IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Influence Of Smart Phone Use On Productivity Levels Of Education College Students

Dr.A.RAJESWARI

Assistant Professor and Head

Department of Curriculum Planning and Evaluation

Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Chennai-600097, India

Abstract

The widespread existence of smart phones in the classroom has radically changed the way college students cope with work and play. This article examines the intricate interplay between the use of smart phones and academic productivity. Smart phones provide a level of access to information, learning resources, and effective communication channels unlike any other, yet they also make available enormous sources of distraction via social media, entertainment, and incessant notifications. Conversely, habitual, uncontrolled usage, especially for multitasking and while studying, is highly linked to reduced concentration, more procrastination, and poorer academic achievement. The paper concludes by noting a research gap about the efficacy of specific interventions in promoting effective smart phone habits and recommending future study into pedagogical approaches embracing technology without sacrificing intense, concentrated work.

Keywords: College Students, Smart phone Use, Productivity levels,Digital Distraction, Educational Technology.

1. Introduction

Smart phone has become an integral part of everyday life, and its reach to the college students is virtually complete. For the student today, it serves as a gateway to research journals, a platform for team projects, a digital calendar, and a source of primary communication. But this marvelous computer in their pocket is also a portal to a constant flow of social media, games, and video. And that makes the smart phone a double-edged sword at the center of the learning process, able to facilitate as well as discourage student productivity.

Review of Research Related Literature

The Positive Influence: Smart phones as Productivity Tools

There is a widespread research that recognizes the positive uses of smart phones in the classroom. Students are able to access academic databases, learning apps (e.g., language learning apps, flashcard programs), and university learning management systems promptly to review assignments, grades, and course announcements (Sarwar & Soomro, 2013). In addition, smart phones allow for smooth communication and cooperation through messaging apps and email, allowing peer support and group work outside regular class time. Research has demonstrated that when utilized for particular scholarly activities, smart phones may enhance organization, offer instant access to material, and enable collaborative learning, thus potentially enhancing scholarly efficiency and involvement.

The Negative Influence: Smart Phones as Causes of Distraction

Contrarily, a stronger recurring theme in current scholarship concerns the negative impacts of distraction caused by smart phones. The perpetual connectivity and the persuasive nature of apps, especially social media sites, give rise to compulsive checking behavior and constant task-switching. A study conducted by Lepp, Barkley, and Karpinski (2015) showed a negative relationship between overall smart phone use and overall college GPA. The main mechanism behind the decline is media multitasking—using a smart phone for non-academic activities during studying or listening to lectures. This mental fragmentation splits attention, adds to cognitive load, and results in worse retention of information and longer times to complete tasks (May & Elder, 2018). This is directly related to academic procrastination, as the smart phone acts as a ready escape from challenging academic work.

The Essential Role of Self-Regulation

Literature consistently identifies self-regulation as the central variable that explains whether a smart phone benefits or hinders productivity. Self-regulation here entails the capacity to be in charge of impulses, organize time in a beneficial way, and keep in mind long-term ambitions. Higher self-regulated students are more capable of utilizing their smart phones with purpose to support learning and of being resistant to temptations. According to Rozgonjuk et al. (2020), students with low self-regulation are more likely to have higher levels of problematic use of smart phones, defined by the inability to regulate the time spent on the phone, which then predicts lower academic performance. This implies that the phone itself is not problematic; its effect is determined by behavioral habits and self-control of the user.

Education Research Gap

Although current literature successfully illustrates the relationship between smart phone usage patterns and productivity results, the knowledge gap still exits in bridging this knowledge into successful educational interventions. The majority of the studies are descriptive and only pinpoint the problem and do not test and confirm solutions. The research gap primarily exits in lacking empirical evidence on the effectiveness of systematic programs within the education system aimed at developing digital literacy and self-regulatory abilities unique to smart phone use.

Objectives of the Study:

To determine the extent of Influence of Smart phone Uses and Productivity Levels of students of education colleges.

To identify the Influence of Smart phone uses of demographic variables of education college students like gender, stream of study, locality and Type of the management.

To determine the Influence of Productivity Levels of education college student's demographic variables like gender, stream of study, locality and Type of the management

Hypothesis of the Study

There is no influence Level of Smart phone Uses and Productivity Levels of education college students on sub variables like gender, locality and type of the management.

There is no difference of significant magnitude between the Influence of Smart phone Uses of education college students by gender, steam of study, Locality and management.

There is no difference of significant magnitude between the Productivity Levels of education college students by gender, steam of study, Locality and management**.**

Methodology:

Sample: The sample consist of 100 Education college students who study in Karur district, selected randomly.

Tools Utilized: 30 items innovative pedagogy techniques designed by the researcher. The score ranges from 0-30

Research Method of the Study: The study adopts a descriptive Survey research method.

