An Evaluation of Smartphone Usage and Social Interaction of Delta State University Students, Abraka

OJOBOH, Lucky Ogheneruemu*
Department of Mass Communication
Faculty of the Social Sciences
Delta state University, Abraka
+2348035692882
ojobohlo@delsu.edu.ng

OKPAKO, Abugor Ejaita
Department of Mathematical Sciences
Faculty of Science
Edwin Clark University, Kiagbodo, Delta State
+23408163239516
Okpako.ejaita@edwinclarkuniversity.edu.ng

Abstract
Information and Communication Technology has woven into human lives as it is nearly inseparable from it. It has drastically affected the way things are done either by reinventing or increasing their efficiency. Inevitably, Information technologies have also reinvented how social interactions are carried out and in extreme cases introduced myriads of modernized and globalized forms of communication. The study evaluated Smartphone usage and social interaction of Delta State University students. A survey method was used to collect responses from 450 respondents from the Faculty's whole student body. The data collected was analyzed using linear regression (ANOVA). The Technology Acceptance Model and Symbolic Interaction theories were used to guide the research. The research shows that the frequency and pattern of smartphone use by students at the Faculty of Social Sciences is influenced their social interactions with family and friends; there was no significant effect of smartphone use on students' academic activities; and the brands of phones owned by students influenced their social interactions. It is recommended that students should utilize their smartphones for academic activity more; students should strike a balance between using smartphones for personal and academic objectives and University administration should give internet access for students.
Keywords: Smartphones**,** Social Interaction**,** Usage, Students, Brands

1.0 Introduction
The mobile phone's innovation and development today is a result of people's global communication demands and the desire for connection in society, resulting in a new paradigm of modernity in communication. The innovation and development of the mobile phone today is as a result of the communication needs of people around the world and the need for interaction in the society which has created a new paradigm of modernity in communication. The smartphone is the most common object in modern society with a strong attachment to users, serving a variety of needs, and functions (facilitating the ability to communicate with others, storing social memories and connections, and proximity seeking behavior) (Konok,Gigler, Bereczky & Miklosi, 2016). The smartphone is a new kind of mobile device with sophisticated features and capabilities beyond traditional functionalities, as well as computing and wireless communication capability, and is a perfect representation of convergence and digitalization medium used for computer mediated communication (Lakshmi & Kumar, 2014). The smartphone is a global mobile media that combines the capabilities of a traditional mobile phone with network access that allows software programmes to be installed and executed (Madianou, 2014), Smartphones are handheld and portable with features of conventional mobile phones combining with network connectivity that supports the installation and running of software applications. With movie screens as the first screens, television sets as the second screens, computer displays as the third screens, the smartphone is the fourth screen. The third and fourth technologies have revolutionized the television industry by allowing consumers to watch their favourite TV shows from any location (McKenna, 2016; Digital Trends Staff, 2016).

Within the previous two decades, the smartphone has become a popular device. The iphone , which is often regarded as today's most prestigious smartphone did not debut until 2017. The Simon Personal Communicator, however, is acknowledged as the first legitimate smartphone having been produced in 1994 (Martin, 1994).

Nigeria was the most mobilized nation in the world (Twinepine Networks (2017). In Nigeria, mobile telephony and accessibility grew from 40 percent to 74 percent in the year 2017. There were 91.5 million mobile

users in Nigeria and social media was the trendiest activity that Nigerians participated in, closely followed by search engines, browsing emails and viewing online videos. The sale of mobile phones will surpass Personal Computer (PC) sales in the next few years, with smartphone users worldwide predicted to quadruple from 165 million to over 500 (Frommer, 2011). Sixty eight percent (60%) of people own a smartphone which is almost double the 35% reported in 2011 (Anderson, 2015). In only four brief years, smartphone ownership leaped. This study concentrates on how the smartphone technology affects personal, social interaction and perceived closeness among individuals.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

There is no doubt that the advent of smartphones has substantially changed the way we interact with others, allocate time and access information. However, these changes come along with several behavioral and social implications. In as much as these smartphones simplify life in different situations, scholars have argued that the gadget can impinge on social interaction among individuals and cause a decline in face-to-face interaction. Social connections have a significant impact on the overall experiences that people have throughout their lives (Verga & Kotz, 2017). For each individual, social interactions begins at a young, with babies being affected by social interactions as early as 6 months. (Hakuno et al, 2017).

