### Mobile Phone Usage and Academic Achievement among Primary and Preparatory School Children

Lamia. A. Awad, <sup>(1)</sup> Nadia Ahmed Eladham <sup>(2)</sup>, Hanem Awad Mekhemier <sup>(3)</sup> Walaa Kamel Tawfeek Farghaly <sup>(4)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> Professor of community health nursing department, faculty of nursing, Mansoura University. <sub>(2,3)</sub> Assistant professor of family and community health nursing department, faculty of nursing, Damietta University. <sup>(4)</sup> Lecturer of Family and community health nursing department, faculty of nursing, Damietta University.

#### Abstract

Background: In the past decade, there has been a significant rise in the amount of an individual subscribing to mobile phone services, and this technology is now widely utilized by teenagers. Aim: this study aimed to examine the effect of mobile phone usage on students' academic achievement in primary and preparatory school children. Method: analytic comparative cross-sectional study was conducted on 400 school children in primary and preparatory private schools in Dakhlia Governorate using a multi-stage stratified cluster sample. a self-administered questionnaire that covers socio-demographic Tool: characteristics details, mobile phone usage habits, and attitudes towards its hazards was utilized. The school achievement was obtained from school records. Data collection lasted from October 2020 to January 2021. Results: showed that 94.3% of the school children were using mobile phones, mostly the smart type, 50.7% used their mobile for one hour or less per day, and 39.8% wre taking mobile phones to school; 61.5% had a positive attitude towards mobile phone use. Higher percentages of those having very good and excellent grades were not taking their phones to school (p=0.007). Using a mobile phone at school has a detrimental effect on grades, and mobile phone use is very common among primary and preparatory schoolchildren. Conclusion: The use of mobile phones appears to have a beneficial effect on students' academic performance but using them in school may have an adverse impact on their grades. **Recommendation:** stricter rules regarding the use of mobile phones in the classroom are necessary, along with a focus on promoting their use for educational purposes and the learning process.

Keywords: Academic achievement, mobile phone, school children.

#### VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024

#### Introduction:

In the last decade, there has been a notable rise in the utilization of mobile phones, attributed to their widespread popularity and userfriendly interfaces, alongside the continuously advancing technology that expands their array of practical features and applications. Today, mobile phone apps cater to a diverse range of purposes beyond basic voice communication, or text including educational tools (Reed et al., 2017; Gavali et al., 2017) and medicine (Kaner et al., 2017; Rico et al., 2017; Varleta et al., 2017).

Over the past ten years, there has been a significant increase in the number of mobile phone subscribers in Egypt. Users reached 96.7% of youth in the 18–29 age groups, according to the statistical yearbook (CAPMAS, 2017).

Communities have evolved due to increasing mobility, longer travel lengths, and the possibility of being exposed to threats, which has resulted in a high incidence of mobile phone People, use. in particular parents of school-age children, must therefore be able to always contact their kids and from any location. As a result, they would feel more comfortable knowing that their children are safe (National Academy of Science, 2012).

Most today's adolescents are greatly impacted by the content they view on social networking sites, to the point where it is easy to observe the effects on their behavior, both in and out of the classroom. The persistent decline in academic performance, the increase in dropout and the majority of the rates. deplorable, immoral, and antisocial behaviors that students today engage such tardiness, massive in; as malpractice, failures. exam and clothing codes inappropriate (Muhammed, Umaru & Ahmed, 2016).

#### VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024

#### Significance of the study

The benefits of this technology have been the subject of numerous studies due to its widespread use, especially among teenagers. Educational. psychological (Movvahedi et al., 2014; Sharma et al., 2017; Vernon et al., 2017), and even addiction and dependence are some forms of negative effect of mobile use (de-Sola et al., 2017). However, some research disproved these risks (Mohan et al., 2016) or even showed that teen smartphone use has positive benefits (Vilchis-Gil et al., 2016; Haug et al., 2017; Law et al., 2017). Thus, the current study is an effort to provide additional data to this resolve controversy and highlight the importance of nurse at schools to enhance student's awareness toward useful usage of mobile phones at class and the negative uses they must avoid during their usage, so they can achieve the

highest benefits from these phones at the educational process.

#### Aim of the study

The aim of this study was to examine the effect of mobile phone usage on students' academic achievement in primary and preparatory school children.

#### **Subjects and Method**

#### **Research Question**

To fulfill the aim of this study, the following research question was formulated:

**H1:** Is there a correlation between students' academic achievement and their usage of mobile phones in the classroom.

#### **Research design and setting:**

This study was carried out using a cross-sectional analytical research design. It was conducted in the Dakhlia Governorate's morning primary and preparatory private schools.