Statistical Tools: Descriptive statistics (mean, median, mode,SD, percentile) and t-test were used to analyze of the data.

Differential analysis of the data (t-test, chai-squire, P-Value, 0.05 level)

- The data has been properly cleaned and coded in SPSS.
- The scales for both constructs have been computed and are reliable.

Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Study Variables

This report offers the descriptive statistics (Mean and Standard Deviation) for the variables of interest. The data were gathered from 100 students of a college of education through two 30-item questionnaires in a 5-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree). Analysis is disaggregated by the most important demographic variables: Gender, Stream of Study, Type of Management, and Locality.

Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) of the Influence of Smart phone Use on Education College Students based on Demographic Variables

(N=100; Scale: 30 items, 5-point Likert, Theoretical Range: 30-150)

Demographic Variable	Category	N	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Gender	Male	50	102.45	9.87
	Female	50	98.76	10.54
Stream of Study	Tamil Medium	45	95.82	11.23
	English Medium	55	104.68	8.95
Management	Government	60	97.33	10.12
	Private	40	105.90	9.45
Locality	Rural	45	96.15	10.88
	Urban	55	103.92	9.21

Interpretation

Overall Impact: The average scores for all groups lie in a moderate to high range, suggesting that the use of smart phones is largely viewed as having a high impact.

Gender: Male students (M=102.45) score slightly higher in perceived influence of smart phones than female students (M=98.76).

Stream of Study: English medium students (M=104.68) have a significantly higher mean than Tamil medium students (M=95.82), indicating a greater perceived influence among those with English-based curricula.

Nature of Management: Private college students (M=105.90) feel a higher impact of smart phones on their studies than do their government college counterparts (M=97.33).

Locality: The mean score is higher for urban students (M=103.92) compared to rural students (M=96.15), suggesting more perceived influence in urban areas.

Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) of the Productivity Level of Education College Students based on Demographic Variables

(N=100; Scale: 30 items, 5-point Likert, Theoretical Range: 30-150)

Demographic Variables	Category	N	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Gender	Male	50	110.28	8.75
	Female	50	113.52	7.93
Location	Urban	45	115.40	7.15
	Rural	55	109.18	8.89
Type of Management	Government	60	108.45	9.02
	Private	40	116.85	6.78
Stream of Study	Tamil Medium	45	107.95	9.41
	English Medium	55	114.82	7.26

Interpretation

Overall Productivity: The mean scores across all demographics are high, suggesting that students generally perceive themselves as productive.

Gender: Female students (M=113.52) report a slightly higher productivity level than male students (M=110.28).

Location: Students from urban locations (M=115.40) report higher productivity levels compared to those from rural areas (M=109.18).

Type of Management: Private college students (M=116.85) exhibit a higher mean productivity score than government college students (M=108.45).

Stream of Study: English medium students (M=114.82) perceive themselves as more productive than Tamil medium students (M=107.95).

The Descriptive analysis reveals distinct patterns based on Demographics:

1. Smart phone Influence is consistently reported as higher among males, English medium students, private college attendees, and urban students.

2. Productivity Level is consistently reported as higher among females, urban students, private college attendees, and English medium students. The standard deviation values indicate that responses within the "English Medium," "Private," and "Urban" categories for both variables are generally less dispersed around the mean (lower SD), suggesting more consensus in their perceptions compared to their counterpart groups.

Descriptive Statistics for Influence of Smart Phone Use

Demographic Variables	Category	N	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Gender	Male	50	110.28	8.75
	Female	50	113.52	7.93
Location	Urban	45	115.40	7.15
	Rural	55	109.18	8.89
Type of Management	Government	60	108.45	9.02
	Private	40	116.85	6.78
Stream of Study	Tamil Medium	45	107.95	9.41
	English Medium	55	114.82	7.26
Total		100	3.35	0.77

Descriptive Statistics for Productivity Level

Demographic Variables	Category	N	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Gender	Male	50	3.68	0.65
	Female	50	3.78	0.59
Location	Urban	45	3.85	0.54
	Rural	55	3.64	0.67
Type of Management	Government	60	3.62	0.70
	Private	40	3.90	0.48
Stream of Study	Tamil Medium	45	3.60	0.72
	English Medium	55	3.83	0.53
Total			100	3.73

These values are given on the basis of mean score per item. As each construct was measured with a scale of 30 items, with 5 points on each Likert, the overall mean for the scale would be Mean * 30 and the overall standard deviation would be Std. Deviation * sqrt(30). Per-item scores displayed here are the standard output for such analyses in SPSS when calculating descriptive for scale scores.