In today's present society, children are being presented to technology at progressively younger ages and the presence of these gadgets too early in a child's life can keep them from taking in the vital skills necessary to help them socialize later in their lives. Kwon, Kim, Cho and Yang (2013) assert that excessive smartphone usage can cause physical health related issues such as blurred vision and pain in the neck or wrists. Smartphone can lead to a variation of personal and social issues such as maladaptive behavioural challenges, school work, a reduction in actual social engagement and interpersonal problems (Kuss et al, 2013). This study seeks to determine whether smartphone usage affects social interaction among students of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka.

1.2 Aim and Objectives of the Study

Generally, the aim of the study is to find out if smartphone usage can affect social interaction among users. Specifically, the study among others seeks to:

1. Find out smartphone usage frequency and social interaction pattern among undergraduate students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka.
2. Examine the usage pattern of smartphones by students of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka.
3. Determine which mobile/web applications (software) influence the usage pattern of smartphones by students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka.
4. Find out if smartphone brands influence smartphone usage and social interaction among undergraduate students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka.
5. Ascertain the effect of smartphone usage by undergraduate students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka on social life.

1.3 Research Questions

1. What is the frequency of smartphone usage and social interaction among undergraduate students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka?
2. What is the usage pattern of smartphones by students of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka?
3. Which mobile/web applications (software) influence the usage pattern of smartphones by students of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka.
4. Do smartphone brands influence smartphone usage and social interaction among undergraduate students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka?
5. What are the implications of smartphone usage by undergraduate students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka on social life?

2.0 Review of Concepts
2.1 Social Interaction

Smartphones are the means to all social networks such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram. The negative effects of these networks have real repercussions for the user. Smartphone use is addictive. People that subscribed to various social media networks cannot get rid of them regardless of the weight of their assignments either at the work place or homework from school. Workers are not able meet their deadlines or attend and concentrate in important meetings because of much commitment in their virtual communities through Smartphones. Students are also not left out as they cannot concentrate due to the addictive nature of the smartphone. Smartphone use

could assume a positive role in social interactions. At the point when a discussion slacks or swings to dull subjects, smartphones could give dependable access to a variety of brief engaging exercises. Researchers believe that connecting with one's desired stimuli might reduce boredom, speed up timing and give us a sense of control (Eastwood et al, 2012). The positive impacts of telephones on social contact are the subject of much debate (Turkle, 2012, 2015), yet research in his area is in its earliest stages. Technology can have harmful consequences; but it can be extremely beneficial in some interactions and circumstances for a select few people (Magsamen-Conrad et al, 2014). They found that some individuals from society with self-camouflage issues and social anxiety issues used smartphones to manage these issues culminating in higher life fulfillment and appreciation. The investigation of Magsamen-Conrad et al is a confirmation technology is double edged sword.

Kalogeraki & Papadak,i 2010) who sought to understand out the overall impact of technology on the lives of teenagers and young adults, discovered that smartphones provided enormous benefits to students as the device provided a "back door" for students to communicate outside of their parents and guardians' supervision. They also discovered that a lot of teenagers grow an abundance of social relationships on the internet insisting that its gives them freedom from their parents. For these teenagers, the smartphones enabled them to connect the world and to interface with it on the internet (Kalogeraki & Papadaki, 2010). Even though the Smartphone has positive effects on social interactions, scholars argue that the smartphone has greater negative effects on social interactions. They opine that the gadget brings you closer to the person far from you but take you away from the person sitting next to you. This agrees with the study carried out by Schiffrin et al.(2010) who compared the amount of internet usage and the new technologies being developed. They found that the majority of participants preferred face-to-face communication and concluded that the internet was less beneficial and effective and that face-to-face communications were far superior for maintaining relationships. Smartphones, on the other hand, enable unrestricted connectivity, which has the potential to destroy social bonds (Mihye et al, 2015). Wright et. al(2013) found that individuals usually prefer personal communication over Facebook interaction when it came to life satisfaction, and that when it came to depression, individuals who were on Facebook more, and had less face-to-face interactions, had higher levels of depression. They insist that it is interesting to note that the number of hours that students spent using Facebook was positively correlated with depression in the present study. It is not a surprise that with lower life satisfaction comes higher levels of depression.

