communications, everyday life practices, political issues, economic issues, social issues, etc. The financial power of the individual, the infrastructure, and the regulation of the country are the main factors which determine the usage capacity of technology in a country. If the situational factors which are identified above are convenient in countries, the behavioral patterns, consumption habits, information gathering ways, everyday life practices, communication ways and many other

Motivated by the impacts of smartphone usage on the change in communication practices and change in daily life practices, this study aims to expand the research literature on the effects of smartphone usage on the social ties and on the face to face (FtF) relationships. The study was conducted by using in-depth interview methods and having interviews with 20 people. The in-depth interview was conducted to get detailed information from the participants as a research method. Each generation does not get affected from technological developments in the same way, that is the reason for attempting to establish such an age range in the research. Communicating with each other (FtF, via internet) is in the scope of interpersonal communication. Interpersonal communication subject is the matter of private space. To get satisfactory and detailed answers, in-depth interview was the correct research method to practice. Participants of the research were 20 Turkish Cypriots who live in Northern Cyprus. The research was held within 1st-31st July 2016 period.

Cyprus is an island in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea which has been divided into two parts as south and north after the war in 1974. In the south side, Greek Cypriots and in the north side Turkish Cypriot live. This study has focused on the Turkish Cypriot society living in Northern Cyprus. Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was declared in 1983. Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is not recognized by any country except Turkey. This results in the isolation of Northern Cyprus economically and politically all over the world [1]. The mobile phone was introduced to North Cyprus in 1994. However penetration of mobile phone throughout North Cyprus was slow until 1999. Penetration of mobile phone in North Cyprus happened after second GSM operator entered into the field.

Humphreys' point of view about telecommunication is important in this point. Humphreys [2] thinks on the one hand telecommunications allow people to connect with the others who are away; on the other hand it causes a reduction in giving importance to connecting with the closest people. He argued that geographic distance has overcome with the implication of internet to mobile phones. According to the research results [2], communicating via Internet has an effect on changing the way of interpersonal communication in recent years. However, generational factors still show differences on preference in the way of communication. Elder generations met with digital

How to cite: Dr. Elianore Quasar and Dr. Kaida Reyes (2020). Exploring the Paradigm Shift: Face-to-Face Communication versus Mobile Technology-Enabled Interaction. Journal of Computer Engineering, 9(10), 43–71. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19342194

technology in their late ages, but younger generations (especially generation Z) are born into the digital age. Adaptation to technological changes is much easier for younger generations compare to elder generations. They are already gaining this ability as a part of their everyday life practices while they are growing. However, the older generations' continuously try to adapt themselves to new technologies. Each change in technology can cause new habits to gain for everyone. As smartphone usage increases and communication applications via internet diversified, every generation try to adapt themselves to these changes according to their needs and possibilities that they have [1].

II. Mobile Lives

Geser [3] argued that sociologists were not interested with the telephone because of the level of bilateral interaction of telephone since it started to be used in 1876. Application of the Internet regarding mobile phones has encouraged sociologists to be interested in phones and their effects on social life. Internet technology can be evaluated as able to support virtual groups, communities, organizations; transsocietal networks on a global scale which can be assessed as multilateral relationships. Geser also mentions that the main function of communication technologies in the historical context has changed from bilateral communication to broadcasting device [4]. However, Hampton's view on the Internet and its two way communication ability for its users is important in this point. Hampton [5] suggests that the Internet is broadcasting like the radio and the television. According to Hampton, Internet has a much more democratic structure when it is compared with earlier broadcasting technologies. Hampton explains this difference with users' usage patterns in the Internet arena; each Internet user can get any content or they can be content creator themselves.

Ingrams [6] thinks that technological ability acts as an activation change which allows reaching information and other sources to be transformed into social, economic and political benefits. Adaptation of internet to mobile phones increased technological ability in usage patterns of people to reach information and react on social, on economic and on political issues.

III. Mobile Phone Usage Patterns in North Cyprus

Öze [7] has the GSM sector of Northern Cyprus within one of her studies in her PhD thesis. The beginning of the mobile phone usage in Northern Cyprus is 1994 [7]. Until 1999 only one operator supplied GSM services in Northern Cyprus. In the middle of the 1999, a second GSM service operator started to facilitate the island and only two GSM operators provide services to date.

KKTCELL is one of two mobile communication firms active in Northern Cyprus. Telsim is the other operator; it is the oldest GSM operator in Northern Cyprus. Telsim was bought by Vodafone in 2008. Vodafone is a GSM Operator which is centralized in Hungary. After management change the competition between Turkcell and Vodafone has increased. KKTCELL is a branch of Turkcell which is originally centralized in Turkey.

KKTCELL has 73% of the total Northern Cyprus mobile communication market according to the research carried by KKTCELL in 2015 [8]. This research shows that smartphone usage has increased 126% within the one year period (2013 to 2014); and smartphone usage has increased from 36% to 44% within a year. According to KKTCELLs' research, over fifty percent (58%) of smartphone users prefer Android operating system. 41% prefer IOS operating systems and only 1% use Windows Mobile Communication [8].

Then another research has been carried out by The Information Technologies and Communication Authority (ITCA) [9] on January 2016. ITCA released data on the third quarter of 2016. The Information Technologies and Communication Authority were established with Law no 62012, Electronical Communications Law in Northern Cyprus. The Information Technologies and Communication Authority aim is to ensure that the regulation and supervision function of the electronic communication sector to be carried out by an independent authority. ITCA is a legal entity that has financial and administrative autonomy and it is independent in its functions [9]. Depending on a research carried out by Information Technologies and Communication Authority, technology is now an integral part of life in North Cyprus [10]. Alper [10] believes that development only counts as meaningful if people can use mobile phones and the internet efficiently. He continued his words with 'If we began to deal with only our phones and don't care about the people around us, it means that we are one step closer to the day that this technology kills us'. Vamık [11] used these data and prepared the news for an online newspaper Kıbrıs Postası which is the oldest online newspaper in North Cyprus. Vamık put forward some statistical graphs in his news. The report, which includes quarterly data in the electronic communications sector, covers July, August and September of 2016. ITCA's report includes monthly phone calls, smart device usage and 3G internet usage rates. As of the third quarter of 2016, there are a total of 827,320 registered mobile subscribers and 645,045 active subscribers in North Cyprus corresponding to an access rate of approximately 188%. According to the population census made in 2011, while the population of North Cyprus is 294,600, according to the projection data of the DPO it is stated that this number has increased to 342,587 in 2016. According to the results, there are active mobile subscribers with twice the rate of the population in North Cyprus [9], [11].

ITCA's report shows that as the diversity of messaging applications and the usage rate of smart devices are increasing, the use of SMS is decreasing at the same rate. The SMS rate sent with the third quarter of 2016 was decreased for 29% compared to the SMS rate posted in 2013. While the monthly SMS average is 37.33 million units in the first quarter of 2013, it has been increasing and falling during the three years to the third quarter of 2016, resulting in a decrease of approximately 29% to 26.57 million units [9], [11].

IV. Methodology

Based on a month-long study (1-31 July 2016) of in-depth interviews, this article explores the social and behavioral pattern changes and discusses the implications of smartphone usage. In this study, the interest was in how people use smartphones and integrate it into their life. Firstly demographic information is collected on the respondents' gender, generation and employment category. Then, questions about smartphone usage patterns and its' effects on their social life have asked to respondents. The intergenerational differences and the smartphone usage patterns were attempted to be explained in this way.

20 in-depth interviews were conducted with smartphone users from five different generations throughout Northern Cyprus. The target respondents were all Turkish Cypriot North Cyprus local residents. The research population consists of 20 people and 100% of the respondents use smartphones. Traditionalist/Silent Generation (1927-1945), Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X/Indigo (1965-1979), Generation Y/Millenials (1980-2000), Generation Z/ Crystals (2001-2020) have been considered as separate generation categories. The sample was compromised of 13 women and 7 men. The sample included ten different occupations: College student, university student, academician, self-employed, secretary, housewife, retired teacher, PR coordinator, retired and cameraman. The research was carried out in a month period; it covers the period 1-31 July 2016. All potential participants were Turkish Cypriots selected according to generation's percentages on the last census. Quantitative data were processed into the SPSS analysis program. Qualitative data (comments of respondents) were used to explain social effects of smartphone usage in everyday life.

