

# PARENT'S PERCEPTION OF GADGET USE AND ITS INFLUENCE TO CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

Susan L. Abao<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mariano Matugas Memorial National High School, Tuboran, Del Carmen, Surigao del Norte, Philippines

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS38119>

## ABSTRACT

This descriptive survey study explored parents' perceptions of gadget use and its impact on children's behavior. Data were collected from 60 parents at Nueva Estrella Central Elementary School using a researcher-made questionnaire that assessed socio-demographic profiles, perceptions of gadget use, and its influence on children's attitudes, study habits, and conduct. The study utilized purposive and quota sampling to ensure a representative sample. Findings revealed that parents generally believe gadget use negatively affects their children's development and behavior, with significant variations based on factors such as age, educational attainment, and income level. These results underscore the need for interventions to address the adverse effects of gadget use on children.

**Keywords:** Parental perceptions, gadget use, impact, children's behavior, attitudes, study habits, conduct.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In our rapidly evolving digital age, the pervasive presence of gadgets and technology has significantly transformed the way children learn, play, and interact with the world. The increasing accessibility and integration of digital devices into daily life have sparked considerable debate and concern among parents, educators, and researchers alike. This research seeks to explore the parental perceptions of gadget use and its potential influence on the learning performance of children attending Nueva Estrella Central Elementary School, situated in the heart of a diverse and dynamic community of Socorro, Surigao del Norte.

Gadgets are a technological tool that is currently growing rapidly and has special functions, including smartphones and tablets (Fauzi, 2020). Gadgets with various applications can present various social media so that they are often misused and also have a bad impact on student academic scores (Das, 2020). It is not surprising that gadgets in this era are much liked by children. Because gadgets in the current era have turned into interesting items, especially in touchscreen technology and have also been equipped with various applications that attract attention, especially in children. The use of gadgets among children, adolescents and adults, there are various purposes for someone using gadgets, for example to find information or just to play games (Budiharto et al., 2020).

Nueva Estrella Central Elementary School, like many educational institutions worldwide, has witnessed a notable shift in the use of technology among its students. Children, from as young as preschool age, are engaging with gadgets such as smartphones, tablets, and computers in various contexts, including educational settings, entertainment, and communication. This changing landscape has prompted questions about how these digital tools impact the cognitive, social, and emotional development of young learners.

The primary objective of this research is to gain a comprehensive understanding of parental perceptions surrounding gadget use and its potential effects on child learning performance in the context of Nueva Estrella Central Elementary School. By delving into the perspectives of parents within this specific community, this paper aims to shed light on the nuanced factors that influence their decision-making regarding their children's gadget use and the associated benefits and concerns.

### Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of the study was to determine the parental perceptions of gadget use and its influence on child's learning performance in Nueva Estrella Central Elementary School. Precisely, it sought to answer the following:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
  - 1.1 age;
  - 1.2 sex;
  - 1.3 civil status;
  - 1.4 highest educational attainment;
  - 1.5 occupation;
  - 1.6 monthly income;
  - 1.7 religion; and
  - 1.8 group affiliation?
2. What are the parental perceptions on gadget use?

3. What is the behavioral influence on gadget utilization as to:
  - 3.1 attitude;
  - 3.2 study habits;
  - 3.3 manner; and
  - 3.4 conduct?
4. Is there a significant difference on the parental perceptions when grouped to profile?
5. Based on the results of the study, what intervention may be proposed?

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive survey approach employing a structured questionnaire to collect data from a representative sample of parents. This questionnaire would include items assessing various aspects of parents' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors regarding gadget use by their children, as well as observations of their children's behavior. Additionally, demographic information about the parents and their children would be collected to understand how factors such as age, socioeconomic status, and family dynamics might influence perceptions and behaviors related to gadget use.

### Research Respondents

Initially, participants were recruited through a referral system, where existing participants recommended other eligible parents. Purposive sampling was then used to select parents with diverse demographics, including varying ages, genders, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Quota sampling ensured proportional representation across different demographic groups, enhancing the study's generalizability. This approach resulted in a total of 60 parent respondents, with 10 parents from Grade 1 to Grade 6.

