IJAAR PUBLISHING®

International Journal of Advanced Academic Research | ISSN: 2488-9849
Vol. 11, Issue 7 (2025) | www.ijaar.org

TECHNOLOGY-FREE ZONES, DUMB-PHONES, AND DO-NOT-DISTURB MODE: EVALUATING LOW-TECH STRATEGIES FOR DIGITAL DETOXIFICATION AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Onah, Lilian Chinenye, Ph.D
lilian_onah@uniport.edu.ng
Department of Curriculum Studies and Educational Technology,
University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

&

Mabel Uchechukwu-Amadi U., Ph.D
mabel_uchechukwu-amadi@uniport.edu.ng,
mabel.uchechukwu-amadi@iaue.edu.ng
Department of Educational Technology, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education,
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

Abstract

This study investigated the implementation of technology-free zones, basic mobile phones, and do-not-disturb mode as low-tech approaches for digital detoxification among university students in Rivers State. The research employed a descriptive survey approach, focusing on a population of 8,751 students from the Faculty of Education across three public colleges in Rivers State. The multistage sampling method was employed to select a sample size of two thousand one hundred thirty-seven (2137) fourth-year students for the study. The data collection instrument was a self-structured questionnaire entitled: Technology-Free Zones, Dumb-Phones, and Do-Not-Disturb Mode: Evaluating Low-Tech Strategies for Digital Detoxification Questionnaire (TDDELTSDDQ). The instrument was validated by three specialists. The instrument's reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha, resulting in a coefficient of 0.89. The data was examined utilising descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Mean and standard deviation were employed to address the study issues, whereas the hypotheses were evaluated by Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The post-hoc analysis was employed after the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test to identify particular variations among the means of the three groups. The analysis was conducted using version 25 of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) at a significance level of 0.05. The study's findings indicated that the majority of pupils utilise do-not-disturb settings, technology-free zones, and basic phones as a digital detoxification approach to a minimal amount. The research determined that the adoption of digital detoxification measures is very minimal among students at public universities in Rivers State. Consequently, the study advised that lecturers at public institutions in Rivers State should instruct students on more effective digital detoxification procedures to diminish dependence on do-not-disturb mode, thereby fostering a healthy equilibrium between technology use and human well-being. The administration of public universities in Rivers State should contemplate offering courses or seminars on alternative digital detoxification procedures for students who predominantly depend on a single method, thereby broadening their alternatives and enhancing their general well-being.

Keywords: Digital Detoxification, **Low-Tech Strategies**, **Technology-Free Zones**, **Dumb Phones**, **Do-Not-Disturb Mode**

Onah, L. C, & Uchechukwu-Amadi, M. U. (2025). Technology-Free Zones, Dumb-Phones, and Do-Not-Disturb Mode: Evaluating Low-Tech Strategies for Digital Detoxification among University Students. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research. 11*(7), 59-69. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16490494

Introduction

The act of temporarily shunning digital technology and connections is now called "digital detoxification" by some groups. It means turning off phones, iPads, computers, TVs, and social media. Digital detoxing is often discussed as a strategy to focus on real-life issues. Short-term breaks from digital gadgets can help people cope with the stress of always being connected and prevent dependence. After a detox, students may focus on their schoolwork without distractions like telephones. Technology and device use can harm your body, psyche, social life, and schooling, according to some experts (Scott, 2019). Technology addiction isn't a formal illness. Immersion, periodic, social media, destination, and content fasts are all approaches to detox digitally. All digital devices must be eliminated from daily life for digital detox immersion. Whoever wants to assess their dependence on technology and digital information can do a digital detox. A protracted detox phase is needed to effectively understand and apply its effects.

Numerous apps cover games, education, business, finance, entertainment, and social networking. Each app is designed to keep us active and in touch. In the classroom and at student projects or research activities, the App-Attack strategy might be effective. Students can focus on the topic or project. Morgan (2017) states App-Attack helps you detach, reconnect, stay focused, live a healthy and balanced life, and avoid technology addiction. Another digital detox method is to avoid using your phone during lectures. This allows students to concentrate. To help the person focus, concentrate, and stay awake, limit internet access on mobile phones and other devices periodically. Overusing technology and the internet can also make people less active.

