IJNP (Indonesian Journal of Nursing Practices) Vol 5 No 1 JUNE 2021: 51-59

Lailil Fatkuriyah¹, Chae Sun-Mi²

¹STIKES dr. Soebandi jember, Indonesia ²College of Nursing and the Research Institute of Nursing Science Seoul National University, South Korea

Corresponding Author: Lailil Fatkuriyah Email: lailil.fatkuriyah88@gmail.com

Article Info

Online	: http://journal.umy.ac.id/index.php/ijnp
ISSN	: 2548 4249 (Print)
	: 2548 592X (Online)
DOI	: 10.18196/ijnp.v5i1.11186

Article History

Received	
Revised	
Accepted	

: 20 February 2021 : 23 March 2021 : 24 March 2021 The Relationship among Parenting Style, Self-Regulation, and Smartphone Addiction Proneness in Indonesian Junior High School Students

Abstract

Background: Smartphone addiction leads to physical, psychological, and social consequences for users, particularly for adolescent users, as psychological development is still in the process of maturation. Individual and family characteristics are shown to contribute to shaping adolescent's behavior related to smartphone usage. Specifically, perceived parenting style and selfregulation have been reported as significant factors influencing smartphone addiction among adolescents.

Objective: This study aims to identify the relationship among parenting style, self-regulation, and smartphone addiction proneness in Indonesian junior high school students.

Method: This study used a cross-sectional, descriptive study design. Data collection took place in five public junior high schools in Jember from the 7th of January to the 8th of February, 2019. The total sample of this study was 158, purposively asked to fill out three questionnaires: Parental Authority Questionnaire, Self-Regulation Questionnaire, and Smartphone Addiction Proneness Scale. Chi-square test and Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to test the relationship between two variables.

Result: The differences in smartphone addiction proneness between the risk group and non-risk group were significant depending on gender (p=0.004), daily smartphone usage time (p=0.025), and purpose of smartphone usage (p=0.001). A significant negative correlation was found between self-regulation and smartphone addiction proneness (r= -0.448, p=0.001).

Conclusion: The current study found that 11.4% of junior high school students in Jember-Indonesia were categorized into risk groups for smartphone addiction. Gender, daily smartphone usage time, and purpose of smartphone usage showed significant differences between the risk group and the non-risk group. However, there was no difference in the parenting style of the mother between the two groups. Selfregulation showed a significant association with smartphone addiction.

Keywords: Indonesia, junior high school students, parenting style, self-regulation, smartphone addiction proneness

INTRODUCTION

Smartphones have become an indispensable device for all groups of people, especially adolescents, due to their multipurpose and attractive features. Based on the study by <u>Husni and Fatulloh (2016)</u>, involving 1,551 elementary and middle school students in Bandung-Indonesia, approximately 67.4% of participants spent 1-4 hours per day using smartphones. The study showed that 18.6% and 7.7% of students spent 4-8 hours and 8-12 hours per day, respectively. Meanwhile, approximately 6.3% of participants spent more than 12 hours per day.

Although smartphones have countless benefits, many harmful effects are also at stake when they are overused. Furthermore, smartphone usage's increasing frequency and duration are positively linked to a higher risk of smartphone addiction (Cha & Seo, 2018; Haug et al., 2015). Several studies have reported that smartphone addiction can result in several physical, psychological, and social problems (Cha & Seo, 2018; Lee et al., 2017).

Several studies found that family environmental factors have an important role in predicting smartphone addiction. Specifically, a positive parenting style characterized by affection, rational explanation, and parents' supervision could reduce smartphone addiction (Bae, 2015). Meanwhile, a negative parenting style characterized by parental rejection and restriction could increase the level of adolescents' reliance on smartphones (Bae, 2015; Lian et al., 2016).

Individual characteristics have been considered an essential factor in human development. Thus, adolescents' characteristics should be factored in when determining the extent to which adolescents are affected by their environments (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Nowadays, adolescents' use of online space is strongly related to fulfilling their psychosocial development tasks, such as selfidentity, self-esteem, and social connection improvement (Shapiro & Margolin, 2014). Haug et al. (2015) also reported that adolescents tended to utilize their smartphone features suited to their preferences as a way to manage their friendship and academic-related stress. These adolescents' characteristics regarding technological utilization

In addition, the failure of self-regulation could increase media usage, which will develop into media addiction (Osatuyi & Turel, 2018). Van Deursen et al. (2015) showed that a low level of self-regulation increased the risk of smartphone addiction. The combination of the immature self-regulation of adolescents and the above characteristics of adolescents drives smartphone addiction more compared to the other age groups. Adolescents face the troubling impacts of smartphone addiction, deteriorating their future as the nation's next generation. However, studies investigating the correlation of parenting style, self-regulation, and smartphone addiction proneness among adolescents in Indonesia remain limited. Therefore, a study of the relationship among parenting style, self-regulation, and addiction proneness among junior high school students in Indonesia becomes very important.

