Eurasian Journal of Educational Research 70 (2017) 57-82



Eurasian Journal of Educational Research www.ejer.com.tr



# Problematic Internet Usage: Personality Traits, Gender, Age and Effect of Dispositional Hope Level\*

Hicran CETIN GUNDUZ<sup>1</sup> Subhan EKSIOGLU<sup>2</sup> Sinem TARHAN<sup>3</sup>

ARTICLE INFO	A B S T R A C T
Article History: Received: 03 January 2017 Received in revised form: 21 March 2017 Accepted: 06 July 2017	<b>Purpose</b> : The aim of this study is to examine the effect of personality traits, gender, age and effects of dispositional hope level in problematic internet usage of university students. <b>Research Methods</b> :
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2017.70.4 <i>Keywords</i> Internet addiction, personality, hope, excessive internet usage	This paper is an example of a descriptive study, which presents the relationship between problematic internet usage of university students considering personality traits, gender, age and dispositional hope level. The study group consists of 376 students from different universities. Research data was collected by using the Problematic Internet Usage Scale, The Big Five Inventory, and the Dispositional Hope Scale. In the analysis of data, parametric tests were used.

**Findings**: It has been observed that as neuroticism increases, excessive usage also increases; as conscientiousness increases, excessive usage of the internet decreases. As openness, extraversion and neuroticism increase, the effects of negative results of internet usage increase; as conscientiousness increases, the effects of negative results of internet usage decrease. At the same time, it can be said that as hope levels increase, the negative effects of internet usage decrease. All of these results can be interpreted as variables, except being an extravert does not have a practical value. **Implications for Research and Practice**: Based on the results, it was suggested that evaluation of results related to the studies made with high school students and adults will contribute to the field. In future studies, relationships between different usage fields of internet and problematic internet usage can be examined. The results would be helpful for prevention and intervention programs.

© 2017 Ani Publishing Ltd. All rights reserved

<sup>\*1</sup> Corresponding Author: Hicran CETIN GUNDUZ, Baskent University, TURKEY, hicrancetin@gmail.com, ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5899-9772.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Sakarya University, TURKEY, eksioglusubhan@gmail.com, ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7411-6482.
<sup>3</sup> Bartın University, TURKEY, tarhansinem@gmail.com, ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7297-2499.

# Introduction

The internet is extensively used throughout the world. It has become an essential part of our lives today, especially among adolescents and youth (Panicker & Sachdev, 2014). Children and adolescents use the internet for socializing and for leisure activities (watching movies and television programs, listening to music and playing online games). The negative impact of the internet usage on individuals and their lives is often underestimated (Chang & Hung, 2012). Internet usage can be evaluated as individuals' mechanism for stating their emotions, being the person that they want to be, acting as a mediator to reach several opportunities, learning about the world and opening up to the world. However, it can transform into an addictive instrument in excessive usage situations. Internet addiction has become a health problem throughout the world (Wang et al., 2013). Increasingly, the problem status of individuals om different developmental periods are identified more in relation with the increasing usage of internet and related tools. Thus, the need for research on problematic internet usage becomes significant with regard to the prevention and intervention programmes.

There is no standard in the literature for the concepts of internet addiction or problematic internet usage. Significant behaviours related to internet usage present such concepts as internet addiction, internet addiction deformity and pathological internet usage (Chou, Condron, & Belland, 2005). The term "internet addiction" is used in some of studies (Breslau, Aharoni, Pedersen, & Miller, 2015). Internet addiction was first recognized by Goldberg (1995) and Young (1996) and is defined as compulsiveness related to excessive internet usage and establishment of a nervous and pessimistic emotion situation in case of not having internet (as cited in Mitchell, 2000). While silence, change in emotion situation, tolerance (increasing period of usage ) deprivation symptoms, conflict and recurrence elements draw attention in internet addiction (Griffiths, 2000a; Griffiths, 2000b), pathological internet usage should include at least three factors, such as excessive game playing, online sexual activities, sending e-mails and texting behaviours (Young, 1999).

As defined by Beard (2005) and Kim and Davis (2009), internet addiction is uncontrolled usage of the internet to create psychological, social or/and working problems in the life of the individual. Similar to this definition, problematic internet usage is defined as not being able to control internet usage, resulting in stress problems in daily life and experiencing functional defects (as cited in Shapira, Goldsmith, Keek Jr, Khosla, & McElroy, 2000). Problematic internet usage can be seen as an impulse control defect that displays itself with an increasing tension and excitation situation before the activity and a relaxing situation after completing the behaviour (Shapira et al., 2003). Individuals with stories of addiction or impulse control in their past are in the risk group for problematic internet usage (Yellowlees & Marks, 2007). This can exist at any age, social, economic or educational level (Beard, 2005; Beard & Wolf, 2001). In this context, problematic internet usage has an important effect on one's life.

It has been found that problematic internet usage correlates with variables such as depression (Chen & Lin, 2016; Ga´mez-Guadix, 2014; Moreno, Jelenchick, & Christakis,

2013; Moreno, Jelenchick, & Breland, 2015; Ostovar et al., 2016; Van den Eijnden, Meerkerk, Vermulst, Spijkerman, & Engels, 2008; Shapira, Goldsmith, Keck, Khosla, & McElroy, 2000), cognitive distortion between individual and life satisfaction, (Odaci & Berber Celik 2013; Cao, Sun, Wan, Hao, & Tao, 2011), loneliness (Ang, Chong, Chye, & Huan, 2012; Kraut et al., 1998; Ostovar et al., 2016; Skues, Williams, Oldmeadow, & Wise, 2016), well being (Chen, 2012; Mei, Yau , Chai, Guo, & Potenza, 2016), online gambling (Tsitsika, Critselis, Janikian, Kormas, & Kafetzis, 2011; Yau et al., 2014), substance use (Rücker, Akre, Berchtold, & Suris, 2015), and low empathy (Melchers, Chen, Zhang, & Montag, 2015). Furthermore, according to Lanchman et al. (2016), gender is a significant variable in terms of problematic internet usage. Internet addiction has been studied using several variables.

While one study conducted among female university students points out a relationship between depression and problematic internet usage (Moreno et.al. 2015), another study presents a relationship between low well-being and problematic internet usage (Casale, Lecchi and Fioravanti, 2015). Yu and Shek (2013) stated in their longitudinal study that problematic internet usage by male adolescents is more commonplace than among female adolescents. Tsitsika et al. (2011) stated that the most meaningful independent variable related to problematic internet usage is online gambling. When studies with problematic internet usage in Turkey were examined, Ceyhan and Ceyhan (2008) in a study conducted among 283 undergraduate students found that individuals whose loneliness level was high used the internet and e-mail more than other students. Oktan (2015a) examined the relationship between doing harm to oneself and engaging in risk behaviour with problematic internet usage in his study. He studied 736 high school students and found a meaningful relationship between problematic internet usage and risk taking and harming oneself.

According to the conducted research, while the internet usage period, grade and school type have been important predictors of problematic internet usage for high school students (Ceyhan, 2011), the most important predictor of problematic internet usage for university students is internet usage with the aim of "building social relationships with the people they do not know" (Ceyhan, 2010). Moreover, belonging, life-satisfaction, achievement and identity issues are significant predictors for problematic internet usage in adolescents (Balkaya Cetin & Ceyhan, 2015). Such variables as the use of the internet for social and entertainment purposes and gender predict problematic internet use (Babacan Gumus, Sipkin, Tuna, & Keskin, 2015). Furthermore, while problematic internet use is predicted positively by impulsivity (Eroğlu, 2016), students' departments, using the internet for social interaction and emotional intelligence are also predictors of problematic internet use (Ancel, Acikgoz, & Yavas Ayhan, 2015). At the same time, there are studies emphasizing the relationships with identity status (Ceyhan, 2010), attitude related to internet usage (Sargin, 2013), time spent on the internet (Durak & Senol-Durak, 2013; Oktan, 2015b), emotional intelligence, self-respect, (Reisoglu, Gedik, & Goktas, 2013), having a computer (Sevindik, 2011; Sirakaya & Seferoglu, 2013) anger stating styles (Ata, Akpinarr, & Kelleci, 2011), loneliness (Cagir, 2010; Odaci & Kalkan, 2010), social anxiety (Cuhadar, 2012; Zorbaz, 2013), depression (Alparslan, Soylu, Kocak, & Guzel, 2015; Odaci & Cikrikci, 2017; Tekinarslan, 2017) perceived social support, loneliness (Oktan, 2015b), life satisfaction (Berber Çelik & Odaci, 2013) psychological well-being and perceived social support of friends (Meral & Bahar, 2016; Uz Bas, Oz Soysal, & Aysan, 2016). In addition, it is observed that there is a significant relationship between problematic internet use level and gender (Ancel, Acikgoz, & Yavas Ayhan, 2015; (Berber Çelik & Odaci, 2013; Esitti, 2015; Oktan, 2015b).