19 questions were addressed to understand smartphone usage habits and effects on respondents' everyday life in the basis of the behavioral pattern changes in social interactions. These questions were open ended. The first question addressed if the participants use the land phone in their living area. This question was asked to measure if the traditional phone usage pattern is continuous. The second question tried to understand participants' selection reasons for mobile phones' operating system categories: Why android or why IOS? The transition from land phone to smartphone has effects on relationship patterns and in the third question these changes on behavior patterns have been tried to understand. The purpose of mobile phone usage by participants was asked in the fourth question. In the fifth question, it has been tried to discover how mobile phone usage affect individuals' perception in the contexts of time and space. The sixth question was about how often the participants checked their phones during the day. Sixth, seventh and eighth questions were combined questions and the seventh question was about reasons of checking mobile phones if there is any incoming notifications by users. The eighth question tried to measure if frequently checking mobile phones for incoming notifications causes a waste of time for the users. The ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth questions were linked to each other. In these questions, it has been tried to understand how mobile phone/smartphone usage affects the face-to-face relationships and tries to understand how mobile phones affect people FtF relationships. The fifteenth question is interested with talking about personal private issues on mobile phones. The sixteenth question was about with whom users get in contact with via mobile phones. The seventeenth question was related with the social ties and the effects of mobile phones regarding these ties. The eighteenth question was about how people feel when they accidentally forget their mobile phone somewhere. In the final question, the ease and difficulty of smartphone usage was questioned.

V. Findings and Discussions

According to this research, 20 smartphone user participants answered the open ended questionnaire form. Additionally information was requested whenever needed during the interviews according to the participants' replies to deepen understanding of replies.

A. From Land Phone to Smartphone

The first two questions tried to figure out if participants are still using land phone and what sort of telephone they are using.

RQ1: Do You Have Land Phone in Your Daily Living Area?

TABLE I
Landphone Usage Patterns of Respondents

Do you have land phone in your daily living area?		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	70.0	70.0	70.0
	No	6	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	20	100.0	100.0	

A total of 70% of participants have and 30% of participants do not have a land phone in their daily living area. According to Northern Cyprus 2014 Economic and Social Indicators, 318 land phones and 1706 cellular phones are used per 1000 people [12]. Each land phone can be used by all residents of the home however; mobile phones are private to each person.

RQ2: What Sort of Telephone Are You Using?

TABLE II
SMARTPHONES OPERATING SYSTEM PREFERENCES

What sort of telephone are you using?		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	IOS	5	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Android	15	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	20	100.0	100.0	

Most (75%) of the participants use android phone and the rest of the participants (25%) use IOS. Research findings about usage of Android and IOS operating systems as a smartphone are very close to the ICTA report [9], [11]. In the ITCA's report, the widespread use of smartphones and the increase in data usage are observed in Northern Cyprus as well as the rest of the world. In this respect, smartphone usage rates of subscribers increased to 71% in the period from the first quarter of 2013 to the third quarter of 2016, reported by mobile communication providers operating in Northern Cyprus, and 28% of IOS operating systems installed on smart devices and 72% of Android operating system devices. In the second quarter of 2016, the numbers of registered smart devices were 291,454 (65%). The number of registered smart devices increased from 65% (291,454), up to 71% to (318,974) in the third quarter of 2016. With 115,000 smartphones and tablets in 2013, this figure rises to 319 in the third quarter of 2016 with a 178% increase over a 3-year period [9], [11].

As integration of smartphones to everyday life, mobile phone usage purposes have changed from technological device to social object. In this research with in-depth analysis of what people do with these phones are trying to be understood. Questions are designed to understand the social effects of smartphone usage in daily life practices in the basis of interactions and especially FtF relationships in this study.

RQ3: How Are your Means of Communication Affected from the Transition of Land Phone to Smartphone?

TABLE III
THE EFFECTS OF THE TRANSITION FROM LAND PHONE TO MOBILE PHONE ON RESPONDENTS

The transition from land telephone to mobile telephone; then transition from mobile telephone to smartphone have been lived. Nowadays still all of them are part of our lives. Have these changes in telephone usages affecting your life?		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	16	80.0	80.0	80.0
	No	2	10.0	10.0	90.0
	In somehow	2	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	20	100.0	100.0	

Srivastava [13] referred that mobile phone moved from a mere technical device to a more social object and the author also discussed personalized nature of mobile phones primarily related to identity construction and social interaction. The land line phone does not allow users to construct their private sphere; because an incoming call to a land phone rings at a fixed place and this call can be to every person in that place been. However mobile phones are private devices and people call mobile phone owners in order to get in contact with them. Wellman [14] explained this situation with portal concept and said that phones are no more the portal to the person; people become a portal with the mobile phones. One of the respondents related this question with becoming a portal with the mobile phones, privacy and freedom.

"No I don't have a land phone in my home. If someone wants to call me, I would prefer them to call me from my smartphone. In that way I feel more comfortable, I can move away and talk freely. No one can listen to my conversation in this way" (Nurettin, male, 26 years old, self-employment, Generation Y)

Another reply is also interesting about transitioning from a land phone to a smartphone and the effect of change on their means of communication. Most of the respondents put forward advantages of smartphone usage in their life and its effects on means of communication.

"Yes we have a land phone in our house; I sometimes use it when I don't have enough credit to call my mum or I use it when I don't want to spend my credits to call my family members. Also, I have to answer it when it rings if my mum is not around. We can't use it in silent mode because it's a home phone and it sometimes disturbs me while ringing when I am sleeping, it makes me angry." (Çisem, 15 years old, college student, Generation Z).

"Once upon a time we had a land phone in our house. It is still somewhere in the house and I'm sure my mum always cleans its dusts but it is not working now. Something happened to it, I think it's corrupted and we didn't repair it. Cause we don't need it anymore. Each member of my family has one or two

mobile phones now." (Sude, 15 years old, college student Generation Z)

"Yes I do have it, but I rarely use my land phone. It becomes much easier to reach people with mobile phones" (Ahmet, male, 54 years old, self-employment, Baby Boomers)

"Yes I have land phone in my house. Mobile phones make our lives easier" (Gülsüm, female, 58 years old, working in private sector, Baby Boomers)

"Yes I have a land phone in my living area. We are communicating more with people by using our mobile phones." (Hatice, female, 18 years old, college student, Generation Y)

"Yes I have, however I can communicate more quickly with the people I call with my mobile phone" (Münise, female, 50 years old, house wife, Generation X)

"It has effects in a positive way. Now we can see people that we are talking to live by using smartphone applications." (Zarif, female, 38 years old, secretary, Generation X)

"No I don't have. I don't believe that it's affecting my relationship with people I am already in communication with. However, the means of communication has changed and adaptation has occurred within the possibilities provided by technology" (Davita, female, 38 years old, academician, Generation X)

"Yes, I have a land Phone in my house. Transmission from land phone to mobile phone lets me talk with people when I'm not in my house; I can communicate with people when I'm in a market, visiting someone or walking on the street" (Kemal, male, 79 years old,
retired teacher, Silent Generation)

"Switching from a land telephone to a mobile telephone has greatly reduced the time and space phenomena" (İbrahim, male, 56 years old, academician, Baby Boomers).

"Yes I have a land phone. Communication with people can be configured more easily now because of the internet and its possibilities. On the other hand my communication with my family has decreased" (Melin, female, 15 years old, college student, Generation Z)

"I can communicate continuously anytime and anywhere" (Ufuk, female, 38 years old, academician,
Generation X)

Most of the respondents indicated that smartphones are more convenient to get in communication with others compared to land phone. The convenience of smartphone is becoming from its mobility, applications and personalization.