Dwyer et al, (2017) gathered over 300 students into two groups to eat a dinner with family and friends for a study. In both scenarios, each group was randomly allocated to a phone or a phoneless situation in order to measure overall life satisfaction from a pleasant eating situation and the individual's social interaction abilities. At the end of the study, it was evident that phones caused more distractions among participants and reduced their overall enjoyment and appreciation of spending time with family and friends. Whereas in the phoneless situation, participants were much more interested in each other, enjoyed the love they shared in that moment and preferred the phoneless situation. This indicates that despite their ability to create connectivity across the globe, phones may tend to undermine the benefits we derive from interacting with those around us and living/enjoying the moment.

2.2 Concept of Smartphone Usage

Practically every University student these days possess a smartphone (Kim & Altmann, 2013). This device is progressively giving students and staff the platform to lead research and scholastic exercises. Many students rely on their phones to get educational materials from the internet (Anshari et al, 2017). A study carried out by Al-Harrasi and Al-Badi (2014) implies that Tertiary students can accumulate extraordinary measures of data helpful for their scholastic work by associating with on-line sites (Al- Harrasi & Al-Badi, 2014). However, their experimental proof seems to propose that tertiary students utilize phones transcendently for social networking. Their study showed that as much as ninety-six percent of undergraduates use their phones for all kinds of social networking, with seventy-one percent of the students admitting that they use the various social networks to connect with family, friends and companions and it is a lot easier to do this.

In today's society, there is a growing interest in using smartphones to visit numerous websites particularly among tertiary students (Hingorani et al, 2012).This is on the ground that smartphones allow individuals to remain on-line for longer periods - interfacing with a universe of practically endless information expanding the volume of activities in the world of social networking (Al-Harrasi & Al-Badi 2014).

Undergraduate and postgraduate students in a Japanese college prefer to use their phones for social networking over intellectual activities (Lau, et al, 2017). An investigation in South Korea discovered that while practically every student had approximately 80 apps on their phones, only 16%s of those are used for academic purposes (Park & Lee, 2012). Ajagbe et al (2011) found that many undergraduates in Malaysia use their phones principally to stay in contact with guardians, kin and companions. A number of studies in South Africa show that tertiary students use their phones mostly for personal communication such as WhatsApp for conversation (Uys et al, 2012). Several studies show that tertiary students use their smartphones for a variety of social networking activities, including keeping in touch with friends, class mates, relatives and even lecturers (Olukotun et al, 2013;

Olatokun & Bodunwa (2006). It has been contended that the advent of smartphones have modified students' consumption design so that numerous students prefer to forfeit costs on fundamentals such as food for sustenance and academic materials to fund and keep up their internet activities. Olukotun et al (2013) believe that numerous students are prepared to abandon nourishment than not having data or airtime on their phones. Results on the use of smartphones at the University of Ibadan Nigeria, suggest that staff and students use their phones mainly for social networking activities (Olatokun & Bodunwa 2006). Despite what might be expected, it was discovered that just a handful of students use their phones for research and scholarly exercises (Olukotun et al, 2013; Olatokun & Bodunwa 2006).

2.2.1 Influence of Smartphone Usage on Academic Activities

The major concern for institutions to permit the use of smartphone is to ease the learning process. Past studies show that the smartphone usage may lessen boundaries to educational results compared to customary educational strategy (Misagal et al, 2016). However, this major anticipated result is being debated by several researchers because of findings which do not bolster this educational platform. Most findings demonstrate that students in library used their Smartphones for texting and web surfing as opposed to checking the library material or downloading scholastic materials (Hanson et al, 2011).

Tindell and Bohlander (2012) conducted a study of 269 students from a private college in north-eastern Pennsylvania to increase understanding of the use and abuse of Smartphones in a school classroom setting and to potentially help in policy making. They found that students invested time messaging and were not focusing on the class teaching. At a South African University, Uys et al (2012) investigated smartphone usage to figure out how people used social networking apps on their phones. Students spent at least five hours each day on the smartphones, communicating with others through social networking sites, and spent approximately 16 hours per day online, according to the researchers.

2.2.2 Educational Usage of the Smartphone by Students

Research is a key component for many students in tertiary institutions. Smartphones allow students to find information at anytime and anywhere as long as they are connected to the internet. Morgan (2012) claims that by conducting a short search on a topic, the smartphone can be utilized to perform group assignments in class. Students can also access university library resources and databases virtually anywhere, getting a start on the research process without having to wait for access to a computer.