Digital gadgets have increased due to COVID-19, making people more dependent on online education. According to Dhull and Sakshi (2017), online learning uses computers and the internet to provide students with educational materials and lessons.Online students depend on mobile technology and internet connection, making them vulnerable to our uncertain digital world. Tech-savvy kids are nevertheless at risk of overusing the internet and cyberbullying, phishing, identity theft, and sexual exploitation. "Digital immigrants," who grew up before the internet, make decisions and instruct "digital natives." The way people learn and teach online may change unintentionally. Digital natives were born after schools adopted technology, according to Prensky (2001). People born after 1980. Researchers Helsper and Eynon (2009) believe that 1980–1990 births are the first digital natives.

But experts are concerned about how kids, especially college students, misuse their phones. Students spend too much time on their phones, which harms their grades. Students' use of cell phones for social media, web browsing, watching films, playing games, taking unauthorised photos, and other non-academic activities, as reported by Jacobson and Forste (2011). Morgan (2017) noted that students use their phones as a "quick fix" for problems and information, which hinders their professional thinking. Teachers and others are concerned about students using their phones for non-academic purposes during lectures. These detoxifying procedures and initiatives will benefitstudents, instructors, and school administrators. These increase university students' academic performance and health.

Statement of the Problem

According to Kemp (2023), social media users are growing at an annual rate of 13%. It is anticipated that the utilisation of digital tools and the number of people who utilise them will continue to expand in tandem with the rapid development of digital technology.On the other hand, dependence on these devices to an excessive degree has been connected to several

unfavourable outcomes, such as decreased productivity, poor social skills, and negative impacts on mental health. A planned period during which persons stop using electronic gadgets is referred to as "digital detoxification," and it is a concept that has arisen as a response to the issues that have been presented. Although there is a growing awareness of the significance of digital detox techniques, there is still a lack of detailed studies on these particular practices. Therefore, this study sought to investigate the use of technology-free zones, dumb-phones, and do-not-disturb mode as low-tech strategies for digital detoxification among university students

Aim and Objectives of the Study

1. Find out the degree to which Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State.

2. Ascertain the level to which Faculty of Education students exploit the use oftechnology-free zones as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State.

3. Determine the extent to which Faculty of Education students utilise dumb-phones as a digital detoxification strategyin public Universities in Rivers State.

Research Questions

In line with the objectives of the study, the following research questions guided the study:

1. To what degree do Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State?

2. To what level do Faculty of Education students exploit the use of technology-free zones as a digital detoxification strategyin public Universities in Rivers State?

3. To what extent do Faculty of Education students utilise dumb-phones as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State?

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in the degree to which Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification strategy across the three public Universities in Rivers State.

2. There is no significant difference in the level to which Faculty of Education students exploit the use of technology-free zones as a digital detoxification strategy across the three public Universities in Rivers State.

3. There is no significant difference in the extent of utilisation of dumb-phones as a digital detoxification strategy among Faculty of Education students across the three public Universities in Rivers State.

Methodology

With a population of 8751 students in the Faculties of Education in three public universities in Rivers State, this study adopted a descriptive survey design. This sample size included 2,137 400-level undergraduate students. This represents 24.4% of the study population. The sample for this study was selected using multistage sampling. The 23 education departments of three public universities were selected using stratified sampling in the first round. The study selected 2,137 400-level students using simple random sampling in the final step. The instrument for data collection was a self-structured questionnaire titled: Technology-Free

Zones, Dumb-Phones, and Do-Not-Disturb Mode: Evaluating Low-Tech Strategies for Digital Detoxification Questionnaire (TDDELTSDDQ). The questionnaire had two sections. Section A collected respondents' institutions and gender demographics. Section B examined research questions. The measure used a 4-point modified Likert scale: VHE, HE, LE, and VLE. When the estimated mean score is larger than the criterion mean of 2.50, it is termed high extent, and when it is less than 2.50, it is low extent. The instrument was validated by three experts. The instrument was reliable according to Cronbach Alpha, which yielded a reliability coefficient of0.89.This data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Research questions were answered using mean and standard deviations.The hypotheses were evaluated with ANOVA at 0.05 significance. Post hoc analysis was utilised following an ANOVA test to identify differences between the three group means. SPSS 25 was utilised for analysis.

Results

Research Question One: To what degree do Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State?