#### Subjects:

All students enrolled in private primary and preparatory schools in Dakahlia Governorate for grade three and grade six during the study period were eligible to be part of the study sample. In a multiple regression study involving 20 independent variables, the sample size was determined to exhibit a medium effect size (r-square = 0.15), with a 95% degree of confidence and 90% power. 191 was the necessary sample size, per (Cohen et al., 2003). This was raised to 400 to account for a non-response rate of roughly 10% as well as a cluster sampling design effect of 2. To find the pupils, a multi-stage stratified cluster sampling technique was employed. Out of the eighteen districts in the Dakhlia Governorate, three districts were chosen at random for the first stage. These were the districts of Mansoura, Dekrnes, and Manzala. One private primary/preparatory school was chosen at random from each district for the second stage. In the third

phase, two main grade 6 classrooms and two third preparatory grade classrooms were chosen from each school. Every student in the twelve classrooms that were chosen was chosen, with an average of thirty to thirty-five students each classroom.

#### **Data collection tool:**

A self-administered questionnaire was created, it included three essential parts. The first part; it had contained regarding details the socio demographic characteristics of school children, as; their age, sex, birth arrange, parents' work and level of education, place of residence, income, crowding index, etc. It moreover involved smoking, exercising, hobbies, history of chronic illnesses or disabilities, and more, etc.

The second part: included data about the utilization of a mobile phone. It inquired about the kind of device, the features utilized daily, messaging, gaming, the typical number of emails and texts sent each day, and the number of hours used each day. It also

inquired about using and bringing mobile phones to school.

The third part: consisted of an attitude scale with thirteen statements that represented how children felt about the risks associated with mobile phones and how it would influence their scholastic accomplishment. It divided to a three-point Likert scale, the response was: agree, unclear, or disagree.

Scoring system: for the Likert scale; these were rated on a scale of 3 to 1, with positive comments receiving a lower score and negative statements receiving a higher score, indicating greater agreement over the detrimental impacts of mobile phones. The overall grade point total and the ranked grades from the previous school year were used to determine the student's success.

**Tool validity & reliability:** 

The instrument experienced intensive modification handle to pertinence, guarantee its comprehensiveness, and clarity by community and medical nursing professionals. the Through measurement of internal consistency, the reliability of the attitude scale was assessed, and the Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.60 indicated adequate reliability.

#### **Pilot study**:

Was carried out on around 10% (40) of the study sample to test the clarity and feasibility of the created tool. It also provided an estimate of the time needed to fill out the tools, and to identify any difficulties or obstacles required to handle before applying it. And it was included in the study.

#### Procedure

**Fieldwork:** the researcher visited the chosen schools and met with the headmasters, clarifying the purpose and methods of the study and requesting their inclusion after

Online ISSN: 3009-7231 The print ISSN: 3009-7053

receiving the required formal approvals. Following that, two classrooms from primary grade 6 and two from preparatory grade 3 were chosen for the selection procedure. There were 199 students in primary grade 6 overall, and 201 students in preparatory grade

3. The students in each classroom that was chosen were informed about the purpose and methodology of the the researcher. study by who moreover requested their parent's consent to participate. They were given the data collecting form, and after perusing each question, the researcher asked each student to jot down their answer. At least two sessions were required for each classroom: one for clarifications and another for form completion. Each of the twelve classrooms that were chosen from the three schools underwent the same procedure twice. The scholarly accomplishments of each youngster that was chosen were decided by looking up their records at school. The process of gathering data took place between October 2020 and January 2021.

## Authoritative and ethical

#### considerations:

After outlining the purpose of the study and the methodology, official authorization was obtained from the Ministry of Education as well as from the territorial executives of education in the districts that were chosen. The headmasters of the schools received these permits to arrange the process of gathering data easier. Before any data was collected, informed consents were signed by the parents or guardians of each student; this was fulfilled through the school administration. The consent form made participation completely voluntary and provided laypeople with an easy-to-understand explanation of the study's purpose. They had gotten confirmation that the data they given would be kept private and anonymous. Moreover, it would only be utilized for study. Before filling out the paperwork, school children gave their verbal assent as well.

Statistical analysis:

The statistical software program SPSS version 20.0 was utilized for both data entry and statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to portray the data as means, standard deviations, and medians for qualitative variables, and frequencies and percentages for quantitative variables. To evaluate the internal consistency of the created tool and decide their reliability, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was computed. The chi-square test was utilized to qualitative compare category variables. Using multiple linear regression analysis and variance for the entire regression model, the independent predictors of the total points grade were found. We employed multiple logistic regressions to find the factors that were associated with academic failure. At p-value~-0.05, statistical significance was taken into consideration.

#### Results

The study sample involved 400 primary and preparatory school students; most of them (76.5%) were girls.

As shown in **Table** (1), their ages ranged from 10 to 16 years. Merely 1.8% of them were smokers, and relatively few had disabilities or chronic illnesses. More than two thirds of them reported participating sports (65.8%) and hobbies in (75.0%). The distribution of their academic achievement throughout the four grade levels was distributed fairly, with slightly more students receiving a fair rating (28.8%). Just 6.0% of them mentioned having failed school in the past.

