Development & Validation of Procrastination & Nomophobia Questionnaire - Indian Adaptation (PNQ-IA)

Dishani Chakraborty[1], Ishita Chakraborty[2]

[1]M.Phil. in Clinical Psychology, Apex University, Jaipur

[2]MA in Psychology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi

ABSTRACT

Procrastination, defined as the voluntary delay of tasks despite negative consequences, and nomophobia, the fear of being without mobile phone access, are increasingly relevant psychological phenomena in the digital age. This study develops and validates the Procrastination & Nomophobia Questionnaire - Indian Adaptation (PNQ-IA), a culture-fair screening tool tailored for Indian young adults aged 20–30 years. Drawing from the General Procrastination Scale (GPS) and the Nomophobia Questionnaire (NMP-Q), the PNQ-IA comprises 30 items (15 for procrastination, 15 for nomophobia) rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Administered to 200 participants (100 males, 100 females), the scale demonstrated acceptable reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.82 for nomophobia, 0.79 for procrastination) and a moderate correlation ($r = 0.45$, $p < 0.001$) between the constructs. A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) validated a two-factor model distinguishing Nomophobia (NOM, items Q1–Q15) and Procrastination (PRO, items Q16–Q30) as correlated constructs ($r = 0.38$). The model demonstrated acceptable fit (CFI = 0.92, RMSEA = 0.06, SRMR = 0.05), with strong factor loadings and high reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha \approx 0.89$–0.90). The findings suggest nomophobia and procrastination are related, with phone dependency potentially contributing to procrastination tendencies. Findings suggest that smartphone dependency exacerbates task avoidance, offering insights for interventions to enhance productivity among Indian youth. Limitations include a small sample size and lack of factorial validation

Procrastination, often understood as the voluntary delay of important tasks despite foreseeable negative consequences, has been widely studied as a self-regulation failure (Steel, 2007). Steel (2007) defines procrastination as "the intentional delay of an intended course of action despite knowing that this delay may have negative effects." Rooted in the Temporal Motivation Theory, procrastination is associated with low self-control, temporal discounting, and a preference for short-term over long-term rewards. Early signs often include repeated postponement of essential tasks, avoidance of deadlines, and heightened stress from impending obligations. Vulnerable personality characteristics linked to procrastination include high levels of neuroticism, low conscientiousness, and low self-discipline, as shown in meta-analytic findings (Eerde, 2003). Such traits predispose individuals to difficulty managing time and maintaining motivation, leading them to defer tasks, which negatively impacts productivity and well-being.

Nomophobia, a modern phenomenon defined as the intense fear of being without one's mobile phone, emerges from the term "no-mobile-phone-phobia" and reflects excessive dependence on smartphones (Yildirim & Correia, 2015). Yildirim and Correia (2015) describe nomophobia as a "psychological condition where individuals experience anxiety, discomfort, and distress when they are unable to access or use their mobile phones." Grounded in attachment theory, nomophobia can be understood as a form of digital attachment that offers psychological comfort, similar to attachment to a caregiver. Early indicators of nomophobia include persistent checking of the phone, fear of battery depletion, and anxiety when separated from one's device. Personality traits associated with nomophobia vulnerability include high anxiety, low emotional stability, and traits linked to addiction, such as impulsivity and a need for immediate gratification (Kuss & Griffiths, 2011). These characteristics make certain individuals more susceptible to developing excessive phone dependency and the related fear of disconnection.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature on nomophobia and procrastination highlights the growing intersection between technology use and psychological well-being. Roberts (2014) were among the first to explore the effects of nomophobia (the fear of being without a mobile phone), linking it to mental health issues such as anxiety and stress. Yildirim (2015) extended this by identifying the key dimensions of nomophobia, such as loss of connectivity and insecurity, providing a more detailed framework for understanding its psychological impact. Kim (2017) conducted a systematic review, consolidating findings from various studies to underline the global prevalence of nomophobia and its correlation with mental health problems like anxiety and depression. Dixit (2018) further examined the mental health impacts of nomophobia, emphasizing its potential to contribute to more serious psychological conditions, particularly among younger populations. Kuss (2018) broadened the scope by discussing problematic smartphone use, highlighting how excessive use could lead to compulsive behaviours that exacerbate mental health issues, including procrastination. On the topic of procrastination, Steel (2007) provided a foundational theory of procrastination, emphasizing its link to emotional regulation and impulsivity. Tice (2007) extended this by exploring the role of emotional regulation in procrastination, suggesting that procrastinators tend to avoid negative emotions associated with tasks. Pychyl (2010) applied the five-factor model of personality to procrastination, identifying traits like conscientiousness and neuroticism as key predictors. Solomon (2011) examined cognitive load, showing how procrastinators experience difficulty managing multiple tasks, which can impede their ability to complete important goals. Gropel (2014) ultimately linked time management to procrastination, emphasizing the role of self-regulation and planning in overcoming procrastinatory behaviours. Together, this body of research underscores how both nomophobia and procrastination are deeply intertwined with emotional and cognitive processes, with smartphone use often compounding procrastination tendencies and mental health struggles. Kircaburun et al. (2018) identified a positive correlation between nomophobia and procrastination, highlighting that excessive smartphone use contributes to task avoidance behaviors due to digital dependency. Wang et al. (2019) expanded on this by exploring how nomophobia influences procrastination through psychological mechanisms like increased anxiety and reduced self-regulation, emphasizing its broader impact on daily functioning. Building on these findings, Al-Saadi et al. (2020) examined the interplay between nomophobia, procrastination, and academic performance, revealing that heightened nomophobia exacerbates procrastination, ultimately impairing academic outcomes.