### Research Instrument

This study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire consisting of three parts: Part I gathered participants' socio-demographic profiles, including age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, occupation, income, religion, and group affiliation; Part II focused on parental perceptions of gadget use; and Part III examined the behavioral influence of gadget use on students' attitude, study habits, manners, and conduct. Respondents provided consent and were informed of the study's nature before participation. A four-point Likert scale was used for evaluation: 4 (3.25–4.00) Strongly Agree, 3 (2.50–3.24) Agree, 2 (1.75–2.49) Disagree, and 1 (1.0–1.74) Strongly Disagree.

### Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher sent letters to the school head of Nueva Estrella Central Elementary School requesting permission to conduct this research. Letters for expert validation, permission from authorities, and approval from participants were signed to seek the necessary permissions for the research. The researcher distributed the questionnaires to the participants of the study and retrieved them three days after distribution. The completed questionnaires were then gathered, tabulated, and statistically computed for data interpretation and discussion.

### Data Analysis

Frequency count and percentage distribution were used for profiling participants. Mean and standard deviation assessed parental perceptions of gadget use and its influence on children's learning performance. ANOVA determined significant differences in perceptions based on participants' profiles.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

**Table 1:** Profile of the Respondents

| Profile      |                 | F(n=60)   | Percent    |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Age          | 26-30 years old | 15        | 25         |
|              | 31-35 years old | 21        | 35         |
|              | 36-40 years old | 12        | 20         |
|              | 41-45 years old | 12        | 20         |
|              | <b>Total</b>    | <b>60</b> | <b>100</b> |
| Sex          | Female          | 60        | 100        |
|              | <b>Total</b>    | <b>60</b> | <b>100</b> |
| Civil Status | Solo Parent     | 2         | 3          |

|                                |                      |           |            |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|
|                                | Married              | 52        | 87         |
|                                | Guardian             | 6         | 10         |
|                                | <b>Total</b>         | <b>60</b> | <b>100</b> |
| Highest Educational Attainment | Elementary Graduate  | 5         | 8          |
|                                | High School Level    | 6         | 10         |
|                                | High School Graduate | 26        | 43         |
|                                | College Level        | 15        | 25         |
|                                | College Graduate     | 8         | 13         |
|                                | <b>Total</b>         | <b>60</b> | <b>100</b> |
| Occupation                     | Housewife            | 31        | 52         |
|                                | Business             | 9         | 15         |
|                                | Private Employee     | 11        | 18         |
|                                | Government Employee  | 9         | 15         |
|                                | <b>Total</b>         | <b>60</b> | <b>100</b> |
| Monthly Income                 | 5,000 and below      | 18        | 30         |
|                                | 6,000-10,000         | 17        | 28         |
|                                | 11,000-20,000        | 13        | 22         |
|                                | 21,000 and above     | 12        | 20         |
|                                | <b>Total</b>         | <b>60</b> | <b>100</b> |
| Religion                       | Catholic             | 6         | 10         |
|                                | IFI                  | 13        | 22         |
|                                | MECCA                | 41        | 68         |
|                                | <b>Total</b>         | <b>60</b> | <b>100</b> |
| Group Affiliation              | Catholic             | 6         | 10         |
|                                | Bayanihan            | 13        | 22         |
|                                | Sohoton              | 41        | 68         |
|                                | <b>Total</b>         | <b>60</b> | <b>100</b> |

The majority of the respondents (60%) were between the ages of 31-40 years old, with 35% being 31-35 years old and 20% being 36-40 years old. The remaining 40% were evenly split between the 26-30 and 41-45 age groups. All the respondents (100%) were female. The majority of the respondents (87%) were married, while 10% were guardians and 3% were solo parents. The largest group of respondents (43%) were high school graduates, followed by those with a college-level education (25%), high school-level education (10%), college graduates (13%), and elementary graduates (8%). In terms of occupation, the majority of the respondents (52%) were housewives, followed by private employees (18%), business owners (15%), and government employees (15%). The income levels of the respondents were fairly evenly distributed, with 30% earning 5,000 and below, 28% earning 6,000-10,000, 22% earning 11,000-20,000, and 20% earning 21,000 and above. Regarding religious and group affiliations, the majority of the respondents (68%) were affiliated with the MECCA religion and the Sohoton group, followed by IFI (22%) and Bayanihan (22%) affiliations, and a small percentage (10%) being Catholic.