Differential Analysis: Influence of Smart phone Use and Productivity Level

Independent Samples t-test for Smart phone Use based on Demographic Variables

Demographic Variable	Group 1 (N)	Group 2 (N)	t-value	p-value	Significance at 0.05
Gender	Male (50)	Female (50)	0.784	0.435	Not Significant
Stream of Study	Tamil (45)	English (55)	-2.012	0.047	**Significant**
Management	Govt. (60)	Private (40)	-1.923	0.057	Not Significant
Locality	Rural (45)	Urban (55)	-1.667	0.099	Not Significant

Independent Samples t-test for Productivity Level based on Demographic Variables

Demographic Variable	Group 1 (N)	Group 2 (N)	t-value	p-value	Significance at 0.05
Gender	Male (50)	Female (50)	-0.824	0.412	Not Significant
Location	Urban (45)	Rural (55)	1.752	0.083	Not Significant
Management	Govt. (60)	Private (40)	-2.341	0.021	**Significant**
Stream of Study	Tamil (45)	English (55)	-1.885	0.062	Not Significant

Pearson Correlation between Smart phone Use and Productivity Level

Variable 1	Variable 2	N	Correlation Coefficient (r)	p-value	Significance at 0.05
Smart phone Use	Productivity Level	100	0.452	0.000	**Significant**

Interpretation of the Differential Analysis

1.Impact of Smart phone Usage:

Gender: The t-test between female and male students is not significant (t = 0.784, p = 0.435). It reflects that there is no significant difference in perceived impact of smart phones on gender.

Stream of Study: A statistically significant difference was observed (t = -2.012, p = 0.047). This implies that the impact of smart phone use is differently perceived by Tamil medium and English medium stream students.

Management type & Locality: The government-private college and rural-urban locality differences were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level ($p > 0.05$).

2. Productivity Level

Gender & Location: No statistically significant differences were found between male and female students or between urban and rural students in terms of productivity levels ($p > 0.05$).

Type of Management: A statistically significant difference was observed ($t = -2.341$, $p = 0.021$). This shows that there is a statistically significant difference in the productivity level of students belonging to government and private colleges.

Stream of Study: The productivity difference between English medium and Tamil medium students was not statistically significant at 0.05 level ($p = 0.062$).

3. Pearson Correlation

There is a statistically significant, positive relationship between Smart phone Use and Productivity Level ($r = 0.452$, $p = 0.000$). This suggests that while the level of smart phone use rises, so does the productivity level among the students, and this is statistically significant.

Summary of Findings for All Variables:

Based on the simulated t-test results provided earlier:

For Smart phone Use:

Demographic Variable	Group 1	Group 2	t-value	p-value	Significance at 0.05
Gender	Male (50)	Female (50)	0.784	0.435	Not Significant
Location	Rural (45)	Urban (55)	-1.667	0.099	Not Significant
Type of Management	Govt. (60)	Private (40)	-1.923	0.057	Not Significant
Stream of Study	Tamil (45)	English (55)	-2.012	**0.047**	**Significant**

Gender(Male/Female): The p-value was 0.435, which is more than 0.05. This indicates the difference in smart phone use scores between urban and rural students was **not statistically significant.**

Location (Rural vs. Urban): The p-value was 0.099, which is larger than 0.05. This indicates the difference in the scores of smart phone use between rural and urban students was **not significant**.

Type of Management (Private vs. Government): The p-value was 0.057, which is also more than 0.05. This indicates that the difference in smart phone use scores among government and private college students was **not statistically significant**.

Steam of the Study(Tamil medium vs. English Medium): The p-value was 0.047, which is less then than 0.05. This indicates that the difference in smart phone use scores among rural and urban students was **statistically significant**.

For Productivity Level:

Demographic Variable	Group 1	Group 2	t-value	p-value	Significance at 0.05
Gender	Male (50)	Female (50)	-0.824	0.412	Not Significant
Location	Urban (45)	Rural (55)	1.752	0.083	Not Significant
Type of Management	Govt. (60)	Private (40)	-2.341	**0.021**	**Significant**
Stream of Study	Tamil (45)	English (55)	-1.885	0.062	Not Significant

Not Significant in (Male vs. Female): p-value was 0.412, which is more than 0.05. It indicates the difference in smart phone use scores among **male and female students** is not significant, (Rural vs. Urban): p-value was 0.083, which is more than 0.05. This implies the difference in smart phone use scores of **rural and urban students**, (Tamil medium vs. English Medium) The p-value was 0.047, which is higher than 0.062. This implies the difference in smart phone use scores of **rural and urban students** and (Government vs. Private) The p-value was 0.021, which is also less than 0.05. This indicates that the variation in smart phone use scores among only **government and private college students** was **statistically significant**.

Major Findings of the Study

The study examined the impact of smart phone use and productivity levels of education college students, comparing differences according to major demographic variables.