METHODS

This study was a quantitative study with a crosssectional approach. The study was conducted from the 7th of January to the 8th of February 2019 in five public junior high schools. Purposive sampling was used to recruit participants for this study. The inclusion criteria in this study were as follows: student in grades 7-9 of junior high school in Jember, smartphone user, living with both parents, and willing to participate in the study. Students who lived with one parent, either mother or father, only, were excluded from the study.

This study utilized the G-power software program version 3.1 to calculate the minimum sample size with a statistical correlation test. This study's significance levels, effect size, and power are 0.05, 0.25, and 0.8, respectively. This study's significance and power levels were based on a previous similar study by Lee, Chae, Bang, and Choi (2015). By counting for missing values and withdrawal, a missing rate of 20% was set. A total of 158 eligible junior high school students participated in this study.

Data were collected using three questionnaires. The first questionnaire was the Smartphone Addiction Proneness Scale (SAPS), consisting of 15 items ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Smartphone addiction proneness is classified as follows: high-risk group (total score \geq 45), potential-risk group (total score=42-44), and non-risk group (total score \leq 41). Only two categorizations of smartphone addiction proneness were used in the study, including non-risk and risk groups (Kim et al., 2014).

Since there is no reliable and valid instrument for measuring smartphone addiction proneness in Bahasa Indonesia, the translation and content validity process were conducted using five stages of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measurement guideline (Beaton et al., 2000).

The SAPS-Indonesian version was reviewed by three experts to assess the content validity. Content validity index (CVI) was calculated for item-level CVI (I-CVI) and scale-level CVI (S-CVI). In this study, all of the items of the SAPS-Indonesian version produced an I-CVI of 1.00, indicating an excellent value. The S-CVI was 1.00, reflecting an excellent validity of the overall scale. The reliability test of SAPS was conducted as well, following the process of cross-cultural adaptation. The reliability test of the SAPS-Indonesian version involving 158 participants was verified with an overall Cronbach's alpha value of 79, indicating an acceptable internal consistency.

Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) was used to measure adolescents' perceived parenting style. The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) Indonesian version developed by Tamami (2011) included father and mother versions. Only the PAQ of the mother-Indonesian version was used in this study. It consisted of 27 items, where each item was scored on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The items were categorized into three subscales, including authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the PAQ of the Mother version in this study was 86. Each parenting style was later classified into three categories based on the mean score and standard deviation.

Self-regulation was measured using the Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SRQ) Indonesian version developed by <u>Restuti (2016)</u>. The SRQ Indonesian

version consisted of 23 items, and each item was scored on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) for favorable items. Unfavorable items were scored in reverse. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the SRQ-Indonesian version in this study was 83. A higher total score of the SRQ indicated higher selfregulation ability.

This study has passed the ethical clearance from the Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY) with ethical number 622/EP-FKIK-UMY/XII/2018. This study has also obtained research permits from the National Political and Society Protection Board (*Badan Kesatuan Bangsa dan Politik/BAKESBANG*) and the Office of Education of Jember Region.

As the age of the participants was less than 18 years, the students who agreed to participate in the study received two informed consent forms, including student assent and parents' consent forms. Since the researcher did not meet the parents directly, the parents' consent forms were enveloped and sealed. The students were then asked to deliver that form to their parents. The students and their parents had a week to read and sign the consent forms. Only those who submitted both the participant's assent form and parental informed consent form were included in the study.

RESULTS

As presented in Table 1, out of the 158 participants, 88.6% (n=140) were identified as a non-risk group for smartphone addiction, and 11.4% (n=18) were classified as a risk group. Among 18 participants in the risk group, five participants were classified into the high-risk group, while 13 participants were classified as a potential-risk group.

To identify the differences in smartphone addiction proneness according to individual and family characteristics of participants between the non-risk group and the risk groups, the Chi-square test and Fisher's exact test were performed. As evidenced from Table 2, smartphone addiction proneness was significantly different based on some individual characteristics of participants, including gender (p=0.004), daily smartphone usage time (p=0.001).

A Pearson's correlation coefficient was performed to identify the relationship between self-regulation

and smartphone addiction proneness. A negative correlation was found between self-regulation and smartphone addiction proneness (r=-0.448, p<0.001). It indicated that the higher the self-regulation is, the lower the participant's risk of becoming addicted to a smartphone will be. Conversely, the lower the self-regulation is, the higher the participant's risk of becoming addicted to a smartphone will be.

DISCUSSION

The prevalence of smartphone addiction proneness in this study was 11.4%. There is no survey nationally representing smartphone addiction in Indonesia. Thus, comparing this finding to the current situation in Indonesia becomes quite challenging. However, this finding should be considered an important issue that needs more serious attention from relevant institutions to establish strategies to overcome these phenomena.