When the literature was examined, a study searching for the relationship between problematic internet usage and personality features with hope has not been found. For this reason, the study findings are expected to provide information and shed light on the studies made on problematic internet usage. In this study, the relationship between problematic internet usage of university students with personality features, gender, age and dispositional hope level has been examined.

### Method

#### Research Design

This study has been conducted using a descriptive method with the aim of presenting the relationship between problematic internet usage of university students with personality traits, gender, age and dispositional hope level.

### Research Sample

The study group in this research consists of 376 students studying for their bachelor's degree in the 2014-2015 academic years at Nevsehir Haci Bektas Veli University, Sakarya University and Bartin University. Of the participants, 250 (66.5%) were female, and 115 of the participants (30.6%) were male; 2.9% of the participants did not state their gender. Age ranges of the students were between 18-25, and 40.2% of them were in their first year (n= 151); 12.5% (n= 47) in their second year; 33.2% (n= 125) in their third year; and 14.1% (n= 53) in their fourth year.

#### Research Instruments and Procedure

Research data was conducted by using demographical information form, problematic internet usage scale (Ceyhan, Ceyhan, & Gurcan, 2007), The Big Five Inventory (Sumer & Sumer, 2005), and the Dispositional Hope Scale (Tarhan & Bacanli, 2015). A demographical information form was prepared by the researcher.

*The Problematic Internet Usage Scale* aims to determine problematic internet usage of university students. The scale was developed by Ceyhan, Ceyhan and Gurcan (2007). This scale contains negative effects of internet, social benefit/social conformity, and excess usage sub-scales. It is in the form of 5 Likert-type scales and includes 33 items. Inner coherency coefficient of the scale has been determined as ( $\alpha$ ) 0.95; inner coherency coefficient for the negative effects of internet as 0.94; for social benefit/social conformity, 0.85, and for excess usage, 0.75.

*The Big Five Inventory* was developed by Benet-Martinez and John (1998) and it includes 44 items. The scale provides information of the sub-divisions of neuroticism,

extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness. A Turkish version of the scale was developed by Sumer and Sumer (2005) in Turkey (as cited in Basim, Cetin, & Tabak, 2009). Cronbach alpha reliability values have been calculated as .79 for neurotic, .77 for extraversion, .76 for development, .70 for agreeableness and .78 for conscientiousness (as cited in Basim, Cetin, & Tabak, 2009). A five item Likert-type scale was used including "absolutely not participate", "not participate", "indecisive", "participate" and "absolutely participate" (Sumer, Lajunen and Ozkan, 2005).

Dispositional Hope Scale. This scale was developed by C.R. Snyder et al. (1991) with the aim of determining dispositional hope levels of individuals at 15 years old and above. The first Turkish version of the scale was adopted by Akman and Korkut (1993) (as cited in Tarhan & Bacanli, 2015). In this study, the Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS) adapted to Turkish by Tarhan and Bacanli (2015) has been used. Four of the twelve items in the scale relate to the dimensions of Alternative Ways of Thinking Dimension of hope (There are lots of ways around any problem) and Actuating Thinking Dimension (I meet the goals that I set for myself). One of these items belongs to the past, one to the moment we live in and one to the future. An additional four items are formed with fillers (I worry about my health). The individuals are requested to mark thereflection levels of their own situations in the items using an eight-item Likert type grading scale. While the scale is being scored, the points taken from Alternative Ways Thinking dimension and Actuating Thinking dimension sub-scales are summed up and the total score from the Dispositional Hope Scale is gathered. The lowest score from the scale is 8 and the highest is 64. It has been determined that the Cronbach alpha value of the Actuating Thinking component is .71-.76 and Cronbach alpha value of Alternative Ways of Thinking component is .63-.80. The total Cronbach alpha value is .74-.84.

### Data Analysis

SPSS 22 was used in the analysis of the data. Before making hierarchic regression analysis, whether the variables have met the assumptions and scattering diagram of normal distributions, the Mahalonobis distance and the Cook's distance were examined by looking at z values. In addition, relationships between predicted variables (excessive usage which are sub-dimensions of problematic internet usage, negative effects of internet and social benefit/social conformity) and predictor variables (personality traits, gender, age and dispositional hope), and distributions of the scores were examined. It was observed that all scores were distributed normally in all scales. Missing data was examined before making the data analysis. Blank items were examined by EM algorithms and average value assignments were made.

As the first step of the analysis, personality traits, followed by gender and age variables and lastly the hope variable were added to the analysis. Predictor variables for every sub-dimension of problematic internet usage were attempted. At the end of the hierarchic regression, partial effect magnitude values for determining whether free variables have a practical meaning or not were determined. Information related to effect magnitudes can be provided by using partial correlation coefficients in regression analysis. (Berberoglu & Tansel, 2014). In addition, the power of predicting

the addictive variable of the models was evaluated by commenting on R<sup>2</sup>ch values of every model. R<sup>2</sup> (as cited in Ozsoy & Ozsoy, 2013), which is the regression coefficient for effect magnitudes of the models, was calculated.

### Results

### Prediction of Excessive Usage Sub-Dimension of Problematic Internet Usage Scale

Correlation coefficients between average, standard deviation and variables related to predicted and predictor variables taking place in the research are given in Table 1.

### Table 1

Correlation Matrix Showing the Relationships between Variables and Mean and Standard Deviation of the Dependent and Independent Variables

	М	SS	Exces- sive Usage	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Excessive Usage	18.93	5.00									
Personality characteristics											
1 Openness	36.01	7.15	10**								
2 Neuroticism	23.90	6.31	.22*	15*							
3 Extraversion	27.28	6.12	03	.40*	25*						
4 Agreeableness	34.17	5.50	10**	.22*	19*	.06					
5 Conscientiousness	31.99	5.84	35*	.29*	29*	.13**	.26*				
6 Sex	1.34	.47	.10	05	12*	.09**	14**	16*			
7 Age	20.93	2.06	07	.07	14*	.08**	.02	.04	.20*		
8 Dispositional hope	47.75	9.76	14*	.42*	25*	.33*	.17*	.32*	03	.00	

\*p<.01 \*\*p<.05,

When Table 1 is examined, there is a negative correlation between the excessive usage sub-dimension of problematic internet usage scale and openness (r= -.10, p<.05), agreeableness (r= -.10, p<.05), dispositional hope level (r= -.14, p<.01), low correlation towards positive relationship between neuroticsm (r= 22, p<.01), and a negative correlation at medium level with conscientiousness (r= -.35, p<.01). Findings related to hierarchic regression analysis are shown in Table 2.

# Table 2

Variables Predicting Excessive Usage Variable

	U		0					
	R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> ch	F	DF	В	β	Р
Block 1								
(Constant)	.369	.136	.136	13.232	5/420	23.728		
Openness						006	009	.862
Neuroticism						.109	.137	.005
Extraversion						.042	.051	.312
Agreeableness						.006	.007	.887
Conscientiousness						267	312	.000
Block 2								
(Constant)	.372	.138	.002	9.564	7/418	26.167		
Openness						006	008	.880
Neuroticism						.103	.130	.009
Extraversion						.044	.054	.292
Agreeableness						.005	.005	.915
Conscientiousness						268	314	.000
Sex						109	010	.833
Age						102	042	.370
Block 3								
(Constant)	.373	.139	.001	8.419	8/417	26.632		
Openness						.002	.002	.964
Neuroticism						.100	.126	.012
Extraversion						.049	.060	.246
Agreeableness						.006	.006	.894
Conscientiousness						263	307	.000
Sex						108	010	.834
Age						107	044	.348
Dispositional						019	037	.488
hope								

When Table 2 is examined, it is apparent that openness, extraversion and agreeableness variables, which are personality features entering into the model at the first step, are not meaningful in their authentic contributions in the model R<sup>2</sup> = .136, F (5,420) = 13,232, p>.05. When the contribution of the neurotics variable to the model was examined, ( $\beta$  = .137, p<.05) excessive usage predicted positively and at a low level whereas conscientiousness ( $\beta$  = .-312, p<.01) predicted negatively at a medium level. In other words, it has been observed that as neuroticism in individuals increases, excessive usage also increases; as conscientiousness increases, excessive usage decreases. The contributions of variables to the variance was determined at 13.6%.

Upon examination of the authentic contributions of gender and age variables, which are entered in the second step, it was seen that none were meaningful ( $R^2 = .138$ , F (7,418) = 9,567, p>.05). The hope variable was added into the model in the third step. The authentic contribution of the hope variable to the model was not found to be meaningful ( $R^2 = .139$ , F (8,417) = 8.419, p>.05). A partial effect magnitude for being neurotic as a meaningful predictor in the model was sr<sup>2</sup> = .02; and for conscientiousness, sr<sup>2</sup> = .09. In other words, when the effect of other variables is considered, the explanation rate of excessive internet usage to neurotics is 2%, and the explanation rate of conscientiousness is 9%.