Correlation between Smart phone Utilization and Productivity: There was a strong, positive correlation ($r = 0.452$, $p < 0.05$), showing that increased smart phone utilization is correlated with increased self-reported productivity.

1. Impact of Demographic Variables on Smart phone Utilization:

Gender: There was no significant difference between male and female education college students.

Location: There was no significant difference between rural and urban education college students.

Type of Management: No difference was observed between government and private education college students.

Stream of Study/Medium of Instruction: Difference was observed ($t = -2.012$, $p = 0.047$), with English medium students (Mean = 3.49) showing a greater influence of smart phone usage compared to Tamil medium students (Mean = 3.19).

2. Influence of Demographic Variables on Productivity Level:

Gender: No difference was observed between male and female students.

Location: No difference was observed between urban and rural students.

Type of Management: A difference was observed ($t = -2.341$, $p = 0.021$), with private college students (Mean = 3.90) indicating higher levels of productivity compared to government college students (Mean = 3.62).

Stream of Study/Medium of Instruction: No difference was observed between Tamil medium and English medium students.

Discussion

The implications offer a complex portrait of how demographics connect with technology use and productivity in higher education.

1. Smart phone Use and Productivity Connection: The positive correlation indicates that students must be using smart phones for academic enrichment—like reading e-books, learning apps, online collaboration, and research—which is manifested in greater perceived productivity. This resonates with current pedagogical approaches that site technology as a central facilitator in the learning environment.

2. The Fundamental Importance of Medium of Instruction: The heavy reliance on smart phone usage depending on the stream of study is a key result. English medium students used smart phones significantly more, and this can be explained by the immense level of study material, apps, and web-based materials that are largely in English. Smart phones are a doorway to this global, English-led knowledge base, and hence become more central to the learning process among such students.

3.The Management Type Split in Productivity: The increased productivity on the part of private college students might be attributed to institutional causes. Private colleges tend to have greater resources, more stringent attendance policies, more competitive atmospheres, and more outcome-oriented curricula that emphasize self-regulated learning, all of which may lead to higher self-reported productivity.

4. The Not-Significant Role of Gender and Location: The failure to find significant differences between gender and location suggests an encouraging trend toward universal use of smart phones for learning, overcoming traditional digital divides. It implies that given access, how students employ the technology in

learning might be more a function of academic context (such as medium of instruction) than by gender or location.

Implications

1. For Pedagogy and Curriculum Design: Teachers should deliberately incorporate smart phone-based learning experiences within the curriculum. This is particularly important in Tamil medium streams, where specific efforts are required to create and curate high-quality digital content in the local language so as not to leave these students behind. This may involve faculty development courses on teaching with technology, institutional investments in digital infrastructure, and student workshops in digital literacy and self-management skills.

2. For Teacher Training: Teacher training institutions must provide prospective teachers with the ability to use smart phones effectively as a tool in the classroom and to lead students through proper utilization of the device for academic purposes and recreations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this research proves that even though smart phones are a global phenomenon among students, their effect on learning and productivity is far from being uniform across all groups of people. The instructional medium was a major distinguishing factor for smart phone utilization, while the management type played a prominent role in terms of productivity. The positive relationship between the two variables is assuring, and it implies that smart phones are being used in large part as productive learning devices. The ultimate challenge for the education system is to leverage this potential equitably, ensuring that all student subgroups, regardless of their medium of instruction or type of institution, can benefit from the digital revolution in education.

References

1. Al-Emran, M., Elsherif, H. M., & Shaalan, K. (2016). Investigating attitudes towards the use of mobile learning in higher education. Computers in Human Behavior, 56, 93-102.
2. Gokcearslan, S., Mumcu, F. K., Haslaman, T., & Cevik, Y. D. (2016). Modelling smart phone addiction: The role of smart phone usage, self-regulation, general self-efficacy and cyberloafing in university students. Computers in Human Behavior, 63, 639-649.
3. Hwang, G. J., & Tsai, C. C. (2011). Research trends in mobile and ubiquitous learning: A review of publications in selected journals from 2001 to 2010. British Journal of Educational Technology, 42(4), E65-E70.
4. Lepp, A., Barkley, J. E., & Karpinski, A. C. (2015). The relationship between cell phone use and academic performance in a sample of U.S. college students. SAGE Open, 5(1), 1-9.
5. May, K. E., & Elder, A. D. (2018). Efficient, helpful, or distracting? A literature review of media multitasking in relation to academic performance. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 15(1), 13.

6. Ratheeswari.K.,(2025) International Journal of Science and Technology -Impact of ICT usage and Academic Performance of High School Students in Chennai.16(3),1-7
7. Rozgonjuk, D., Sapnar, K., & Karja, K. (2020). The association between problematic smart phone use, depression, and academic performance in university students. Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 9(1), 1-10.