Table 1: Mean rating and standard deviation of the degree to which Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State

S/N	Items	Respondents (n=2137)		
		$\bar{x}$	SD	Decision
.1	How often do you use the do-not-disturb mode on your digital devices?	2.29	0.90	LD
.2	To what extent do you use do-not-disturb mode during your study hours?	2.22	0.97	LD
.3	How often do you use do-not-disturb mode during your leisure time to engage in offline activities	2.20	0.94	LD
.4	To what extent do you use do-not-disturb mode during certain times of the day (e.g., before bedtime)?	1.74	0.79	VLD
.5	How often do you use do-not-disturb mode to reduce interruptions from notifications?	2.00	0.89	LD
.6	To what extent do you use do-not-disturb mode to improve your focus and productivity?	2.14	0.73	LD
.7	How often do you use do-not-disturb mode to manage your technology use?	1.84	0.84	VLD
.8	To what extent do you find do-not-disturb mode effective in reducing your screen time?	2.10	0.81	LD
.9	How often do you recommend do-not-disturb mode to your peers as a digital detoxification strategy?	1.84	0.87	VLD
.10	To what extent do you plan to continue using do-not-disturb mode in the future as a part of your digital detoxification strategy?	2.17	0.78	LD
	Grand mean	**2.05**	**0.85**	

Criterion Mean = 2.50, Mean: 1.0-1.99 = VLD, 2.0-2.49=LD, 2.5-2.99 = HD, 3.00-4.00=VHD.

Table 1 shows how often Rivers State public university Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode for digital detoxification. Most respondents scored items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10 as “Low Degree,” with mean values between 2.0 and 2.49. Finally, most respondents evaluated items 4, 7, and 9 as “Very Low Degree,” with mean ratings below 2.5 and between

1.0-1.99. The mean of 2.05 for all responders implies that most Rivers State public university Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode for digital detoxification to a limited level.

Research Question Two: To what level do Faculty of Education students exploit the use of technology-free zones as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State?

Table 2: Mean rating and standard deviation of the level to which Faculty of Education students exploit the use of technology-free zones as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State

S/N	Items	Respondents (n=2137)		
		$\bar{x}$	SD	Decision
.11	How often do you designate certain areas as technology-free zones?	2.41	0.87	LE
.12	To what extent do you respect and adhere to the rules of technology-free zones?	2.40	0.96	LE
.13	How often do you use technology-free zones to reduce your screen time?	2.33	0.91	LE
.14	To what extent do you find technology-free zones effective in managing your technology use	1.80	0.86	VLE
.15	How often do you use technology-free zones to improve your focus and productivity?	2.03	0.91	LE
.16	To what extent do you use technology-free zones to engage in face-to-face social interactions?	2.44	1.00	LE
.17	How often do you recommend technology-free zones to your peers as a digital detoxification strategy?	2.21	1.23	LE
.18	To what extent do you plan to continue using technology-free zones in the future as a part of your digital detoxification strategy?	2.49	1.08	LE
.19	How often do you feel the need for more technology-free zones in your university?	2.13	1.13	LE
.20	To what extent do you believe that technology-free zones contribute to a healthier digital lifestyle?	2.32	0.97	LE
	Grand Mean	**2.26**	**0.99**	

Criterion Mean = 2.50, Mean: 1.0-1.99 = VLE, 2.0-2.49=LE, 2.5-2.99 = HE, 3.00-4.00=VHE.

Table 2 shows how Rivers State public university Faculty of Education students use technology-free zones for digital detoxification. Most respondents evaluated items 11, 12, 13, and 15-20 as "Low Extent," with mean scores between 2.0-2.49. Finally, most respondents ranked item 14 as "Very Low Extent," with mean scores between 1.0 and 1.99, below the criterion mean of 2.5. The mean of 2.26 for all responses reveals that most Rivers State public university Faculty of Education students use technology-free zones for digital detoxification to a limited extent.

Research Question Three: To what extent do Faculty of Education students utilize dumb-phones as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State?

Table 3: Mean rating and standard deviation of the extent to which Faculty of Education students utilize dumb-phones as a digital detoxification strategy in public Universities in Rivers State

