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Abstract: The symptoms of smartphone addiction have been extensively observed in adolescent students. This study aims to investigate the effects of smartphone addiction on students’ communication with their families, their learning, as well as guidance and counseling processes. The causal correlational design was applied, involving 103 participants selected total samplings of eighth-graders junior high school students. The data was garnered through the smartphone addiction scale and family communication scale. Both of those scales had item validity of 0.3, with Alpha Cronbach reliability of 0.937 and 0.850, respectively. The obtained data were analyzed using regression. The analysis results suggest that smartphone addiction significantly decreased the quality of students’ communication with their families, by -0.416. This result can be fundamental for school counselors and the subject teachers in formulating and implementing the learning process, to reduce the effects of smartphone addiction, enhance their communication skills, and improve the learning efficiency through the use of the smartphone as learning media, instead of restraining the smartphone use.
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Abstrak: Dewasa ini, gejala kecanduan smartphone semakin meluas pada siswa remaja. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui kontribusi kecanduan smartphone terhadap kualitas komunikasi siswa dalam keluarga, dan membahas implikasinya bagi pembelajaran, serta bimbingan dan konseling. Rancangan kausal korelasional digunakan pada 103 responden siswa kelas delapan yang menggunakan smartphone lebih dari 5 jam sehari, yang diperoleh secara total sampling di sekolah menengah pertama, dengan Alpha Cronbach reliability 0.937 dan 0.850. Data dianalisis menggunakan regresi. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa kecanduan smartphone berkontribusi signifikan menurunkan kualitas komunikasi siswa dalam keluarga sebesar -0,416. Implikasinya adalah konselor sekolah perlu berkolaborasi dengan guru bidang studi dalam menyusun dan melaksanakan program untuk mengurangi dampak negatif, meningkatkan kemampuan komunikasi, dan meningkatkan keefektivitas pembelajaran dengan menggunakan smartphone sebagai media belajar, alih-alih membatasi penggunaannya baik di rumah maupun di kelas.

Kata kunci: siswa remaja; regresi; kecanduan smartphone; komunikasi keluarga; pembelajaran
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INTRODUCTION

Smartphone has indicated the current rapid development of communication technology. Different from a regular phone, a smartphone is equipped with extensive memory capacity, camera, internet connection, and numerous features, such as email, social media, games, maps, and so forth. In the United States of America, 72% of citizens use a smartphone (Poushter, 2016). Universally, this number of smartphone users has substantially grown (Slavin, 2019). In Indonesia, 98% out of 400 children and adolescents aged 10-19 years old concede that they have understood the internet, while 79.5% of them have become internet users (Gayatri, Rusadi, Meiningsih, Mahmudah, & Sari, 2016).

A survey from the Ministry of Communication and Informatics of the Republic of Indonesia (2017) signifies that half of Indonesia’s society already has smartphones (66.31% from n = 6246). From the education perspective, 19.79, 19.02, and 19.67 % of smartphone users are elementary school, junior high school, and high school graduates, while 13.46 and 6.98% of them have bachelor’s and master’s or doctoral degrees, respectively, and 21.08% have no formal school background. Meanwhile, 13.97, 5.76, 19.07, 34.51, and 26.69 % of them spend < 1 hour, 1-3 hours, 3-5 hours, 5-10 hours, and >10 hours using a smartphone, respectively. They use a smartphone from their home (80.90%), workplace (17.90%), school/college (7.15%), and everywhere (89.63%). With the absence of Internet connection, 95.68, 41.06, 17.52, and 13.97% of the users use their smartphones for communication, entertainment, working, and learning. Meanwhile, with the internet connection, the users use the smartphone for communication (93.46%), entertainment (65.29%), browsing (76.88%), working (27.51%), and learning (25.70%).