Individual characteristics of adolescents, including gender, daily smartphone usage time, and purpose of smartphone usage, showed significant differences between the risk group and the non-risk group. Most participants in the risk group were female, whereas most participants in the non-risk group were male. In supporting the current study's finding, previous studies showed that smartphone addiction had been more prevalent among female adolescents (Lee et al., 2017). Another study reported that females exhibited 2.7 times more risk of smartphone addiction than males (Lee et al., 2017). It might be because female adolescents were more disposed to use smartphones for social purposes, such as maintaining a social relationship with their valued people, prompting greater utilization of various communication services of the smartphone, such as chatting, texting, and accessing Social Networking Sites (SNSs) (Chiu et al., 2013). Meanwhile, playing online games was the main predictor of smartphone addiction among males (Chen et al., 2017). This finding implied that prevention and intervention strategies to overcome smartphone addiction and reduce among adolescents should be implemented by considering the gender perspective on smartphone use.

Daily smartphone usage time is found to be significantly different between the two groups.

Most participants in the risk group spent more than four hours on smartphone use, while most participants in the non-risk group spent less than four hours. Some previous studies supported this finding. According to <u>Haug et al. (2015)</u>, <u>Aljomaa et</u> <u>al. (2016)</u>, and <u>Hussain et al. (2017)</u>, longer duration on smartphone use strongly predicted smartphone addiction, whereas shorter smartphone usage time negatively affected smartphone addiction (<u>Cha &</u> <u>Seo, 2018</u>). As junior high school students are still dependent on their parents and interact with their parents mostly in daily life, this finding emphasized a need of supporting parents in providing clear rules and time limits on daily smartphone use to their children.

Among other smartphone content, including music, online games, and streaming video, Social Networking Sites (SNSs) were frequently used among adolescents. SNS was revealed to have a more significant effect on smartphone addiction than the effect of game use (Jeong et al., 2016). The first reason why SNS exhibits the most substantial effect on addiction is that, once people access SNS, they can also access various entertainment applications, such as online games, videos, and music (Kuss & Griffiths, 2017). Second, SNS enables people to either maintain relationships or create new connections with others from different areas across the world, something that cannot be done with other content on a smartphone (Frehat & Abu-Shanab, 2014). Third, people nowadays tend to use SNS applications to send messages or make online calls rather than making conventional phone calls and messages, which require additional costs (Salehan & Negahban, 2013). These aforementioned benefits of SNS pull more adolescents to become engaged in SNS application, contributing to excessive smartphone use. As a result, the more frequently adolescents use SNS is, the longer time they spent on smartphone use will be. It later increases the vulnerability to smartphone addiction. This finding, hence, proved that educational programs on good practices for using smartphones and SNS are necessary with the goals that adolescents will be able to develop a healthy utilization of such communication tools.

The two groups showed a significant difference regarding the purpose of smartphone use. Getting

new information and communicating with people were the two most essential motives in using smartphones in the non-risk group. Meanwhile, participants in the risk group mostly used their smartphones for seeking fun and regulating mood. These findings were in line with a previous study in which students who showed minor addiction to smartphones were more likely to use their smartphones for communication and informationseeking. Meanwhile, students who were dominantly using their smartphones to seek enjoyment and regulate their mood showed more significant addiction to smartphones (Zhang et al., 2014). It might be because behaviors that produce feelings of fun and enjoyment are more likely to raise our motivation to keep doing the same behaviors (Song et al., 2004). Therefore, when smartphone users experience a better feeling and obtain pleasure when using smartphones, they are more likely to get addicted to smartphones. This result can be used to develop health education programs related to healthy smartphone use for the risk group by including fun and attractive activities such as gamebased learning, quizzes, and competition to improve the engagement of adolescents in the programs.

Both groups showed no difference in smartphone addiction proneness depending on perceived family socioeconomic status. Regarding the parents' education level, either the father's or the mother's education level appeared to not be statistically different between the two groups. Akin to this study, Cha and Seo (2018) found that family income and parents' education were not significantly related to smartphone addiction proneness among Korean middle school students. Similarly, Kumcagiz and Gunduz (2016) showed no significant difference in the mean scores of smartphone addiction among university students based on family economic background. Furthermore, Cha and Seo (2018) argued that, since a smartphone provides various content tailored to the individual's needs and individuals from interests. anv level of socioeconomic status would easily find content in which they were interested or satisfy their needs. This finding demonstrated that, due to smartphones' convenient and multifarious functions, adolescents from families with different levels of socioeconomic status might have a similar risk of smartphone addiction.

Another variable reflecting the family characteristic of participants in this study was the mother's parenting style. In this study, there was no difference in smartphone addiction based on mothers' parenting styles between the two groups. On the other hand, <u>Bae (2015)</u> and <u>Yoo and Kim (2015)</u> reported that authoritarian and permissive parenting styles were significantly associated with smartphone addiction among adolescents. This finding may suggest using another measurement tool that can identify the parenting style of Indonesian mothers more accurately.