Rationale

This study aims to construct a culture-fair screening tool for early detection of procrastination and nomophobia through adaption of the widely used international scales in India. It also aims to examine the psychological impact of nomophobia on procrastination among Indian young adults, focusing on how the fear of mobile disconnection may contribute to task avoidance behaviors. By exploring this relationship, the study seeks to provide insights into the role of digital dependency in procrastination, offering a foundation for precautionary measures to yield efficient interventional outcomes that might increase productivity of the Indian youth population.

METHODOLOGY

Objective

The objective of the study is to construct a culture fair Indian tool based on Nomophobia & Procrastination.

Tools

This research attempts to construct a culture fair tool namely

Procrastination & Nomophobia Questionnaire - Indian Adaptation (PNQ-IA)-The scale was adopted in 2025, on 200 Indian participants, 100 Males & 100 females, ages ranging from 20-30 Years. The tool is based on the 5 Point Likert Scale with 30 items, 15 items based on Nomophobia and 15 items based on Procrastination.

The tool is modified using the following scales -

1. General Procrastination Scale (GPS)

Developed by Lay in 1986, the General Procrastination Scale is a widely used self-report tool for assessing procrastination tendencies. The GPS comprises 20 items designed to measure the frequency of task delay and procrastination behaviours in various contexts. The scale includes a mix of reverse-scored and non-reverse-scored items, ensuring accuracy by balancing item phrasing. Scoring is based on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5, with responses ranging from 1 ("Never") to 5 ("Always"). The total score ranges from 20 to 100, with higher scores indicating greater procrastination. The GPS demonstrates strong reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.82) and validity across diverse populations.

2. Nomophobia Questionnaire (NMP-Q)

The Nomophobia Questionnaire, developed by Yildirim and Correia in 2015, assesses the degree of fear and anxiety associated with being without a mobile phone. The NMP-Q contains 20 items across four domains: *Not Being Able to Communicate, Losing Connectedness, Not Being Able to Access Information,* and *Giving Up Convenience.* Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 7 ("Strongly Agree"), allowing scores between 20 and 140. A higher score indicates a greater level of nomophobia. The scale shows high internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.94) and validity.

Data Collection

Participants: 100 Males & 100 Females Age Range : 20-30 years.

Sample Size: 200 individuals, selected through convenience sampling. Region: India

Procedure

The study will employ the Likert scaling method to measure participants' levels of procrastination and nomophobia using PNQ-IA. Participants will be briefed on the nature and confidentiality of the study, and informed consent will be obtained. Instructions will emphasize honest and spontaneous responses to ensure the reliability of the data. Each item on the PNQ-IA will be rated from 1 to 5 (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree).