Cohen (1988) indicated that the reference values for small effect magnitude was 0.02; for medium, 0.13; and for big ones, 0.26 in regression analysis (as cited in Berberoglu & Tansel, 2014). According to this partial effect magnitude, it can be said that partial effect magnitude of neuroticism and self-discipline have a small value. In this situation, the effect of variables does not have a practical value. When the effect magnitude of models is evaluated, an explanation of predicted variable power of variables can be accepted as small ( $R^2 = .136, .138, 139$ ). According to Cohen (1988), these effect magnitude results can be stated as: ( $R^2 = .0196$  as small; .1300 as medium; and .2600 as big effect (as cited in Ozsoy & Ozsoy, 2013). In addition, when the  $R^2$  ch values of the model are examined, whereas explanation rate of addictive variable of the first model is  $R^2$  ch = .136, the second and third ones are .002 and .001. In this case, it can be seen that the variables that have been added in the model in the second and third steps do not have practical meaning. The contributions of all variables to the variance was found to be 13.8%. When generally evaluated, it is observed that the contribution of the first model is higher than the other two models ( $R^2$  ch= .136).

### Prediction of Negative Results of İnternet Sub-Scale of Problematic İnternet Usage Scale

Correlation coefficients between average, standard deviation and variables related to predicted and predictor variables are shown in Table 3.

# Table 3

Correlation Matrix Showing the Relationships between Variables and Mean and Standard Deviation of the Dependent and Independent Variables

			Negati								
	М	SS	ve Result	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Negative Results of Internet	16.32	3.55									
Personality characteristics											
1 Openness	36.02	6.14	.20*								
2 Neuroticism	23.79	5.69	.20*	21*							
3 Extraversion	27.32	5.99	.35*	.45*	.30*						
4 Agreeableness	34.04	4.71	05	.28*	.21*	.11					
5 Conscientiousnes	32.25	5.41	26*	.28*	35*	.12	.31				
6 Sex	1.32	.46	.13* *	01	13**	.12	16	14*			
7 Age	20.71	1.51	.09* *	.09* *	04	.13* *	09	.05	.20*		
8 Dispositional hope	48.79	8.34	06	.52*	.30*	.37*	.30	.39*	.03	.00	

\*p<.01

\*\*p<.05

When Table 3 is examined, it is found that there is a relationship between negative results of internet sub-scale and openness (r=.20, p<.01), neurotic (r=.20, p<.01), gender (r=.13, p<.05) and age (r=.09, p<.05) at a positive low level; additionally, there is a relationship at a positive medium level between extraversion (r=.35, p<.01) and openness, as well as its negative correlation at low a level with conscientiousness (r=.26, p<.01). Findings related to hierarchic regression analysis are provided in Table 4.

### Table 4.

Variables Predicting the Internet's Negative Results Variable

Block 1   .529   .280   .280   28.06   5/370     Openness   .93   .160   .002     Neuroticism   .158   .253   .000     Extraversion   .226   .381   .000     Agreeableness   .022   .003   .946     Conscientiousness   .009   .002   .003   .946     Conscientiousness   .009   .009   .002   .003   .946     Conscientiousness   .009   .009   .002   .003   .946     Conscientiousness   .009   .009   .002   .003   .946     Openness   .009   .009   .009   .000   .000     Block 2   .009   .158   .003   .000     Qpenness   .011   .015   .754     Openness   .011   .015   .754     Conscientiousness   .011   .015   .754     Conscientiousness   .011   .015   .754     Sex   .044   .083   .077     Age   .000   .037   .422 <th></th> <th>R</th> <th>R<sup>2</sup></th> <th>R<sup>2</sup> ch</th> <th>F</th> <th>DF</th> <th>В</th> <th>β</th> <th>Р</th>		R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> ch	F	DF	В	β	Р
Openness   .093   .160   .002     Neuroticism   .158   .253   .000     Extraversion   .226   .381   .000     Agreeableness  002  003   .946     Conscientiousness  169  257   .000     Block 2   .158   .269   .000     (Constant)   .537   .289   .009   21.352   7/368     Openness   .537   .289   .009   21.352   7/368	Block 1							•	
Neuroticism   .158   .253   .000     Extraversion   .226   .381   .000     Agreeableness  002  003   .946     Conscientiousness  169  257   .000     Block 2   .0091   .158   .003     (Constant)   .537   .289   .009   21.352   7/368     Openness   .091   .158   .003     Neuroticism	(Constant)	.529	.280	.280	28.806	5/370			
Extraversion   .226   .381   .000     Agreeableness   .002   .003   .946     Conscientiousness   .169   .257   .000     Block 2   .009   21.352   7/368	Openness						.093	.160	.002
Agreeableness  002  003   .946     Conscientiousness  169  257   .000     Block 2   (Constant)   .537   .289   .009   21.352   7/368     Openness   .537   .289   .009   21.352   7/368	Neuroticism						.158	.253	.000
Conscientiousness  169  257   .000     Block 2   (Constant)   .537   .289   .009   21.352   7/368     Openness   .001   .158   .003     Neuroticism	Extraversion						.226	.381	.000
Block 2   .537   .289   .009   21.352   7/368     Openness   .091   .158   .003     Neuroticism   .168   .269   .000     Extraversion   .168   .269   .000     Agreeableness   .168   .269   .000     Conscientiousness   .161   .011   .015   .754     Conscientiousness	Agreeableness						002	003	.946
(Constant)   .537   .289   .009   21.352   7/368     Openness   .091   .158   .003     Neuroticism   .168   .269   .000     Extraversion   .168   .269   .000     Agreeableness   .11   .015   .754     Conscientiousness   .161   .245   .000     Sex   .086   .037   .422     Block 3   .077   .086   .037   .422     Openness   .1126   .217   .000     Neuroticism   .126   .217   .000     Sex   .126   .217   .000     Age   .126   .217   .000     Neuroticism   .126   .217   .000     Neuroticism   .126   .217   .000     Agreeableness   .160   .256   .000     Agreeableness   .126   .217   .000     Neuroticism   .160   .256   .000     Agreeableness   .024   .032   .506	Conscientiousness						169	257	.000
Openness   .091   .158   .003     Neuroticism   .168   .269   .000     Extraversion   .219   .369   .000     Agreeableness   .011   .015   .754     Conscientiousness   .161  245   .000     Sex   .644   .083   .077     Age   .086   .037   .422     Block 3   .077   .016   .2285   8/367     (Constant)   .554   .307   .018   20.285   8/367     Openness   .126   .217   .000     Neuroticism   .160   .256   .000     Extraversion   .234   .394   .000     Agreeableness   .024   .032   .506	Block 2								
Neuroticism   .168   .269   .000     Extraversion   .219   .369   .000     Agreeableness   .011   .015   .754     Conscientiousness   .161  245   .000     Sex   .644   .083   .077     Age   .086   .037   .422     Block 3   .011   .015   .754     (Constant)   .554   .307   .018   20.285   8/367     Openness   .126   .217   .000     Neuroticism   .160   .256   .000     Extraversion   .234   .394   .000     Agreeableness   .024   .032   .506	(Constant)	.537	.289	.009	21.352	7/368			
Extraversion   .219   .369   .000     Agreeableness   .011   .015   .754     Conscientiousness  161  245   .000     Sex   .644   .083   .077     Age   .086   .037   .422     Block 3   .077   .016   .245   .000     Openness   .307   .018   20.285   8/367   .000     Neuroticism   .554   .307   .018   20.285   8/367   .000     Extraversion   .554   .307   .018   20.285   8/367   .000     Agreeableness   .024   .234   .394   .000	Openness						.091	.158	.003
Agreeableness   .011   .015   .754     Conscientiousness  161  245   .000     Sex   .644   .083   .077     Age   .086   .037   .422     Block 3   .018   20.285   8/367     Openness   .126   .217   .000     Neuroticism   .126   .217   .000     Extraversion   .234   .394   .000     Agreeableness   .024   .032   .506	Neuroticism						.168	.269	.000
Conscientiousness  161  245   .000     Sex   .644   .083   .077     Age   .086   .037   .422     Block 3   .07   .018   20.285   8/367     Openness   .018   20.285   8/367   .000     Neuroticism   .126   .217   .000     Extraversion   .234   .394   .000     Agreeableness   .024   .032   .506	Extraversion						.219	.369	.000
Sex   .644   .083   .077     Age   .086   .037   .422     Block 3   .076   .086   .037   .422     (Constant)   .554   .307   .018   20.285   8/367   .000     Openness   .126   .217   .000   .000   .256   .000     Extraversion   .234   .394   .000   .302   .506	Agreeableness						.011	.015	.754
Age   .086   .037   .422     Block 3   .018   20.285   8/367     (Constant)   .554   .307   .018   20.285   8/367     Openness   .126   .217   .000     Neuroticism   .160   .256   .000     Extraversion   .234   .394   .000     Agreeableness   .024   .032   .506	Conscientiousness						161	245	.000
Block 3     .554     .307     .018     20.285     8/367       Openness     .126     .217     .000       Neuroticism     .160     .256     .000       Extraversion     .234     .394     .000       Agreeableness     .024     .032     .506	Sex						.644	.083	.077
(Constant)   .554   .307   .018   20.285   8/367     Openness   .126   .217   .000     Neuroticism   .160   .256   .000     Extraversion   .234   .394   .000     Agreeableness   .024   .032   .506	Age						.086	.037	.422
Openness     .126     .217     .000       Neuroticism     .160     .256     .000       Extraversion     .234     .394     .000       Agreeableness     .024     .032     .506	Block 3								
Neuroticism     .160     .256     .000       Extraversion     .234     .394     .000       Agreeableness     .024     .032     .506	(Constant)	.554	.307	.018	20.285	8/367			
Extraversion     .234     .394     .000       Agreeableness     .024     .032     .506	Openness						.126	.217	.000
Agreeableness .024 .032 .506	Neuroticism						.160	.256	.000
8	Extraversion						.234	.394	.000
Conscientiousness 126 207 000	Agreeableness						.024	.032	.506
13020/ .000	Conscientiousness						136	207	.000
Sex .723 .093 .045	Sex								
Age .059 .025 .576	8							.025	
Dispositional hope072169 .002	Dispositional hope						072	169	.002