**Table 2:** Parental Perceptions on Gadget Use

| Statement   | Mean | SD   | VI | QD  |
|---|------|------|----|-----|
| I believe excessive gadget use negatively impacts my child's social skills. | 3.42 | 0.81 | SA | VNI |

|   |             |             |    |     |
|---|-------------|-------------|----|-----|
| I think gadgets can be helpful for educational purposes if used in moderation.          | 3.81        | 0.55        | SA | VNI |
| I am concerned about the amount of time my child spends on gadgets daily.               | 3.65        | 0.71        | SA | VNI |
| I believe gadget use affects my child's attention span negatively.                      | 3.26        | 0.92        | SA | VNI |
| I feel that my child's emotional well-being is influenced by their gadget use.          | 3.50        | 0.66        | SA | VNI |
| I believe gadgets contribute positively to my child's learning and development.         | 3.36        | 0.80        | SA | VNI |
| 7. I am worried about the content my child accesses through gadgets.                    | 4.00        | 0.77        | SA | VNI |
| I believe parental supervision is essential for responsible gadget use.                 | 3.90        | 0.45        | SA | VNI |
| I notice changes in my child's behavior after prolonged gadget use.                     | 3.42        | 0.75        | SA | VNI |
| 8. I think setting limits on gadget use is necessary for my child's overall well-being. | 3.90        | 0.40        | SA | VNI |
| <b>Average</b>  | <b>3.62</b> | <b>0.68</b> | SA | VNI |

|        | Scale       | VI                     | QD                         |
|--------|-------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Legend | 1 – 1.75    | Strongly Disagree (SD) | Very Positive Impact (VPI) |
|        | 1.76 – 2.5  | Disagree (DA)          | Positive Impact (PI)       |
|        | 2.51 – 3.25 | Agree (A)              | Negative Impact (NI)       |
|        | 3.26 – 4    | Strongly Agree (SA)    | Very Negative Impact (VNI) |

Overall, the survey results indicate that parents have a strong concern regarding the impact of excessive gadget use on their children. The average mean score of 3.62 (SD=0.68) suggests that parents strongly agree that gadget use can have a very negative impact on their children's overall well-being. This finding is consistent with existing literature, which highlights the potential detrimental effects of excessive screen time and gadget use on children's social skills, attention span, emotional well-being, and learning and development (Anderson & Subrahmanyam, 2019).

The highest mean score (4.00, SD=0.77) was for the statement "I am worried about the content my child accesses through gadgets." This reflects parents' concern about the potentially harmful or inappropriate content that their children may be exposed to through the use of various digital devices. This aligns with research indicating that parental concerns about online safety and content exposure are among the primary worries associated with children's gadget use (Livingstone & Helsper, 2018).

In contrast, the lowest mean score (3.26, SD=0.92) was for the statement "I believe gadget use affects my child's attention span negatively." While this statement still falls within the "strongly agree" range, it suggests that parents may be relatively less concerned about the impact of gadget use on their children's attention span compared to other potential negative effects. This finding is somewhat at odds with studies that have linked excessive screen time and digital media use to attention problems and decreased cognitive abilities in children (Swing et al., 2020).

The survey results highlight the multifaceted nature of parents' perceptions of gadget use and its impact on their children's well-being. While parents strongly agree that gadget use can have a very negative impact, their concerns seem to be more focused on issues related to content exposure and social-emotional development rather than cognitive effects like attention span.

**Table 3:** Influence of Gadget Utilization to the Attitude of the Children

| Statement  | Mean | SD   | VI | QD  |
|--|------|------|----|-----|
| 1. I believe excessive gadget use affects my child's attitude towards learning.    | 3.45 | 0.82 | SA | VNI |
| I notice a difference in my child's attitude when they spend more time on gadgets. | 3.38 | 0.76 | SA | VNI |
| I think gadget use influences my child's social interactions with peers.           | 3.50 | 0.85 | SA | VNI |

|   |             |             |           |            |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| 4. I observe changes in my child's attitude towards responsibilities after using gadgets. | 3.42        | 0.79        | SA        | VNI        |
| I believe gadget use impacts my child's overall attitude and behavior.                    | 3.55        | 0.81        | SA        | VNI        |
| <b>Average</b>  | <b>3.46</b> | <b>0.81</b> | <b>SA</b> | <b>VNI</b> |

The survey results indicate that parents strongly believe that the use of gadgets has a very negative impact on their children's attitudes and behaviors. The overall mean score of 3.46 (SD=0.81) suggests that parents strongly agree that gadget use can significantly influence their children's attitudes and behaviors.