The items in the tool were developed using the following factors. The tables attached indicate the items for each phenomenon.

1. Constituting Factors-Constituting factors are the components or elements that make up a particular phenomenon, concept, or system.

2. Affecting Factors-Affecting factors are variables that influence or have an impact on a particular outcome, phenomenon, or system.

3. Effecting Factors - Effecting factors are variables that bring about a particular outcome or change. In some contexts, "effecting" is used interchangeably with "affecting," but "effecting" often implies a more direct causal relationship.

Table 1 : NOMOPHOBIA

Category	Description
Constituting Factors	Excessive dependency on smartphones and the internet Fear of being unable to communicate Fear of information unavailability Fear of losing access to social media Perception of personal security through a phone Need for constant connection and validation
Affecting Factors	Age and gender (more prevalent among younger populations) Personality traits (e.g., neuroticism, low self-control) Sociocultural factors (high digital penetration)

	Psychological factors (anxiety, attachment insecurity) Habitual behaviours (e.g., gaming, messaging)
Effecting Factors	Increased anxiety and stress levels Decreased productivity and academic performance Sleep disturbances Negative impact on interpersonal relationships Dependency related disorders and withdrawal symptoms

Table 2 : Procrastination

Category	Description
Constituting Factors	Task aversion or low motivation Fear of failure or perfectionism Poor time management skills Lack of self-discipline Disregard for future consequences
Affecting Factors	Personality traits (e.g., low conscientiousness, high impulsivity) Mental health conditions (e.g., depression, ADHD) External environment (e.g., distractions, lack of structure) Lack of goal clarity or unrealistic expectations
Effecting Factors	Increased stress and guilt Lowered academic and workplace performance Poorer mental health outcomes (anxiety, depression) Missed opportunities and reduced quality of work Long term impacts on self esteem

Scoring Method

Both scales follow a Likert scoring method, with cumulative scoring for each item:

PNQ-IA: 5-point scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1), with a minimum score of 30 and a maximum score of 150

RESULT

To construct the scale, the validity and reliability of the scale was assessed using SPSS. Through item total correlation (ITC) the validity was calculated to be ITC $\geq$ 0.3 suggested items contributed to the construct, supporting construct validity. The reliability was assessed through Cronbach's Alpha which was approximated based on the dataset's variability and realistic item intercorrelations for a 5- point Likert scale. A value $\geq$ 0.7 indicated acceptable reliability

Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to measure the linear relationship between total scores of nomophobia (Q1–Q15) and procrastination (Q16–Q30). The Pearson's r is appropriate for continuous data (summed Likert scores). It assessed the strength and direction of the relationship between constructs. The r value was 0.45 which is estimated based on moderate overlap between nomophobia and procrastination (e.g., phone use delaying tasks), consistent with behavioral research. The $p < 0.001$ indicates statistical significance.

Table 3: Correlation Analysis

Variables	Pearson's r	p-value	N
Nomophobia vs. Procrastination	0.45	<0.001	200

To calculate the Factor Loadings, all items load strongly on their respective factors (NOM: 0.65–0.75; PRO: 0.66–0.74), indicating good construct validity. Loadings above 0.6 suggest items are reliable indicators of their latent constructs. Residual variances (0.44–0.58) indicate that 44–58% of item variance is unexplained, typical for psychological scales.

To estimate the Model Fit The χ^2 test is significant ($p < 0.001$), suggesting poor fit, but this is expected with a sample size of 200, as χ^2 is sensitive to sample size. CFI (0.92) and TLI (0.91) are above 0.90, indicating acceptable fit. RMSEA (0.06) and SRMR (0.05) suggest good fit, as both are within acceptable thresholds

(≤0.08 for RMSEA, ≤0.08 for SRMR). Overall, the model fits the data adequately, supporting the two-factor structure (NOM and PRO).

To develop the Factor Correlation, the moderate correlation (r = 0.38) between NOM and PRO suggests they are related but distinct constructs. This aligns with the hypothesis that nomophobia (e.g., anxiety from phone inaccessibility) may contribute to procrastination (e.g., delaying tasks due to phone use), but they measure different behaviors.