S/N	Items	Respondents (n=2137)		
		$\bar{x}$	SD	Decision
.21	How often do you use a dumb-phone (basic phone without internet access) as a part of your digital detoxification strategy?	2.37	1.05	LE
.22	To what extent do you find using a dumb-phone effective in reducing your screen time?	2.36	1.15	LE
.23	How often do you use a dumb-phone to avoid distractions from social media notifications?	2.33	1.10	LE
.24	To what extent do you use a dumb-phone to improve your focus and productivity?	1.66	1.00	VLE
.25	How often do you use a dumb-phone to manage your technology use?	1.87	1.05	VLE
.26	To what extent do you find using a dumb-phone helpful in improving your sleep quality?	2.11	0.85	LE
.27	How often do you recommend using a dumb-phone to your peers as a digital detoxification strategy?	1.76	1.02	VLE
.28	To what extent do you plan to continue using a dumb-phone in the future as a part of your digital detoxification strategy?	2.19	0.97	LE
.29	How often do you feel the need for a break from smart devices and switch to a dumb-phone?	1.91	1.03	VLE
.30	To what extent do you believe that using a dumb-phone contributes to a healthier digital lifestyle?	2.24	0.96	LE
	Grand mean	**2.08**	**1.02**	

Criterion Mean = 2.50, Mean: 1.0-1.99 = VLE, 2.0-2.49=LE, 2.5-2.99 = HE, 3.00-4.00=VHE.

Table 3 shows how often Rivers State public university Faculty of Education students use dumb phones for digital detoxification. Most respondents evaluated items 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, and 30 as “Low Extent,” with mean values between 2.0 and 2.49. Finally, most respondents evaluated items 24, 25, 27, and 29 as "Very Low Extent," with mean scores below 2.5, precisely 1.0 to 1.99. The mean of 2.08 for all responders implies that most Rivers State public university Faculty of Education students use dumbphones for digital detoxing to a limited extent.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference in the degree to which Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification strategy across the three public Universities in Rivers State.

Table 4.a: Summary of ANOVA on the difference in the degree to which Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification strategy across the three public Universities in Rivers State

ANOVA

Sources	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	14316.19	2	7158.10	431.47	0.00
Within Groups	35402.95	2134	16.59		
Total	49719.14	2136			

Table 4a indicates a significant difference in the adoption of do-not-disturb mode by Faculty of Education students at three public universities in Rivers State ($F_{2, 2134} = 431.47$, $p = 0.00 < 0.05$). The 0.05 significance level rejects the null hypothesis.

Table 4b: Scheffe Post Hoc test of homogeneity of variance on the difference in the degree to which Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification strategy across the three public Universities in Rivers State

Multiple Comparisons

(I) Universities	(J) Universities	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
UNIPORT	RSU	0.96*	0.22	0.00	0.41	1.50
	IAUE	-6.00*	0.22	0.00	-6.55	-5.45
RSU	UNIPORT	-0.96*	0.22	0.00	-1.50	-0.41
	IAUE	-6.96*	0.27	0.00	-7.62	-6.30
IAUE	UNIPORT	6.00*	0.22	0.00	5.45	6.55
	RSU	6.96*	0.27	0.00	6.30	7.62

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The Scheffe Post Hoc test shows that Faculty of Education students at Rivers State's three public universities use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification approach similarly (Table 4b). The responses from UNIPORT students differ significantly from RSU (mean = 0.96, standard error = 0.22, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05) and IAUE (mean = -6.00, standard error = 0.22, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05). RSU students' responses differ significantly from UNIPORT (mean difference = -0.96, standard error = 0.22, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05) and IAUE (mean difference = -6.96, standard error = 0.27, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05).IAUE students' responses differ significantly from UNIPORT (mean difference = 6.00, standard error = 0.22, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05) and RSU (mean difference = 6.96, standard error = 0.27, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05).The results show that Faculty of Education students at Rivers State's three public colleges use do-not-disturb mode as a digital detoxification method differently.

Hypothesis Two: Faculty of Education students at Rivers State's three public universities employ technology-free zones as a digital detoxification approach similarly.

Table 5a: Summary of ANOVA on the difference in the level to which Faculty of Education students exploit the use of technology-free zones as a digital detoxification strategy across the three public Universities in Rivers State

ANOVA

Sources	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8940.67	2	4470.34	100.14	0.00
Within Groups	95262.07	2134	44.64		
Total	104202.74	2136			

Table 5a indicates a significant difference in how much Faculty of Education students use technology-free zones for digital detoxification across Rivers State's three public universities ($F2, 2134 = 100.14$, $p = 0.00 < 0.05$). Null hypothesis two fails at 0.05.