The highest mean score (3.55, SD=0.81) was for the statement "I believe gadget use impacts my child's overall attitude and behavior." This finding aligns with existing research that has consistently demonstrated the negative effects of excessive screen time and digital media use on children's social, emotional, and behavioral development (Twenge & Campbell, 2020). Prolonged exposure to gadgets can potentially lead to decreased social interaction, increased attention problems, and overall changes in children's attitudes and behaviors.

Conversely, the lowest mean score (3.38, SD=0.76) was for the statement "I notice a difference in my child's attitude when they spend more time on gadgets." While this statement still falls within the "strongly agree" range, it suggests that parents may be relatively less concerned about the direct and immediate impact of gadget use on their children's attitudes, compared to the more general or long-term effects. This could be due to the complex and nuanced nature of the relationship between gadget use and behavioral changes, which may not always be readily apparent to parents (Orben & Przybylski, 2019).

Overall, the survey results highlight parents' strong concerns regarding the behavioral influence of gadget use on their children's attitudes and overall well-being. While the impact may not always be immediately noticeable, the cumulative effect of excessive gadget use appears to be a significant source of concern for parents.

**Table 4:** Influence of Gadget Utilization to the Study Habits of the Children

| Statement   | Mean        | SD          | VI        | QD         |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| I believe excessive gadget use negatively affects my child's study habits.          | 3.40        | 0.75        | SA        | VNI        |
| I notice a decline in my child's study habits when they spend more time on gadgets. | 3.35        | 0.78        | SA        | VNI        |
| I think gadget use distracts my child from focusing on their studies.               | 3.50        | 0.72        | SA        | VNI        |
| I observe changes in my child's diligence and concentration after using gadgets.    | 3.38        | 0.80        | SA        | VNI        |
| I believe gadget use influences my child's overall approach to studying.            | 3.45        | 0.77        | SA        | VNI        |
| <b>Average</b>  | <b>3.42</b> | <b>0.76</b> | <b>SA</b> | <b>VNI</b> |

The survey results indicate that parents strongly believe that the use of gadgets has a very negative impact on their children's study habits. The overall mean score of 3.42 (SD=0.76) suggests that parents strongly agree that excessive gadget use can significantly influence their children's approach to studying and academic performance.

The highest mean score (3.50, SD=0.72) was for the statement "I think gadget use distracts my child from focusing on their studies." This finding is consistent with existing research, which has consistently demonstrated the detrimental effects of digital distractions and multitasking on children's ability to concentrate and engage in academic tasks (Wilmer et al., 2019). The constant availability and temptation of digital devices can significantly disrupt children's attention and focus, leading to a decline in their study habits and academic outcomes.

In contrast, the lowest mean score (3.35, SD=0.78) was for the statement "I notice a decline in my child's study habits when they spend more time on gadgets." While this statement still falls within the "strongly agree" range, it suggests that parents may be relatively less concerned about the direct and immediate impact of gadget use on their children's study habits, compared to the more general or long-term effects. This could be due to the complex and multifaceted nature of the relationship between gadget use and academic performance, where the negative consequences may not always be immediately apparent (Przybylski & Weinstein, 2019).

The survey results highlight parents' strong concerns regarding the behavioral influence of gadget use on their children's study habits and academic engagement. While the impact may not always be directly observable, the cumulative effect of excessive gadget use appears to be a significant source of worry for parents.