According to **Table** (2), less than one-fourth of parents of schoolage children had a university degree, while the largest percentage of parents had no formal education. Mothers made up 84.3 % of the study sample and were housewives, while fathers were, 74.0 %. Most of the parents (85.3%) were urban residents, (55.6%) had a crowding index of

#### VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024

more than one person per room, and (62.8%) had a decent income.

Table (3) reveals that, nearly all school children (94.3%) owned a cell phone, with the majority had models with touchscreens smart (82.5%). Games (71.6%) and music (64.2%) were the most frequently functionalities, utilized everyday whereas email sending and receiving (16.4% and 17.0%) were the least frequently used. Most school children said they played games with both hands (63.1%) and texted with one hand (64.7%). One to ten SMSs were sent on average each day (61.3%). In the meantime, significantly fewer than half of them (47.7%) did not send any emails via phone. Fifty-seven percent of them used their phones for an hour or less a day on average.

About two-fifths (39.8%) of the students in the study sample bring their phones to class, as **Table (4)** shows. Most users (70.0%) were only using it in recess. Playing games (34.5%) and listening to music (32.1%) were the most common applications used by school students, while emailing only being utilized by 9.3% of users. Less than two-thirds of school students (61.5%) disagreed with the negative aspects of cell phone use and had a positive view toward it.

Table (5) shows that, there is a significant correlation statistically (p=0.007) between students' usage of mobile phones in class and their academic achievement. It has been observed that a greater proportion of students who obtained very good or excellent grades have been found to have not brought their phones to class. meantime. there In the is no meaningful connection earlier to school failure.

Table (6) demonstrates a statistically significant relationship (p=0.01)and p<0.001) between students' attitudes on using mobile phones and their earlier school disappointment scholastic and progress. It is evident that a greater proportion of students with reasonable

and extraordinary grades and those who had previously failed showed a positive attitude toward mobile phones.

As children grew older and their birth order increased, they were found to be significant risk variables for earlier school disappointment in multiple logistic regression analysis mentioned in Table as (7). Conversely, having a mobile phone, living in an urban region, and having a mother with a higher educational attainment were protective factors against this sort of disappointment, with odds ratios (ORs) much lower than one.

Table (8) appears that, the recurrence of SMS sent daily, urban residency and parents' educational attainment were statistically significant independent positive predictors of the overall grade point multivariate analysis. On the other hand, unfavorable pointers included bringing a phone to class, having a working mother. and higher a scholarly year. Of the overall grade

point fluctuation, 27% can be explained by the model

| DJNRHS VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024 |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
|------------------------------------|--|

| Table 1: Students characteristics regarding; personal, h | health, and academic |
|--|----------------------|
| achievement (n=400)                                      |                      |

| Items                               | Frequency | Percent |  |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|--|
| Age:                                |           |         |  |
| <=12                                | 143       | 35.8    |  |
| >12                                 | 257       | 64.3    |  |
| Range                               | 10.0-16   | 5.0     |  |
| Mean±SD                             | 13.3±1    | .2      |  |
| Median                              | 14.0      |         |  |
| Gender:                             |           |         |  |
| Male                                | 94        | 23.5    |  |
| Female                              | 306       | 76.5    |  |
| Birth order:                        |           |         |  |
| 1                                   | 153       | 38.3    |  |
| 2+                                  | 247       | 61.8    |  |
| Persistent chronic disease          | 41        | 10.3    |  |
| Have disability                     | 11        | 2.8     |  |
| Smoking                             | 7         | 1.8     |  |
| Play sports                         | 263       | 65.8    |  |
| Engage hobbies                      | 300       | 75.0    |  |
| School achievement:                 |           |         |  |
| Fair                                | 115       | 28.8    |  |
| Good                                | 102       | 25.5    |  |
| Very good                           | 90        | 22.5    |  |
| Excellent                           | 93        | 23.3    |  |
| Total Grade Point Average (max=100) |           |         |  |
| Range 18.0-100.0                    |           |         |  |
| Mean±SD                             | 75.9±13.4 |         |  |
| Median                              | 74.50     |         |  |
| Prior school failure                | 24 6.0    |         |  |

| DJNRHS | VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024 |
|--------|-----------------------------|
|--------|-----------------------------|

# Table 2: Socio-demographic characteristics of students' parents in the study sample (n=400)

| Items             | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Father education: |           |         |
| Nonformal         | 144       | 36.0    |
| Basic             | 46        | 11.5    |
| Intermediate      | 125       | 31.3    |
| University        | 85        | 21.3    |
| Father job        |           |         |
| Employee          | 104       | 26.0    |
| Manual work/trade | 296       | 74.0    |
| Mother education: |           |         |
| Nonformal         | 135       | 33.8    |
| Basic             | 46        | 11.5    |
| Intermediate      | 127       | 31.8    |
| University        | 92        | 23.0    |
| Mother job:       |           |         |
| Housewife         | 337       | 84.3    |
| Working           | 63        | 15.8    |
| Residence:        |           |         |
| Rural             | 59        | 14.8    |
| Urban             | 341       | 85.3    |
| Crowding index:   |           |         |
| 1                 | 177       | 44.3    |
| >1                | 223       | 55.8    |
| Income:           |           |         |
| Not enough        | 111       | 27.8    |
| Enough            | 251       | 62.8    |
| Conserving        | 38        | 9.5     |

| DJNRHS | VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024 |
|--------|-----------------------------|
|--------|-----------------------------|