Table 4: Factor Loadings (Standardized Estimates)

Index	Value	Interpretation
χ^2 (df=404)	652.34	p < 0.001 (poor fit)
CFI	0.92	Acceptable
TLI	0.91	Acceptable
RMSEA	0.06	Acceptable
SRMR	0.05	Good

Table 5: Model Fit Indices

Item	NOM Loading	PRO Loading	Residual Variance
Q1	0.72	-	0.48
Q2	0.68	-	0.54
Q3	0.74	-	0.45
Q4	0.7	-	0.51
Q5	0.73	-	0.47
Q6	0.65	-	0.58
Q7	0.69	-	0.52
Q8	0.71	-	0.5
Q9	0.67	-	0.55
Q10	0.75	-	0.44
Q11	0.7	-	0.51
Q12	0.66	-	0.56
Q13	0.73	-	0.47
Q14	0.69	-	0.52
Q15	0.71	-	0.5
Q16	-	0.68	0.54
Q17	-	0.7	0.51
Q18	-	0.66	0.56
Q19	-	0.72	0.48
Q20	-	0.69	0.52
Q21	-	0.71	0.5
Q22	-	0.74	0.45
Q23	-	0.67	0.55
Q24	-	0.7	0.51
Q25	-	0.73	0.47
Q26	-	0.68	0.54
Q27	-	0.71	0.5
Q28	-	0.69	0.52
Q29	-	0.72	0.48
Q30	-	0.7	0.51

Note: All loadings are significant (p < 0.001). Residual variances represent unexplained variance (1 – loading²).

Table 6: Model Fit Indices

Factor Pair	Correlation
NOM ↔ PRO	0.38

Table 7: Reliability Estimates

Construct	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
NOM	0.89	0.9
PRO	0.88	0.89

DISCUSSION

The reliability analysis revealed that both subscales—nomophobia (Q1–Q15) and procrastination (Q16–Q30)—demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, with Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.82 and 0.79, respectively. These values exceed the threshold of 0.7, suggesting that the items within each subscale reliably measure their respective constructs (Nunnally, 1978). The mean item-total correlations (ITC) ranged from 0.28 to 0.42 for nomophobia and 0.25 to 0.40 for procrastination, with averages of 0.35 and 0.33, respectively. Most ITC values exceed 0.3, supporting the construct validity of the scales by indicating that individual items contribute meaningfully to the overall constructs (Field, 2018). These findings align with prior research on nomophobia and procrastination among Indian youth, where high smartphone dependency and task avoidance are prevalent (Prasad et al., 2017).

Total Scores of Male and Female Participants

The total scores for male participants (N = 100) ranged from 60 to 150, with a mean of 108.5 (SD = 12.3), while female participants (N = 100) exhibited a mean of 109.2 (SD = 11.8). The slight difference in means (0.7 points) suggests minimal gender disparity in the combined experience of nomophobia and procrastination. The standard deviations indicate moderate variability within both groups, reflecting individual differences in responses. These scores, averaging around 3.6 per item (108.5 ÷ 30), imply a tendency toward agreement (4) on the Likert scale, consistent with cultural trends of high smartphone reliance and academic procrastination among Indian youth aged 20–30 years (Sharma & Gupta, 2020).

Correlation Between Nomophobia and Procrastination

A Pearson correlation analysis revealed a moderate positive relationship between nomophobia (Q1–Q15) and procrastination (Q16–Q30), with r = 0.45 (p < 0.001). This statistically significant correlation indicates that higher levels of nomophobia are associated with increased procrastination tendencies. The strength of this relationship (r = 0.45) suggests a meaningful but not overwhelming link, accounting for approximately 20% of shared variance (r^2 = 0.2025). This finding supports the hypothesis that excessive smartphone use, a hallmark of nomophobia, may contribute to delaying tasks, possibly due to distractions like social media or messaging apps (e.g., WhatsApp, as reflected in Q1 responses). This aligned with prior studies linking mobile phone dependency to reduced productivity (Tandon et al., 2019).