B. Motivations for Mobile Phone Usage

Palen et al. [15] reveal the reasons for their first acquisition of mobile phone in their investigation as motivation by a particular event; safety; business; and mobile phone as a second line to landline telephony. The last decade has witnessed an enormous increase in smartphone usage. Smartphones include a variety of functions which can be used as an equivalent to other devices: Photo camera, pc, scanner, calculator, recorder, media player, etc. Nowadays, most of people cannot imagine themselves without their smartphone and without access to the internet. Smartphones have become so prevalent in peoples everyday lives. In this point, smartphone usage purposes have been tried to be understood in order to detect smartphone usage motivational factors.

RQ4: For What Purposes Are You Using Your Mobile Phone?

TABLE IV
MOBILE PHONE USAGE PURPOSES

For what purposes are you using your mobile phone		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Mostly for social purposes	1	5.0
	For communication purposes	5	25.0
	Mostly for communication purposes	2	10.0
	For both (social and communication) purposes	12	60.0
	Total	20	100.0

Most (60%) participants are using smartphones for both social and instrumental purposes. Quarter (25%) of the participants are using their smartphones only for communication (instrumental) purpose (60% of participants are from Baby Boomers), 10% of the participants mostly use their smartphones mostly for communication purpose and only 5% (Generation Z) of the participants use their smartphone mostly for social purposes.

Researchers emphasize that cell phone usage can be described as a tool, including talking, searching, texting, playing or to get in touch. They argue that, cell phone usage now has changed also by serving as a tool for social connection [16], [17]. Ishii [18] said that mobile phones are no longer just a voice call. Rodney Mason (Chief Marketing Officer (CMO) of the digital-branding agency Moosylvania) [19] emphasized that smartphones are a remote control for the next generation. Mason also passed this judgment on because of the properties of smartphones which let people use many applications at the same time. People can play games and make calls, surf the Internet and text, use Facebook and MySpace, tweet on Twitter, watch movies and TV channels, e-mail, actually listen to music and

transfer money, book a hotel and pay bills via applications on smartphone's.

"I am using my mobile phone both for social and for business reasons. I can track my business cars on my smartphone via GPS, I can send price lists to my customers instantly, I can check the workplace by connecting to the camera and use it as a social tool also. And of course I aman amateur photographer, and I use it to take photos" (Nurettin, male, 26 years old, selfemployed, Generation Y)

"I use my smartphone both for social and for communication. In addition to that I sometimes use it as a photo camera and calculator purposes" (Davita, female, 38 years old, academician, Generation X)

"I am always listening music, playing games, texting with my friends and family, calling people, taking photos and recording videos, taking notes, following my courses and exam results, etc... with my phone" (Elnaz, female, 19 years old, university student, Generation Y)

"It means many things: Video, photo camera, notebook, communication device, alarm clock" Çisem, 15 years old, college student, Generation Z).

Moreover, Srivastava [13] argued that there has never been a technical device which became this important in human lives ever. People use mobile phones for many purposes such as alarm clock, calculator, communication portal, pc, photo camera, voice recorder, video recorder and player and so on. Also, users sleep with their phones. Based on these determinations, Srivastava [13] claims that mobile phones have become a part of the personal sphere. Mobile phone becomes the provider of an intimate aspect of private sphere which gives users connection to the portal world and social life.

C. Time and Space

Individuals lost the advantage of temporary being unavailable to get in touch with, they have to be always keeping in touch regardless of their location or them being on the move. In addition to that, Bates et al. [20] explain that cellular phone usage possibilities are anytime and anywhere, while on the move with the expansion of the wireless technology and its application to telephony. The fifth question tried to discover the effects of mobile phone usage on time and space regarding the users' perception.

RQ5: How mobile phone usage affects time and space perception of users?

All participants said that mobile phone usage has effects on their time and space perception. Geser believes that mobile phones remove strict circumstances, change conditions and provide freedom to people in micro-social interactions: without the obligation to comply with institutional norms and demanding them to be in a fixed place [3]. Furthermore, people eager to get in contact with close kin anytime and anywhere when needed. People in different places can remain in simultaneous contact by using cellular phones [6], [13], [14], [21]-[25].

"The person that uses a smartphone when he/she meets with his/her friends or family, the user forgets the reality or is lost in time and space" (Melin, female, 15 years old, college student, Generation Z).

"Mobile phones have removed the perception of time and space. Nowadays, we can easily get in contact with our relatives who live in dispersed locations" (Münise, female, 50 years old, house wife, Generation X).

"Time and space perception has disappeared by mobile phones" (Hatice, female, 18 years old, student, Generation Y)

"It steals our time, it's a thief" (Sude, 15 years old, college student Generation Z).

"We can reach people whenever we want" (Çisem, 15 years old, college student, Generation Z)

"Time and space perception of people are affected negatively" (İrfan, male, 33 years old, cameraman, Generation Y)

"Smartphones cause the disappearance of time, space and distance problems" (İmge, female, 35 years old, PR

Speacialist, Generation Y)

'On duty anywhere at any time and all the time' has fore fronted and nowadays the concept of 'working hours' has been eliminated especially for the self-employed people with the smartphone adaptation. They are always 'on-call' with their smartphones and ready to work.

"Thanks to the smart phones, people can be accessed without regard to time and space. In terms of business, it made life easier. Now I can handle all the business easily while I'm abroad" (Nurettin, male, 26 years old, selfemployment, Generation Y).

"Mobile phones let us get in communication quicker than land phones" (Kemal, male, 79 years old, retired teacher, Silent Generation)

Then frequency of smartphone checking has been questioned to comprehend the spending of time for the respondents regarding their smartphones.

RQ6: During the Day, How Many Times Do You Check Your Mobile Phone?

TABLE V
MOBILE PHONE CHECKING FREQUENCY

During the day for how many times are you controlling your mobile phone?	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	9	45.0
Rarely	3	15.0
When it rings and to call someone	2	10.0
In my free times	1	5.0

It depends to my daily routine	5	25.0
Total	20	100.0

Answer of the 20 participants can be categorized within five main headings: Frequently (45%); it depends to my daily routine (25%); rarely (15%); when it rings and to call someone (10%); in my free time (5%). The following question was about the reason of checking smartphones.

RQ7: For What Reason Do You Check Your Mobile Phone?

The answers given here can be collected under five main headings: Because of necessity (35%); because of habit (35%); because of necessity and habit (15%); I am not checking my telephone frequently (10%); because I get bored (5%). During the in-depth interviews it was observed that people who are working hard and using their phones frequently to call people or to answer calls from people in order to organize their work think that smartphones do not waste their time. That's why they mostly said they are checking their phones because of necessity. As the age categories decreased answers changed from necessity to habit. It is linked with having a free time in their daily life routine.

"As I get bored I check it. So, frequently!" (Sude, 15 years old, college student Generation Z).

"I'm checking my phone when I feel more boredom" (Melin, female, 15 years old, college student, Generation Z)

"Mostly when it rings and if I'm alone" (Zarif, female, 38 years old, secretary, Generation X).

"I check it 4-5 times a day, except when I make and receive calls" " (İbrahim, male, 56 years old, academician, Baby Boomers).

"When I do not have my phone, I feel lost and feel the need to carry with me" (Münise, female, 50 years old,
house wife, Generation X)

The last question about this issue was whether it is a waste of time to constantly check your phone.

RQ8: Do You Think Checking Your Telephone during the Day Causes You to Waste Time?

TABLE VI
FREQUENCY OF CHECKING PHONE AND ITS RELATION WITH TIME WASTE

Do you think controlling your telephone during the day causes to waste your time?		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Yes	13	65.0
	No	7	35.0
	Total	20	100.0

Most of the respondents said "yes it does (65%)" and the rest said "no it doesn't" (%35) to this question. *"When I check my phone, yes it does take my time" (Zarif, female, 38 years old, secretary, Generation X).*

"When I say just to have a look, I spend time especially on social media" (İbrahim, male, 56 years old, academician, Baby Boomers).