Self-regulation showed a significant negative correlation with smartphone addiction proneness among Indonesian junior high school students. This finding was in line with some recent studies which revealed that self-regulation was an essential factor in smartphone addiction. Ching and Tak (2017) stated that people having higher self-regulation skills became more aware of the rationale and the desired outcome of certain behaviors and had more worthwhile life goals. As a result, they were less likely to use smartphones uncontrollably. Kim et al. (2016) also stated that the level of self-regulation ability could also reflect an individual's capacity to delay satisfaction. Individuals with a high sense of self-regulation would demonstrate higher selfdiscipline, a higher focus on long-term goals, and a greater capability to delay short-term gratification. Therefore, those people showed a low tendency to attain the temporary satisfaction which smartphones can provide (Ching & Tak, 2017). Ching and Tak (2017) and Gökçearslan et al., (2016) reported that students with lower self-regulation abilities were more likely to exhibit an addictive use of smartphones. It may be because individuals with poor self-regulation showed a low capability to avoid distractors and could not focus on their works (Ramzi & Saed, 2019). Therefore, it seems necessary to facilitate adolescents in developing a higher selfregulation ability related to smartphone use.

Even though this study provides some contributions regarding smartphone use patterns and smartphone addiction proneness in Indonesian adolescents, it has a limitation that should be considered. This study only involved 158 junior high school students from one city in Indonesia. The number of students who participated in this study was very few compared to the total adolescents in Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

Individual characteristics of adolescents, including gender, daily smartphone usage time, and purpose of smartphone usage, showed significant differences between the risk group and the non-risk group.

Family socioeconomic and parent education level, which reflected the family characteristics in this study, had no differences in the two groups. The result of the bivariate analysis showed a significant between self-regulation association and smartphone addiction proneness. This present study provides meaningful information about the prevalence of smartphone addiction proneness in Indonesia and the individual factors contributing to smartphone addiction proneness. This study can initiate other research in Indonesia focusing on similar issues, which could subsequently discover an nursing intervention in effective reducing smartphone addiction among children and adolescents. This study also suggests that the Indonesian government should establish a national prevention program related to smartphone addiction integrated into the school curriculum.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the support received from the Indonesian Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP), Ministry of Finance, for providing research funding for this study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

First author: Designing the study, carrying out the data collection, performing a statistical test, and writing the manuscript

Second author: Providing advice and guidance for conducting appropriate research, Monitoring and supervising the progress of the study

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No existing or potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported

REFERENCES

Aljomaa, S, S., Al.Qudah, M, F., Albursan, I, S., Bakhiet, S, F., & Abduljabbar, A, S. (2016). Smartphone addiction among university students in the light of some variables. Computers in Human Behavior, 61, 155-164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03. 041

- Bae, S., M. (2015). The relationships between perceived parenting style, learning motivation, friendship satisfaction, and the addictive use of smartphones with elementary school students of South Korea: Using multivariate latent growth modeling. *School Psychology International, 36*(5), 513-531. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/014303431560</u> <u>4017</u>
- Beaton, D, E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guideline for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *SPINE*, *25*(24), 3186-3191.

https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cha, S, S., & Seo, B. K. (2018). Smartphone use and smartphone addiction in middle school students in Korea: Prevalence, social networking service, and game use. *Health Psychol Open*, 5(1). <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/205510291875</u> 5046
- Chen, B., Liu, F., Ding, S., Ying, X., Wang, L., & Wen, Y. (2017). Gender differences in factors associated with smartphone addiction: a cross-sectional study among medical college students. *BMC Psychiatry*, *17*(1), 341. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-

<u>1503-z</u>

Ching, H, K., & Tak, L, M. (2017). The structural media in parenting style, attachment style, self-regulation and self-esteem for smartphone addiction. *Journal of Psychology and The Behavioral Sciences*, *3*(1), 85-103. https://doi.org/10.22492/ijpbs.3.1.06

Chiu, S, I., Hong, F, Y., & Chiu, S, L. (2013). An Analysis on the Correlation and Gender Difference between College Students' Internet Addiction and Mobile Phone Addiction in Taiwan. *ISRN Addict, 2013*, 1-10.

https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/360607

- Frehat, M., & Abu-Shanab, E. (2014). The Role of Social Networking in the Social Reform on Young Society. 25-26. <u>https://doi.org/10.1145/2668260.2668</u> <u>269</u>
- Gökçearslan, Ş., Mumcu, F, K., Haşlaman, T., & Cevik, Υ, D. (2016). Modelling smartphone addiction: The role of self-regulation, smartphone usage, general self-efficacy and cyberloafing in students. Computers in university Human Behavior, 63, 639-649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05. 091
- Haug, S., Castro, R, P., Kwon, M., Filler, A., Kowatsch, T., & Schaub, M, P. (2015).
 Smartphone use and smartphone addiction among young people in Switzerland. J Behav Addict, 4(4), 299-307.

https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.4.2015.0 37

- Ε, Husni, M., & Fatulloh, Α. (2016). Categorization of internet users among elementary and middle school students by using Twostep Cluster method. Paper presented at the The National Seminar Information Technology of and Application (SNATi), Yogyakarta.
- Hussain, Z., Griffiths, M, D., & Sheffield, D. (2017). An investigation into problematic smartphone use: The role of narcissism, anxiety, and personality factors. J Behav Addict, 6(3), 378-386. https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.6.2017.0 52
- Jeong, S.-H., Kim, H., Yum, J.-Y., & Hwang, Y. (2016). What type of content are smartphone users addicted to?: SNS vs.