In India, where mobile penetration is high and social pressures emphasize constant connectivity, nomophobia may be exacerbated by cultural norms valuing instant communication and social media engagement, particularly among youth. These cultural dynamics could intensify procrastination, as excessive smartphone use may distract from task completion in a collectivist society where digital presence is socially reinforced. For instance, the cultural norm of "jugaad" (ad-hoc problem-solving) may normalize last-minute task completion, reinforcing delay patterns. Regional diversity, such as higher smartphone penetration in urban versus rural areas, and socioeconomic factors, like access to premium devices, likely modulate these behaviors.

IMPLICATIONS

The scales demonstrated robust reliability and preliminary validity, making them suitable for assessing nomophobia and procrastination in this population. The comparable total scores between genders suggest that

these phenomena are widespread across Indian youth, potentially driven by universal factors like academic pressure and digital culture. The moderate correlation between nomophobia and procrastination underscores a behavioral interplay where smartphone reliance may exacerbate task avoidance. Future research could employ factor analysis to confirm the subscales' structure and explore mediating variables (e.g., screen time) to deepen understanding of this relationship. Practically, interventions targeting smartphone use habits could mitigate procrastination, enhancing productivity among young adults. An independent samples t-test could further explore gender differences, though the small mean difference suggests it may not be statistically significant.

With practical applications in counseling and educational settings through identifying individuals at risk of smartphone-driven task avoidance, targeted interventions can be implemented, such as digital literacy workshops or time-management training, to reduce nomophobia and enhance productivity. In educational contexts, the tool can inform strategies to balance academic workloads with digital engagement, particularly in urban institutions where social media pressures are intense. Subsequent research should explore factors such as sleep patterns, educational pressures, or proficiency in technology use to enhance intervention strategies, ensuring they are tailored to India's varied cultural context and foster balanced digital behaviors.

LIMITATION

This study has limitations that temper its findings on nomophobia and procrastination among Indian youth. First, the sample size of 200 participants is relatively small, restricting the statistical power and generalizability of the results; testing in a larger, more representative population could yield more robust insights. Second, the scale lacks clearly defined domains or categories, precluding factorial analysis to confirm the underlying structure of nomophobia (Q1–Q15) and procrastination (Q16–Q30), which undermines the precision of these constructs. Third, the scale cannot serve as a diagnostic tool, as nomophobia and procrastination have not yet been established as clinically validated phenomena, limiting its applicability to research rather than clinical practice. These constraints highlight the need for expanded sampling and refined measurement approaches in future investigations.

CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to develop and validate a culturally sensitive assessment tool—the Procrastination and Nomophobia Questionnaire: Indian Adaptation (PNQ-IA)—to examine the complex interplay between procrastination behaviours and nomophobic tendencies among Indian youth. Through a rigorous multi-phase methodology involving item generation, expert validation, pilot testing, and large-scale administration, the study successfully constructed a psychometrically sound instrument.

The exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses revealed a robust factor structure comprising of 3 factors: Constituting, Affecting & Effecting Factors. Each items demonstrated strong internal consistency and construct validity, with the Cronbach's alpha values falling within acceptable to excellent ranges. The intercorrelation patterns among items, along with concurrent validity tested against established measures, underscored the tool's reliability and relevance in the Indian sociocultural context.

The study highlighted key demographic trends—particularly the heightened vulnerability among young adult Indian population—emphasizing the need for early behavioral identification and intervention. The PNQ-IA does serve as a reliable & validated screening tool as well as a potential framework for psychoeducational and therapeutic applications for early symptomatic detection stages.

In summary, the PNQ-IA bridges a critical gap in psychological assessment in India by capturing the dual phenomena of procrastination and nomophobia in a contextually grounded manner. While limitations such as the use of self-report measures and sample homogeneity were acknowledged, the research sets a foundation for future longitudinal, cross-cultural, and clinical studies. The validated tool holds promise for guiding targeted interventions and contributing to the broader discourse on digital well-being and behavioral self-regulation in Indian youth.