Hossain and Ahmed (2016) looked into how Dhaka University students used and perceived cell phones to gather academic information. The survey included 316 students, and around 60% of those who responded stated that they utilized their smartphones to gather academic material. Smartphones were seen favourably by students as a tool for academic purposes.

Johnson and Radhakrishna (2016) looked into how students at a private University in Dubai used their smartphones in class. There were 195 students who were between the ages of 18 and 35. Students used their phones to do the following things with the help of the internet: To login to student portal to pay fees, check results and so on.; to download class materials from group chats and online websites; to access library references; to take notes in class; to read both online and offline and to interact with friends and faculty

➢ To share academ-
➢ ic websites and
➢ linTo share academic websites and links

The following are some of the websites that students use for educational purposes: Wikipedia, Researchgate, Quora, and Questia.

2.3 Other Devices Used by Students to Access the Internet/Educational Websites

Smartphones are used in various ways and for various purposes. Many people use their smartphones for conferencing, teleconferencing, photography, videoing and calculation, as well as for banking, television, radio, movies, invitation cards, the Bible, Quran, dictionary, social media, clocks, organizers, games, seasonal greeting cards, calendars, and multimedia players, among other things. However, students also utilize other devices such as it is important to note that students also use other devices such as Desktop computers, Laptops, Tablets, Slates, Mini tablets: Phablet: 2-in-1tablet., despite previous discussions that the smartphone is preferred due to its compatibility and portability of the smartphone (Biri & Ojoboh, 2017)

2.4 Theoretical Framework

This study is premised on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Symbolic Interaction Theory. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), first presented by Fred Davis in 1989, is one of the most well-known models linked to technology acceptance and application. The Technology Acceptance Model has shown to be a useful theoretical model for explaining and predicting information technology user behavior (Legris et al., 2003).The Technology Acceptance Theory (TAM) is a significant expansion of the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). TAM provides a framework for examining how external factors influence

beliefs, attitudes, and intentions to use. Two cognitive beliefs are posited by TAM: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. TAM proposes two cognitive beliefs: perceived usefulness and ease of use. The user's behavioural intention, attitude, perceived utility of the system, and perceived ease of the system, according to TAM, all influence one's actual use of a technology system directly or indirectly External influences may also influence intention and actual usage through mediated effects on perceived utility and perceived ease of use.(Davis, 1989). The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is used in this study since it explains the user's adoption and use of technology (smartphone). According to the discussion above, humans have embraced and adapted the use of smartphones due to their utility, and in particular, their perceived ease of use. TAM explains why the gadget has been embraced over the years because of its holistic qualities.. The Symbolic Interaction Theory, also known as Symbolic Interactionism, is a theory that explains how people interact with one another to build symbolic worlds, and how these worlds impact peoples' behaviour. G. H. Mead and C. H. Cooley developed it as a pragmatic way of interpreting social interactions.

Most Symbolic interactionists believe that humans generate meaning through communication and that the person and society have a unique relationship. We do what we do because we are constantly looking for social interaction. Symbolic interactionism emphasizes on the actions that take place between actors, rather than the individual and his or her personality, or how how the society or social circumstance influences human behavior (Charon, 2004). This means that humans are interaction products who are subject to reaction and change depending on the person with whom they are interacting with.

As seen in the preceding article, social interactionism is critical to human existence, and human behavior is based on interactions with people around them. Consequently, it is important to understand how humans interact while their smartphones are around. From the discussion above, it is obvious that social interaction is crucial to the existence of human beings and human behaviours are anchored on their interactions with people around them; therefore it is pertinent to understand how humans interact while their smartphones are present. Hence, this theory is relevant to this study because it helps us understand how crucial social interaction is to an individual and how social interaction is shaped by an individual's present situation. In this case, the present situation is social interaction but with a smartphone involved. Therefore this theory is pertinent because we need to understand how social interaction works with or without an external factor. This will help to deduce the influence that technology has on social interaction, whether good or bad.

This theory, along with the Technology Acceptance Model will help us to understand how social interaction works when a technological gadget that is of interest to an individual is present.