### Table 3: Utilization of mobile phone among students in the study sample

(**n=400**)

| Items                            | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Make of your phone               | 377       | 94.3    |
| Type:                            |           |         |
| Regular                          | 40        | 10.6    |
| Smart                            | 18        | 4.8     |
| Intelligent touchscreen          | 311       | 82.5    |
| Multiple                         | 8         | 2.1     |
| *Daily use of several functions: |           |         |
| Making phone calls               | 163       | 43.2    |
| Being called on the phone        | 183       | 48.5    |
| Transmitting text messages       | 112       | 29.7    |
| Obtaining text messages          | 200       | 53.1    |
| Sending email                    | 62        | 16.4    |
| Receiving email                  | 64        | 17.0    |
| Browsing net                     | 192       | 50.9    |
| Seeking a study subject          | 134       | 35.5    |
| Games                            | 270       | 71.6    |
| Audio                            | 242       | 64.2    |
| Texting using:                   |           |         |
| One hand                         | 244       | 64.7    |
| Both hands                       | 133       | 35.3    |
| Playing games using:             |           |         |
| One hand                         | 139       | 36.9    |
| Both hands                       | 238       | 63.1    |
| Average daily SMS sent:          |           |         |
| None                             | 113       | 30.0    |
| 1-10                             | 231       | 61.3    |
| 11-25                            | 22        | 5.8     |
| 26-50                            | 11        | 2.9     |
| Average daily email sent:        |           |         |
| None                             | 180       | 47.7    |
| 1-10                             | 156       | 41.4    |
| 11-25                            | 30        | 8.0     |
| 26-50                            | 11        | 2.9     |
| Daily mobile usage hours:        |           |         |
| 1 or less                        | 191       | 50.7    |
| 2-3                              | 74        | 19.6    |
| 4+                               | 112       | 29.7    |

\*More than one answer was allowed

| DJNRHS | VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024 |
|--------|-----------------------------|
|--------|-----------------------------|

 Table 4: Use of cell phone at school among students in the study sample

(n=400)

| Items                                  | Frequency | Percent |  |
|--|-----------|---------|--|
| Bring your phone to school             | 150       | 39.8    |  |
| Used in:                               |           |         |  |
| Class                                  | 5         | 3.3     |  |
| Recess                                 | 105       | 70.0    |  |
| Both                                   | 40        | 26.7    |  |
| *Used for:                             |           |         |  |
| Being called on the phone              | 103       | 27.3    |  |
| Receiving voice calls                  | 113       | 30.0    |  |
| Sending text messages                  | 82        | 21.8    |  |
| Obtaining text messages                | 104       | 27.6    |  |
| Sending email                          | 35        | 9.3     |  |
| Receiving email                        | 41        | 10.9    |  |
| Browsing net                           | 62        | 16.4    |  |
| Searching for study topic              | 88        | 23.3    |  |
| Games                                  | 130       | 34.5    |  |
| Music                                  | 121       | 32.1    |  |
| Attitude towards cell phone drawbacks: |           |         |  |
| Agree (negative)                       | 154       | 38.5    |  |
| Disagree (positive)                    | 246       | 61.5    |  |

\*More than one answer was allowed

## Table 5: Relationship between students' academic achievement and theirusage of mobile phones in class.

|                       | Take mobile to school |      |     |      |                     |         |  |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------|-----|------|---------------------|---------|--|
| Items                 | No                    |      | Yes |      | X <sup>2</sup> test | p-value |  |
|                       | No.                   | %    | No. | %    |                     |         |  |
| Prior school failure: |                       |      |     |      |                     |         |  |
| No                    | 215                   | 60.1 | 143 | 39.9 |                     |         |  |
| Yes                   | 12                    | 63.2 | 7   | 36.8 | 0.07                | 0.79    |  |
| School achievement:   |                       |      |     |      |                     |         |  |
| Fair                  | 64                    | 61.5 | 40  | 38.5 |                     |         |  |
| Good                  | 44                    | 45.8 | 52  | 54.2 | 12.13               | 0.007*  |  |
| Very good             | 56                    | 65.9 | 29  | 34.1 |                     |         |  |
| Excellent             | 63                    | 68.5 | 29  | 31.5 |                     |         |  |