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that openness to development, neuroticism, extraversion and conscientiousness variables, which are entering in the model at the first step, are meaningful in their authentic contributions in the model R<sup>2</sup> = .280, F (5,370) = 28,806 p<.01. Coherence variety has no authentic contribution to the model ( $\beta$  = .-003, p>05). Openness ( $\beta$  = .160, p<.01) and neuroticism ( $\beta$  = .253, p<.01) predict negative effects of internet positively at a low level, and extraversion ( $\beta$  = .381, p<.01) predicts positively at a medium level. Conscientiousness ( $\beta$  = -.257, p<.01) predicts negatively at a medium level. The total contribution of variables to the variance has been found to be 28%.

It has been seen that gender and age variables, which are entered into the model in the second step, do not show a meaningful relationship with the predicted variable (R2 = .289, F (7,368) = 21,352, p>.05). An authentic contribution of the hope variable, which was entered into the model in the third step, has been found meaningful (r R2 = .307, F (8,367) = 20,285 p<.01). There is a negative relationship between dispositional hope level and negative results of internet at a low level ( $\beta$  = -.169, p<.01). Whereas the contribution of all variables to the model in the third step was found to be 30.7%. When

summarized, as openness, extraversion and neuroticism increase, the effects of negative results of the internet increase. As conscientiousness increases, the effects of negative results of the internet decrease. At the same time, it can be said that as the hope level increases, the effects of negative results of the internet decreases. When partial effect magnitudes of the predictors are examined, openness has been found as  $sr^2 = .03$ ; neuroticism as  $sr^2 = .07$ ; extravert as  $sr^2 = .13$ ; and conscientiousness as  $sr^2 = .05$ . In other words, when all variables are considered, 3% of negative results of the internet are explained by openness; 7% by neuroticism; 13% by extraversion; and 5% by conscientiousness.

When partial effect magnitudes are evaluated, they are found to be at a low level for openness to development, neuroticism and conscientiousness; and at a medium level for extraversion. All variables except extraversion have no practical value. When effect magnitudes of these models are viewed, the power of models in explaining the predicted variable can be accepted as low ( $R^2$ = .280, .289, .307) (as cited in Ozsoy and Ozsoy, 2013). In addition, the model, which is conducted at the first step, was the highest predictor ( $R^2$  ch = .280). When  $R^2$  ch values of the models are examined, whereas explanation rate of addictive variable of the first model was  $R^2$  ch = .280, the contribution of the second model was  $R^2$  ch = .009, and the contribution of the third model was  $R^2$  ch = .018. The most effective model in explaining the addictive variable is the first model.

**Prediction of social benefit/social comfort sub-scale of problematic internet usage scale:** Correlation coefficients between average, standard deviation and variables related to predicted and predictor variables taking place in the research are given in Table 5.

### Table 5

Correlation Matrix Showing The Relationships Between Variables And Mean And Standard Deviation of the Dependent And İndependent Variables

	М	SS	Social Benefit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Social Benefit	19.06	7,71	Denejti								
Personality											
characteristics											
1 Openness	36.02	6.14	22*								
2 Neuroticism	23.79	5.69	.24*	21*							
3 Extraversion	27.32	5.99	19*	.45*	30*						
4 Agreeableness	34.04	4.71	31*	.28*	21*	.11					
5 Conscientiousness	32.25	5.41	29*	.28*	35*	.12	.31*				
6 Sex	36.02	.46	.11	01	13**	.12	.16*	14*			
7 Age	23.79	1.51	.13**	.09	04	.13**	09**	.05	.20*		
8 Dispositional hope	27.32	8.34	34*	.52*	30*	.37*	.30*	.39*	.03	.00	

\*p<.01 \*\*p<.05

According to Table 5, there is a negative relationship at a low level between social benefit/social comfort sub-scale of problematic internet usage scale and openness (r= -.22, p<.01), extraversion (r= -.19, p<.01), and conscientiousness (r= -.29, p<.01). There is a negative relationship at a medium level between dispositional hope (r= -.34, p<.01) and coherence (r= -.31, p<.01). Positive and low level relationships have been found between neuroticism (r= .24, p<.01) and age (r= .13, p<.05). Findings related to hierarchic regression analysis are shown in Table 6.

# Table 6

Variables Predicting Social Benefits/Social Comfort Variable

	R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> ch	F	DF	В	β	Р
Block 1								
(Constant)	.410ª	.168	.168	14.912	5/370			
Openness						062	050	.376
Neuroticism						.126	.093	.081
Extraversion						126	098	.075
Agreeableness						355	217	.000
Conscientiousness						236	166	.002
Block 2								
(Constant)	.436	.190	.023	12.350	7/368			
Openness						073	058	.294
Neuroticism						.142	.104	.050
Extraversion						151	118	.032
C onscientiousness						310	190	.000
Agreeableness						233	163	.002
Sex						.986	.059	.241
Age						.672	.132	.007
Block 3								
(Constant)	.461	.213	.023	12.411	8/367			
Openness						.012	.009	.874
Neuroticism						.121	.089	.091
Extraversion						115	089	.104
Conscientiousness						279	171	.001
Agreeableness						172	121	.028
Sex						1.182	.070	.156
Age						.607	.119	.014
Dispositional hope						177	191	.001

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that openness, neuroticism and extraversion variables, which are entering in the model at the first step. are not meaningful in their authentic contributions in the model ( $R^2 = .168$ , F (5,370) = 14,912 p>.05). The authentic contributions of coherence and conscientiousness variables are meaningful ( $R^2 = .168$ , F (5,370) = 14,912 p<.05). Agreeableness ( $\beta = -.217$ , p<.01) and conscientiousness ( $\beta = -.166$ , p<.01) predict social benefit/social comfort sub-dimension negatively and at a low level. In other words, as agreeableness and conscientiousness increase in individuals, usage of internet with the aim of social

benefit/social comforts decreases. The contribution of variables to total variance has been found to be 17%.

The gender variable, which was entered into the model in the second step, does not show a meaningful relationship with the predicted variable (R2 = .190, F (7,368) = 12,350, p>.05). The authentic contribution of age variable to the model is meaningful  $(\beta = .132, p < .05)$  and positive and there is a low level predictor. The authentic contribution of the hope variable, which was entered into the model in the third step, has been found meaningful ( $R^2 = .213$ , F (8,367) = 12,411 p<.05). There is a negative relationship between dispositional hope level and negative results of internet at a low level ( $\beta$  = -.191, p<.01). While the contribution of all variables to the model was 19% in the second step, the contribution of all variables to the model in the third step was 21.3%. Partial effect magnitudes for coherence are  $sr^2 = .05$ ; for self-discipline  $sr^2 = .08$ ; for age  $sr^2 = .02$ ; and for dispositional hope  $sr^2 = .03$ . These values can be interpreted as partial effect magnitudes, for all free variables are small and practical values are nonexistent. When effect magnitudes are evaluated, the explanation power of predicted variables can be accepted at a medium level. (R<sup>2</sup> = .168, .190, 213) (as cited in Ozsoy & Ozsoy, 2013). In addition, when R<sup>2</sup> ch values of the model are examined, whereas the explanation rate of addictive variables of the first model were  $R^2 ch = .168$ , the contribution of the second and third models were .023. In this situation, the variables that were added in the model in the second and third steps do not have a practical value.