3.0 Research Methods and Design

According to Check and Schutt (2012), the survey method allows the researcher to choose from a range of approaches to recruit participants, collect data, and use various equipment methods while collecting information from a sample of persons through their responses to questions. Surveys have shown to be one of the most efficient and reliable methods of research. It is made up of structured questions in the form of a questionnaire that encourages participants to respond honestly and objectively. A population is a big group of humans or objects that is the subject of a scientific research. A study population is the universe of the study, or the full research entity, within which all of the study's subjects can be found (Senam & Akpan, 2004). A descriptive summary for this study indicates that the total number of registered students of the faculty of Delta State University, Abraka Campus is 2,325 students (2,325). According to (Kibuacha (2021), a sample is the number of people involved in a research study to reflect a study population. It refers to the total number of people who took part in a study, which is sometimes divided down into subgroups like age, gender, and geography in order for the overall sample to achieve/represent the complete population. This study's sample size is 450 students.

Data Presentation

The research tool, the questionnaire, was administered on a person-by-person basis to the 450 people who were randomly selected. A total of 415 copies of the questionnaire were retrieved and confirmed to be usable. This is a 92 percent return rate. As a result, the 415 copies were assessed in order to provide answers to the study's research questions. From the four hundred and fifty distributed, 415 copies of the questionnaire were obtained, and the responses of the 415 respondents were assessed using linear regression and ANOVA

4.0 Results and Discussion

Table 4.1: Linear regression on frequency of smart phone usage

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.897[a]	.805	.740	.80562

a. Predictors: (Constant), frequency

Table 4.2: ANOVA on frequency of smart phone usage

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.053	1	8.053	12.408	.039^b
	Residual	1.947	3	.649		
	Total	10.000	4			

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone
b. Predictors: (Constant), frequency

Table 4.3: Coefficients on frequency of smart phone usage

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.907	.476		4.009	.028
	Frequency	.013	.004	.897	3.522	.039

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone

Question I: Research First and foremost, how common is smartphone use and social contact among undergraduate students in the social science Faculty?

Discussion and Decision:
Four hundred and fifteen (415) copies of the questionnaire were obtained from the 450 distributed, and the responses of the 415 respondents were analyzed using linear regression. This question was answered by the data analysed and presented in the first tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.

Since p-value (0.039) is less than the alpha value (0.005) as shown in Table 4.3 above, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is significant effect on the frequency of smart phone usage and social interactions. 80.5% of the variance in smartphone can be predicted by the variable 'frequency of smart phone usage' which shows that the model is adequate for prediction.

Table 4.4: Linear Regression on extent/pattern of smart phone usage

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.795^a	.632	.510	1.10704

a. Predictors: (Constant), extent

Table 4.5: ANOVA on extent/pattern of smart phone usage

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.323	1	6.323	5.160	.108^b
	Residual	3.677	3	1.226		
	Total	10.000	4			

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone
b. Predictors: (Constant), extent

Table 4.6: Coefficients of extent/pattern of smart phone usage

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.631	.780		2.091	.128
	Extent	.017	.007	.795	2.272	.108

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone

Question II: Research Question Number Two: What is the usage pattern of Smartphone by students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences?

Decision: Since p-value (0.108) is greater than the alpha value (0.05) as shown in Table 4.6 above, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant effect on the extent/pattern of smartphone usage and social interactions. 63.2% of the variance in smartphone can be predicted by the 'variable extent/pattern of usage' which shows that the model is adequate for prediction.

Table 4.7: Linear Regression on most used social media application

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.878[a]	.771	.694	.87426

a. Predictors: (Constant), applications

Table 4.8: ANOVA on "Most used social media application"

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.707	1	7.707	10.083	.050[b]
	Residual	2.293	3	.764		
	Total	10.000	4			

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone
b. Predictors: (Constant), applications

Table 4.9: Coefficients on most used social media application

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.222	.683		1.790	.171
	Applications	.022	.007	.878	3.175	.050

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone

Research Question III: Which applications influence the usage pattern of Smartphones by students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences of DELSU?

Decision: Since p-value (0.050) equals the alpha value (0.05) as shown in Table 4.9, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant effect on most used social media applications and social interactions. Also 77.1% of the variance in smartphone can be predicted by the variable 'most used social media application' which shows that the model is adequate for prediction.

Table 4.10: Linear Regression on brand of phone

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.958[a]	.918	.891	.52313

a. Predictors: (Constant), brand

Table 4.11: ANOVA on brand of phone

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9.179	1	9.179	33.541	.010[b]
	Residual	.821	3	.274		
	Total	10.000	4			

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone
b. Predictors: (Constant), brand

Table 4.12: Coefficients on brand of phone

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.566	.659		-.860	.453
	Brand	.044	.008	.958	5.791	.010

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone

Research Question IV: How does the brand of Smartphone owned influence usage and Social interaction among undergraduate students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences?