(\*) Statistically significant at p<0.05

| DJNRHS | VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024 |
|--------|-----------------------------|
|--------|-----------------------------|

| Table                                     | 6: | Relation | between | students' | attitude | towards | mobile | phone |
|---|----|----------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|--------|-------|
| drawbacks and their academic achievement. |    |          |         |           |          |         |        |       |

|                       | Attitude            |      |                        |      |                     |          |  |
|-----------------------|---------------------|------|------------------------|------|---------------------|----------|--|
| Items                 | Agree<br>(negative) |      | Disagree<br>(positive) |      | X <sup>2</sup> test | p-value  |  |
|                       | No.                 | %    | No.                    | %    |                     |          |  |
| Prior school failure: |                     |      |                        |      |                     |          |  |
| No                    | 139                 | 37.0 | 237                    | 63.0 |                     |          |  |
| Yes                   | 15                  | 62.5 | 9                      | 37.5 | 6.21                | 0.01*    |  |
| School achievement:   |                     |      |                        |      |                     |          |  |
| Fair                  | 34                  | 29.6 | 81                     | 70.4 |                     |          |  |
| Good                  | 45                  | 44.1 | 57                     | 55.9 | 24.11               | < 0.001* |  |
| Very good             | 51                  | 56.7 | 39                     | 43.3 |                     |          |  |
| Excellent             | 24                  | 25.8 | 69                     | 74.2 |                     |          |  |

(\*) Statistically significant at p<0.05

## Table 7: Best fitting multiple variety logistic regression models for thefactors determining previous school failure.

| Items  | Wald  | Df | p-<br>value | Odds<br>Ratio<br>(OR) | 95.0% CI<br>for OR |        |  |
|--|-------|----|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------|--|
|  |       |    |             |                       | Upper              | Lower  |  |
| Constant   | 3.445 | 1  | 0.063       | 0.00                  | 0.063              | 0.00   |  |
| Age  | 9.789 | 1  | 0.002       | 5.21                  | 1.85               | 14.66  |  |
| Birth order  | 6.589 | 1  | 0.010       | 47.63                 | 2.49               | 910.02 |  |
| Mother education   | 9.296 | 1  | 0.002       | 0.06                  | 0.01               | 0.36   |  |
| Urban residence  | 7.937 | 1  | 0.005       | 0.04                  | 0.00               | 0.37   |  |
| Use cell phone   | 7.384 | 1  | 0.007       | 0.03                  | 0.00               | 0.37   |  |
| Nagelkerke R Square: 0.63  |       |    |             |                       |                    |        |  |
| Hosmer and Lemeshow Test: p=1.00   |       |    |             |                       |                    |        |  |
| Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients: p<0.001   |       |    |             |                       |                    |        |  |
| Non-significant variables: gender, grade, father education, mother work, crowding index, income, chronic |       |    |             |                       |                    |        |  |
| disease,   |       |    |             |                       |                    |        |  |
| disability, exercise, smoking, allowance, hobbies, attitude score  |       |    |             |                       |                    |        |  |

| DJNRHS | VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024 |
|--------|-----------------------------|
|--------|-----------------------------|

| Items                  | Unstandardized<br>Coefficients |            | Standardized<br>Coefficients | t-test | p-value | 95%<br>Confidence<br>Interval for B |       |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------------|--------|---------|-------------------------------------|-------|
|                        | В                              | Std. Error |                              |        |         | Lower                               | Upper |
| Constant               | 66.34                          | 6.26       |                              | 10.592 | < 0.001 | 54.00                               | 78.67 |
| Grade (school<br>year) | -5.69                          | 1.65       | -0.20                        | 3.440  | 0.001   | -8.95                               | -2.43 |
| Father education       | 1.79                           | 0.76       | 0.17                         | 2.350  | 0.020   | 0.29                                | 3.29  |
| Mother<br>education    | 2.67                           | 0.79       | 0.25                         | 3.397  | 0.001   | 1.12                                | 4.22  |
| Working mother         | -0.73                          | 0.27       | -0.16                        | 2.710  | 0.007   | -1.25                               | -0.20 |
| Urban residence        | 4.97                           | 2.06       | 0.14                         | 2.411  | 0.017   | 0.91                                | 9.03  |
| Income                 | -2.64                          | 1.33       | -0.12                        | 1.991  | 0.048   | -5.26                               | -0.03 |
| Take mobile to school  | -4.80                          | 1.55       | -0.18                        | 3.098  | 0.002   | -7.85                               | -1.75 |
| No. of SMS             | 3.01                           | 0.97       | 0.17                         | 3.112  | 0.002   | 1.10                                | 4.91  |

Table 8: Best fitting multivariate logistic regression model for the totalgrade points.

r-square=0.27 Model ANOVA: F=12.78, p<0.001

Non-significant variables: age, gender, crowding index, chronic disease, disability, exercise, smoking, allowance, hobbies, attitude score, hours of use, media

#### Discussion

In this study, the effects of cell scholarly phone use on accomplishment were evaluated in attending primary students and preparatory schools. Overall beneficial effects on grade point averages and scholastic success are the studies. indicated by Their scholarly performance appears to suffer because of using cell phones in class, though. Nearly all students in schools use cell phones, according to the results of this study. In addition, they primarily use touchscreenequipped high-tech smartphones. Given that numerous school students have a steady family pay and live in cities, it may be the case that these expensive gadgets vital. are Moreover, the (CAPMAS, 2016) research states that, 88% of Egypt's population has more mobile phone lines than there are people in the country. Similar to a study conducted in Spain, 90% of the study sample reported using a mobile phone, which is a similarly high rate of use (Muñoz-Miralles et al., 2014). Additionally, almost two-thirds of a sample of students in Rome, Italy reported using a smartphone (Poscia et al., 2015). That reflects the massive transformation toward technologies in all sectors including education.

