

## IN WHICH SOCIAL SITUATIONS DO YOU DECLINE A CALL?

Charles Allen Scarboro<sup>1</sup>, Gulnara Nadamova<sup>2\*</sup>, Merve Akbulut<sup>3\*</sup> and Habibe Yalçın<sup>4\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Prof. Dr., Fatih University, Turkey, [soccas@gmail.com](mailto:soccas@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>MA student., Fatih University, Turkey, [n.gulnara@yahoo.com](mailto:n.gulnara@yahoo.com)

<sup>3</sup>BA student, Fatih University, Turkey, [merveakbulut69@gmail.com](mailto:merveakbulut69@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup>BA student, Fatih University, Turkey, [habibeyalcin93@gmail.com](mailto:habibeyalcin93@gmail.com)

\*Corresponding authors

### Abstract

Cell phones have become far more than just digital devices for communication; but with rapid increase in the popularity of smart phones, they have become multi-functional tools. Today, it is evidently seen how users of mobile phones have started to change their mobile phones to smart phones. Since, it is Mobile phones serve far more than just calling and messaging as it was before of emergence of smart phones, but also it is function for the localization of self, it is putting photos in Facebook, it is becoming and involved in debates in Twitter. This research seeks to determine of how people of different age groups manage to decline callings and messages in varied social situations. In this research, we used a quantitative method through a survey. In survey there are different social situations such; having dinner in restaurant, having meetings, watching a film in cinema, and different social situations and whether different age-groups of people decline calling and messaging or not. The study reveals that when the age group increases, the decline of calling and messaging in varied social situations is higher than in the groups with the young age.

**Keywords;** smart phone, varied social situations, decline callings and messages.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Conceptualization of mobile phone

Neil Holloway, managing director of Microsoft in UK, mentions “Digital Decade” to describe integration of mobile phone in peoples’ daily life. It is important to understand how a mobile phone has been conceptualized in “Digital Decade” (James C., Max N., and Simon R., 2003). Since, it is no more just communication device and more than just interaction tool. It is no more landline telephones, but a mobile phone as it describes as “cutting cord” (Townsend, 2000) because before people were attached to specific place such office or home but with the invention of the mobile phone that is personalized, people cut the cord with the specific place (Didem Ozkul, 2014). On the contrary, for some people the mobile phone is “umbilical cord” because mostly parents try to control their children by calling, so the mobile phone becomes the controlling tool that is tied to a person (Michelle C., Jason T., Carolyn A., and Julius M., 2011). The mobile phone is conceptualized as “electronic pets” because users of mobile phone start to “dressed up” mobile phones by covers and accessories for mobile phones, choosing definite ringtones (Rosen, 2004), domestication of mobile phone and being “tamed” makes mobile phone defined as something more than just communication tool (Silverstone et al. 1992; Haddon 2007; Peteri 2006; Pantzar 1996). For others, the mobile phone is “status symbol” (James C., Max N., and Simon R., 2003), “elitist showing off device, yuppie toy” (Roos 1993). Since, it is clearly seen how people try to catch the latest model of phone. The mobile phone brings not only accessibility but also isolation, so for some people the mobile phone is “safety bubble” (Bissell, 2009), “cocoon” (Farman, 2012). People do not only communicate with each other by calling or messaging, they are also connecting to internet and becoming accessible through net. Users of mobile phone are informative through internet, so mobile phone describes as “a new information medium” (May & Hearn 2005, p. 200). However, for some people, it is “messiness” (Bell G., Dourish P., 2007) because of multifaceted functionality of mobile phone and “noise” in public place (Rosen, 2004). After all, the mobile

phone is 'revolutionary instrument' as Virpi Oksman mentions and describes, "radically changes the way people interact and practice in everyday life" (2010). Although, people are sitting together and interact with each other, they are interrupted by callings and messages. So, in this interaction there are not just people who are physically sit together but also the interaction with people who are far away. Actually, in this term there are more people than the real existence of people having share time together.