As smartphone offers features facilitating communication and exploration of information, adolescents are inseparable from the smartphone. It simplifies the communication, searching of literature and information in the education, art, culture, social, politics, economy, and other fields (Irawan, 2014). These convenience and pleasure induce high time consumption, resulting in smartphone addiction. Smartphone addiction refers to smartphone use for more than five hours a day (James & Drennan, 2005). A study signifies that 290 adolescents aged 15-20 years old have used smartphones for more than five hours a day (Hasanah, Hijrianti, & Iswinarti, 2020), while 48% of 416 adolescents use the smartphone for more than four hours, daily (Aljomaa, Al.Qudah, Albursan, Bakhiet, & Abduljabbar, 2016).

Family refers to the relationship of a group of people bound by matrimony, blood ties, and commitment, that have lived together and shared their future for a long period of time (Galvin, Braithwaite, & Bylund, 2015). In a family, communication is defined as conversation or dialog between parents and children where they are free to express their experience, thought, feeling, and ambition in a friendly and attentive situation, full of acceptance.

Recently, smartphone use has been reported as the cause of decreasing face-to-face communications between parents and children (Alifiani, Nurhayati, & Ningsih, 2019; Lestari, Riana, & Taftazani, 2015; Nurchayati, 2017; Sarla, 2019). Both parents and children spend most of their time using a smartphone, rather than talking with their family (Ariani, 2018), thus, reducing the family time.

This study investigates the effects of smartphone addiction on the quality of junior high school students’ family communication. The findings are expected to be used in formulating effective family communication, effective learning management by the teachers, and the design of guidance and counseling programs by the school counselors.

METHOD

This study used the causal correlational design, with a population of eight grade students considered as heavy smartphone users in a junior high school in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. The 270 eighth-graders were asked to fill out the checklist on their average daily use of a smartphone. The classification referred to criteria constructed by James and Drennan (2005), consisting of the low user (< 1.5 hours a day), the moderate user (between 1.5 to 5 hours a day), and heavy user (>5 hours a day). The results suggested that 103 students were smartphone users. Thus, a total sampling was used. The students’ duration of smartphone usage is presented in Table 1.
The data were obtained using the smartphone addiction scale and family communication scales. The developed smartphone addiction scale, initially, had 30 items concerning six indicators, namely daily life disruption, positive anticipation, withdrawal, the orientation of cyber relationship, overuse of smartphones, and tolerance (Kwon et al., 2013). For the instrument validity, item correlation analysis was carried out, with minimum $r$ count table > $r$ table of 0.3120, for $n = 40$. The items were declared valid if the correlation value was > 0.3120 and vice versa. After a try-out involving 40 eighth graders with similar characteristics with the research population, 28 items were declared valid. Items number 3 and 24 were not used since they obtained lower correlation scores than 0.3. The scale had an Alpha Cronbach reliability score of 0.937. The results of item validity are presented in Table 2. The (*) marks the unused items (item numbers 3 and 24), due to their scores being lower than 0.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fav</th>
<th>Total valid items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone addiction</td>
<td>A. Daily life disruption</td>
<td>a. Unable to finish a task punctually&lt;br&gt;b. Difficulty to concentrate during the learning process&lt;br&gt;c. Physical disturbance in using smartphone</td>
<td>1, 14&lt;br&gt;2, 15&lt;br&gt;3*, 16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Positive anticipation</td>
<td>a. Excitement to use smartphone&lt;br&gt;b. Smartphone usage as a media to release stress</td>
<td>4, 17, 27&lt;br&gt;5, 18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Withdrawal</td>
<td>a. Uncomfortable feeling without smartphone&lt;br&gt;b. Get irritated when feeling disturbed while using the smartphone&lt;br&gt;c. Withdraw from the real association and prefer using smartphone</td>
<td>6, 19&lt;br&gt;7, 20&lt;br&gt;9, 22, 28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Orientation of cyber relationship</td>
<td>a. Have a close relationship with social media&lt;br&gt;b. Continuously checking their smartphone</td>
<td>10, 23&lt;br&gt;11, 24*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Excessive usage</td>
<td>a. Excessive use of smartphone&lt;br&gt;b. Encouragement to repeatedly use their smartphone</td>
<td>12, 25,&lt;br&gt;8, 29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Tolerance</td>
<td>a. Obstacles in controlling smartphone use&lt;br&gt;b. Inclination to continuously use smartphone</td>
<td>13, 26&lt;br&gt;21, 30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The family communication quality scale was developed based on five indicators, namely openness, considerate, empathy, support, and impartiality (Rahmawati & Budiningsih, 2018). The try-out of the family communication scale and smartphone addition scale was carried out simultaneously. From 30 items, 24 items were classified as valid, while items number 8, 10, 23, 24, 25, and 29 had a lower inter-item correlation score than the 0.3 $r$ table. Thus, those 6 items were not used. The results of the validity test are presented in Table 3, with (*) marks the invalid items, numbers 8, 10, 23, 24, 25, and 29.