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

This study has searched for the relationship between problematic internet usage behaviours of university students and personality features, i.e., age, gender and dispositional hope level. Every sub-dimension of problematic internet usage has been used as predicted variables (excessive usage as sub-dimension of problematic internet usage, negative results of internet and social benefit/social comfort) and hierarchic regression analysis has been done for every predicted variable in three blocks.

The results of the analysis show that whereas neuroticism as a personality traitpredicts excessive internet usage positively and at low level, self-discipline predicts usage negatively at a medium level. In other words, as neuroticism increases, excessive internet usage also increases; while conscientiousness increases, excessive internet usage decreases. When findings related to negative results of the internet are analyzed, openness, extraversion and neuroticism increase as the negative effects of the internet increase. As conscientiousness increases, the negative effects of the internet decrease. When findings are evaluated in light of the literature, several studies indicate that personality traits are related to internet usage behaviours (Amichai-Hamburger & Ben-Artzi, 2003, Kayis et al., 2016; Laconi et al., 2016; Laconi, Vigouroux, Lafuente, & Chabrol, 2017; Truzoli, Osborne, Romano, & Reed, 2016; Wolfradt & Doll, 2001). Many people turn to the internet in order to manage stress, loneliness, depression, and anxiety (Panicker & Sachdev, 2014). There is a meaningful relationship

between shyness, internet use, personality traits and problematic internet use (Ebeling Witte, Frank, & Lester, 2007) Extraversion and neuroticism in women are related to the use of social websites (Hamburger & Ben-Artzi, 2000). Likewise, Hardie and Tee (2007) and Eksi (2012) found that neuroticism was a predictor of excessive internet usage. Consistent with this research, internet addiction was linked positively to anxiety and stress. (Panicker & Sachdev, 2014). Similarly, Kayis et al. (2016) emphasize the relationship between problematic internet use and openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. Zhou, Li, Li, Wang and Zhao, (2017) indicate that personality traits have a role in problematic internet use. On the other hand, Odaci and Berber Celik (2013) did not find a meaningful relationship between problematic internet usage.

When findings related to social benefit/comfort are evaluated, agreeableness and conscientiousness predict the social benefit/comfort sub-dimension negatively and at a low level. In other words, as agreeableness and conscientiousness increase in individuals, usage of internet with the aim of providing social benefit/comfort decreases. Shi, Chen and Tian (2011) found that internet self-efficacy and sensation-seeking positively predicted problematic internet use.

As the hope level increases, the level of being affected from negative results of the internet decreases. At the same time, there is a negative relationship between the dispositional hope level and negative results of internet usage at a low level. In the literature, studies related to problematic internet usage and dispositional hope level were not found, while the number of studies conducted about well-being in relation to positive psychology has drawn attention (Chen, 2012; Mei et al., 2016).

When the results are evaluated in the frame of age and gender, age predicts positively at a low level. On the other hand, gender was not found to be meaningful as a predictor variable in the three dimensions of problematic internet usage. The findings provided in this context show a consistency with the studies stating that there is not a difference (Hardie and Yi- Tee, 2007, Panicker & Sachdev, 2014) in the frame of internet usage style and time period between genders (Wolfradt & Doll, 2001). On the other hand, there are studies presenting that problematic internet usage is affected by gender (Mei et al., 2016; Ostovar, et al., 2016; Sariyska, Reuter, Lachmann, & Montag, 2015). In a study conducted among university students, they found that problematic internet usage was higher among males than females (Ancel, Acikgoz, & Yavas Ayhan, 2015; Esitti, 2015; Odaci & Kalkan, 2010; Oktan, 2015b). Likewise, Sargin (2013) found a difference at a meaningful level in favour of males and problematic internet usage sub-dimensions, such as loneliness, decreased instinct control, social support and distracted attention total scores and attitude towards internet usage. Likewise Durak and Senol-Durak (2013) demonstrated that gender (being male) and spending time with internet was meaningful on the effect of related cognitions about problematic internet usage.

In addition, many studies indicated that the level of males' problematic internet usage was higher than for females (Zorbaz, 2013; Zorbaz & Tuzgol Dost, 2014; Durmus & Basarmak, 2014; Cagir, 2010). However, these results based on gender on problematic internet usage can differ according to the research method and selected study group, especially in recent years among those who are defined as "digital natives" (Prensky, 2001) and have continuous access to the internet via smart phones. However, this is true for both genders.

There are differences between internet usage periods and activities conducted on the internet. For example, Fernández-Villa et al. (2015) found that weekly internet usage was found more in females than males. In addition, differences in problematic internet usage between males and females emerged according to the areas in which they are interested. While males exhibit problematic internet usage online playing games and shopping, females use it for chatting and using social websites. Yu and Shek (2013) stated that male adolescents have more problematic internet usage than the females in their studies with adolescents. Wang et al. (2013) and Li, Dang, Zhang, Zhang and Guo (2014) presented that in a similar way gender was a predictor of internet addiction during adolescence. In addition to this, Gross (2004) indicated no difference in the frame of internet addiction according to the gender among 7th and 10th grade students; he states that older adolescents spend more time on the internet.

When the results are evaluated, it is seen that especially self-discipline as a personality feature has been a predictor variable in all sub-dimensions of problematic internet usage and it has relationship with problematic internet usage at low levels. In this frame, when increased internet usage is considered, it is important to research the elements that provide self-discipline in individual development. Neuroticism predicts problematic internet usage positively. It is seen that the hope concept, which has an important place in the positive psychology has been a predictor variable in problematic internet usage.

In the context of this study, university students were selected as a study group. Evaluation of results related to the studies made with high school students and adults make a contribution to the field. In addition, relationships between internet usage fields and gender have not been evaluated. In future studies, relationships between different usage fields of internet and problematic internet usage can be examined. It is also important to evaluate the general situation of problematic internet usage developmentally in individuals in the frame of preventing studies. Qualitative studies will provide detailed evaluation of problematic internet usage behaviours of the individuals.

### References

- Alpaslan, A. H., Soylu, N., Koçak, U. & Guzel, H. I. (2016). Problematic internet use was more common in Turkish adolescents with major depressive disorders than controls. *Acta Paediatrica*, 105 (6), 695-700.
- Amichai-Hamburger, Y. & Ben-Artzi, E. (2003). Loneliness and internet use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 19 (1), 71–80.

- Ancel, G., Açıkgoz, I., & Yavaş Ayhan, A. G. (2015). Problemli internet kullanımı ile duygusal zeka ve bazı sosyodemografik degişkenler arasındaki iliski [The relationship between problematic internet using emotional intelligence and some sociodemographic variables]. Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry/Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi, 16(4), 255-263
- Ang, R. P., Chong, W. H., Chye, S., & Huan, V. S. (2012). Loneliness and generalized problematic internet use: Parents' perceived knowledge of adolescents' online activities as a moderator. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28 (4), 1342-1347.
- Ata, E. E., Akpinar, S. & Kelleci, M. (2011). The relationship between students problematic internet usage and their anger expression manner. *TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin*, 10 (4), 473-480.
- Babacan Gumus, A., Sipkin, S., Tuna, A., & Keskin, G. (2015). Universite öğrencilerinde problemli internet kullanımi, siddet egilimi ve bazi demografik degiskenler arasındaki iliski [The relationship between problematic internet use, violence trend and some demographic variables among university students]. *TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin*, 14(6),460-467
- Balkaya Cetin, A., & Ceyhan, A. A. (2015). Ergenlerin internette kimlik denemeleri ve problemli internet kullanim davranislarii [Adolescents' identity experiments on the internet and problematic internet use behavior]. Addicta: The Turkish Journal on Addiction, 1(2), 5-46.
- Basim, H. N., Cetin, F. & Tabak, A. (2009). Bes Faktor Kisilik ozelliklerinin kisilerarasi catisma cozme yaklasimlariyla iliskisi [The relationship between Big Five Personality characteristics and conflict resolution approaches]. *Turk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 24 (63), 20-34.
- Beard, K. W. (2005). Internet addiction: a review of current assessment techniques and potential assessment questions. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 8 (1), 7-14.
- Beard, K. W., & Wolf, E. M. (2001). Modification in the proposed diagnostic criteria for internet addiction. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 4 (3), 377-383.
- Benet-Martinez, V. & John, O.P. (1998). Cinco grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: multitrait multimethod analyses of the big five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75 (3), 729-750.
- Berber Celik, C. & Odaci, H. (2013). The relationship between problematic internet use and interpersonal cognitive distortions and life satisfaction in university students. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35 (3), 505-508.
- Berberoglu, G., & Tansel, A. (2014). Does private tutoring increase students' academic performance? Evidence from Turkey. *International Review of Education*, 60 (5), 683-701.