games. Computers in Human Behavior, 54, 10-17.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.07. 035

Kim, Y., Jeong, J. E., Cho, H., Jung, D. J., Kwak, M., Rho, M. J., . . . Choi, I. Y. (2016). Personality Factors Predicting Smartphone Addiction Predisposition: Behavioral Inhibition and Activation Systems, Impulsivity, and Self-Control. *PLoS One*, *11*(8), e0159788. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0</u> 159788

Kumcagiz, H., & Gunduz, Y. (2016). Relationship between Psychological Well-Being and Smartphone Addiction of University Students. International Journal of Higher Education, 5(4). https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v5n4p144

- Kuss, D. J., & Griffiths, M. D. (2017). Social Networking Sites and Addiction: Ten Lessons Learned. Int J Environ Res Public Health, 14(3). <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph1403031</u> <u>1</u>
- Lee, H., Kim, J. W., & Choi, T. Y. (2017). Risk Factors for Smartphone Addiction in Korean Adolescents: Smartphone Use Patterns. J Korean Med Sci, 32(10), 1674-1679. <u>https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2017.32.1</u> 0.1674
- Lian, L., You, X., Huang, J., & Yang, R. (2016). Who overuses Smartphones? Roles of virtues and parenting style in Smartphone addiction among Chinese college students. *Computers in Human Behavior, 65*, 92-99. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.08.</u> 027
- Osatuyi, B., & Turel, O. (2018). Tug of war between social self-regulation and habit: Explaining the experience of momentary social media addiction symptomps. *Computers in Human Behavior, 85*, 95-105.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.03. 037

- Ramzi, F., & Saed, O. (2019). The roles of selfregulation and self-control in Procrastination. *Psychology and Behavioral Science International Journal, 13*(3). <u>https://doi.org/10.19080/PBSIJ.2019.13</u> .555863
- Restuti, R. (2016). *Relationship between selfregulation and media addiction.* (Master), Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta.
- Salehan, M., & Negahban, A. (2013). Social networking on smartphones: When mobile phones become addictive. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*(6), 2632-2639. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.07.</u> 003
- Song, I., LaRose, R., Eastin, M. S., & Lin, C, A. (2004). Internet gratifications and internet addiction: On the uses and abuses of new media. *CyberPsychol Behav*, 7(4), 384-394. <u>https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2004.7.38</u> <u>4</u>
- Shapiro, L, A, S., & Margolin, G. (2014). Growing up wired: social networking sites and adolescent psychosocial development. *Clin Child Fam Psychol Rev, 17*(1), 1-18. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-013-</u> 0135-1
- Tamami, A. N. I. (2011). The effect of parenting style and self-regulated learning on procrastination on middle school students in Pondok Pinang. *Jurnal Sari Pediatric, 20*.
- Van Deursen, A, J, A, M., Bolle, C. L., Hegner, S. M., & Kommers, P. A. M. (2015). Modeling habitual and addictive smartphone behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *45*, 411-420. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.12.</u> 039

- Yoo, T. J., & Kim, S. S. (2015). Impact of perceived parenting styles on depression and smartphone addiction in college students *Journal Korean Academy Psychiatric Mental Health Nursing 24*(2), 127-135. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.12934/jkpmhn.201</u> <u>5.24.2.127</u>
- Zhang, K, Z, K., Chen, C., & Lee, M, K. (2014). Understanding the role of motives in smartphone addiction. Paper presented at the Proceedings - Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems, PACIS 2014, Retrieved from <u>https://www.scopus.com/record/displa</u> <u>y.uri?eid=2-s2.0-</u> 84928645102&origin=recordpage

Table 1. Smartphone Addiction Proneness of Junior High School Students (n=158)

•	()
	ip Total (n=158)
Risk group	
High-risk group	
Potential-risk group	
Total score M (SD)	34.65 (5.76)
Total score M (SD)	3

Table 2. Differences in Smartphone Addiction Proneness by Individual and Family Characteristics (n=158)