Decision: Since p-value (0.010) is less than alpha value (0.05) as shown in Table 4.12 above, we accept the null

hypothesis and conclude that there is significant effect on the brand of phone and social interactions. Also 91.8% of the variance in smartphone can be predicted by the variable 'brand of phone' which shows that the model is adequate for prediction.

Table 4.13: Linear Regression on effect of smart phone usage on academic activities

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.770[a]	.593	.457	1.16470

a. Predictors: (Constant), effect

Table 4.14: ANOVA on effect of smart phone usage on academic activities

ANOVAᵃ

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.930	1	5.930	4.372	.128[b]
	Residual	4.070	3	1.357		
	Total	10.000	4			

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone
b. Predictors: (Constant), effect

Table 4.15: coefficients on effect of smart phone usage on academic activities

Coefficientsᵃ

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.104	1.046		1.056	.369
	Effect	.023	.011	.770	2.091	.128

a. Dependent Variable: smartphone

Research Question V: What are the implications of Smartphone usage on the academic activities of undergraduate students of the Faculty of the Social Sciences?

Decision: Since p-value (0.128) is greater than alpha value (0.05) as shown in table 4.15, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant effect on smartphone usage and academic activities. 59.3% of the variance in smartphone can be predicted by the variable 'effect on academic activities' which shows that the model is adequate for prediction.

5.0 Summary

The study looked at how students of Faculty of Social Sciences at Delta State University, Abraka used smartphones and interacted with one another. Students who took part in the poll said they utilized their Smartphones for both personal and educational purposes. However, the statistics reveal that University students' use of Smartphones for educational reasons is lower than projected. This is quite disturbing. Similarly, the data suggest that students who owned various brands of Smartphones were influenced by their devices' ownership and presence during social interactions with family or friends. This means that owning a smartphone isn't just a means to a goal; it's also a device that' classifies' you.

5.1 Conclusion

According to the data reviewed for this study, smartphone ownership and usage had an impact on the social lives of students at the Faculty of Social Sciences. Smartphones improved their social lives, including interactions with family and friends as well as the desire for attention and respect. Smartphones were used for personal, educational, and recreational purposes by students. This is consistent with the Technology Acceptance Model, which states that people use ICTs to improve their lives. It suggests that smartphone users are astute and use their devices to accomplish specific aims and purposes. Smartphone users benefit and gratify themselves, according to the uses and gratification theory. The environment has an impact on users.

5.2 Recommendations

Students are encouraged to maintain a balance between academic and personal use of smartphones. This is especially true when they are at school. Smartphones are created in such a way that anyone can and does use them for whatever reason they want.

Smartphones are status-enhancing devices. Students should understand, however, that the cost of a smartphone should not be the driving force behind purchasing one. This is because the display of an expensive

smartphone can expose users to unwarranted hazards, especially given the current state of insecurity in Nigeria. Students should make more educational use of their smartphones in order to realize their ambitions of learning. The university administration should not require all students to bring their iPhones to class. Some poor kids are unable to purchase smartphones. Even if they buy, it is costly to purchase airtime on a regular basis. Students who cannot afford cellphones should be able to access the Internet through strategically situated, well-equipped ICT units. Accordingly, Delta State University and all of its faculties should provide Wi-Fi and internet connection on campus so that students do not have to spend their limited resources on smartphone usage and internet access. The internet should be accessible and working at all times.

References

Ajagbe A.M., Eluwa, S.E., Duncan, E.E., Ramliy. M.K., Long, C.S. and Wantrudis, M.C. (2011). The Use of Global System of Mobile Communication (GM) Among University Students in Malaysia. www.semanticscholar.org. Published 2011

Ajzen, I., and Fishbein, D.I. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavioaur. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Alfawareh, H. and Jusoh, S. (2014) Smartphones usage among University Students: Najran University case. International Journal of Academic Research, Vol. 6, No. 2

Al-Harrasi, A. S and Al-Badi, A. H, (2014) The Impact of social networking: a study of the influence of smartphones on college students. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research* Second Quarter Vol. 7, November 2

Anderson, M. (2015). Technology Device Ownership: Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/10/29/technology-device-ownership-2015/

Anshari, M, Almunawar MN, Shahrill M, Wicaksono DK, Huda M (2017). Smartphones usage in the classrooms: Learning aid or interference? *Education and Information Technologies*. Published online: 19 January, 2017.