- Breslau, J., Aharoni, E., Pedersen, E., & Miller, L. L. (2015). A review of research on problematic internet use and well-being: with recommendations for the U.S. Air Force. RAND Health Quarterly, 5(1), 20
- Cagır, G. (2010). Lise ve universite ogrencilerinin problemli internet kullanım duzeyleri ile algilanan esenlik halleri ve yalnizlik duzeyleri arasındaki iliski [The relationship between the levels of high school and university students' problematic use of internet and their perceived wellness and loneliness levels]. Unpublished master's thesis, Balikesir Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Balıkesir.
- Cao, H., Sun, Y., Wan, Y., Hao, J. & Tao, F. (2011). Problematic internet use in Chinese adolescents and its relation to psychosomatic symptoms and life satisfaction. *BMC Public Health*, 11 (1), 802-1810.
- Casale, S., Lecchi, S., & Fioravanti, G. (2015). The association between psychological well-being and problematic use of internet communicative services among young people. *The Journal of Psychology*, 149 (5), 480-497.
- Ceyhan, A. A. & Ceyhan, E. (2008). Loneliness, depression, and computer self-efficacy as predictors of problematic internet use. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11 (6), 699-701.
- Ceyhan, E. (2010). Predictiveness of identity status, main internet use purposes and gender on university students' the problematic internet use. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 10 (3), 1343-1355.
- Ceyhan, A. A. (2011). Internet kullanma temel nedenlerine gore universite ögrencilerinin problemli internet kullanimi ve algiladıkları iletisim beceri duzeyleri [University students' problematic internet use and communication skills according to the internet use purposes]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 11 (1), 59-77.
- Ceyhan, E., Ceyhan, A.A. & Gurcan, A., (2007). Problemli internet kullanimi olçeginin gecerlik ve guvenirlik çalismalari [The validity and reliability of the problematic internet usage scale]. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* [Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri-KUYEB Dergisi], 7 (1), 387-416.
- Chang J P-C, Hung C-C. (2012). Problematic internet use. In J.M. Rey (Ed), *IACAPAP e-Textbook of Child and Adolescent Mental Health*. Geneva: International Association for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Allied Professions.
- Chen, S. K. (2012). Internet use and psychological well-being among college students: A latent profile approach. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28 (6), 2219–2226.
- Chen, S. K., & Lin, S. S. (2016). A latent growth curve analysis of initial depression level and changing rate as predictors of problematic Internet use among college students. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 54, 380-387.

Chou, C., Condron, L. & Belland, J. C. (2005). A review of the research on internet addiction. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17 (4), 363-388.

Çağır, G. (2010). Lise ve üniversite öğrencilerinin problemli internet kullanım düzeyleri ile algılanan esenlik halleri ve yalnızlık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between the levels of high school and university students' problematic use of internet and their perceived wellness and loneliness levels]. Unpublished master's thesis, Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Balıkesir.

- Cuhadar, C. (2012). Exploration of problematic Internet use and social interaction anxiety among Turkish pre-service teachers. *Computers & Education*, 59 (2), 173-181.
- Durak, M. & Senol-Durak, E. (2013). Associations of social anxiety and depression with cognitions related to problematic internet use in youths. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 38 (169), 19-29.
- Durmus, A. & Basarmak, U. (2014). Oğretmen adaylarının egitsel internet kullanım ozyeterlik inanclari ve problemli internet kullanım durumları arasındaki iliskinin incelenmesi [Investigation of the relation between teacher candidates internet self-efficiency belief and their problematic intended use]. *Ahi Evran Universitesi Kirsehir Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 15 (3), 49-67.
- Ebeling-Witte, S., Frank, M.L. & Lester, D. (2007). Shyness, internet use, and personality. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*. 10(5): 713-716.
- Eksi, F. (2012). Examination of narcissistic personality traits' predicting level of internet addiction and cyber bullying through path analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12 (3), 1694-1706.
- Eroglu, Y. (2016). Universite ögrencilerinde problemli internet kullanimi: İliskiselkarsilikli bagimli benlik kurgusu ve durtuselligin yordama gucleri [Problematic internet use in university students: The predictive stenght of relational-Interdependent self-construal and impulsivity]. *Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 11* (3), 1091-1114.
- Esitti, S. (2015). Bilgi caginda problemli internet kullanimi ve enformasyon obezitesi : Problemli internet kullanimi olceginin üniversite ogrencilerine uygulanmasi [The problematic internet usage and information obesity in the information age: application of the problematic internet usage scale to the university students]. University Faculty of Communication Journal/Istanbul Üniversitesi İletisim Fakültesi Hakemli Dergisi, 49, 75-97.
- Fernández-Villa, T., Ojeda, J.A., Gómez, A.A., Carral, J.M.C., Delgado-Rodríguez, M., García-Martín, M., Jiménez-Mejías, E., Llorca, J., Molina, A.J., Moncada, R.O., Valero-Juan, L.F., Martín, V. (2015). Problematic internet use in university students: associated factors and differences of gender. *Addiciones*, 27 (4), 265-275.

- Gámez-Guadix, M. (2014). Depressive symptoms and problematic internet use among adolescents: Analysis of the longitudinal relationships from the cognitivebehavioral model. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 17 (11), 714-719.
- Griffiths, M. D. (2000a). Does internet and computer —addiction exist? Some case study evidence. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 3 (2), 211-218.
- Griffiths, M. (2000b). Does internet and computer" addiction" exist? Some case study evidence. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 3 (2), 211-218.
- Gross, E. F. (2004). Adolescent internet use: What we expect, what teens report. *Journal* of Applied Developmental Psychology, 25 (6), 633-649.
- Hamburger, Y. A. & Ben-Artzi, E. (2000). The relationship between extraversion and neuroticism and the different uses of the internet. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 16, 441–449.
- Hardie, E. & Yi-Tee, M. (2007). Excessive internet use: the role of personality, loneliness and social support networks in internet addiction. *Australian Journal of Emerging Technologies and Society*, 5(1), 33–47.
- Kayis, A. R., Satici, S. A., Yilmaz, M. F., Simsek, D., Ceyhan, E., & Bakioglu, F. (2016). Big five-personality trait and internet addiction: A meta-analytic review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 63, 35-40.
- Kim, H. K. & Davis, K. E. (2009). Toward a comprehensive theory of problematic internet use: Evaluating the role of self-esteem, anxiety, flow, and the selfrated importance of internet activities. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25, 490-500.
- Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox. A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, 53, 1017–1031.
- Lachmann, B., Sariyska, R., Kannen, C., Cooper, A., & Montag, C. (2016). Life satisfaction and problematic Internet use: Evidence for gender specific effects. *Psychiatry research*, 238, 363-367.
- Laconi, S., Andréoletti, A., Chauchard, E., Rodgers, R. F., & Chabrol, H. (2016). Problematic Internet use, time spent online and personality traits. *L'Encephale*, 42(3), 214-218.
- Laconi, S., Vigouroux, M., Lafuente, C., & Chabrol, H. (2017). Problematic internet use, psychopathology, personality, defense and coping. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 73, 47-54.
- Li, C., Dang, J., Zhang, X., Zhang, Q. & Guo, J. (2014). Internet addiction among Chinese adolescents: The effect of parental behavior and self-control. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 41, 1-7.