The popular two most activities that school children in this research did with their mobile phones were playing games and listening to music. These are recreational tools that won't directly improve their scholarly accomplishment achievement. Furthermore, slightly less than thirds of them two expressed that they used both hands to play games, demonstrating a high manipulation level of skill and frequent use for this purpose. According to Reolid-Martínez et al., (2016), which conducted a study on teenagers in Spain, girls primarily used their phones for music listening and chat, while guys primarily used them for gaming. A study on French

#### VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024

pupils conducted in their teens uncovered a similar pattern of use, appearing that playing games and viewing videos accounted for more than half of the time spent using electronic devices such tablets and cellphones (**Royant-Parola et al., 2017**). From the investigator point of view, this emphasizes the negative reflect of mobile phones on academic achievements of students at schools

However, only about one-third of the school children participating in the current study mentioned using their phones for scholastic purposes, such as finding a study topic. Furthermore, approximately 50% of students utilized their phones to browse the internet, which may well be supportive for their studies. The truth that an awfully little rate of students in this survey used their phones for these positive objectives suggests that they did not see the of benefits this innovation. According to research conducted in Turkey, the vast majority of parents of school-age student expressed that;

their children's education depends on the having access to internet (Dinleyici et al., 2016). That confirms the truth that technology and usage of mobile phones in education become a base and students depend on it in studying and education.

Most of the school students in current study brought their the cellphones to school, and around onethird of them utilize it there. Since most of them were playing games and listening to music, these students' use of their phones in class impossible to be for scholarly purposes. This study concluded that the school child's total grade point average was negatively correlated with carrying a cell phone to school. the same line. Ling and At Helmersen, (2010) discovered that using cell phones in class disrupts the rules and roles of both the school and the students. Similarities among studies reflect that permitting contacts exterior of the school setting tends to divert pupils and change

#### VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024

their focus and consequently affect their achievement.

According the current to study's discoveries, around two thirds of the school children had a favorable of utilizing mobile supposition phones. Regarding its disadvantages, which include time loss, diversion, physical risks, and moral dilemmas, largely they were at odds. Furthermore, there was a diminishing in scholarly disappointment among those with such an optimistic outlook. But the relationship between attitude and scholarly success, as measured by grades, appeared that this kind of attitude is a double-edged sword. As a result, a large part of school students with a positive outlook belonged to the group that received the highest grades, fair and exceptional. Because of this, an optimistic outlook may empower scholastic success, or conversely, it may result in a passing grade that might be linked to the negative effects of cell phones. They would scholastically awful pass more

because of this. Similar to the current study, a survey conducted on South African university students by **Cilliers et al., (2017)** found that, most of them had good opinions about using their phones to find information for their studies.

Moreover, with an Odds Ratio (OR) of 0.03, using a cell phone shows up to be protective against failing school. This recommends that employing a cell phone progresses scholastic execution. Concurring to a study conducted in Iran, exposure to mobile phone radiation improves the short-term memory capacities of primary school students (Movvahedi et al., **2014).** Furthermore, two studies conducted Nigerian on secondary school students showed a significant correlation between the students' scholarly accomplishment and their use of mobile phones (Rabiu et al., 2016; Jairus et al., 2017).

Furthermore, it was discovered that the quantity of text

messages (SMS) sent daily was a profoundly significant positive predictor of their overall grade points, indicating increased scholastic execution. increased Their vocabulary may help to explain this. The results are consistent with a study conducted on Dutch primary school students, which found that text messaging improved their language and linguistic aptitudes (Van Dijk et al., 2016). It confirms the positive impact of utilizing the phones if it is used by the correct way and at the appropriate time.

Certain socio-demographic traits had an impact on students' scholarly execution as well. Given that students who are older than their peers typically have poorer scholastic capacities, it appears that older children and those with high birth order rank are more likely to fail school. The higher birth arrange could be explained, in portion, by the reality that second born get less attention at home than firstborns. The education of parents and living in an urban zone were two other sociodemographic factors that the current study found to be associated with scholastic accomplishment. These had a favorable effect on the child's scholastic execution because improved care, which may have been caused by the family's increased financial status. On the other hand, a working

of

mother had a detrimental impact on her child's academic performance. This may be the result of the mother's expanded workload at work combined with the fact that she spends less time with her child. These socio-demographic traits were found to interact with the way that mobile phones are used in a study of Chinese teenagers, which uncovered comparable correlations (Jiang et al., **2014**). Similarities among studies showed how environment students live in and parents' occupation and interest with their children affect strongly on their way of education and to what extant students need very strict observation and guidance in

#### VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024

using their phones at school and education.