The data were gathered by using Google Form in August 2021. Coordinated by the classroom teacher, the participant filled the scales through their smartphone from their homes with the teacher’s supervision. They filled the scales within two weeks. The data were analyzed using regression. The assumption test used in this study were normality, linearity, heteroscedasticity, and regression feasibility tests.
Table 3. Outline of Family Communication Quality Scale After The Tryout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fav.</th>
<th>Unfav.</th>
<th>Total valid items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication quality in the family</td>
<td>A. Openness</td>
<td>a. Willingness to open up to the other family members</td>
<td>1,10*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Willingness to communicate honestly</td>
<td>11,20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Considerate</td>
<td>a. Feel that they are heard</td>
<td>3,21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Feel that their family understand them</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4,13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Empathy</td>
<td>a. Can relate to other people feeling</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Capable of positioning themselves in other people’s shoes</td>
<td>15,24*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Supportive</td>
<td>a. Mutual support between family member</td>
<td>6,14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Mutual appreciation between family member</td>
<td>16, 29*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Impartiality</td>
<td>a. Accept other people</td>
<td>8*,17,26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Equal communication between children and parents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18,27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 24

RESULTS

Results of Assumption Test

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with variables of smartphone addiction (X) and quality of students’ communication in their family resulted in a significance score of 0.200 > 0.50, showing that those variables were normally distributed. The linearity and heteroscedasticity tests were carried out using a scatterplot chart (Field, 2017). The scatterplot graph illustrated in Figure 1 shows that the dots are spread randomly, forming no specific pattern. It showed no heteroscedasticity and linear relationship between X and Y variables. Table 4 shows an F value of 21.163 with sig = 0.000, indicating that the regression model has been fit (feasible).

Figure 1. Scatterplot of Heteroscedasticity and Linearity Test
Table 4. Feasibility Test of The Regression Model (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1703.040</td>
<td>21.163</td>
<td>0.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9830.777</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: communication
b. Predictors: (Constant), addiction

Results of the Hypothesis Test

Table 5 shows the constant value of $= 95.289$, $B\text{ addiction} = -0.449$ (standardized Beta = -0.416) and significance = 0.000. Thus, the H0 was rejected and H1 was accepted. It showed a significant negative contribution from smartphone addiction toward the quality of adolescent students’ family communication. The regression formula is presented in Formula 1.

$Y^* = (B_0 + B_1X_1) + \text{error}$

The regression model of students family communication quality $= (95.289 + -0.416X_1) + 0.098$. In the summary model presented in Table 6, the obtained $R^2 = 0.173$ and adjusted $R^2 = 0.165$, with a difference of 0.008 (from $0.173 - 0.165 = 0.008$) which is classified as very low.

Table 5. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>95.289</td>
<td>5.853</td>
<td>16.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addiction</td>
<td>-0.449</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>-0.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: communication

Table 6. Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$ Change F Change df2 Sig. F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.416a</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.173 21.163 101 0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), addiction
b. Dependent Variable: communication

DISCUSSION

As this study had fulfilled the normality, heteroscedasticity, and linearity tests, the regression model was feasible (fit), showing that the X variable (smartphone addiction) was the appropriate predictor of variable Y (quality of adolescent student’s family communication). The difference between $R^2$ reduced by adjusted $R^2$ was 0.008, classified as very low. Field (2017) states that lower $R^2$ reduced by adjusted $R^2$ represents better model generalization to the population, and vice versa. Therefore, the regression model from 103 heavy smartphone users can be generalized to adolescent heavy smartphone users, indicating that 8 from 1000 students experience a variation of the predicted outcome.