"When I check it, it causes me to waste time" (Arif, male, 11 years old, secondary school student, Generation Z)

"Yes it is a waste of our time" (Sude, 15 years old, college student Generation Z).

"Steals a lot of time" (Nurettin, male, 26 years old, self-employment, Generation Y).

"Absolutely yes" (İmge, female, 35 years old, PR Speacialist, Generation Y)

"No it doesn't. Because I use my phone to answer incoming calls from my customers and also call them to give information" (Ahmet, male, 54 years old, selfemployment, Baby Boomers)

During the in-depth interviews it was observed that, people who are working hard and using their phones frequently to call people or to answer calls from people in order to organize their work think that smartphones do not waste their times.

D. Exaggerated Use of Smartphones and Social Ties

According to Geser [3], cell phones have a capacity to direct people to spend their free time in personal interactions. The 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th questions were related to each other. In these questions, it was investigated how people's face-to-face relationships are affected by smartphone usages and how smartphones influenced people in their close relationships. At this point, it is necessary to consider the effects of internet usage rather than mobile phone usage. It should not be forgotten that with the adaptation of the Internet to mobile phones, mobile phones are now much more than telephones. Mobile phones, of course, have caused many things to change: Mobility and reachability of people; decrease in importance of time and space; increase in the privacy with the mobile phone; intersection of the public sphere and the private sphere. The effects of the Internet on social life have become more evident in everyday life practices after the internet has been applied to mobile phones. Derks et al. [26], in a research on the role of emotion in computer mediated communication, has questioned the difference between online and FtF communication. Their findings show that there is no indication that computer mediated communication is a less emotional or less personally containing medium than FtF. Licope and Smoreda [27] mention that different means of communication affect human life in different ways. They [27] believe that

particular means of communications have the ability to contribute to strengthening ties and establishing closer relationships when used correctly. Here, it is needed to question if respondents use their smartphones correctly and how their smartphone usage patterns influenced their FtF relationships.

RQ9: Have Your Face to Face Relationship Patterns Been Influenced with Your Smartphone Usage?

TABLE VII
SMARTPHONE USAGE AND ITS INFLUENCES ON FTF RELATIONSHIPS

Have your face to face relationships pattern been influenced with your smartphone usage?	Frequency	Percent
Yes	18	90.0
No	2	10.0
Total	20	100.0

Most (90%) of respondents said FtF relationship patterns have been influenced with their smartphone usage patterns. Only 10% of respondents said that smartphone usage did not affect their FtF relationship patterns. One of the respondents is from Baby Boomers' and the other is from Generation X. Both of them said they are only using their phone to call and receive call and they are checking their phones rarely. On the other hand, 90% of respondents expressed their feelings about relationship pattern changes in positively, negatively or in both. Ninth question was asked in order to understand respondents' positive or negative feelings on this issue.

"It has positive and negative effects on us. It affects us negatively because we are linking via the smartphone instead of visiting the people around us. It affects us positively because we have the opportunity to have visual conversation people who are living far away from us who we have not had the chance to see for years" (Zarif, female, 38 years old, secretary, Generation X).

"Thanks to video chat we can easily connect with our acquaintances and friends in far-off places. Even if you speak to people close to you face to face, three out of ten people constantly check their social media accounts while having face to face contact"(İmge, female, 35 years old, PR Speacialist, Generation Y)

"I think smartphones have both positive and negative effects at the same time. On the positive side, we know many people around the world; it is possible to get in contact with them frequently instead of few times with the help of smartphones. On the negative side, we do not prefer to talk to people we can easily talk to and we connect to them via smartphones" (Nurettin, male, 26 years old, self-employment, Generation Y).

Reinforcing strong social ties have effects by using smartphone applications in geographically dispersed relatives which have been put forward by respondents above. Kim et al. [28] defended this positive affect of mobile phone usage in their study. According to Kim et al., mobile phone users can use the device and its properties to reinforce strong social ties with geographically dispersed friends and kin [28]. However, most of the respondents believe that negative effects of smartphone usage are more than positive' on social ties. Zhao [21] mentions that the internet is the most used medium of communication today. Zhao says, "the internet allows people to establish new social contacts outside the FtF context as well as to maintain existing ties formed in corporeal copresence".

"Some people behave very friendly in the virtual environment, but they are not so in real life" (Çisem, 15 years old, college student, Generation Z).

"Yes it's changed in negative way. For example when we are sitting in a coffee shop with our friends the expectation is to have a conversation however all of my friends and I are dealing with our phones" (Sude, 15 years old, college student Generation Z).

Our communication is getting poorer and poorer. For example, when we are having lunch my grandson is always doing something on his smartphone. (Kemal, male, 79 years old, retired teacher, Silent Generation)

"We are not visiting our families and friends anymore." (Muazzez, female, 68 years old, Retired)

Ling [29] argued that 'normative pressure' has an effect on people while they have conversations on their mobile phones in indoor places which are public spaces. This concept can be used on another way also. One of participants said the controversy to all of these. He focused on normative expectations of the society. Cyprus is a small island in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea. Turkish Cypriots are living in a small island within a small society. FtF relationships are really important especially in older generations. They are waiting for the younger family members, friends, and neighbors to visit them and it is sign of respect to older people in Turkish Cypriot community. It can be called a normative expectation.

"It would be a shame to call a person I should be visiting at home in a normal circumstance because of the reduced face-to-face communication. I have to visit that person in his/her house" (İbrahim, male, 56 years old, academician, Baby Boomers).

Differences between FtF conversation and conversation via smartphones and influences on relationships have been questioned in the next question.

RQ10: Do You Think There is Any Difference between Face to Face Conversation and Conversation via Smartphone?

TABLE VIII

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FACE TO FACE CONVERSATION AND CONVERSATION VIA SMARTPHONE

Do you think there is there any difference between face to face conversation and conversation via smartphone?	Frequency	Percent
Yes, positively	3	15.0
Yes, negatively	13	65.0
No	1	5.0
Yes (both positive and negative effects)	3	15.0
Total	20	100.0

RQ11: Are Your Interpersonal Close Relationshi Influenced by Smartphone Usage?

TABLE IX
SMARTPHONE INFLUENCES ON INTERPERSONAL CLOSE R .ATIONS IIPS

Are your interpersonal close relationships influenced by smartphone usage?	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	70.0
No	6	30.0
Total	20	100.0

Over half (65%) of the respondents had a thought on negative effects of smartphone usage on FtF relationships and they think conversation via smartphone is different than FtF. Some of the respondents (15%) think that smartphone usage has both positive and negative effects on people FtF behavioral patterns. Also 15% of respondents believe smartphones have positive effects on peoples FtF behavioral patterns. Only 5% of respondents said smartphones have not got any effect on users FtF behavioral patterns.

"There is no difference" (Ufuk, female, 38 years old, academician, Generation X).

"Face to face communication is much more effective. I rarely use telephone in these situations"(İbrahim, male, 56 years old, academician, Baby Boomers).

The following question was related with distance perception and importance of FtF relationships.

RQ12: If You Would Like to Say Something to Someone, Do You Go near Him/Her or Do You Get in Contact via Your Mobile Phone?

TABLE X
CONTACT PATTERNS OF RESPONDENTS

If you would like to say something to someone, do you go near him/her or do you get in contact via your mobile phone?	Frequency	Percent
Go to near him/her	3	15.0
Get in contact him/her via mobile phone	12	60.0
It depends to the situation	5	25.0
Total	20	100.0

Over half (60%) of the respondents get in contact via smartphone to talk about something. Quarter (25%) of respondents said that it depends to the situation and only 15% of respondents visit people to talk about on an issue.

"Sometimes distance may be a problem because I can't drive because of my age. I prefer to meet if I can, if I can't; I use my smartphone to reach the people I need" (Çisem, 15 years old, college student, Generation Z).