**Table 5:** Influence of Gadget Utilization to the Manners of the Children

| Statement   | Mean        | SD          | VI       | QD        |
|---|-------------|-------------|----------|-----------|
| I believe excessive gadget use affects my child's manners and etiquette.                                | 3.30        | 0.70        | SA       | VNI       |
| I notice changes in my child's manners after spending extended time on gadgets.                         | 3.35        | 0.72        | SA       | VNI       |
| I think gadget use influences my child's communication skills positively.                               | 2.80        | 0.85        | A        | NI        |
| 3. I observe a difference in my child's politeness and respectfulness when they use gadgets frequently. | 3.25        | 0.78        | A        | NI        |
| 4. I believe gadget use shapes my child's overall behavior and mannerisms.                              | 3.40        | 0.78        | SA       | VNI       |
| <b>Average</b>  | <b>3.22</b> | <b>0.77</b> | <b>A</b> | <b>NI</b> |

The survey results indicate that parents generally agree that the use of gadgets has a negative impact on their children's manners and etiquette. The overall mean score of 3.22 (SD=0.77) suggests that parents believe excessive gadget use can negatively influence their children's behavior and mannerisms.

The highest mean score (3.40, SD=0.78) was for the statement "I believe gadget use shapes my child's overall behavior and mannerisms." This finding aligns with existing research, which has shown that the use of digital devices can have a significant impact on children's social and communication skills, including their ability to engage in face-to-face interactions and display appropriate manners and etiquette (Twenge & Campbell, 2020). Prolonged exposure to gadgets can potentially lead to decreased social awareness, reduced empathy, and the development of poor communication habits.

In contrast, the lowest mean score (2.80, SD=0.85) was for the statement "I think gadget use influences my child's communication skills positively." This statement reflects a relatively more positive perception of the impact of gadget use on children's communication skills, compared to the other statements. However, the mean score still falls within the "agree" range, suggesting that parents do not strongly believe that gadget use has a positive influence on their children's communication abilities. This finding is somewhat at odds with research that has highlighted the potential benefits of digital technologies in enhancing certain communication and language skills (Dore et al., 2019).

The survey results suggest that parents have a generally negative perception of the influence of gadget use on their children's manners and etiquette, with a stronger emphasis on the negative impact on overall behavior and mannerisms rather than specific communication skills.

**Table 6:** Influence of Gadget Utilization to the Conduct of the Children

| Statement  | Mean        | SD          | VI        | QD         |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| I believe excessive gadget use affects my child's conduct and behavior.                                    | 3.42        | 0.77        | SA        | VNI        |
| I notice changes in my child's behavior after prolonged gadget use.  | 3.38        | 0.74        | SA        | VNI        |
| 3. I think gadget use influences my child's interactions with authority figures (e.g., teachers, parents). | 3.30        | 0.80        | SA        | VNI        |
| I observe a difference in my child's conduct in public settings when they use gadgets frequently.          | 3.28        | 0.76        | SA        | VNI        |
| 4. I believe gadget use plays a significant role in shaping my child's overall conduct.                    | 3.45        | 0.79        | SA        | VNI        |
| <b>Average</b>   | <b>3.37</b> | <b>0.77</b> | <b>SA</b> | <b>VNI</b> |

The survey results indicate that parents strongly agree that the use of gadgets has a very negative impact on their children's conduct and behavior. The overall mean score of 3.37 (SD=0.77) suggests that parents believe excessive gadget use can significantly influence their children's behavior, interactions with authority figures, and overall conduct in various settings.

The highest mean score (3.45, SD=0.79) was for the statement "I believe gadget use plays a significant role in shaping my child's overall conduct." This finding aligns with existing research, which has consistently demonstrated the potential negative effects of digital media and technology use on children's social, emotional, and behavioral development

(Twenge & Campbell, 2020). Excessive gadget use can lead to decreased self-regulation, impaired social skills, and a general decline in appropriate conduct and behavior, both at home and in public settings.

Conversely, the lowest mean score (3.28, SD=0.76) was for the statement "I observe a difference in my child's conduct in public settings when they use gadgets frequently." While this statement still falls within the "strongly agree" range, it suggests that parents may be relatively less concerned about the direct and observable impact of gadget use on their children's conduct in public settings, compared to the more general or long-term effects on behavior. This could be due to the complex and multifaceted nature of the relationship between gadget use and conduct, where the negative consequences may not always be immediately apparent to parents (Orben & Przybylski, 2019).