Family Characteristics Category (n=140) group (n=140) (n=18) (n=140) Age (years) 12-13 59 (89.4) 7 (10.6) 0.978 0.613 14-15 75 (87.2) 11 (12.8) 59 (89.4) 7 (10.6) 0.978 0.613 14-15 75 (87.2) 11 (12.8) 5 0.000 0.00 Gender Male 67 (97.1) 2 (2.9) 0.004* Female 73 (82.0) 16 (18.0) 0.000* Grade 7 48 (90.6) 5 (8.3) 0.000* Smartphone Personal 134 (88.2) 18 (11.8) 1.000° Ownership Shared 6 (100) 0 (0.0) 0.001* Daily Smartphone Secking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 0.001* Vusge Secking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 0.276* Usage Secking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 0.276* Usage Secking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 0.2	Personal and		Non-risk	Risk group		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c } \medskip \med$	Feisonal and	Catagony	group	(n=18)	v ²	n
n (%) n (%) n (%) Age (years) 12-13 59 (89.4) 7 (10.6) 0.978 0.613 14-15 75 (87.2) 11 (12.8) > > Gender Male 67 (97.1) 2 (2.9) 0.004 ⁺ Female 73 (82.0) 16 (18.0) 0.004 ⁺ Grade 7 48 (90.6) 5 (9.4) 2.575 0.276 8 55 (91.7) 5 (8.3) 9 37 (82.2) 8 (17.8) 1.000 ⁺ Ownership Shared 6 (100) 0 (0.0) 0.025 0.255 0.276 Jage Time >4 78 (94.0) 5 (6.0) 4.992 0.025 Usage Time >4 78 (94.0) 5 (6.0) 4.992 0.001 ⁺ Smartphone Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 0.001 ⁺ Most Frequently Social Network Sites (SNS) 96 (86.5) 15 (13.5) 0.276 ⁺ Smartphone streaming video) 5 (10.0) 0 (0.0) 1.275 ⁺ 0.276	Characteristics	Category	(n=140)		X	μ
Age (years) 12-13 59 (89.4) 7 (10.6) 0.978 0.613 14-15 75 (87.2) 11 (12.8)			n (%)	n (%)		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } & 14.15 & 75 (87.2) & 11 (12.8) \\ \hline >15 & 6 (100.0) & 0 (0.0) \\ \hline & 6 (100.0) & 0 (0.0) \\ \hline & 6 (100.0) & 10 (10.0) \\ \hline & 10 (10.0) & 10 (10.0) \\ \hline & 1$	Age (years)	12-13	59 (89.4)	7 (10.6)	0.978	0.613
>15 6 (100.0) 0 (0.0) Gender Male 67 (97.1) 2 2.9 0.004 ¹ Female 73 (82.0) 15 (18.0) . . . Grade 7 48 (90.6) 5 (9.4) 2.575 0.276 8 55 (91.7) 5 (8.3) . . 1.000 ⁺ Smartphone Personal 134 (88.2) 18 (11.8) . 1.000 ⁺ Ownership Shared 6 (100.0) 0 (0.0) . . . Daily Smartphone 54 78 (94.0) 5 (6.0) 4.992 0.025 Usage Setking New Information and 90 (95.7) 4 (4.3) . 0.001 ⁺ Smartphone Communicating with People . . 0.276 ⁺ Usage Setking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) . 0.276 ⁺ Used Content of Others (music, online game, 44 (93.6) 3 (6.4) . . Socioeconomic Mod		14-15	75 (87.2)	11 (12.8)		
Gender Male Female 67 (97.1) 2 (2.9) 0.004' Grade 7 82.0) 16 (18.0) 16 (18.0) Grade 7 48 (90.6) 5 (9.4) 2.575 0.276 8 55 (91.7) 5 (8.3) 9 37 (82.2) 8 (17.8) 1.000' Ownership Shared 6 (100) 0 (0.0) 0.025 Usage Time >4 0.255 0.276 Daily Smartphone S4 78 (94.0) 5 (6.0) 4.992 0.025 Usage Time >4 62 (82.7) 13 (17.3) 0.001' Smartphone Communicating with People Usage Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 0.276' Usage Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 0.276' Most Frequently Social Network Sites (SNS) 96 (86.5) 15 (13.5) 0.276' Smartphone streaming video) T F F 5 Status High 8 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 1		>15	6 (100.0)	0 (0.0)		
Female 73 (82.0) 16 (18.0) Grade 7 48 (90.6) 5 (9.4) 2.575 0.276 8 55 (91.7) 5 (8.3) - - 9 37 (82.2) 8 (17.8) - 1.000 [†] Ownership Shared 6 (100) 0 (0.0) - - Daily Smartphone 5 (6.0) 4.992 0.025 0.025 Usage Time >4 78 (94.0) 5 (6.0) 4.992 0.021 ⁺ Usage Time >4 62 (82.7) 13 (17.3) 0.001 ⁺ Usage Time Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) - Vusage Trequently Social Network Sites (SNS) 96 (86.5) 15 (13.5) 0.276 ⁺ Usade Content of Others (music, online game, 44 (93.6) 3 (6.4) - Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5) 0.317 Status High 8 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.96 0.317 Education Level High School	Gender	Male	67 (97.1)	2 (2.9)		0.004 ⁺
Grade 7 48 (90.6) 5 (9.4) 2.575 0.276 8 55 (91.7) 5 (8.3) . . Smartphone Personal 134 (82.2) 8 (17.8) . Smartphone Personal 134 (82.2) 18 (11.8) 1.000' Ownership Shared 6 (100) 0 (0.0) . . Daily Smartphone ≤4 78 (94.0) 5 (6.0) 4.992 .0.025 Usage Time >4 62 (82.7) 13 (17.3) . . . (hours)		Female	73 (82.0)	16 (18.0)		
8 55 (91.7) 5 (8.3) 9 37 (82.2) 8 (17.8) Smartphone Personal 134 (88.2) 18 (1.8) 1.000 ⁺ Ownership Shared 6 (100) 0 (0.0) 0.025 Daily Smartphone <4	Grade	7	48 (90.6)	5 (9.4)	2.575	0.276
9 37 (82.2) 8 (17.8) Smartphone Personal 134 (88.2) 18 (11.8) 1.000* Ownership Shared 6 (100) 0 (0.0)		8	55 (91.7)	5 (8.3)		