#### Conclusion

In conclusion, the study discoveries indicated that mobile phone utilization is widespread among primary and preparatory school students. Their execution in school appears to advantage

### Recommendations

The study suggests tighter guidelines for schools when it comes to student cell phone use. It is advisable to propel students to upgrade their use of technology for educational reasons and applications that bolster their learning. To clarify the impacts of utilizing educational mobile apps on students' learning process, more inquiries about is required.

#### References

CAPMAS. (2016): 88% of Egypt's 91 million People Own Mobile Phones – CairoScene. Retrieved on Oct. 22, 2017, at: www.cairoscene.com/.../88-of-Egypt-s-91-Million-People-Own-Mobile-Phones.

- CAPMAS. (2017): 96.7% of youth in the age group 18-29 use mobile phones: CAPMAS; Retrieved on Oct. 22, 2017, at: <u>http://www.capmas</u>. gov.eg/HomePage.aspx
- Cilliers L., Viljoen K.L., and Chinyamurindi W.T. (2017): A study on Students' Acceptance of Phone Use to Seek Mobile Information in South Health Africa. HIM J. 2017 Jan 1:1833358317706185. doi: 10.1177 /1833358317706185.
- Cohen J., Cohen P., West S.G., and Aiken L.S. (2003): Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (3rd edition). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

- De-Sola J., Talledo H., Rodríguez de Fonseca F., and Rubio G. (2017): Prevalence of Problematic Cell Phone Use in an Adult Population in Spain as Assessed by the Mobile Phone Problem Use Scale (MPPUS). PLoS One.;12(8): e0181184. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0181184. eCollection 2017.
- Dinleyici M., Carman K.B., Ozturk E., and Sahin-Dagli F. (2016): Media Use by Children, and Parents' Views on Children's Media Usage. *Interact J Med Re.s.*;5(2): e18. doi: 10.2196/ijmr.5668.
- Gavali M.Y., Khismatrao D.S.,
  Gavali Y.V., and Patil K.B.
  (2017): Smartphone, the New
  Learning Aid amongst Medical
  Students. J Clin Diagn
  Res.;11(5): JC05-JC08. doi:
  10.7860/JCDR/2017/20948.9826.
  Epub 2017 May 1.

- Haug S., Paz Castro R., Kowatsch T., Filler A., and Schaub M.P. (2017): Efficacy of a Technology-Based, Integrated Smoking Cessation and Alcohol Intervention for Smoking Cessation in Adolescents: Results of **Cluster-Randomised** а Controlled Trial. J Subst Abuse 82:55-66. doi: Treat. 10.1016/j.jsat.2017.09.008. Epub 2017 Sep 14.
- Jairus **E.U.** Christian **U.U. Ogwuche A.J., and Thomas** O.I. (2017): Impact of Mobile Phone Usage on Students' Academic Performance Among Public Secondary Schools in Oju Government Local Area of State IJSRM. Benue (International Journal Of Science And Research *Methodology*); Issue:3.
- Jiang XX., Hardy L.L., Ding D., Baur L.A., and Shi H.J. (2014): Recreational Screen-Time among Chinese Adolescents: a cross-

sectional study. J Epidemiol.;24(5):397-403. Epub 2014 Jun 14.

Kaner E.F., Beyer F.R., Garnett Crane D., Brown **C.. J.**, Muirhead C., Redmore J., O'Donnell A., Newham J.J., de Vocht F., Hickman M., Brown H., Maniatopoulos G., Michie S. (2017): Personalized Digital Interventions for Reducing Hazardous and Harmful Alcohol Consumption in Community-Dwelling Populations. Cochrane Database Syst Rev.;9:CD011479. doi:

> 10.1002/14651858.CD011479.pu b2. [Epub ahead of print] Review.

Law J.K., Thome P.A., Lindeman B., Jackson D.C., and Lidor A.O. (2017): Student Use and of Perceptions Mobile Technology in Clinical Clerkships Guidance for \_ Curriculum Design. Am J Surg. 2017 Jan 30. pii: S00029610(16)30458-5. doi: 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2017.01.038.

- Ling R. and Helmersen P. (2010): It Must be Necessary; it has to cover a Need: The Adoption of Mobile Telephony among Pre-Adolescents Students.
- Mohan M., Khaliq F., Panwar A., and Vaney N. (2016): Does Chronic Exposure to Mobile Phones Affect Cognition? *Funct Neurol.*;31(1):47-51.
- Movvahedi **M.M.** Tavakkoli-Golpayegani A., Mortazavi S.A., Haghani M., Razi Z., Shojaie-Fard M.B., Zare M., Mina E., Mansourabadi L., Nazari-Jahromi, Safari A., Shokrpour N., and Mortazavi S.M. (2014): Does exposure to GSM 900 MHz Mobile Phone Radiation Affect Short-Term Memory of Elementary School Students? J Pediatr Neurosci.; 9(2):121-4. doi: 10.4103/1817-1745.139300.