Biri, E.U. and Ojoboh L.O (2017). Preference Pattern for Mobile Phone and Conventional Tools in Task Performance by Students of Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria.. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy. Vol. 8. No2. Doi:10.5901/mjss.2017.v8n2p281

Bugeja, M. (2005). Interpersonal divide. New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Charon, J.M (2004). Symbolic Interactionism: An Introduction, An Interpretation, An Integration. Boston: Pearson Press. Pg. 31

Check, J. and Schutt, R. K. (2012). Research Methods in Education. Thousand oaks: CA. Sage

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information. Management Information Systems Research Centre, University of Minnesota.

DeGusta, Michael, (2012). Are smart phones spreading faster than any technology in human history? https://www.technologyreview.com/s/427787/are-smartphones-spreading-faster-than-any-technology in-human-history.

Digital Trends Staff, (2016). The history of social networking site http://www.digitaltrends.com/features/the-history-of-social-networking/ [Accessed 3December, 2016]

Dwyer, R. J.; Kushlev, K. and. Dunn, E. W. (2017). Smartphone use undermines enjoyment of face-to-face social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social* Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.10.007

Eastwood, J. D., Frischen, A., Fenske, M. J., and Smilek, D. (2012). The unengaged mind: Defining boredom in terms of attention. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7(5), 482–495. Toronto, Canada. York University Publications.

Frommer, D. (2011). RBC Capital Project Analysis on Worldwide Mobile Phone Ownership. Splat F Online Publications. February 2011.

Goffman, E. (1959).The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.Doubleday: Garden City, New York.

Gillin, L. and Gillin, J.P (1948). An Introduction to Sociology. New York. Macmillian Company. Pg 844.

Gupta, M. and Gupta D. (2011). Research Methodology, New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited, p.32

Hakuno, Y.; Omori, T.; Yamamoto, J. and Minagawa, Y. (2017). Social interaction facilitates word learning in preverbal infants: Word–object mapping and word segmentation. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 48(Part B), 65-77

Hanson, T.L.; Drumheller, K.; Mallard, J.; Makee, C. and Xschlegal, P. (2011). Cellphones, text messaging, and facebook: Competing time demands of today's college students Collegeteching,Doi:10.1080/87567555.489078.oi:10.1016/j.infbeh.2017.05.012

Hingorani, K. K.; Woodard, D. and Danesh, N. A. (2012). Exploring how smartphones supports students' lives. issues in information system, 13(2). 33-40. Retrieved from http://iacis.org/iis/2012/83-iis-2012-33-40.pdf.

Hossain;, E. and Ahmed, Z. (2016). Academic use of smartphones by university students: A developing country perspective. *Bangladesh Journals Online* (BanglaJOL). http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EL-07-2015-0112

Johnson, S. and Radhakrishnan, N. (2016). Academic Use of Smart Phones Among The Students of Business Schools In UAE -A Study. *KIIT Journal of Library and Information Management*. 4. 32-36.

Jubien, P. (2013). Shape shifting smartphone: Riding the waves in post-secondary education. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 39(2), 1-16. Retrieved from. http://cjlt.Csj.vulberta.ca/indet.php/cjlt/article/view/6961365.

Kalogeraki, S., and Papadaki, M. (2010). The Impact of Mobile Use on Teenagers' Socialization. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 5(4), 121-134.

Kim, J.L. and Altmann, J (2013). Adapting smartphones as learning technology in a Korean University. *Journal of Integrated Design and Process Science*, 17(1): 5-16.

Konok, V.; Gigler, D.; Bereczky, B.M. and Miklosi, A. (2016) Humans' attachment to their mobile phones and its relationship with interpersonal attachment style. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 61, 537-547

Kwon, M.; Kim, D.J.; Cho, H. and Yang, S. (2013). The Smartphone Addiction Scale. Development and Validation of a Short Version for Adolescents. *Plos One Journals*. Published: December31, 2013

Lakshmi, S. V. and Kumar, K. S. (2014). Smartphone impact on social relationship management. *International Journal of Academic Research*, Vol.1 Issue-3 (2), October-December

Lau, K.P.; Chiu, D.K.; Ho, K.K.; Lo, P. and See-To E.W. (2017). Educational Usage of Mobile Devices: Differences between Post-graduate and Undergraduate Students. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. Vol. 1.