"I prefer to use my smartphone. However if it is an important issue face to face interaction is better" (Hülya, female, 49 years old, self-employed, Generation X)

"It's easy to use my smartphone to reach people" (Elnaz, female, 19 years old, university student, Generation Y)

"I absolutely prefer FtF conversation" (İbrahim, male, 56 years old, academician, Baby Boomers).

"If it is possible to meet, I absolutely prefer to meet" (Kemal, male, 79 years old, retired teacher, Silent Generation)

As it is seen here, younger generations including Generation X mostly prefer to use their smartphones to get in contact with other people. On the other hand, older generations mostly prefer to FtF conversation. The following questions were trying to understand smartphone usage and its effects on close relationships and general social relationships.

RQ13. Do Your Offline Relationships Transfer to Online Space with Smartphone Usage?

RQ14: What Do You Think about, How Smartphone Usage Affects Your General Social Relations?

Wei and Lo [30] focused on how the cell phone affects users' personal and social relations. This research is important for this study. They claim that the social group determines the behavior pattern of the people who are in-group. They [30] also argue that genders behavioral patterns are differentiate in their cell phone use.

TABLE XI
SMARTPHONE EFFECTS ON GENERAL SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

What do you think about, how smartphone usage affects your general social relations?	Frequency	Percent
Affects too much	17	85.0
Doesn't affect	3	15.0
Total	20	100.0

Most (85%) of the respondents said that their general social relationships are affected from their smartphone usage. Only a few (15%; 5% Silent Generation, 5% Baby Boomers, 5% Generation X) respondents stated that smartphones do not affect their general social relationship. People who said their general social relationships are not affected from smartphone usage are respondents who use smartphones rarely or when it rings or to call someone and also they do not talk about their private issues on the phone. As a result, they are using their phones as a communication portal and they did not become a portal yet; as the rest of respondents did. Skenazy [19] questions whether smartphones are being considered as a means of communication and perhaps evaluating the exact opposite. In these results, it is possible to say that smartphones have negative effects on close and general social relationships. Fortunati [31] argued that short and instrumental discussion in families is an emerging situation. Fortunati said that the value of communication in everyday life has decreased and it is also to be reflected to having conversations over mobile phones.

"No one talks to each other in my family, when we are sitting in the living room together at night. Everyone is looking at their smartphones and texting with others or observing what the others do on social media. I feel alone and I leave the living room. When I go to my room they say that I'm not interesting in them. Is that right?" (Sude, 15 years old, college student Generation Z).

"I think that there are unlimited factors in the shaping of social relations which have influences in different dimensions and levels. However as a device, I think the phone does not affect our relationships. Our communication method has changed" (Davita, female, 38 years old, academician, Generation X)

"We can reach people that we love using the phone whenever we wish" (Ahmet, male, 54 years old, selfemployment, Baby Boomers)

"At the advanced level" (Arif, male, 11 years old, secondary school student, Generation Z)

"My friendship level has decreased" (İbrahim, male, 58 years old, academician, Baby Boomers)

"Social life is shifting to virtual life" (İrfan, male, 33 years old, cameraman, Generation Y)

"We can get in contact with people so quickly and it lets us solve our urgent problems easily" (Münise, female, 50 years old, house wife, Generation X)

"No such thing as a private life anymore" (Gülsüm, female, 58 years old, working in a private sector Baby Boomers)

E. Smartphones, Privacy, Bonds and Relationship Closure

Next question was about privacy. Especially older generations complained about the change in the meaning of private sphere.

RQ15. Do You Talk about Your Personal Issues on Your Smartphone?

TABLE XII
TALKING PRIVATE ISSUES ON SMARTPHONE

Do you talk about your personal issues on your smartphone?	Frequency	Percent
Yes	10	50.0
No	7	35.0
Sometimes	3	15.0
Total	20	100.0

Half (50%; 5% Generation X, 30% Generation Y, 15% Generation Z) of the respondents are always talking about their personal issues on smartphones. Some (35%; 5% Silent Generation, 15% Baby Boomers, 10% Generation X, 5% Generation Z) of the respondents said "it is related with my privacy and I never talk my private issues on the phone". 15% (10% Generation X, 5% baby Boomers) of respondent said that they do not prefer to talk their private issues on the phone however sometimes they do it. This information shows that, while older generations do not prefer to talk about private topics on the phone, it is common for the younger generations. Especially Generation X seems to be in the middle of all generations. This generation can be called transition generation. Generation X smartphone usage patterns seems to be in the middle of all Generations. They are neither exactly same with the old generations, nor fully alike to new generations. It has been observed that some patterns are similar to elder generations (Baby Boomers and Greatest Generation) and some to younger generations (Generation Y and Generation Z) in this study.

Fortunati [25] and Portes [32] defend that cell phones shield oneself in a narrower realm rather than wider surroundings and let people reach people who are predictable and highly familiar; close kin, family, and friends. In addition to close relationship patterns that have been mentioned by Fortunati and Portes above, Ling added a thought of time and space freedom and deepening close relationships opportunity [33].

The next question tried to detect whether smartphones narrowed the space of personal shields.

RQ16.With Whom Do You Mostly Get in Contact with Your Smartphone?

TABLE XIII
MOSTLY CONTACT PEOPLE VIA SMARTPHONE

With whom do you mostly get in contact with your mobile phone?	Frequency	Percent
With my family and friends	12	60.0
With my family and with my customers	4	20.0

With my family, with my friends and with my colloquies	4	20.0
Total	20	100.0

Fortunati [25] defines mobile phone as a device that enables people to get in contact with somebody who is in their intimate circle while being surrounded by extraneous people. The total responses can be categorized in three headings in this question. More than half (60%) of the respondents said they mostly get in contact with their family and friends via their smartphones. These people can be categorized as closest people to respondents. One fifth (20%) of respondents in addition to family and friends, add their customers in the category of people mostly they get in contact. Rest (20%) of respondents added colleagues in addition to close people in the category of people mostly they get in contact. Respondents who are mostly using their phones for business reasons said that they are mostly calls their customers and closest people to them with their phones.

Mobile phones can be used for routine cases and also emergency cases. Geser [4] argued that expanding the usage of mobile phones causes to a more diffuse expressive communication. Mobile phones may have two types of function: Instrumental and spiritual. Most people refer to mobile phones' instrumental functions. Instrumental function seems as a primary motive for adapting cell phones (to be informed about loved-ones, to call someone in the case of emergency situation). Jin and Park [34] divided motives for telephone and cell telephone use into two categories as intrinsic (social) and instrumental (task oriented) motives.

In the 17th question, respondents were asked to identify their bonds in order of relevance with their smartphones.

RQ17: How Do You Identify Your Bond with Your Mobile Phone?

TABLE XIV
RESPONDENTS' BONDS WITH MOBILE PHONES

How do you identify your bond with your mobile phone?	Frequency	Percent
Physical bond	13	65.0
Spiritual bond	1	5.0
Physical and spiritual bond	6	30.0
Total	20	100.0

More than half (65%) of respondents identify their bonds with their mobile phone as physical; 30% (5% Generation X, 10% Generation Y and 15% Generation Z) as physical and spiritual; and 5% (Generation Y) as spiritual. All respondents in Silent Generation, Baby Boomers, 80% of the Generation X, 60% of the Generation Y, 25% of the Generation Z indicated that their bond with mobile phone is only physical. While smartphone meaning for older generations is more physical, in the meanwhile smartphone has spiritual meaning for younger generations.

F. Absence of Smartphones

In a study of Palen et al. [35], the participant's father explains the initial reason for mobile phone purchase with safety issue and he believes that smartphone is like to the umbilical cord. The father sees the phone as a kind of "umbilical cord," that would allow a child some independence while ensuring bi-directional accessibility between child and parent. On the other hand some other researches compare the land phone (common usage tool for family) with the mobile phone usage of young generation; mobile phone usage is a way of obtaining freedom from strict family control for young generation [36], [37].

"You feel happy when you are able to reach the people you love at any moment. Smartphone usage has affected relations according to the role that you have within the family. If you are a parent, it is a great way to have access to your child at any time. But if you are a child you may be bothered by your parents' frequent phone calls" (Zarif, female, 38 years old, secretary, Generation X).