Online ISSN: 3009-7231 The print ISSN: 3009-7053

#### **VOL. 1, ISSUE. 2, JULY 2024**

**Muñoz-Miralles R.**, Ortega-González R., Batalla-Martínez López-Morón **C.**, **M.R.** J.M., Manresa Torán-**P.**, Tavakkoli-Monserrat Golpayegani M.M., Mortazavi A., Haghani S.A., Razi M., Shojaie-Fard Z., Zare M.B., Mina M., Mansourabadi E., Nazari-Jahromi1 L.,,, Safari A., Shokrpour N., and Mortazavi S.M. (2014): Access and Use of New Information and Telecommunication

DJNRHS

Technologies among Teenagers at High School, Health Implications. JOITIC Study. *Aten Primaria*. 2014 Feb;46(2):77-88. doi:

10.1016/j.aprim.2013.06.001. Epub 2013 Sep 12.

- National Academy of Science, (2012): Studying Media on Children and Youth, Washanton D.C.
- Poscia A., Frisicale E.M., Parente P., de Waure C., La Milia D.I.,

and Di Pietro M.L. (2015): Study Habits and Technology Use in Italian University Students. *Ann Ist Super Sanita*.;51(2):126-30. doi: 10.4415/ANN\_15\_02\_10.

- Rabiu Н.. Indo A., and Muhammad (2016): Impact of Mobile Phone Usage on Academic Performance among Secondary School Students in Taraba State, Nigeria. European Scientific Journal; 12(1 ISSN): 1857 - 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431.
- Reed J., Hirsh-Pasek K., and Golinkoff R.M. (2017): Learning on hold: Cell Phones Sidetrack Parent-Child Interactions. *Dev Psychol.*; 53(8):1428-1436. doi: 10.1037/dev0000292. Epub 2017 Jun 26.
- Reolid-Martínez R.E., Flores-Copete M., López-García M., Alcantud-Lozano P., Ayuso-

Raya M.C., and Escobar-Rabadán F. (2016): Frequency and Characteristics of Internet Use by Spanish Teenagers. A cross-sectional study. *Arch Argent Pediatr*.;114(1):6-13. doi: 10.5546 /aap.2016.eng.6. Epub 2015 Dec 28.

- Rico T.M., Dos Santos Machado K., Fernandes V.P., Madruga S.W., Noguez P.T., Barcelos C.R.G., Santin M.M., Petrarca C.R., and Dumith S.C. (2017): Text Messaging (SMS) Helping Cancer Care in Patients Undergoing Chemotherapy Treatment: a Pilot Study. J Med *Syst.*;41(11):181. doi: 10.1007/s10916-017-0831-3.
- **Royant-Parola S.**, Londe **V..** Tréhout S., and Hartley S. (2017): The use of Social Media Teenagers' Modifies Sleep-Related Behavior. Encephale. 2017 Jun 8. pii: S0013-7006(17)30114-8. doi: 10.1016/j.encep. 2017.03.009.

- Sharma M.K., Rao G.N., Benegal V., Thennarasu K., and Thomas D. (2017): Technology Addiction Survey: An Emerging Concern for Raising Awareness and Promotion of Healthy Use of Technology. *Indian J Psychol Med.*;39(4):495-499. doi: 10.4103/IJPSYM.IJPSYM \_171\_17.
- Van Dijk C.N., van Witteloostuijn M., Vasić N., Avrutin S., and Blom E. (2016): The Influence of Texting Language on Grammar and Executive Functions in Primary School Children. PLoS One.;11(3): e0152409. doi: 10.1371/journal. phone.0152409. eCollection 2016.
- Varleta P., Acevedo M., Akel C., Salinas C., Navarrete C., García A., Echegoyen C., Rodriguez D., Gramusset L., Leon S., Cofré P., Retamal R., and Romero K. (2017): Mobile Phone Text Messaging Improves Antihypertensive Drug

Adherence in the Community. JClin Hypertens(Greenwich).2017Sep21.10.1111/jch.13098.

- Vernon L., Modecki K.L., and Barber B.L. (2017): Mobile Phones in the Bedroom: Trajectories of Sleep Habits and Subsequent Adolescent Psychosocial Development. Child Dev. 2017 May 29. doi: 10.1111/cdev.12836.
- Vilchis-Gil **J.** Klünder-Klünder M., Duque X., and Flores-Huerta S. (2016): Decreased Mass Index Body in Schoolchildren After Yearlong Information Sessions with Parents Reinforced With Web and Mobile Phone Resources: Community Trial. J Med Internet *Res.*;18(6): e174. doi: 10.2196/jmir.5584.
- Muhammed, H. R. A. I., Umaru, Y., & Ahmed, H. T. (2016). Impact of Mobile Phone Usage

**Online ISSN: 3009-7231 The print ISSN: 3009-7053**  on Academic Performance among Secondary School Students in Taraba State, Nigeria. *European scientific journal*, 12(1), 1857-7881.