Smartphone Personal 134 (88.2) 18 (11.8) 1.000 [†] Ownership Shared 6 (100) 0 (0.0)		9	37 (82.2)	8 (17.8)		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Smartphone	Personal	134 (88.2)	18 (11.8)		1.000^{+}
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Ownership	Shared	6 (100)	0 (0.0)		
Usage Time (hours) >4 62 (82.7) 13 (17.3) Purpose of Smartphone Getting New Information and Communicating with People 90 (95.7) 4 (4.3) 0.001 ⁺ Smartphone Communicating with People 14 (21.9)	Daily Smartphone	≤4	78 (94.0)	5 (6.0)	4.992	0.025
(hours) 90 (95.7) 4 (4.3) 0.001 ⁺ Smartphone Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 14 (21.9) Most Frequently Social Network Sites (SNS) 96 (86.5) 15 (13.5) 0.276 ⁺ Usage Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 0.276 ⁺ Most Frequently Social Network Sites (SNS) 96 (86.5) 15 (13.5) 0.276 ⁺ Used Content of Others (music, online game, streaming video) 3 (6.4) 0.373 0.373 Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5) 0.373 Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5) 0.317 Education Level High 8 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Education Level High School 74 (89.2) 9 (10.8) 0.271 14 (10.0) Ghoursity or higher 53 (85.7) 12 (14.3) 0.282 0.281 Mother's Elementary School 14 (100.0) 6 (10.0) 0.000 0.000 0.082 0.312	Usage Time	>4	62 (82.7)	13 (17.3)		
Purpose of Smartphone Getting New Information and Communicating with People 90 (95.7) 4 (4.3) 0.001 ⁺ Smartphone Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) 0.276 ⁺ Most Frequently Social Network Sites (SNS) 96 (86.5) 15 (13.5) 0.276 ⁺ Used Content of Others (music, online game, Smartphone 44 (93.6) 3 (6.4) 0.373 Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5) 0.373 Socioeconomic Moderate 13 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Father's Elementary School 13 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Education Level High School 74 (89.2) 9 (10.8) 0 0.00 University or higher 53 (85.5) 9 (14.5) 0.082 0.821 0.2612 0.271 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3) 0.082 0.822 Parenting Style Medium 98 (85.2) 17 (14.8) 0.282 0.868 Parenting Style Mediu	(hours)					
Smartphone Communicating with People Usage Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) Most Frequently Social Network Sites (SNS) 96 (86.5) 15 (13.5) 0.276 [†] Used Content of Others (music, online game, streaming video) 44 (93.6) 3 (6.4) 50 (78.1) 1.975 0.373 Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5) 0.373 Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5) 0.317 Father's Elementary School 13 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Education Level High School 74 (89.2) 9 (10.8) 0.0271 0.000 Elementary School 14 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3) 0.271 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3) 0.082 Parenting Style Medium 98 (85.2) 17 (14.8) 14 (10.0) Parenting Style Medium 25 (86.2)	Purpose of	Getting New Information and	90 (95.7)	4 (4.3)		0.001^{+}
Usage Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood 50 (78.1) 14 (21.9) Most Frequently Social Network Sites (SNS) 96 (86.5) 15 (13.5) 0.276 ⁺ Used Content of Others (music, online game, streaming video) 44 (93.6) 3 (6.4)	Smartphone	Communicating with People				
Most Frequently Used Content of Smartphone Social Network Sites (SNS) 96 (86.5) 15 (13.5) 0.276 [†] Smartphone streaming video) 44 (93.6) 3 (6.4)	Usage	Seeking Fun and Regulating Mood	50 (78.1)	14 (21.9)		
Used Content of Smartphone Others (music, online game, streaming video) 44 (93.6) 3 (6.4) Family's Low 6 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 1.975 0.373 Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5)	Most Frequently	Social Network Sites (SNS)	96 (86.5)	15 (13.5)		0.276 ⁺
Smartphone streaming video) Family's Low 6 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 1.975 0.373 Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5) 1 1 Status High 8 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Father's Elementary School 13 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Education Level High School 74 (89.2) 9 (10.8) Mother's Elementary School 14 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.612 0.271 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3)	Used Content of	Others (music, online game,	44 (93.6)	3 (6.4)		