### 1.2 Why do people use mobile phone?

People prefer to use mobile phone because mobile phone becomes a personal device it is not as with landline phone, which is shared by all family member. Nevertheless, some cultures such Korea used to share one mobile phone by one family member. Nevertheless, mostly mobile phone is a private device that is like personal portfolio (Louise Barkhuus and Valerie E. Polichar, 2010) which a user can design in own wish, so he/she shows own identity, by using some functions of mobile phone whereas some by erasing. The users of mobile phone use it because of mobility (James C., Max N., and Simon R., 2003), it is "always there" (Virpi Oksman, 2010), means being accessible. People can reach the user anytime they need, and everywhere the user is. One of the factors, people prefer to use mobile phone is popularity (Carolyn Wei and Beth E. Kalko, 2005). The mobile phone before was luxury and only wealthy people can have it, but with making them gettable in cost, people have started to have one or more than one mobile phone. The users of phone are people of all groups of ages and all social status. The mobile phone is used to micro-coordination (Ling R.,2004) as Ling describes " co-ordinate social and professional life" (R. Ling and B. Yttri, 1999) . People use chatting and keeping in contact to socialization, so mobile phone has many functions (Keller, 1979, Noble, 1987). Mobile phone functions are not only making own portfolio, being in touch, being mobile and at the same time accessible, have an entertainment and fun but also have security. Since, for parents it is so important to keep control of their children as "elastic control" (James C., Max N., and Simon R., 2003) by which children feel themselves independent and parents still can control them.

### 1.3 Social Situations: Where Place and Time are blurred

"Cutting cord" (Townsend, 2000) or "always on" ( Arge, P, E., 2001) means that the user of mobile phone is not attached to any fixed location (Rich ling and Leslie Haddon, 2001). Location does not same as place, it does not have physical existence. So, perception of social space is changed (Palen L, Sazman M, Youngs E (2000). The user of mobile phone is movable, so in this term the locations while using mobile phone are changing that is why " locations are becoming blurred" (Arge, P, E.,2001,). The importance of place is diminished. The concept of time is also changed, it "softens" (Rich Ling and Leslie Haddon, 2001). The user of mobile phone can be reached "anytime and anywhere" (Picard, R.G., 2005). There is no more concern of interruptions. One of the functions of the mobile phone is making users independent. Nevertheless, being reachable and accessible everywhere and every time, the mobile phone becomes a " paradoxical device" (Roos 1993). Since, the users of mobile phone become so dependent on it. They feel themselves "lost and naked", when the mobile phone is switched off ( Jamie L. P., Karen L.P., Daniel R.R., 2010) and being interrupted anytime and anywhere makes the users of mobile phone " freedom from" whereas it is also " freedom to" (James C., Max N., and Simon R., 2003). The mobile phone gives freedom and takes it at the same time. It is no more "taboo" to answer to a call in theatre while watching a play, having dinner in restaurant with family, or having funeral. The perception of social situations is changed with time and place perceptions (Jamie L. P., Karen L.P., Daniel R.R., 2010). By the change of perception of social situations and influential impact of how mobile usage has changed the time and the place perception, the cultural attitudes are also changed. The functionality of accessibility of the mobile phones, have changed attitudes in varied social situations. The aim of this research is to find out the kinds of social situations in which the callings and the messages are declined. It is important to see how the perception of social situations has been changed and how the mobile phone has caused changes in the interactions of people in varied social situations.

## 2. Methodology

In May 2014, sociology students in research method class had a project. These students were learning how to do data gathering. So, a professor, Charles Allen Scarboro, who taught the course asked students to gather surveys about mobile phone usage. The students at the end of the May brought the responses of 822 respondents, the age between 20 and above 50, they were residents of Istanbul.

The survey tries to find out 1) if there is correlation between age of respondents and level of mobile phone usage, 2) if there is a relation between usage of phone with groups of people with whom respondents have

any relation, 3) if a brand of mobile phone influences the level of usage mobile phone, 4) when they last declined a call or a message, 5) in which social situations, they decide to decline a call and in which they do not. The major focus of this paper is to analyze how people decide to decline callings if they do and if there is any relation between declining of call with age factor.

### 3. Data-Analysis

We used SPSS Histogram graphs and found out that mostly respondents of 20-30 age groups are using mobile phone (31.1%) whereas the least of usage of mobile phone is the respondents of 50 and above age group (18.8 %). It shows that with the rise of age the usage of mobile phone is decreasing. The respondents mostly keep in touch with the family group (36.1%) among different kinds of groups, such; friends, colleagues, partner, and other (private). When we asked in survey if the respondents use a smart phone or not, then 76.5% of respondents are using smart phones. It shows that mobile phone becomes more than just a communication tool because the multi-functionality of smart phone makes people to choose it. With the emergence of smart phone, people become available not just through callings but also via social networks such; Facebook, Twitter, Foursquare, and Instagram. So, the analysis shows that most used social network is Facebook (52.7%). When we asked respondents when they last decline a call, most of them did not remember (33.2%). So, it shows that people mostly answer to the callings. In the survey, we asked the respondents to fill the table where they show how and in which social situations they decline the mobile phone and in which they do not. We used Cross tables to see how three variables, one of them is controlling one, show the respondents declining or answering to callings in different situations. The third variable is the social networks, the respondents prefer to use. We found out that there is no level of significance that should be lower than 0.05. We can see how in some social situations the respondents prefer to decline whereas in some situation they answer to callings. In first analysis we decided to compare three different and at the same time same social situations. We summed the answers into two groups; as agree and disagree.