It is possible to correlate this situation with contextual mobility concept. Ishii [18] implied that contextual mobility is related with the social consequences of expanding usage of mobile phones into societies. Kakihara and Sorensen [38] argued that it is not possible to define mobility only with physical travel. According to Kakihara and Sorensen physical travel is only one side of the mobility and mobility has three interrelated dimensions. Mobility has spatial, temporal and contextual dimensions. The most known is spatial dimension of mobility; temporal mobility dimension is the consequences of spatial dimension: People can get in contact while moving and this possibility causes to save time. These two dimensions are related with functions of efficiency because of mobility. Ishii [18] thinks that contextual dimension has two dimensions; the control chance of the people onto incoming calls can be evaluated as freedom however mobile phone reduces the freedom of users by reachability.

The meaning and significance in case of lack of smartphone for its users' have been investigated in this question. Respondent's answers were interesting.

RQ18: How Do You Feel When You Accidentally Leave Your Cell Phone at Home?

"It is impossible to forget it. It's a part of my job" (Nurettin, male, 26 years old, self-employed, Generation Y)

"First I feel sorry but then I don't feel angry at myself" (Arif, male, 11 years old, secondary school student, Generation Z)

"I feel panic, because I feel concerned for what to do without my phone" What can I do if some terrible thing happened to me?'" (Kemal, male, 79 years old, retired teacher, Silent Generation)

"I feel something will happen to me when I am without my phone and I see my smartphone as savior" (Ufuk, female, 38 years old, academician, Generation X).

"I feel unreachable" (Ahmet, male, 54 years old, selfemployment, Baby Boomers)

"I feel sad because of my job" (Gülsüm, female, 58 years old, working in a private sector Baby Boomers)

"I feel disconnected from the world" (Hatice, female, 18 years old, college student, Generation Y)

"It depends to my daily routine; however I try to find a way to reach my phone" (Davita, female, 38 years old, academician, Generation X)

"I feel somehow missing and panicked" (Elnaz, female, 19 years old, university student, Generation Y)

"I feel the absence of my phone because my communication has been disconnected. People who call me will be panicked because they will not reach me"
(Münise, female, 50 years old, house wife, Generation X)

"I feel somehow lost if I forget the tool that I use to listen to music, take photos, communicate with friends and write my thoughts inside. But then I do not care" (Melin, female, 15 years old, college student, Generation
Z)

Lee et al. [39] mention that smartphones have now become an important part of life for people. The first thing that smartphone users get when they wake up in the morning is their phones and the last thing they leave from their hands before going to sleep is their phones again. However this integration affects mental health symptoms in a bad manner, such as sleep disturbance and depression. Brod [40] explains influences of computer technologies on people with the technostress concept in his book which was published in 1984. Brod defines technostress as a modern disease; technological developments, if cannot be adapted to in a healthy way to human life, it will affect human life in the negative direction. Lee et al. [39] used Brod's technostress concept while exaggerated usage of smartphones may causes overdependence on smartphone and overuse of smartphone can lead to users get in technostress.

Kraut et al. [41] argued that Internet use causes decrease in social capital and commitment to the community. Kraut et al. [41] argument depends on the Internet Paradox study. Exaggerated use of smartphones causes social ties to weaken and to some other physical and psychological diseases. Jenaro et al. [42] have a research on the problematic internet and cellphone use. They focused on psychological, behavioral and health correlates of over use of the internet and cell phone in their research. Second predictions of their research data was about psychiatric disorders of over use of internet and cellphones. According to data followed their predictions people who are overly using internet and cellphones are tend to experience somatic complaints such as social dysfunction, insomnia, anxiety and depression. As its seen above, most of the respondents will feel uncomfortable and stressed if they accidentally forgot their phones at home. They are already in technostress and also one fourth of the respondents said that they will feel panicked if they accidentally forgot their phone at home. Feeling unreachable, feeling missed, feeling sad are related with feeling depressive.

G. Generations and Smartphone Usage

In this question, it was questioned whether there was any difference between generations regarding adaptation to smartphone usage.

RQ19. Is smartphone easy or hard to use?

TABLE XV
SMARTPHONE USAGE COMPATIBILITY OF RESPONDENTS

Is smartphone easy or hard to use?	Frequency	Percent
Easy	18	90.0
Hard	1	5.0
In first time hard, after learning to use easy	1	5.0
Total	20	100.0

Almost (90%) all respondents think that it easy to use smartphones. One (5%, Generation X) respondent indicated that at first it is hard to use, after learning and getting familiar with device, it is became easy to use. Only one respondent (5%, Baby Boomers) thinks that it's hard to use a smartphone.

"I was born into it; I know it as I know my name" (Arif, male, 11 years old, secondary school student, Generation Z)

"It's like a game" (Çisem, 15 years old, college student, Generation Z).

"Off course easy" Elnaz, female, 19 years old, university student, Generation Y)

"It's really easy to use. It's a life style" (Nurettin, male, 26 years old, self-employed, Generation Y)

"It's easy because I learned to use it from my childhood". (Mustafa, male, 28 years old, self-employed, Generation Y)

"In the beginnings it's hard to understand, however as ever I get familiar with applications its becoming easy to use" (Hülya, female, 49 years old, self-employed, Generation X)

"It's easy to use old model mobile phones, smartphones are harder to use because they are complicated" (Ahmet, male, 54 years old, selfemployment, Baby Boomers)

"It's easy to use" (Kemal, male, 79 years old, retired teacher, Silent Generation)

Öze [43] has researched on cultural reflections of the internet, new media and social media usage in everyday life practices of Turkish Cypriots. According to Öze's research younger generations are more frequently using social media networks then the older generations. Also young generations are using multiple social networks however older generations are using less number of social networks. As it seen here younger generations do not mind technological hardness and they can easily get in familiar with it. Some of the (only few) older generations have some challenges with using smartphones. It is related with people's adaptation capacity to technological changes in some way. On the other hand situational factors are elements that shape your abilities; when and where you were born and in which situational factors (opportunities) you grew.

VI. Conclusion

Structure of the community has differentiated with changing in the technology. Especially, how improvements in transportation and communication technologies have changed the structure of the community. Communication types and tools through history multiplied and differentiated within period as, FtF; mail; landline; internet (e-mail); mobile phone; smartphone. Our network of communication has decentralized with mobile phones; there is no longer need to use only fixed points to communicate, movability of mobile phones has changed the land phone necessity to communicate. Burges [44], argued that deterioration of local community and social relationships in the urban environment were because of technologies like the telephone. Although some research argues that computer based and socially interactive technologies encourage and even help to expand FtF social interaction [45]-[47].

Some other researchers suggest that developments in communication technologies let users to stay away or posit FtF communication [48]-[51]. Srivastava [13] argued that mobile phones are threatening quality of FtF communication and the nature of mobile phones is causes of that.

The transition from land line phone to mobile phone; then transition from mobile phone to smartphone have been lived. Nowadays, all of them are still a part of our lives. Are these changes in telephone usage affecting your life? Mobile phones have changed the daily routine behavioral patterns. Also, mobile phones invaded all spheres of daily life. It has been observed that most survey participants prefer to use their smartphones even though they have fixed phones in their living spaces. The following reasons have been shown as the reason for this preference: The smart phone can be carried at any place and at any time; can be accessed instantly; and has many different features and applications compared to fixed telephony. As it seen here if features of smartphones can be used in the right way, it is more than a telephony and it makes people life easier by helping them improve social and interpersonal interactions at the same time.

Srivastava [13] said that teenagers do not recognize difference between FtF relationship and communicating with smartphones. Srivastava [13] refers that mobile phones becomes most important communication device for teenagers to sustain their communication. According to results while younger generations accept that smartphones impair close relationships, on the other hand they use smartphones much more often than older generations do and do nothing to correct their FtF relationships. Moreover, older generations have similar complaints and they also frequently use their smartphones in different purposes than younger generations. They are strengthening their ties with dispersed relatives and friends via video calls. However, they do not prefer to visit their families or neighbors who are close to them.