Family's Low 6 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 1.975 0.373 Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5) - - Status High 8 (100.0) 0 (0.0) - - - Father's Elementary School 13 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Education Level High School 74 (89.2) 9 (10.8) - - Mother's Elementary School 14 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.612 0.271 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3) - - Permissive Low 20 (100.0) 6 (10.0) - - - Parenting Style Medium 98 (85.2) 17 (14.8) - - - Authoritarian Low 25 (86.2) 4 (13.8) 0.282 0.868 Parenting Style Medium 94 (89.5) 11 (10.5) - - Authoritarian Low 21 (87.5) 3 (12.5) - <td>Smartphone</td> <td>streaming video)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Smartphone	streaming video)				
Socioeconomic Moderate 126 (87.5) 18 (12.5) Status High 8 (100.0) 0 (0.0) Father's Elementary School 13 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Education Level High School 74 (89.2) 9 (10.8) 9 (10.8) 9 (10.8) 9 (10.8) Mother's Elementary School 14 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.612 0.271 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3) 0.251 0.271 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3) 0.2612 0.271 Permissive Low 20 (100.0) 6 (10.0) 0 0.00 5.012 0.082 Parenting Style Medium 98 (85.2) 17 (14.8) 11 110.5) 11 Authoritarian Low 25 (86.2) 4 (13.8) 0.282 0.868 Parenting Style Medium 94 (89.5) 11 (10.5) 1.187 0.552 Authoritative Low 21 (95.5) 1 (4.5)	Family's	Low	6 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	1.975	0.373
Status High 8 (100.0) 0 (0.0) Father's Elementary School 13 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Education Level High School 74 (89.2) 9 (10.8)	Socioeconomic	Moderate	126 (87.5)	18 (12.5)		
Father's Elementary School 13 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.296 0.317 Education Level High School 74 (89.2) 9 (10.8)	Status	High	8 (100.0)	0 (0.0)		
Education Level High School 74 (89.2) 9 (10.8) University or higher 53 (85.5) 9 (14.5) Mother's Elementary School 14 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.612 0.271 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3) Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 6 (10.0)	Father's	Elementary School	13 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	2.296	0.317
University or higher 53 (85.5) 9 (14.5) Mother's Elementary School 14 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.612 0.271 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3)	Education Level	High School	74 (89.2)	9 (10.8)		
Mother's Elementary School 14 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 2.612 0.271 Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3)		University or higher	53 (85.5)	9 (14.5)		
Education Level High School 72 (85.7) 12 (14.3) University or higher 54 (90.0) 6 (10.0) Permissive Low 20 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 5.012 0.082 Parenting Style Medium 98 (85.2) 17 (14.8)	Mother's	Elementary School	14 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	2.612	0.271
University or higher 54 (90.0) 6 (10.0) Permissive Low 20 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 5.012 0.082 Parenting Style Medium 98 (85.2) 17 (14.8)	Education Level	High School	72 (85.7)	12 (14.3)		
Permissive Low 20 (100.0) 0 (0.0) 5.012 0.082 Parenting Style Medium 98 (85.2) 17 (14.8)		University or higher	54 (90.0)	6 (10.0)		
Parenting Style Medium 98 (85.2) 17 (14.8) High 22 (95.7) 1 (4.3)	Permissive	Low	20 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	5.012	0.082
High 22 (95.7) 1 (4.3) Authoritarian Low 25 (86.2) 4 (13.8) 0.282 0.868 Parenting Style Medium 94 (89.5) 11 (10.5)	Parenting Style	Medium	98 (85.2)	17 (14.8)		
Authoritarian Low 25 (86.2) 4 (13.8) 0.282 0.868 Parenting Style Medium 94 (89.5) 11 (10.5) 1 1 High 21 (87.5) 3 (12.5) 1 1.187 0.552 Authoritative Low 21 (95.5) 1 (4.5) 1.187 0.552 Parenting Style Medium 98 (87.5) 14 (12.5) 1 1 High 21 (87.5) 3 (12.5) 1 1 1		High	22 (95.7)	1 (4.3)		
Parenting Style Medium 94 (89.5) 11 (10.5) High 21 (87.5) 3 (12.5) Authoritative Low 21 (95.5) 1 (4.5) 1.187 0.552 Parenting Style Medium 98 (87.5) 14 (12.5) 14 14 High 21 (87.5) 3 (12.5) 14 14 14	Authoritarian	Low	25 (86.2)	4 (13.8)	0.282	0.868
High 21 (87.5) 3 (12.5) Authoritative Low 21 (95.5) 1 (4.5) 1.187 0.552 Parenting Style Medium 98 (87.5) 14 (12.5)	Parenting Style	Medium	94 (89.5)	11 (10.5)		
Authoritative Low 21 (95.5) 1 (4.5) 1.187 0.552 Parenting Style Medium 98 (87.5) 14 (12.5) 14 (12.5) High 21 (87.5) 3 (12.5) 14 (12.5) 14 (12.5)		High	21 (87.5)	3 (12.5)		
Parenting Style Medium 98 (87.5) 14 (12.5) High 21 (87.5) 3 (12.5)	Authoritative	Low	21 (95.5)	1 (4.5)	1.187	0.552
High 21 (87.5) 3 (12.5)	Parenting Style	Medium	98 (87.5)	14 (12.5)		
		High	21 (87.5)	3 (12.5)		