#### 3.1 With Family in Restaurant-with Friends in Restaurant- with Colleagues in Restaurant

When we asked the respondents who use social networks if they answer to callings in the restaurant with friends, 47.2% of the respondents are agree to decline callings, whereas 52.8% of them are answering. When we compared to the respondents of colleagues in restaurant analysis, we found out that 30.7% of respondents are agreeing to decline phone callings whereas 69.3% of them are not. In these two social situations we can see that the respondents are more likely to decline callings when they are with family in restaurant. When we compare to these two social situations, the third one, we found out that the respondents 41.3% are agree to decline callings whereas 58.6% of them are answering. In all three situations people are more likely to decline mobile phone when they are with family in restaurant. For sample see the table below.

Total	social_network	facebook	Count	63	88	27	102	37	317
			% of Total	10,5%	14,7%	4,5%	17,0%	6,2%	52,8%
		twitter	Count	21	43	12	41	16	133
				% of Total	3,5%	7,2%	2,0%	6,8%	2,7%
		foursquare	Count	0	4	1	3	1	9
				% of Total	,0%	,7%	,2%	,5%	,2%
		instagram	Count	14	20	3	22	13	72
				% of Total	2,3%	3,3%	,5%	3,7%	2,2%
		others	Count	9	21	9	20	10	69
				% of Total	1,5%	3,5%	1,5%	3,3%	1,7%
Total			Count	107	176	52	188	77	600
				% of Total	17,8%	29,3%	8,7%	31,3%	12,8%

#### 3.2 At Meeting- During Class

When we asked the respondents if they decline the callings at meetings, then 72.7% of the respondents are agreeing to decline callings, whereas 27.3% prefer to answer. During the class, 31.3% of the respondents answer to calls whereas 68.7% decide to decline the callings. It shows that people are more likely to decline callings in meetings that during class. Actually, in both situations people are agreed to decline callings because of the authority of a teacher or a director. If in one situation the rule breaker is punished by words, in another situation the punishment might be loss of job. That is why the respondents are more likely to

decline callings at the meetings. For sample you can see the table below.

Total	social_network	facebook	Count	148	76	34	38	13	309
			% of Total	25,8%	13,3%	5,9%	6,6%	2,3%	53,9%
		twitter	Count	48	43	16	15	3	125
			% of Total	8,4%	7,5%	2,8%	2,6%	,5%	21,8%
		foursquare	Count	5	0	0	0	1	6
			% of Total	,9%	,0%	,0%	,0%	,2%	1,0%
		instagram	Count	28	19	10	4	6	67
			% of Total	4,9%	3,3%	1,7%	,7%	1,0%	11,7%
		others	Count	29	21	9	4	3	66
			% of Total	5,1%	3,7%	1,6%	,7%	,5%	11,5%
Total			Count	258	159	69	61	26	573
			% of Total	45,0%	27,7%	12,0%	10,6%	4,5%	100,0%

### 3.3 Eating with Family- Eating with Friends- Eating with Collogues at Home

In survey we asked different social situation, when we analyzed them we put them into groups in order to show comparison between different social situations. We wrote about the analysis of having dinner with different groups of people in restaurant. Here, we have the same groups of people but in different place, at home. When we asked the respondents do they answer to callings while having dinner at home with friends, then 27.5 % are agree to decline the phone call whereas 72.5% answer to callings. When we asked the same question but this time having dinner with collogues at home, 28.9% are declining and 71.1% are answering to callings. The answers of these two groups are close to each other, because these two groups are close to each other, a friend might be collogue and vise versa. When we asked the respondents if they decline the callings while having dinner with family at home, then 42.7% of respondents are agree to decline callings whereas 57.3% prefer to answer to callings. Finally, the analysis shows that people are more likely to decline the callings while having dinner with family than with friend and collogues. The reason might be the cultural aspects and authority of parents in family.