From one predictor (smartphone addiction), the 0.173 $R^2$ change was obtained with a significance of 0.000. This score shows that additional predictors will result in 0 to 0.173 (175) of $R^2$ square score within the regression model, remaining significant in the 0.000 level.
The results of the assumption test had fulfilled the requirement so that the regression model was feasible. The obtained R square, adjusted R square, and R square change shows that the proposed regression model and the findings (constant and beta) have fulfilled the academic requirements and can be generalized to the adolescent junior high school students population who experienced smartphone addiction.

The intersection degree between the predictor and criterion variables within the regression model is represented by the constant, while the beta value shows the correlation degree and direction, positive or negative correlation (Field, 2017). This study obtained a constant of 95.289 and a beta value of -0.416. The value indicates significant effects of smartphone addiction in decreasing students’ communication quality in their families. The high beta value of -0.416 with a significance of 0.00 < 0.05, implied that smartphone addiction reduced 41.6% of students’ communication quality in their family.

In addition, the beta value also demonstrates that in every one level increase of smartphone addiction, the quality of students’ family communication decreases by 0.416 times of communication quality standard deviation. The standard deviation of communication quality is 9.8 (mean = 68.6), so the smartphone addiction contribution toward students’ decreasing family communication quality is four times of Y predicted score (from -0.416 x 9.8 = -4.7, made into -4). The negative contribution signifies that higher smartphone addiction lowers students’ communication quality with their families, by four times or 41.6%. Other studies also suggest that smartphone addiction carries a negative contribution to family communication (Guo et al., 2019; Nurchayati, 2017; Seo & Bang, 2017).

**Effects of Smartphone Addiction on Effective Learning**

People with smartphone addiction are unable to control their smartphone use (Haug et al., 2015), presented by their failure to reduce the time they spend using smartphones and get ecstatic when using a smartphone, compared to when they are with their family or friends (Cho & Lee, 2015). For students, smartphone addiction disrupts their daily activities, such as their unfinished daily tasks or assignments, sloppy diet, messy sleep patterns, and so forth (Lestari et al., 2015). Their long period usage of smartphones results in physical exhaustion, reduced sleeping hours, depression, lower academic achievement, and even lower life satisfaction (Hawi & Samaha, 2016; Kim, 2013; Lin et al., 2015; Raza, Yousufi, Rafi, & Javaid, 2020; Samaha & Hawi, 2016; Sunday, Adesope, & Maarhuis, 2021). Another study presents that a long period of smartphone use may affect students’ concentration during the learning process (Manumpil, Ismanto, & Onibala, 2015). Further, adolescents with smartphone addiction are reported to have low academic achievement, unsatisfied with their academic lives, and have a distant relationship with their family (Lee & Lee, 2017).

A number of factors cause smartphone addiction in adolescents, namely the internal, social, and external factors (Lestari et al., 2015). The internal factor covers sensation seeking and low self-control, while the social factor contains the connected presence which represents the inclination to socially interact in the virtual world. The external factors consist of smartphone ability to provide stimulating information, various features, and situational factors especially boring learning burden. In an interview, the students admitted that they used smartphones for more than 5 hours daily because of the boredom of online learning, having no friends during the pandemic, no outdoor activities, and online game addiction.