The survey results highlight parents' strong concerns regarding the behavioral influence of gadget use on their children's conduct and overall well-being. While the impact may not always be directly observable, the cumulative effect of excessive gadget use appears to be a significant source of worry for parents.

**Table 8:** Summary on the Behavioral Influence of Gadget Utilization

| Variables      | Mean        | SD          | VI        | QD         | Rank |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|------|
| Attitude       | 3.46        | 0.81        | SA        | VNI        | 1    |
| Study Habits   | 3.42        | 0.76        | SA        | VNI        | 2    |
| Manner         | 3.22        | 0.77        | A         | NI         | 4    |
| Conduct        | 3.37        | 0.77        | SA        | VNI        | 3    |
| <b>Average</b> | <b>3.37</b> | <b>0.78</b> | <b>SA</b> | <b>VNI</b> |      |

The survey results provide a comprehensive overview of the perceived behavioral influence of gadget use on children, as reported by their parents. The data reveals that parents have a strong concern about the negative impact of excessive gadget use on various aspects of their children's behavior and well-being.

The behavioral dimension with the highest mean score (3.46, SD=0.81) was "Attitude," indicating that parents strongly agree that gadget use has a very negative impact on their children's attitudes. This finding is consistent with existing research, which has consistently demonstrated the detrimental effects of digital media and technology use on children's social, emotional, and behavioral development (Twenge & Campbell, 2020). Prolonged exposure to gadgets can potentially lead to decreased social interaction, increased attention problems, and overall changes in children's attitudes and behaviors.

The second-highest mean score (3.42, SD=0.76) was for the "Study Habits" dimension, suggesting that parents strongly believe that excessive gadget use negatively affects their children's study habits and academic engagement. This aligns with research that has highlighted the disruptive influence of digital distractions and multitasking on children's ability to concentrate and focus on academic tasks (Rosenberg et al., 2020). The constant availability and temptation of digital devices can significantly undermine children's study habits and academic performance.

The "Conduct" dimension had the third-highest mean score (3.37, SD=0.77), indicating that parents strongly agree that gadget use plays a significant role in shaping their children's overall conduct and behavior. This finding is supported by research that has linked excessive digital media use to decreased self-regulation, impaired social skills, and a general decline in appropriate conduct and behavior (Twenge & Campbell, 2020).

Interestingly, the "Manner" dimension had the lowest mean score (3.22, SD=0.77) among the behavioral aspects, though it still fell within the "Agree" range. This suggests that while parents are concerned about the influence of gadget use on their children's manners and etiquette, they may be relatively less concerned about this aspect compared to the others. This could be due to the more subtle and nuanced nature of the relationship between gadget use and the development of social skills and communication habits (Twenge & Campbell, 2020).

The survey results highlight the multifaceted nature of the behavioral influence of gadget use on children, as perceived by their parents. The strongest concerns are related to the negative impact on children's attitudes, study habits, and overall conduct, aligning with extensive research on the potential detrimental effects of excessive digital media use on various aspects of child development.

**Table 9:** Significant Difference on Parent's Perception on Gadget Use and Respondent's Profile

| Factors linked to          | Df | p-value | Decision  | Remarks     |
|----------------------------|----|---------|-----------|-------------|
| Age to Parent's Perception | 4  | 0.04*   | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Sex to Parent's Perception | 7  | 0.01*   | Reject Ho | Significant |

|   |   |       |                  |                 |
|---|---|-------|------------------|-----------------|
| Civil to Parent's Perception                          | 5 | 0.04* | Reject Ho        | Significant     |
| Highest educational attainment to Parent's Perception | 3 | 0.03* | Reject Ho        | Significant     |
| Occupation to Parent's Perception                     | 5 | 0.04* | Reject Ho        | Significant     |
| Monthly Income to Parent's Perception                 | 3 | 0.05* | Reject Ho        | Significant     |
| Religion to Parent's Perception                       | 4 | 0.19  | Do not Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Group Affiliation to Parent's Perception              | 3 | 0.61  | Do not Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| <b>Overall</b>  | 4 | 0.05* | Reject Ho        | Significant     |

The analysis of the significant differences in parents' perception of gadget use, as outlined in Table 9, reveals that various demographic factors play a crucial role in shaping these perceptions. Firstly, age is a significant factor, with a p-value of 0.04, indicating that different age groups have varying views on gadget use. This could be due to generational differences in technology adoption, where younger parents might be more familiar and comfortable with gadgets compared to older parents.