- Mei, S., Yau, Y. H., Chai, J., Guo, J. & Potenza, M. N. (2016). Problematic Internet use, well-being, self-esteem and self-control: Data from a high-school survey in China. Addictive Behaviors, 61, 74-79.
- Meral, D., & Bahar, H. H. (2016). Ortaogretim ogrencilerinde problemli internet kullaniminin yalnizlik ve psikolojik iyi olus ile iliskisinin incelenmesi [Investigating the relationship between problematic internet use and psychological well being and loneliness in secondary education students]. *Journal of Education Faculty*, 18(2), 1117-1134
- Melchers, M., Li, M., Chen, Y., Zhang, W., & Montag, C. (2015). Low empathy is associated with problematic use of the Internet: Empirical evidence from China and Germany. *Asian journal of psychiatry*, *17*, 56-60..
- Mitchell, P. (2000). Internet addiction: Genuine diagnosis or not? *The Lancet*, 355, 632-635.
- Moreno, M. A., Jelenchick, L. A. & Christakis, D. A. (2013). Problematic internet use among older adolescents: A conceptual framework. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29 (4), 1879-1887.
- Moreno, M. A., Jelenchick, L. A. & Breland, D. J. (2015). Exploring depression and problematic internet use among college females: a multisite study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 49, 601-607.
- Odacı, H. & Berber Celik, C. (2013). Who are problematic internet users? An investigation of the correlations between problematic internet use and shyness, loneliness, narcissism, aggression and self-perception. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29 (6), 2382-2387.
- Odacı, H., & Cikrikci, O. (2017). Differences in problematic internet use based on depression, anxiety, and stress levels. *Adducta: The Turkish Journal on Addictions*, 4(1), 51-61.
- Odaci, H. & Kalkan, M. (2010). Problematic internet use, loneliness and dating anxiety among young adult university students. *Computers & Education*, 55 (3), 1091-1097.
- Oktan, V. (2015a). An investigation of problematic internet use among adolescents in terms of self-injurious and risk-taking behavior. Children and Youth Services Review, 52, 63-67.
- Oktan, V. (2015b). Universite ogrencilerinde problemli internet kullanimi, yalnizlik ve algilanan sosyal destek [Problematic internet use, loneliness and perceived social support among university students ]. *Kastamonu Egitim Dergisi*, 23(1), 281-292.
- Ostovar, S., Allahyar, N., Aminpoor, H., Moafian, F., Nor, M. B. M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2016). Internet addiction and its psychosocial risks (depression, anxiety, stress and loneliness) among Iranian adolescents and young adults: A

structural equation model in a cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 14(3), 257-267.

- Ozsoy, S. & Ozsoy, G. (2013). Effect size reporting in educational research. *Ilkogretim* Online (Elementary Education Online), 12 (2), 334-346.
- Panicker, J. & Sachdev, R. (2014). Relations among loneliness, depression, anxiety, stress and problematic internet use. International Journal of Research in Applied. Vol. 2, Issue 9, 1-10. www.impactjournals.us.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. On the Horizon, 9 (5), 1-6.
- Reisoglu, I., Gedik, N. & Goktas, Y. (2013). Ogretmen adaylarinin ozsaygi ve duygusal zekâ duzeylerinin problemli internet kullanimiyla iliskisi [Relationship between pre-service teachers' levels of self-esteem, emotional intelligence and problematic internet use]. Eğitim ve Bilim, 38 (170), 150-166.
- Rücker, J., Akre, C., Berchtold, A., & Suris, J. C. (2015). Problematic Internet use is associated with substance use in young adolescents. *Acta paediatrica*, 104(5), 504-507.
- Sargin, N. (2013). Universite ogrencilerinin internete yönelik tutumlari ve problemli internet kullanimlari [Internet attitudes and problematic internet use of university students]. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 2 (2), 44-53.
- Sariyska, R., Reuter, M., Lachmann, B., & Montag, C. (2015). Attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder is a better predictor for problematic Internet use than depression: evidence from Germany. *Journal of Addiction Research & Therapy*, 6(209), 1-6.
- Sevindik, F. (2011). Firat Universitesi ogrencilerinde problemli internet kullanimi ve saglikli yasam bicimi davranislarinin belirlenmesi. Unpublished doctorate thesis, İnönü Universitesi Saglik Bilimleri Enstitusu, Malatya.
- Shapira, N. A., Goldsmith, T. D., Keck, P. E., Khosla, U. M. & McElroy, S. L. (2000). Psychiatric features of individuals with problematic internet use. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 57, 267–272.
- Shapira, N.A., Lessing, M.C., Goldsmith, T.D., Szabo, S.T., Lazoritz, M., Gold, M.S. & Stein, D.J. (2003). Problematic internet use: Proposed classification and diagnostic criteria. *Depression and Anxiety*, 17, 207-216.
- Shi, J., Chen, Z. & Tian, M. (2011). Internet self-efficacy, the need for cognition, and sensation seeking as predictors of problematic use of the internet. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking. 14(4): 231-234.
- Sirakaya, M. & Seferoglu, S. S. (2013). Ogretmen adaylarinin problemli internet kullanımlarinin incelenmesi [Investigation of problematic internet usage of teacher candidates]. *Hacettepe Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 28 (1), 356-368.

- Skues, J., Williams, B., Oldmeadow, J., & Wise, L. (2016). The effects of boredom, loneliness, and distress tolerance on problem Internet use among university students. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 14(2), 167-180.
- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T. & et al. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 570-585.
- Sumer, N., Lajunen, T. & Ozkan, T. (2005). Big five personality traits as the distal predictors of road accident. *Traffic and Transport Psychology: Theory and Application*, 215-227.
- Sumer, N. & Sumer, H. C. (2005) Beş faktör kişilik özellikleri ölçeği [The Big Five Inventory] (Unpublished study).
- Tarhan, S. & Bacanli, H. (2015). Surekli umut olçegi'nin Turkce'ye uyarlanmasi: Gecerlik ve guvenirlik calismasi [Adaptation of dispositional hope scale into Turkish: Validity and reliability study]. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(1), 1-14
- Tekinarslan, E. (2017). Relationship between problematic internet use, depression and quality of life levels of Turkish university students. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(3), 167-175.
- Truzoli, R., Osborne, L. A., Romano, M., & Reed, P. (2016). The relationship between schizotypal personality and internet addiction in university students. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 63, 19-24.
- Tsitsika, A., Critselis, E., Janikian, M., Kormas, G. & Kafetzis, D. A. (2011). Association between internet gambling and problematic internet use among adolescents. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 27 (3), 389-400.
- Uz Bas, A., Soysal, F., & Aysan, F. (2016). Universite ogrencilerinde problemli internet kullaniminin psikolojik iyi-olus ve sosyal destek ile iliskisi [Relationship of problematic internet usage to psychological well-being and social support in college students]. *Itobiad: Journal of the Human & Social Science Researches*, 5(4), 1035-1046
- Van den Eijnden, R., Meerkerk, G. J., Vermulst, A. A., Spijkerman, R., & Engels, R. (2008). Online communication, compulsive internet use, and psychosocial wellbeing among adolescents: A longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(3), 655–665.
- Wang, L., Luo, J., Bai, Y., Kong, J., Luo, J., Gao, W. & Sun, X. (2013). Internet addiction of adolescents in China: Prevalence, predictors, and association with wellbeing. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 21 (1), 62-69.
- Wolfradt, U. & Doll, J. (2001). Motives of adolescents to use the Internet as a function of personality traits, personal and social factors. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 24 (1), 13-27.

- Yau, Y. H., Pilver, C. E., Steinberg, M. A., Rugle, L. J., Hoff, R. A., Krishnan-Sarin, S. & Potenza, M. N. (2014). Relationships between problematic internet use and problem-gambling severity: Findings from a high-school survey. *Addictive Behaviors*, 39 (1), 13-21.
- Yellowlees, P. M. & Marks, S. (2007). Problematic internet use or internet addiction?. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23 (3), 1447-1453.
- Young, K. (1999) Internet addiction: symptoms, evaluation and treatment. In L. Van de Creek & T. Jackson (Eds.). *Innovations in clinical practice: A Source Book* (19-31). Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Press.
- Yu, L. & Shek, D. T. L. (2013). Internet addiction in Hong Kong adolescents: a threeyear longitudinal study. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*, 26 (3), 10-17.
- Zhou, Y., Li, D., Li, X., Wang, Y., & Zhao, L. (2017). Big five personality and adolescent Internet addiction: The mediating role of coping style. *Addictive behaviors*, 64, 42-48.
- Zorbaz, O. (2013). Lise ogrencilerinin problemli internet kullaniminin sosyal kaygi ve akran iliskileri acisindan incelenmesi [Examination of problematic internet use of high school student in terms of gender, social anxiety and peer relations]. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Ankara.
- Zorbaz, O. & Tuzgol Dost, M. (2014). Lise ogrencilerinin problemli internet kullaniminin cinsiyet, sosyal kaygi ve akran iliskileri acisindan incelenmesi [Examination of problematic internet use of high school student in terms of gender, social anxiety and peer relations]. *Hacettepe Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 29, (1), 298-310.