Table 5b: Scheffe Post Hoc test of homogeneity of variance on the difference in the level to which Faculty of Education students exploit the use of technology-free zones as a digital detoxification strategy across the three public Universities in Rivers State

Multiple Comparisons

(I) Universities	(J) Universities	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
UNIPORT	RSU	-2.00*	0.37	0.00	-2.89	-1.10
	IAUE	4.07*	0.37	0.00	3.17	4.97
RSU	UNIPORT	2.00*	0.37	0.00	1.10	2.89
	IAUE	6.07*	0.44	0.00	4.98	7.15
IAUE	UNIPORT	-4.07*	0.37	0.00	-4.97	-3.17
	RSU	-6.07*	0.44	0.00	-7.15	-4.98

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The Scheffe Post Hoc test shows that Faculty of Education students at three public universities in Rivers State use technology-free zones as a digital detoxification approach similarly (Table 5b). The responses from UNIPORT students differ significantly from RSU (mean difference = -2.00, standard error = 0.37, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05) and IAUE (mean difference = 4.07, standard error = 0.37, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05).

RSU students' responses differ significantly from UNIPORT (mean difference = 2.00, standard error = 0.37, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05) and IAUE (mean difference = 6.07, standard error = 0.44, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05). IAUE students' responses differ significantly from UNIPORT (mean difference = -4.07, standard error = 0.37, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05) and RSU (mean difference = -6.07, standard error = 0.44, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05). The results show that Rivers State's three public universities' Faculty of Education students use technology-free zones as a digital detoxification approach differently.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference in the extent of utilization of dumb-phones as a digital detoxification strategy among Faculty of Education students across the three public Universities in Rivers State.

Table 6a: Summary of ANOVA on the difference in the extent of utilization of dumb-phones as a digital detoxification strategy among Faculty of Education students across the three public Universities in Rivers State

ANOVA

Sources	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1567.47	2	783.73	15.08	0.00
Within Groups	110936.16	2134	51.99		
Total	112503.62	2136			

Table 6a indicates a significant difference in the use of dumb-phones for digital detoxification among Education students at three public universities in Rivers State ($F2, 2134 = 15.08$, $p = 0.00 < 0.05$). The 0.05 significance level rejects null hypothesis three.

Table 6b: Scheffe Post Hoc test of homogeneity of variance on the difference in the extent of utilization of dumb-phones as a digital detoxification strategy among Faculty of Education students across the three public Universities in Rivers State

Multiple Comparisons

(I) Universities	(J) Universities	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
UNIPORT	RSU	1.51*	0.39	0.00	0.54	2.47
	IAUE	1.92*	0.40	0.00	0.95	2.89
RSU	UNIPORT	-1.51*	0.39	0.00	-2.47	-0.54
	IAUE	0.41	0.48	0.69	-.76	1.58
IAUE	UNIPORT	-1.92*	0.40	0.00	-2.89	-0.95
	RSU	-0.41	0.48	0.69	-1.58	0.76

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 6b shows the Scheffe Post Hoc test results for Faculty of Education students at three public colleges in Rivers State using dumb-phones for digital detoxification. Student responses at UNIPORT differ significantly from RSU (mean = 1.51, standard error = 0.39, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05) and IAUE (mean = 1.92, standard error = 0.40, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05).

The responses from RSU students differ significantly from UNIPORT (mean difference = -1.51, standard error = 0.39, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05) and non-significantly from IAUE (mean difference = 0.41, standard error = 0.48, p-value = 0.69 > 0.05). IAUE students reported a significant difference compared to UNIPORT (mean difference = -1.92, standard error = 0.40, p-value = 0.00 < 0.05) and a non-significant difference compared to RSU (mean difference = -0.41, standard error = 0.48, p-value = 0.69 > 0.05).

The results show that Rivers State's three public universities' Faculty of Education students use technology-free zones as a digital detoxification approach differently.

Discussion of Findings

Research question one found that most Rivers State public university Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode for digital detoxification to a limited level. Hypothesis one showed that Rivers State's three public institutions' Faculty of Education students use do-not-disturb mode for digital detoxification differently. The post hoc research showed that Faculty of Education students at Rivers State's three public universities use do-not-disturb mode as a

digital detoxification method differently. The findings supported Villanti et al. (2017)'s 2016 study on US Young Adults' Social Media Use and Digital Technology Access. Respondents used 7.6 social media networks on average. Tumblr, LinkedIn, Snapchat, Instagram, and Vine dominated social media. The study found that 87% of young adults had a computer, laptop, or internet-enabled device, 11% had a mobile without internet, and 3% had neither.The study supports Radtke et al. (2021), who found that digital detoxification programs had different effects on health and well-being, social interactions, self-control, and performance.