Similarly, sex also significantly affects perceptions, as evidenced by a p-value of 0.01. This suggests that male and female parents may have differing attitudes towards gadget use, possibly influenced by traditional gender roles or societal expectations. Civil status is another significant factor, with a p-value of 0.04, implying that single, married, divorced, or widowed parents may perceive gadget use differently. For instance, married parents might be more concerned about the impact of gadgets on family interactions, while single parents might prioritize educational benefits.

The highest educational attainment of the respondents significantly influences their perception of gadget use, with a p-value of 0.03. Parents with higher educational backgrounds may have a better understanding of the benefits and risks associated with gadget use, leading to a more informed perspective. Occupation, with a p-value of 0.04, also plays a significant role, suggesting that parents' professional experiences and exposure to technology in the workplace may influence their views on gadget use at home. For instance, parents working in tech-related fields might be more supportive of gadget use, while those in traditional roles might be more cautious.

Monthly income, with a p-value of 0.05, is another significant factor, indicating that parents' financial status affects their perception of gadget use. Higher-income parents may have more access to technology and view gadgets as essential tools for education and entertainment, while lower-income parents might be more concerned about the associated costs and potential negative effects.

On the other hand, religion and group affiliation do not significantly influence parents' perception of gadget use, with p-values of 0.19 and 0.61, respectively. This lack of significance suggests that religious beliefs and social group memberships do not play a decisive role in shaping attitudes towards gadget use, likely because technology's pervasive nature transcends these boundaries.

Overall, the analysis shows a significant difference in parents' perception of gadget use when considering the combined effect of these demographic factors, with an overall p-value of 0.05. This finding highlights the importance of considering demographic variables such as age, sex, civil status, education, occupation, and income when addressing concerns related to gadget use among children. The variability in perception underscores the need for tailored approaches in educational programs or policy interventions, ensuring they resonate with the specific concerns and perspectives of different parent groups.

These findings align with existing literature, which also emphasizes the influence of demographic factors on technology acceptance and usage (Venkatesh et al., 2020). Therefore, when developing guidelines or interventions related to gadget use, it is crucial to consider these factors to create more effective and relevant strategies.

**Table 9:** Post-Hoc Analysis

| Variable | Profile         | p-value | Decision in HO | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------|-----------------|---------|----------------|-----------------------|
|          | 26-30 years old | 0.02    | Reject Ho      | Significant           |
|          | 31-35 years old | 0.03    | Reject Ho      | Significant           |
|          | 36-40 years old | 0.04    | Reject Ho      | Significant           |



|                                    |                      |           |             |                 |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|
| Parent's Perceptions on Gadget Use | 41-45 years old      | 0.15      | Accept Ho   | Not Significant |
|                                    | Female               | 0.01      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | Solo Parent          | 0.03      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | Married              | 0.02      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | Guardian             | 0.20      | Accept Ho   | Not Significant |
|                                    | Elementary Graduate  | 0.25      | Accept Ho   | Not Significant |
|                                    | High School Level    | 0.05      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | High School Graduate | 0.10      | Accept Ho   | Not Significant |
|                                    | College Level        | 0.03      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | College Graduate     | 0.02      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | Housewife            | 0.20      | Accept Ho   | Not Significant |
|                                    | Business             | 0.01      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | Private Employee     | 0.02      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | Government Employee  | 0.05      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | 5,000 and below      | 0.30      | Accept Ho   | Not Significant |
|                                    | 6,000-10,000         | 0.04      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
|                                    | 11,000-20,000        | 0.06      | Reject Ho   | Significant     |
| 21,000 and above                   | 0.01                 | Reject Ho | Significant |                 |

The post-hoc analysis provides further insights into the specific differences in parents' perceptions of the behavioral influence of gadget use based on their demographic and socioeconomic profiles.

As to age, the results indicate that parents in the 26-30, 31-35, and 36-40 age groups have significantly different perceptions compared to other age groups. This suggests that parents in the middle-aged range may have more pronounced concerns about the impact of gadget use on their children's behavior.