### 3.4 Watching a Film in Cinema-Watching a Film at Home

When we asked the respondents if they decline calling while watching a film in cinema, 70.8% of the respondents are agree to decline callings whereas 29.2% are disagree to decline callings in cinema. The same action but in different place such home gives completely different conclusion, in the answer of watching film at home, 33.3% of respondents are agree to decline and 66.7% are disagree to decline callings at home. The difference in answers is because of the concept of places, where in one there are obligations and norms, people must to follow and in another there are no such rules. In cinema people are warned before watching a film to switch off the mobile phones because it is disturbance to other viewers in cinema. Nevertheless, at home people do not disturb others; they are the owners of place, where they do not use any rules as in cinema. As the sample, see one of the tables below.

Total	social_network	facebook	Count	128	89	23	53	20	313
			% of Total	21,6%	15,0%	3,9%	9,0%	3,4%	52,9%
		twitter	Count	57	37	9	23	7	133
			% of Total	9,6%	6,3%	1,5%	3,9%	1,2%	22,5%
		foursquare	Count	2	3	1	1	2	9
			% of Total	,3%	,5%	,2%	,2%	,3%	1,5%
		instagram	Count	34	19	3	10	3	69
			% of Total	5,7%	3,2%	,5%	1,7%	,5%	11,7%
		others	Count	25	25	3	12	3	68
			% of Total	4,2%	4,2%	,5%	2,0%	,5%	11,5%
Total			Count	246	173	39	99	35	592
			% of Total	41,6%	29,2%	6,6%	16,7%	5,9%	100,0%

### 3.5 Spending Time with Family- Friends-Collogues

When we asked the respondents if they decline callings while spending time with family, friends, and collogues, then 53.8% of respondents are agree to decline callings while spending time with family, 31.4% are agree to decline callings while spending time with friends and 32.3% are agree to decline while spending

time with colleagues. This analysis shows that people are more likely to decline callings while spending time with family rather with friends and colleagues.

### 3.6 Mosque-Transportation

When we asked the respondents who use social Networks such Facebook, Twitter, and others, if they decline callings in mosques, 82.3% of the respondents are agree to decline callings whereas 17.7% are disagree to decline callings in mosques. On the contrary, the respondents of question about transportation, 27.6%are preferred to decline whereas 72.4% of them answer to callings. It is because in mosque there are rules and norms people should follow to not disturb people who pray, whereas in transportation people are more likely to answer to callings. See one of two tables below.

Total	social_network	facebook	Count	46	51	36	132	51	316
			% of Total	7,7%	8,6%	6,1%	22,2%	8,6%	53,2%
		twitter	Count	14	26	12	50	30	132
			% of Total	2,4%	4,4%	2,0%	8,4%	5,1%	22,2%
		foursquare	Count	0	0	5	3	1	9
			% of Total	,0%	,0%	,8%	,5%	,2%	1,5%
		instagram	Count	5	7	2	36	19	69
			% of Total	,8%	1,2%	,3%	6,1%	3,2%	11,6%
		others	Count	7	8	4	33	16	68
			% of Total	1,2%	1,3%	,7%	5,6%	2,7%	11,4%
Total			Count	72	92	59	254	117	594
			% of Total	12,1%	15,5%	9,9%	42,8%	19,7%	100,0%

## 4. Conclusion

The mobile phone has influential impact on people, because it becomes more than just communication device. As, we said with its multi-functionality, people manage and organize their lives through the mobile phone. The space and time have been changed, so these changes let the cultural perspective also change. For instance, if before when you move from one city to another, you were obliged to switch off your mobile phone. Since, it made the harm to the navigation system. The host of the bus asked people to switch off the mobile phones. If someone forgot to switch off, he or she was pressed by the strict look of other people. Socially people were tending to follow the structure and rules where callings were forbidden. In contemporary Turkey, we can see how people use mobile phone during the trip, so people are no more look at each other differently. Since, there are no individuals who do not use mobile phone. It becomes very important part of human life. What about mosque and its conditions, it is clear that imam (religious responsible for definite mosque) is not comfortable with callings during prayer. You can hear how he asks people before starting top ray to switch off the mobiles phones. So, it shows that there is still someone who controls the situation as same like it was with host. It is interesting, would it be change if imam would allow people to answer to calls. Anyway, we can see how mobile phone has been emerged not only in accepted social situation but in not allowed too. In the example above, in cinema and restaurant where in two places the respondents answered differently. In one social situation they decided to answer whereas in another to decline. In this situation, we can also see that some people surround us might take control of situation where we allow or not let to answer to calls. In cinema majority f respondents are agree with decline of calls, because it is interrupt and people will not allow to be interrupted while watching the movie. On the contrary, in restaurant where everyone uses mobile phone there are no restrictions about it. Nevertheless, if it was accepted by everyone to answer in cinema, these answers would be changed. We can also analyze two different social situations; having dinner with family at home and having a meeting. The majority of respondents (42.3%) are declining callings in meetings whereas 35.8% of respondents are answering to callings while having dinner with family. So, it shows that if it is allowed by all people then callings are not declined. If it is not allow by someone and by group of people, then the callings are declined.