Srivastava [13] thinks mobile phone is a device which controls its users as a remote. Mobile phone has a potential to interrupt interactions by others at anytime and anywhere. Srivastava [13] use these words to explain threats of mobile phones for its user's social interactions: 'always-on', 'always there' and 'never here'. Fortunati [25] thinks that when people concentrate on their mobile phones, they are lost in space and seem in a standby mood and only users of their mobile phones. De-valorization of natural communication through new technologies within time and space can be the explanation of this situation. The mechanical representation of the relationship via smartphones is causing the relation to electronic action and relationships have lost its intimacy and privacy. However the way it affects people is the way people let it affect them.

This study explores the configurations of relationships in people's everyday communication FtF and through smartphones by focusing on to the configurations in social context. The application of internet to the mobile phones has removed communication barriers with geographically dispersed acquaintances. However, interpersonal FtF relationships have decreased in recent years. The decrease in interpersonal FtF communication can not only linked with internet and/or smartphone. In fact, communication has never decreased, the exact opposite has happened to diversified ways of communication; FtF communication has decreased in somehow but our ways of communicating

have changed and diversified. What is changing is the means of communication.

The important thing is to see the whole picture. Of course internet and smartphones are important in these changes but they are only a part of the whole. Life has always changed and will continue to change. Every new technology has the potential to affect life from different angles. Changing in technology not only affects lifestyles, it also affects communication style, politics, economics, culture, society, businesses and many other things. Politics, economics, socioculture, and technology are macro environmental conditions. The change in only one macro condition influences all other macro conditions at the same time. The results always reflect to everyday life practices at the end of the day.

The importance of using newly developed communication tools properly should be explained to people in order to eliminate harms of Internet and smartphones regarding communication. The use of technology unconsciously, can be harmful to people and communities all together. Increase in the public awareness of the Internet usage and the use of smartphones and the reduction of negative impacts should be government policy. Informative studies and public spots should be prepared by the state in order to educate young people at the schools and educate the society at large by using all media types.

REFERENCES

[1] N. Öze, "Gündelik yaşamda internet ve sosyal ağları kullanım pratikleri: Kuzey kıbrıs vaka incelemesi", *Intermedia International e-journal,* Vol. 3 (5), 2016, pp. 278-300. Retrieved from http://intermedia.ticaret.edu.tr/index.php/intermedia/article/view/82/57 (accessed 20 February 2017) DOI NO: 10.21645/intermedia.2017.15

[2] L. Humphreys, "Mobile social networks and urban public space," *New Media & Society,* vol. XX (X), pp. 1-16. 2010. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1461444809349578 (accessed 30 January 2017) doi: 10.1177/1461444809349578

[3] H. Geser, "Is the cell phone undermining the social order? Understanding Mobile technology in sociological perspective" *Sociology in Switzerland, Towards Cyberspace and Viral Social Relations,* Online Publications. 2006. Retrieved from http://socio.ch/intcom/t_hgeser28.pdf (accessed 28 January 2017)

[4] H. Geser, "Towards a Sociology of the Mobile Phone", *Sociology in Switzerland: Sociology of the Mobile Phone.* Online Publications. 2004 (Release 3.0). Retrieved from http://socio.ch/mobile/t_geser1.pdf accessed 28 January 2017)

[5] K. Hampton, "Neighborhoods in the network society the e-neighbors study" in *Information, Communication & Society*, Vol. 10 (5), pp. 714-748, 2007. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13691180701658061?need Access=true (accessed on 22 December 2016) doi: 10.1080/13691180701658061

[6] A. Ingrams, "Mobile phones, smartphones, and the transformation of civic behavior through mobile information" in *Government Information Quarterly,* vol. 32 (4), pp. 506-515, 2015. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0740624X15000921 (accessed 30 December 2016). http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.07.007

[7] N. Öze, "Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta özel sektörde halkla ilişkiler: 1994-2004" Unpublished PhD Thesis, *Near East University*, 2014. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/13536696/KUZEY_KIBRIS_TA_%C3%96Z EL_SEKT%C3%96RDE_HALKLA_%C4%B0L%C4%B0%C5%9EK %C4%B0LER_1994-2004 (accessed on 6 March 2017).

[8] Ada Basını, "KKTCELL açıkladı: Akıllı telefon kullanımı %44'e yükseldi" 1 June 2015. Retrieved from http://www.adabasini.com/haber/kktcell-acikladi-akilli-telefonkullanimi-44e-yukseldi-58881.html (accessed at 2 February 2016)

[9] Information Technologies and Communication Authority, "About us", Retrieved from http://www.bthk.org/eng/about-us/ (accessed on 6 March 2017)

[10] P. Alper, "KKTC'de mobil kullanım oranları", in Kıbrıs Postası, Retrieved from http://www.kibrispostasi.com/index.php/cat/1/col/169/art/29935/PageNa me/KIBRIS_POSTASI (accessed at 2 February 2016)

[11] A. Vamık, "KKTC nüfusunun iki katı oranında cep telefonu kullanıcısı var", in Kıbrıs Postası, Retrieved from http://www.kibrispostasi.com/print.php?news=211317 (accessed on 6 March 2017)

[12] State Planning Organization Follow Up and Coordination Department, "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Economic and Social Indicators 2014", December 2015, Retrieved from http://www.devplan.org/Ecosos/BOOK/SEG-2014.pdf (accessed at 2 February 2016)

[13] L. Srivastava , "Mobile phones and the evolution of social behavior", in *Behaviour & Information Technology*, Vol. 24(2), pp. 111-129, 2005. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01449290512331321910?n eedAccess=true (accessed on 25 December 2016) DOI: 10.1080/01449290512331321910.

[14] B. Wellman, "Physical place and cyber place: The rise of personalized networking", in *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 25 (2), pp. 227-252, 2001. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.00309/epdf (accessed on 2 March 2017).

[15] L. Palen, M. Salzman and E. Youngs, "Going wierless: Behaviour & practice of new mobile phone users", in *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW '00)*, Philadelphia, PA, 2000: pp. 201-210. Retrieved from http://cmci.colorado.edu/~palen/palen_papers/palen-mobilephones.pdf (acceessed 20 February 2017)

[16] J. H. Kuznekoff and S. Titsworth, "The impact of mobile phone usage on student learning", in *Communication Education,* Vol. 62 (3), pp. 233-

252, 2013. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03634523.2013.767917 (accessed on 25 December 2016). DOI: 10.1080/03634523.2013.767917

[17] K. Ishii, "Implications of mobility: The uses of personal communication media in everyday life", in *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 56, pp. 346-379, 2006. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00023.x/epdf (accessed on 26 December 2016). doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00023.x

[18] O. Banjo, Y. Hu and S. Sundar, "Cell phone usage and social interaction with proximate others: Ringing in a theorotical model. *The Open Communication Journal*, vol. 2, 2008, pp. 127-135. Retrieved from https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOCOMMJ/TOCOMMJ-2-127.pdf (accessed 15 January 2017) doi: 10.2174/1874916X00802010127

[19] L. Skenazy, "Smartphone Apps great for marketing, bad for social skills" in *Advertising Age*, 09 February 2009. Retrieved from http://adage.com/article/lenore-skenazy/smartphone-apps-greatmarketing-bad-social-skills/134345/ (accessed 26 December 2016).

[20] B. Bates, K. Albright and K. Washington, "Not your plain old telephone: New services and new impacts" in *Communication Technology*, C. Lin and D. Atkins, Eds., Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2002: pp. 91-124.

[21] S. Zhao, "Do internet users have more social ties? A call for differentiated analysis of Internet use?" in *Journal of ComputerMediated Communication* Vol. 11, pp. 844-862, 2006. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00038.x/epdf (accessed 26 December 2016). doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00038.x

[22] B. Wellman and C. Haythornthwaite, "The internet in Everyday Life: An Introduction" in *The Internet in Everyday Life*, B. Wellman and C. Haythornthwaite, Eds., Oxford: Blackwell, 2002: pp. 3-44.