The prevalence of smartphone addiction among students is around 48% (Aljomaa et al., 2016). During the pandemic situation, all junior high schools in Indonesia conduct online learning that results in students’ increased use of the smartphone, so smartphone addiction is predicted to accelerate. Consequently, this phenomena carries negative effects on the quality of students’ communication in their family and surrounding environment (Guo et al., 2019; Nurchayati, 2017; Seo & Bang, 2017). Besides, the higher smartphone addiction level also causes fatigue, low sleeping hour, depression, reduced academic achievement, low life satisfaction, disrupted daily activities (unfinished tasks or assignments), sloppy diet, and distant relationships with their family. Smartphone addiction also correlates with boring online learning, as well as a minimum to no outdoor activities and friends, during the pandemic.
Those negative effects are predicted to be experienced by more adolescents with higher severity. Therefore, in planning the learning process, the teacher should consider the time spent by students to operate a smartphone. First, teachers should identify the number of students with more than 5 hours of smartphone daily use, the information they accessed, their activities in the virtual world, and the materialized negative effects. Second, the teacher should understand students’ conditions and aid them in reducing the negative effects, such as for students physical exhaustion, they should provide specific recess periods during the learning process. Third, the teachers should adopt motivational classroom management using smartphones (Asplund & Kontio, 2020). It is linear with the gradual adoption of technology in the learning process of schools in the United States of America (Slavin, 2019). Thus, the smartphone should be integrated into the learning process. The teacher should no longer oppose the use of smartphones in the classroom, they should rather employ smartphones as the learning media. The smartphone can be used to download videos relevant to the learning, deliver more compelling material, communicate assignments, and discuss thought-provoking ideas related to the learning. For instance, after students finish their assignments correctly, teachers may let them play a regulated game. Fourth, during the learning, the teachers should aid the students to search and use credible sources of information, such as official government sources, reference books, and credible websites. Teachers should guide students to critically identify and select correct or wrong, useful or useless information, and use the information wisely.

**Effects of Smartphone Addiction on School Guidance and Counselling Services**

Family communication has an essential role in adolescent development (Álvarez-García, González-Castro, Núñez, Rodriguez, & Cerezo, 2019; Cai et al., 2021; Faltýnková, Blinka, Ševěnková, & Husarova, 2020). Proper communication facilitates students to freely communicate their thought and feeling, while also helping the teacher to understand the students’ eagerness. Besides, through great communication, each family member can understand their role, expectation, regulation, and habituate them to form and regulate the relationship with other people. Great family communication is illustrated from their intensity, openness, discussion on various aspects, equal respect, as well as parents who do not control and restrict their children (Aramburu Alegret et al., 2020; Jafarnezhad, Asadiyonesi, & Rastgoomoghadam, 2015).

Good family communication affects children’s behavior, especially when they become adults as communication with parents tremendously affects children’s development and moral formation, thus, parents should direct and help children to comprehend the concept of good and bad in various aspects (Sumartono, 2017). A study has reported that low-intensity family communication makes the children receive limited attention and guidance, resulting in greater chances for children to consume alcohol and drugs, be involved in fights, bullying, and so forth (Sambuaga, 2014).

Smartphone has been widely used by an adolescent with a high duration (more than 5 hours a day). This long period of smartphone usage reduces adolescent students’ communication quality with their families. Low-quality family communication induces students to feel left out, and receive minimum guidance and attention, while also opening their chances to do negative behavior. Besides, the findings also suggest that smartphone addiction negatively impacted students’ academic learning outcomes.

School counselors should organize a guidance and counseling service, collaborating with the subject teachers. The collaboration can be initiated by planning students’ need assessment related to smartphone use, family communication, as well as their learning motivation and behavior. Further, another collaboration is required in formulating the instrument (scale) to obtain students’ data, analyze the data, and summarize the programs appropriate for students’ needs. According to the need analysis, the subject teachers should collaborate with the school counselors in providing guidance services, such as guidance to wisely use a smartphone, have better learning time management and enhance students’ direct or virtual communication skills. The subject teachers can also help identify students with heavy smartphone addiction who have issues with physical health and learning process, requiring counseling service from the school counselors.
CONCLUSION

Smartphone addiction is predicted to reduce the quality of students’ communication with their families by 41.6%. Studies have also confirmed that smartphone addiction carries negative effects on students’ physical, emotional, and learning behavior, as well as on the learning process. Therefore, school counselors should cooperate with the subject teacher in decreasing the negative effects of the smartphone, enhancing students’ communication skills, increasing learning effectiveness, and optimizing students’ academic achievement without prohibiting the use of smartphones at school and home.
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