# Problemli İnternet Kullanımı: Kişilik Özellikleri, Cinsiyet, Yaş ve Sürekli Umut Düzeyinin Etkisi

Özet

### Atıf:

Gunduz, H. C., Eksioglu, S. & Tarhan, S. (2017). Problematic internet usage: Personality traits, gender, age and effect of dispositional hope level. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 70, 57-82, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.14689 ejer.2017.70.4

Problem Durumu: Bireylerin kimi zaman duygularını ifade etme, istedikleri kişi olma aracı olarak kullandıkları, kimi zamansa çeşitli fırsatlara ulaşmaya aracılık eden, dünyayı tanıma ve dünyaya açılma aracı olarak değerlendirilebilecek olan internet kullanımı, aşırı kullanım durumlarında bağımlılığa dönüşebilmektedir. İnternetle ilişkili belirli davranışlar internet bağımlılığı, internet bağımlılık bozukluğu, patolojik internet kullanımı gibi kavramlarla karşımıza çıkmaktadır. İnternet bağımlılığında sessizlik, duygu durumunda değişim, tolerans (kullanılan sürenin giderek artması), yoksunluk belirtileri, çatışma ve nüks etme ögelerine dikkat çekilirken, patolojik internet kullanımının aşırı derece oyun oynama, online cinsel etkinlikler, e-mail atma ve yazışma davranışlarından en az üçünü içermesi gerekmektedir. Problemli internet kullanımı ise internet kullanımının kontrol edilememesi ve bu nedenle de günlük yaşamda stres bozuklukları ve işlev bozuklukları yaşanması hali olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Geçmişinde bağımlılık ya da dürtü kontrolüyle ilgili hikayesi olan kişiler internetin problemli kullanımında risk grubunda yer almaktadır. Problemli internet kullanımı herhangi bir yasta, sosyal, ekonomik ve eğitimsel düzeyde ortaya cıkabilmektedir.

*Araştırmanın Amacı:* Literatür incelendiğinde problemli internet kullanımı ile kişilik özellikleri ve umut arasındaki ilişkiyi araştıran bir çalışmaya rastlanmamıştır. Bu nedenle çalışmanın bulgularının problemli internet kullanımı konusunda yapılan çalışmalara ışık tutması ve literatüre bilgi sağlaması beklenmektedir. Bu amaçla bu çalışmada üniversite öğrencilerinin problemli internet kullanımları ile kişilik özellikleri, cinsiyet, yaş ve sürekli umut düzeyi arasındaki ilişki araştırılmıştır.

*Araştırmanın Yöntemi:* Bu çalışma üniversite öğrencilerinin problemli internet kullanımları ile kişilik özellikleri, cinsiyet, yaş ve sürekli umut arasındaki ilişkiyi ortaya koyabilmek amacıyla yapılan betimsel bir çalışmadır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubu Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi, Sakarya Üniversitesi ve Bartın Üniversitesinde 2014-2015 akademik yılında lisans eğitimine devam eden 376 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Katılımcıların 250'si kadın, 115'i erkektir. Öğrencilerin yaş aralıkları 18-25 arasındadır ve 151'i birinci sınıfa, 47'si ikinci sınıfa, 125'I üçüncü sınıfa ve 53'ü dördüncü sınıfa devam etmektedir. Araştırma verilerinin toplanmasında demografik bilgi formu, "Problemli İnternet Kullanımı Ölçeği", "Beş Faktör Kişilik Ölçeği" ve "Sürekli Umut Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde SPSS 22 kullanılmıştır. Hiyerarşik regresyon analizi yapılmadan önce değişkenlerin varsayımları karşılayıp karşılamadığı ve dağılımın normalliği saçılma diyagramı,

mahalonobis, cook'a distance, z değerlerine bakılarak incelenmiştir. Ayrıca yordanan değişkenler (Problemli internet kullanımının alt boyutları olan aşırı kullanım, internetin olumsuz sonuçları ve sosyal fayda/ sosyal rahatlık) ve yordayıcı değişkenler (kişilik özellikleri, cinsiyet, yaş ve sürekli umut) arasındaki ilişkiler ve puanların dağılımları incelenmiş ve puanların tüm ölçeklerde normal dağıldığı görülmüştür. Veriler ile analiz yapılmadan önce eksik veriler incelenmiş, boş bırakılan maddeler EM algoritması yoluyla incelenerek ortalama değer ataması yapılmıştır. Analizlerin birinci adımında kişilik özellikleri, ardından cinsiyet ve yaş değişkenleri ve en son olarak umut değişkeni analize dahil edilmiş, problemli internet kullanımının her bir alt boyutu için yordayıcı değişkenleri belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır. Hiyerarşik regresyon sonunda bağımsız değişkenlerin pratik anlamı olup olmadığını belirlemek için kısmi etki büyüklükleri değerleri belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca her bir modelin R<sup>2</sup> ch değerleri yorumlanarak da modellerin bağımlı değişkeni yordama güçleri değerlendirilmiştir. Modellerin etki büyüklükleri için regresyon katsayısı olan R<sup>2</sup> hesaplanmıştır.

*Araştırmanın Bulguları*: Problemli internet kullanımı ölçeği *aşırı kullanım* alt boyutu ile gelişime açıklık, uyumluluk, sürekli umut düzeyi arasında negatif, nörotiklik arasında pozitif yönde düşük korelasyon, öz disiplin ile orta düzeyde negatif yönde korelasyon bulunmuştur. problemli internet kullanımı ölçeği *internetin olumsuz sonuçları* alt boyutu ile gelişime açıklık, nörotiklik, cinsiyet ve yaş arasında pozitif düşük düzeyde, dışa dönüklük ile arasında pozitif orta düzeyde ilişki bulunurken, öz disiplin ile düşük düzeyde negatif korelasyon bulunmuştur. Problemli internet kullanımı ölçeği sosyal fayda/sosyal rahatlık alt boyutu ile gelişime açıklık, dışa dönüklük, öz disiplin arasında düşük düzeyde ve negatif bir ilişki görülürken, sürekli umut ve uyumluluk ile arasında negatif orta düzeyde bir ilişki görülmüştür. Nörotiklik ve yaş arasında ise pozitif ve düşük düzeyde ilişki bulunmuştur.

Araştırmanın Sonuç ve Önerileri: Bu çalışmada üniversite öğrencilerinin problemli internet kullanım davranışları ile kişilik özellikleri, cinsiyet, yaş ve sürekli umut düzeyi arasındaki ilişki araştırılmıştır. Yapılan analizler sonucunda kişilik özelliklerinden nörotiklik, aşırı internet kullanımını pozitif ve düşük yönde yordarken, özdisiplinin negatif yönde orta düzeyde yordadığı görülmüştür. Bir diğer deyişle bireylerde nörotiklik arttıkça aşırı internet kullanımı artarken, özdisiplin arttıkça aşırı internet kullanımı azalmaktadır. İnternetin olumsuz sonuçları ile ilgili bulgulara bakınca, gelişime açıklık, dışa dönüklük ve nörotiklik arttıkça internetin olumsuz sonuçlarından etkilenme artarken, öz disiplin arttıkça internetin olumsuz sonuçlarından etkilenme azalmaktadır. Aynı zamanda umut düzeyi arttıkça internetin olumsuz sonuçlarından etkilenme düzeyinin de azaldığı söylenebilir. Sosyal fayda/rahatlık ile ilgili bulgular değerlendirildiğinde, uyumluluk ve özdisiplin sosyal fayda/sosyal rahatlık alt boyutunu negatif yönde ve düşük düzeyde yordamaktadır. Bir diğer değişle bireylerde uyumluluk ve öz disiplin arttıkça internetin sosyal fayda/rahatlık sağlamak amacıyla kullanımı azalmaktadır. Yas değiskeni de pozitif yönde düşük düzeyde yordamaktadır. Aynı zamanda sürekli umut düzeyi ile internetin olumsuz sonuçları arasında negatif düşük düzeyde ilişki bulunmaktadır. Sonuçlar cinsiyet açısından değerlendirildiğinde, problemli internet kullanımının üç boyutunda da cinsiyet yordayıcı değişken olarak anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Bulgular değerlendirildiğinde, özellikle kişilik özelliklerinden öz disiplinin problemli internet kullanımının tüm alt boyutlarında yordayıcı bir değişken olduğu ve problemli internet kullanımının düşük düzeyleri ile ilişkisi olduğu görülmüştür. Bu çerçevede özellikle son yıllarda internet kullanımının yaygınlığının giderek arttığı düşünüldüğünde, bireylerin gelişiminde öz disiplin sağlayabilecekleri unsurların araştırılması ve desteklenmesi önemli görülmektedir. Son yıllarda pozitif psikolojide önemli bir yer bulmaya başlayan umut kavramının da problemli internet kullanımında yordayıcı bir değişken olduğu görülmektedir. Bu çalışma kapsamında çalışma grubu olarak üniversite öğrencileri seçilmiştir. Lise grupları ve yetişkin grupları ile yapılan çalışmalarda çıkan sonuçların değerlendirilmesi de alana katkı sağlayacaktır. Ayrıca bu çalışmada internetin kullanım alanları ile cinsiyet arasındaki ilişkiler değerlendirilmemiştir. Gelecek çalışmalarda internetin farklı kullanım alanları ve problemli internet kullanımı arasındaki ilişkiler incelenebilir. Nitel veriler ile çalışmanın desteklenmesi de bireylerin problemli internet kullanım davranışlarını ayrıntılı olarak değerlendirilmesini sağlayacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İnternet Bağımlılığı, kişilik, umut, internetin aşırı kullanımı.