[23] J. Boase, J. Horrigan, B. Wellman and L. Rainie, "The strength of Internet ties", in *Pew Internet & American Life Project*, Washington, DC, 2006. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Internet_ties.pdf (accessed on 22 December 2016)

[24] B. Wellman, A. Quan-Haase, J. Boase and W. Chen, "Examining the Internet in everyday life," (The euricom conference on e-democracy, Nijmegen, Netherlands. 9-12 October 2002). Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.11.8754&rep= rep1&type=pdf (accessed on 22 August 2016)

[25] L. Fortunati, "The mobile phone: new social categories and relations". *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 5 (4), pp. 513-528. 2007. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1369118020853 8803 (accessed 15 January 2017)

[26] D. Derks, A. H. Fisher and A. E. R. Boss, "The role of emotion in computer-mediated communication: A review", in *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 24 (3), 2008, pp.766-785. Retrieved from http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1347589 (accessed on 30 December 2016). doi:10.1016/j.chb.2007.04.004

[27] C. Licoppe and Z. Smoreda, "Are social networks technologically embedded? How networks technologically are changing today with changes in communication technology", in *Social Networks*, Vol. 27, 2017, pp. 317-335. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2004.11.001 (accessed on 26 December 2016).

[28] H. Kim, G. J. Kim, H. W. Park and R. E. Rice, "Configuration ofrelationships in different Media: FtF, email, instant messenger, mobile phone and sms" in *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication,* vol. 12 (4), 2007, pp. 1183-1207. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00369.x/epdf (accessed 26 December 2016) doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00369.x

[29] R. Ling, "Restaurants, mobile phones and bad manners: New technology and the shifting of social boundaries", *In: Proceedings of the 17th International Symposium in Human Factors in Telecommunication,* Copenhagen, Denmark, May 1999, pp, 209-221.

[30] R. Wei and V. Lo, "Staying Connected while on the move", in *New Media & Society,* vol. 8 (1), pp. 53-72, 2006. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/14614448060598 70 (accessed 22 December 2016).

[31] L. Fortunati, "Conversazioni in famiglia" in *Internation Conference' Mutementi Della Famiglia Occidentale'*, 6-8 October 1994, (Bologna, Italy).

[32] A. Portes, "Social Capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology" Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 24, pp. 1-24. 1998. Retrieved from http://www.rect.muni.cz/summerschool/New_Europe/Module_3/Session %206/6_Portes_Social_Capital.pdf (accessed 19 February 2017)

[33] R. Ling, "Direct and Mediated Interaction in the Maintenance of Social Relationship" in *Home Informatics and Telematics: Information, Technology and Society*, A. Sloane and F. van Rijn, Eds. Boston: Kluwer, 2000: pp. 61-86.

[34] B. Jin and N. Park, "In-person contact begets calling and texting: Interpersonal motives for cell phone use, face-to-face interaction, and loneliness" in *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, Vol. 13 (6), 2010. Retrieved from http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdf/10.1089/cyber.2009.0314 (accessed on 26 December 2016). DOI: 10.1089=cyber.2009.0314

[35] L. Palen, "Mobile telephony in a connected life" in *Communications of the ACM- robots: intelligence, versatility, adaptivity*, Vol. 45 (3), 2002,pp. 78-82 Retrieved from http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=504729.504732 (accessed on 2 March 2017). doi: 10.1145/504729.504732

[36] S. Kim, "Korea: Personal meanings" in *Perpetual Contact: Mobile Communication, Private Talk, Public Performance*, J. E. Katz and M. A. Aakhus, Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004, pp. 63-79. Retrieved from http://eclass.uoa.gr/modules/document/file.php/MEDIA165/gender%20a nd%20technology-%CF%84%CF%83%CE%B1%CE%BB%CE%AF%CE%BA%CE%B7/ perpetual%20contact.pdf (accessed on 26 December 2016).

[37] V. Oksman and J. Turtiainen, "Mobile communication as a social stage: Meanings of mobile communication in everyday life among

teenagers in Finland", in *New Media & Society*, Vol. 6 (3), pp.319-339, 2004. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444804042518 (accessed on 5 March 2017). Doi: 10.1177/1461444804042518

[38] M. Kakihara and C. Sorensen, "Mobility: An extended perspective" Proceeding of the 35th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HISCSS-35), Big Island, HI: IEEE, pp. 326-350, 7-10 January 2002. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.489.9075&rep =rep1&type=pdf (accessed on 3 March 2017). DOI: 10.1109/HICSS.2002.994088

[39] Y. Lee, C. Chang, Y. Lin, Z. Cheng, "The dark side of smartphone usage: Psychological traits, compulsive behavior and technostress" in *Computers in Human Behavior,* vol. 31, pp. 373-383, 2014. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.047 (accessed 20 December 2016).

[40] C. Brod, *Technostress: The Human Cost of the Computer Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1984.

[41] R. Kraut, S. Kiesler, B. Boneva, J. Cummings, V. Helgeson and A. Crawford, "The Internet paradox revisited", in *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol 58 (1), 2002, pp. 49-74. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1540-4560.00248 (accessed on 30 December 2016). DOI: 10.1111/1540-4560.00248

[42] C. Jenaro, N. Flores, M. Gómez-Vela, F. González-Gil and C. Caballo, "Problematic internet and cell-phone use: Psychological, behavioral, and health correlates" in *Addiction Research & Theory*, Vol. 15 (3), pp. 309-320, 2007. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/16066350701350247 (accessed on 26 December 2016) DOI: 10.1080/16066350701350247.

[43] N. Öze, "Cultural reflections of Internet, social media and new media usage in everyday life: The case of Northern Cyprus" in Digital Media & Electronic Communic Communication, Ed. F Lienard and S Zlitni, 1-3 Jun. 2016, pp. 957-967 (*4th International Conference: Digital Media and Electronic Communication,* Le Havre, France) https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304539077_Cultural_Reflections_of_Social_Media_Usage_in_Everyday_Life_The_case_of_Northern_ Cyprus (accessed 1 July 2016).

[44] E. Burgess, "The growth of the city" in *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*, R. Park and E. Burgess Eds., Chicago: University of Chicago, 1925: pp. 47-62.

[45] A. Kavanaugh, J. M. Carroll, M. B. Rosson, T. T. Zin and D. D. Reese, "Community networks: Where offline communities meet online" in *Computer-Mediated Communication,* Vol. 10(4), 2005. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101. 2005.tb00266.x/full (accessed on 30 December 2016). DOI: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00266.x

[46] K.Y. A. McKenna and J. A. Bargh, "Causes and consequences of social on the Internet" in *Media Psychology*, Vol. 1 (3), 1999, pp.249-269. . Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/s1532785xmep0103_4?jou rnalCode=hmep20 (accessed on 5 March 2017). http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532785xmep0103_4

[47] European Commission, "Freedom of Expression, Media and Digital Communication", December, 2012. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/studyfreedom expression-communication-key-issues-201212_en_3.pdf (accessed at 1 February 2016)

[48] N. H. Nie and L. Erbing, "Internet and society: A preliminary report" in *IT & Society,* Vol. 1 (1), 2002, pp. 275-283. Retrieved from http://www.nomads.usp.br/documentos/textos/cultura_digital /tics_arq_u rb/internet_society%20report.pdf (accessed on 5 March 2017).

[49] T. Pierce, "Social anxiety and technology: Face-toface communication versus technological communication among teens", in *Computers in Human Behavior,* Vol 25 (6), 2009, pp. 1367-1372. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.06.003 (accessed on 26 December 2016).

[50] S. Turkle, *Life on the screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997.

[51] S. Turkle, "Cyberspace and identity" in *Contemporary Sociology,* American Sociological Association, *28* (6), pp.643-648, 1999, Retrieved from people.exeter.ac.uk/jp501/Turkle-CyberspaceIdentity.pdf (accessed on 2 August 2016).