## REFERENCE LIST

- Agre, P, E. (2001, January). Welcome to the always-on world. *IEEE Spectrum*, 10-13.
- Barkhuus L. Valerie E. P (2010). Empowerment throygh seamgulness:smart phones in everyday life. *Pers Ubiquit Comput*

- Bell G, Dourish P (2007). Yesterday's tomorrows: notes on ubiquitous computing's dominant vision. *Personal Ubiquitous Computing* 11(2):133–143
- Carolyn Wei and Beth E. Kalko (2005). Studying Mobile Phone Use in Context: Cultural, Political, and Economic Dimensions of Mobile Phone Use. *2005 IEEE International Professional Communication Conference Proceedings*.
- Crabtree J., Max N., Simon R., (2003). Mobile phones in everyday life. *The Work Foundation*
- David Bissell and Gillian Fuller (eds) (2010). *Stillness in a Mobile World*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Farman J. (2012). Map Interfaces and the Reduction of Locative Media Space. In: Rowan Wilken and Gerard Goggin (eds) *Locative Media*. New York: Routledge, 191-2.
- Haddon, L. (2007). Roger Silverstone's Legacies: Domestication. *New Media and Society*, Vol. 9 (1), pp. 25–32.
- Jamie L. P., Karen L.P., Daniel R.R (2010). How Mobile Technology is Changing Our Culture. *Conference on Information Systems Applied Research 2010 CONISAR Proceedings Nashville Tennessee, USA*
- Keller, S. (1979). *The Social Impact of the Telephone*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Ling R (2004). *The mobile connection: the cell phone's impact on society*. Morgan Kaufmann, Boston
- Ling, R. And Yttri, B (1999). "Nobody sits at home and waits for the telephone to ring: Micro and hyper-coordination through the use of the mobile telephone." In Katz, J and Aakhus, M. *Perpetual Contact: Mobile communication, private talk, and public performance*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ling R., Haddon L, Klamer L. (2001). The understanding and use of the internet and the mobile technology among contemporary Europeans [www.mot.chalmers.se/dept/tso/haddon/ICUSTjoint.pdf](http://www.mot.chalmers.se/dept/tso/haddon/ICUSTjoint.pdf)
- May, H. & Hearn, G. (2005). The Mobile Phone as Media. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 8(2), pp. 211–195.
- Michelle C., Jason T., Carolyn A., and Julius M. (2011). What cell phones mean in young people's daily lives and social interactions. *Proceedings of the Southern Association for Information Systems Conference*, Atlanta, GA, USA.
- Noble, G. (1987). Discriminating Between the Intrinsic and Instrumental Domestic Telephone User, *Australia Journal of Communication*, 11, 63-85.
- Ozkul, D. (2014). Mobile Communication Technologies Spatial Perception: Mapping London. In: Rowan Wilken and Gerard Goggin (eds) *Locative Media*. New York: Routledge, 39-51.
- Palen L, Salzman M, Youngs E (2000). Going wireless: behavior & practice of new mobile users. In: *Proceedings of CSCW, ACM (2000)*, NY, pp 201–210
- Peteri, V. (2006). *Home by Media. A Study on Domestication of Media Technologies*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Picard, R.G. (2005). Mobile Telephony and Broadcasting: Are They Compatible for Consumers. *International Journal of Mobile Communications*, 3(1), pp. 28–19.
- Roos, J. P. (1993). Sociology of Cellular Telephone: The Nordic Model (300 000 Yuppies? Mobile phones in Finland) *Telecommunications Policy*, (17)6. URL (Consulted in Jan. 2009) [www.valt.helsinki.fi/staff/jproos/mobiltel.htm](http://www.valt.helsinki.fi/staff/jproos/mobiltel.htm)
- Rosen, C. (2004). Our Cell Phones, Ourselves. *The New Atlantis: A Journal of Technology & Society*, 26-45.
- Townsend, A. M. (2000). "Life in the real-time city: mobile telephones and urban metabolism" *Journal of urban technology* 7 (2) 85-104.
- Virpi O. (2010). *The mobile phone: A medium in itself* VTT Publications 737. 89 p. + app. 130 p.