Research question two found that most Rivers State public university Faculty of Education students use technology-free zones for digital detoxification to a limited level.Hypothesis two showed that Rivers State's three public universities' Faculty of Education students use technology-free zones for digital detoxification differently. The post hoc research showed that Faculty of Education students at Rivers State's three public universities use technology-free zones as a digital detoxification approach differently. The results match Danilo et al. (2018), who tested a smartphone detox program for university students with smartphone addiction. The intervention improved lifestyle, health, and relationships, according to the study. The study confirms Langmia and Glass (2014), who found that all survey participants, except those using smartphones as educational tools, reported distractions, making the classroom noisy and unsuitable for instruction.

Research question three found that most Rivers State public university Faculty of Education students use dumb-phones for digital detox, at least somewhat.Hypothesis three found that Faculty of Education students at Rivers State's three public universities used dumb phones differently for digital detoxification. The post hoc research showed that Rivers State's three public colleges' Faculty of Education students' use of technology-free zones for digital detoxification varied greatly. Basu's (2019) study found that digital detox increased employees' productivity and job effectiveness. Thus, managers should encourage tech-free meetings and regular breaks for employees to use their interpersonal skills to communicate ideas.

Conclusion

The research examined the implementation of technology-free zones, basic mobile phones, and do-not-disturb mode as low-tech methods for digital detoxification among education faculty students at public universities in Rivers State. The study's findings indicated that the majority of students utilise do-not-disturb settings, technology-free zones, and basic phones as a minimal low-tech digital detoxification technique. The survey revealed that students at public universities in Rivers State employ digital detoxification measures at a relatively low frequency. This stemmed from an absence of understanding and implementation of digital detoxification methods. The report concludes that educational institutions in Rivers State must prioritise the introduction of digital detoxification programs to aid students in developing healthy relationships with technology. This will not only improve mental health and academic performance but also promote a more sustainable and balanced use of technology among students. Universities must provide students with the resources and support necessary to understand the significance of digital cleansing and effectively incorporate it into their daily lives.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are put forward:

1. Lecturers should teach students better digital detoxification practices to lessen do-not-disturb mode and improve technology-health balance.

2. Managers and other stakeholders in Rivers State public universities should host monthly seminars to teach students how technology-free zones promote focus, productivity, and well-being.

3. Universities in Rivers State should offer workshops or seminars on alternative digital detoxification tactics for students who heavily use dumb phones to widen their options and improve their well-being.

References

Basu, R. (2019). Impact of digital detox on individual performance of the employees. *International Journal of Research Analysis,6* (2), 378-381.

Danilo, B. B., Nami, K. & Kyung, E. P. (2018). Development and evaluation of smartphone detox programme for university students. *International Journal of Contents, 14* (4), 33-41.

Dhull, I., & Sakshi, M. S. (2017). Online learning. *International Education and Research Journal (IERJ), 3*(8), 32-34.

Helsper, E., & Eynon, R. (2009). Digital natives: Where is the evidence?*British Educational Research Journal*, 1-18.

Jacobson, W. C. (2011). The wired generation: academic and social outcomes of electronic media use among university students. *Cyberpsychology, Behaviour and Social Networking, 14* (5), 275-280.

Kemp, S. (2023). Digital 2023: Global overview report. https://datareportal.com/global-digital-overview

Langmia, K. & Glass, A. (2014). Coping with smartphone 'distractions' in a college classroom. *Teaching Journalism and Mass Communication, 4* (1), 13-23.

Morgan, K. (2017). *The pros and cons of cell phone usage in college*. https://www.education.seatle-upi.com/pros-con-cell-phone-usage-college-1578html

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the horizon, 9*(5), 1-3.

Radtke, T., Apel, T., Schenkel, K., Keller, J., & von Lindern, E. (2021). Digital detox: An effective solution in the smartphone era? A systematic literature reviews. *Mobile Media & Communication, 2*(2), 190-215. doi:10.1177/20501579211028647

Scott E. (2019). *The stress of social comparison*. https://wwwverywellmind.com/the-stress-of-social-comparison-4154076.

Villanti, A., Johnson, A., Ilakkuvan, V., Jacobs, M., Graham, A., & Rath J. (2017). Social media use and access to digital technology in US young adults in 2016. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 19*(6), DOI: 10.2196/jmir.730. https://www.jmir.org/2017/6/e196