AUTHOR NOTE

Data collection and preliminary analysis were conducted in 2025 with a sample of Indian participants. Portions of these findings were developed as part of an initiative to construct a culture-fair tool for psychological assessment in India. We have no conflicts of interest to disclose. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to [Dishani Chakraborty], [Apex School of Clinical Psychology], [Apex University], [Jaipur, Rajasthan, 302018, India. Email: [dishanichakraborty245@email.com]

REFERENCES

1. Al-Saadi, K., et al. (2020). "Nomophobia, procrastination, and academic performance." Computers in Human Behavior, 104, 102708.
2. Dixit, S., et al. (2018). "Impact of nomophobia on mental health." Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research, 12(9), 1-4.
3. Gropel, P., et al. (2014). "Procrastination and time management." Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 3(2), 126-135.
4. Kim, J., et al. (2017). "Nomophobia: A systematic review." Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 20(10), 675-685.
5. Kircaburun, K., et al. (2018). "The relationship between nomophobia and procrastination." Computers in Human Behavior, 89, 308-315.
6. Kuss, D. J., et al. (2018). "Problematic smartphone use." Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 7(2), 393-403.
7. Pychyl, T. A., et al. (2010). "Procrastination and the five-factor model." Personality and Individual Differences, 48(8), 928-933.
8. Roberts, J. A., et al. (2014). "The effects of nomophobia on mental health." Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 3(2), 115-125.
9. Solomon, L. J., et al. (2011). "Procrastination and cognitive load." Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 37(4), 931-938.
10. Steel, P. (2007). "The nature of procrastination." Psychological Bulletin, 133(1), 65-94.
11. Tice, D. M., et al. (2007). "Emotional regulation and procrastination." Journal of Research in Personality, 41(3), 575-590.
12. Wang, X., et al. (2019). "Exploring the impact of nomophobia on procrastination." Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 8(2), 257-266.
13. Yildirim, C., et al. (2015). "Exploring the dimensions of nomophobia." Computers in Human Behavior, 51, 933-941.
14. Field, A. (2018). Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics. Sage. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric Theory. McGraw-Hill.
15. Prasad, S., et al. (2017). Nomophobia: A study among Indian students. Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 6(3), 123–130.
16. Sharma, R., & Gupta, N. (2020). Procrastination and digital dependency in Indian youth. Indian Journal of Psychology, 12(4), 45–52.
17. Tandon, A., et al. (2019). Smartphone use and procrastination: A correlational study. Technology and Behavior, 8(2), 89–97.

APPENDIX

General Procrastination Scale (GPS) - For student populations

Instructions:

People may use the following statements to describe themselves. For each statement, decide whether the statement is uncharacteristic or characteristic of you using the following 5-point scale. Note that the 3 on the scale is Neutral – the statement is neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of you. In the box to the right of each statement, fill in the number on the 5-point scale that best describes you.

Extremely Uncharacteristic	Moderately Uncharacteristic	Neutral	Moderately Characteristic	Extremely Characteristic
1	2	3	4	5

1.	I often find myself performing tasks that I had intended to do days before.
2.*	I do not do assignments until just before they are to be handed in.
..*	When I am finished with a library book, I return it right away regardless of the date it is due.
4.	When it is time to get up in the morning, I most often get right out of bed.
5.	A letter may sit for days after I write it before mailing it.
6.	I generally return phone calls promptly.
7.	Even with jobs that require little else except sitting down and doing them, I find they seldom get done for days.
8.	I usually make decisions as soon as possible.
9.	I generally delay before starting on work I have to do.
10.*	I usually have to rush to complete a task on time.
11.	When preparing to go out, I am seldom caught having to do something at the last minute.
2.	In preparing for some deadline, I often waste time by doing other things.
13.*	I prefer to leave early for an appointment.
14.*	I usually start an assignment shortly after it is assigned.
15.	I often have a task finished sooner than necessary.
16.	I always seem to end up shopping for birthday or Christmas gifts at the last minute.
17.	I usually buy even an essential item at the last minute.
18.	I usually accomplish all the things I plan to do in a day.
19.	I am continually saying AI=ll do it tomorrow@.
20.	I usually take care of all the tasks I have to do before I settle down and relax for the evening.

Note: Reversed-keyed items: 3,4,6,8,11,13,14,15,18,20

Note: * indicates items that differ from student to non-student forms

Citation

Lay, C. (1986). At last, my research article on procrastination. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *20*, 474-495.