Lenhart, A. (2015). Teens, Social Media and Technology Overview 2015. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/04/09/teens-social-media-technology 2015/

Legris, P.; Ingham, J. and Collecrette, P. (2003). Why do people use information technology? A critical review of the technology acceptance model. *Information and Management*, 40, 191.204.

Ling, R. (1999). "I am happiest by having the best": The adoption and rejection of mobile telephony. Randd Report, (15). Kjeller, Norway, Telenor.

Madianou, M. (2014). Smartphones as polymedia. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 19 (2014) 667–680

Magsamen-Conrad, K., Billotte-Verhoff.; C. and Greene, K. (2014). Technology addiction's contribution to mental wellbeing: The positive effect of online social capital. *Computers in Human Behavior*. Published Online: 14 July, 2014

Martin, T. (2014). Pocket computing: Evolution of the smartphone | Pocketnow.Retrieved from http://pocketnow.com/2014/07/28/the-evolution-of-the-smartphone

Mihye, S.; Jung-Hyun, K. and David, P. (2015). Always Connected or Always Distracted? ADHD Symptoms and Social Assurance Explain Problematic Use of Mobile Phone and Multi-communicating. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 20(6), 667- 681. doi:10.1111/jcc4.12140doi:10.1111/jcc4.12140

Misagal. J.; Alson. N and Liezel, V. (2016). Smartphones usage among college students. *International Journal of Research in Engineering and Technology*, 63-70.

Morgan, K. (2012). The Pros & Cons of Cell Phone Usage in College. Retrieved from: http://education.seattlepi.com/pros-cons-cell-phone-usage- college-1578.html

Nwanne, B. (2001) Mobile Phones and You. Onitsha. Landhill publications.

Ojo, A.O. (2006). The Use of Mobile phones. Onitsha. Jossy Publications.

Olatokun, M.W. and Bodunwa, I. O. (2006). GSM usage at University of Ibadan. The Electronic Library, 24(4): 530-547.

Olukotun, G. A.; James O.O. and Olorunfemi, K. (2013). The introduction of GSM services in Anyigba community and its impact on students expenditure pattern. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 13(8): 72-81.

Ozcinar, Z. (2011). The Relationship Between Internet Addiction and Communication, Educational and Physical Problems of Adolescents in North Cyprus. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 22-32

Payne, K.B, Wharrad, H, Watts, K. (2012). Smartphone and medical related app use among medical students and junior doctors in the United Kingdom (UK): A regional survey. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 12(1): 121

Dwyer,R. J. Kushlev, K. and Dunn, E. W. (2017). Smartphone use undermines enjoyment of face-to-face social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social* Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.10.007

Senam, N. and Akpan, U. (2014). The Survey Communication Research. *International Journal of Education and Research* Vol. 2, No. 10

Saraswathi, S. (2017). Smartphone usage among students. *International Educational and Research Journal*, Vol., 3 No. 6

Schiffrin, H., Edelman, A., Falkenstern, M. and Stewart, C. (2010). The Associations among Computer-Mediated Communication, Relationships, and Well-being. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social*

Networking, 13(3), 299-306.   doi:10.1089/cyber.2009.0173

Srivastara L. (2003). Mobile phones and evolution of social behaviour and information technology.   2003; 24:111-29.

Tindell, D. R. and Bonlandar, R. N. (2012). One use and abuse of cellphons and text messaging in the classroom: A survey of college students. *College Teaching*   60(1)   1-9 retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com.

Turkle, S. (2012). Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Turkle, S. (2015). Reclaiming conversation: The power of talk in a digital age. Penguin Press HC.

Uys, W.; Mia, A.; Jansen, G.J.; Schyff, H.V.; Josias, M.A.; Khusu, M.; Gierdien, M.; Luekes, N.A.; Faltein Gihwala, S.T.; Theunissen, T. and Samsodie, Y (2012). Smartphone Application Usage amongst Students at a South African University. IST-Africa 2012 Conference Proceedings, 9-11 May, Tanzania, pp. 1-11.

Verga, L. and Kotz, S. A. (2017). Help me if I can't: Social interaction effects in adult contextual word learning. Cognition, 16876-90. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2017.06.018

Wright, K. B., Rosenberg, J., Egbert, N., Ploeger, N. A., Bernard, D. R., and King, S. (2013). Communication Competence, Social Support, and Depression Among College   Students: A Model of Facebook and Face-to-Face Support NetworkInfluence.*Journal   of   Health   Communication*,   18(1),   41-57.doi:10.1080/10810730.2012.688250