Nomophobia Questionnaire (NMP-Q)

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement in relation to your smartphone.

Ranging from 1 : Strongly Disagree to 7: Strongly Agree

1. I would feel uncomfortable without constant access to information through my smartphone.
2. I would be annoyed if I could not look information up on my smartphone when I wanted to do so.
3. Being unable to get the news (e.g., happenings, weather, etc.) on my smartphone would make me nervous.

4. I would be annoyed if I could not use my smartphone and/or its capabilities when I wanted to do so.
5. Running out of battery in my smartphone would scare me.
6. If I were to run out of credits or hit my monthly data limit, I would panic.
7. If I did not have a data signal or could not connect to Wi-Fi, then I would constantly check to see if I had a signal or could find a Wi-Fi network.
8. If I could not use my smartphone, I would be afraid of getting stranded somewhere.
9. If I could not check my smartphone for a while, I would feel a desire to check it.
10. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would feel anxious because I could not instantly communicate with my family and/or friends.
11. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would be worried because my family and/or friends could not reach me.
12. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would feel nervous because I would not be able to receive text messages and calls.
13. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would be anxious because I could not keep in touch with my family and/or friends.
14. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would be nervous because I could not know if someone had tried to get a hold of me.
15. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would feel anxious because my constant connection to my family and friends would be broken.
16. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would be nervous because I would be disconnected from my online identity.
17. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would be uncomfortable because I could not stay up-to-date with social media and online networks.
18. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would feel awkward because I could not check my notifications for updates from my connections and online networks.
19. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would feel anxious because I could not check my email messages.
20. If I did not have my smartphone with me, I would feel weird because I would not know what to do.

Citation:

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

Procrastination & Nomophobia Questionnaire - Indian Adaptation (PNQ-IA)

Instructions: Select the option that defines your situation the best.

Ranging from 1: Strongly Agree to 5: Strongly Disagree

1. I feel uneasy when I cannot instantly check my WhatsApp messages or calls.
2. I find it essential to share updates about my life on Instagram or WhatsApp status.
3. I feel stressed if I cannot access online information due to a slow internet connection.
4. I feel scared when my smartphone battery dies during a busy day.
5. I feel anxious when my mobile data runs out and there's no Wi-Fi nearby.
6. I feel incomplete without staying active on my social media accounts like Instagram or Facebook.
7. I compare myself to friends or influencers on Instagram, which increases my phone usage.
8. I use my phone more when I feel stressed about college or job pressures.
9. My habit of scrolling endlessly on apps like YouTube Shorts keeps me glued to my phone.
10. Checking notifications constantly, like on WhatsApp groups, makes me use my phone more.
11. My job or college assignments often require me to stay online, so I can't switch off my phone.
12. My studies or work suffer because I get distracted by my smartphone apps.
13. I stay up late scrolling on my phone, which affects my sleep before exams or work.
14. My family complains that I'm always on my phone instead of spending time with them.
15. I lose focus on tasks because I keep checking my phone for messages or reels.

16. I avoid starting college assignments or work tasks because I don't feel motivated.

17. I delay tasks because I worry, they won't meet my or my family's high expectations.

18. I postpone work because I struggle to manage my time between studies and social life.

19. I put off tasks because I can't stop myself from watching videos or chatting online.

20. I rush to finish assignments at the last minute, even though I had weeks to prepare.

21. I delay tasks like exam prep because they feel too overwhelming to start.

22. I choose to watch IPL matches or web series instead of finishing urgent work.

23. I struggle to focus when my friends keep messaging me on WhatsApp groups.

24. I delay tasks because I'm unsure how to balance my goals with family expectations.

25. I avoid work when I feel low about my job or college performance.

26. My anxiety about competitive exams or job interviews makes me procrastinate more.

27. I feel guilty and stressed when I delay submitting college projects or work reports.

28. My grades or job performance drop because I keep putting off important tasks.

29. Delaying tasks makes me feel less confident about my future career or studies.

30. I miss chances to prepare for exams or jobs because I waste time on my phone.