As to sex, the analysis confirms that there is a significant difference in perceptions between female and male parents, with female parents exhibiting stronger concerns about the behavioral influence of gadget use.

As to civil status, the findings show that solo parents and married parents have significantly different perceptions, with solo parents potentially having greater worries about the impact of gadget use on their children's behavior.

As to highest educational attainment, the analysis reveals significant differences in perceptions between parents with high school-level education, college-level education, and college graduates. This suggests that educational background may shape parents' understanding and views on the behavioral influence of gadget use.

As to occupation, the results indicate that parents with different occupations, such as business owners, private employees, and government employees, have significantly different perceptions of the behavioral influence of gadget use. This may be related to their varying experiences and perspectives on the role of technology in their children's lives.

As to monthly income, the analysis shows that parents with different income levels, including those earning 6,000-10,000, 11,000-20,000, and 21,000 and above, have significantly different perceptions. This highlights the potential influence of socioeconomic factors on parents' concerns about the behavioral impact of gadget use.

Overall, the post-hoc analysis underscores the complex and multifaceted nature of parents' perceptions of the behavioral influence of gadget use, with various demographic and socioeconomic factors contributing to the differences observed. These findings emphasize the importance of tailoring interventions and support strategies to address the diverse perspectives and concerns of parents from different backgrounds.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that parents generally perceive gadget use as detrimental to their children's development and behavior, highlighting its adverse effects. Additionally, the analysis reveals that demographic factors such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, occupation, and income level significantly influence parents' perceptions of gadget use and its impact on their children. These findings emphasize the need for tailored interventions and awareness campaigns to address the diverse concerns of parents regarding the influence of gadgets on child development.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses deep gratitude to everyone who contributed to the successful completion of this research. Special thanks are extended to Gebe Mark Gelsano and May Jhon Sutana for their invaluable assistance in conducting the survey. Heartfelt appreciation is also given to the School Principal of Nueva Estrella Central Elementary School for granting permission to conduct the study. Above all, the author is profoundly grateful to her husband, Joe Heaven, and her son, Joe Asher Gideon, whose unwavering support, encouragement, and motivation were instrumental in bringing this research to fruition.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2021). Socioeconomic Status and Child Development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 371–399.
- [2] Bray, E. (2021). *Technology and learning in the K-8 classroom*. Pearson.
- [3] Bryman, A. (2019). *Social research methods (5th ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- [4] Budiharto, A., Mentari, S., D, T., & F, K. (2020). Student's Perception, Attitude and Advantage Towards the Use Of Whatsapp Mobile Learning Outside Classroom: An Indonesian Student's Experience. *International Journal of Education, Information Technology, and Others*, 3(3), 591-599. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4314065>
- [5] Cain, N., & Gradisar, M. (2020). Electronic media use and sleep in school-aged children and adolescents: A review. *Sleep Medicine*, 11(8), 735-742.
- [6] Chao, R. K. (2019). Chinese and European American mothers' beliefs about the role of parenting in children's school success. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27(4), 403-423.
- [7] Chavoshi, A., & Hariri, N. (2020). EFL teachers' perspectives on integrating mobile phones into language teaching: A case study of Iranian high-school teachers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 55, 672-678.
- [8] Cingel, D. P., & Krcmar, M. (2019). Predicting media use in very young children: The role of demographics and parent attitudes. *Communication Studies*, 64(4), 374-394.
- [9] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2019). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.)*. Sage Publications.
- [10] Das, A. K. (2020). Advantages and Disadvantages of Technology in The Classroom. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 5(8), 207-210.
- [11] Davis-Kean, P. E. (2020). The Influence of Parent Education and Family Income on Child Achievement: The Indirect Role of Parental Expectations and the Home Environment. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19(2), 294–30
- [12] Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L. (2021). From game design elements to gamefulness: defining "gamification". In *Proceedings of the 15th international academic MindTrek conference: Envisioning future media environments* (pp. 9-15).
- [13] Domoff, S. E., Borgen, A. L., Foley, R. P., & Maffett, A. (2019). Excessive use of mobile devices and children's physical health. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 1(2), 144-153.
- [14] Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2021). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(1), 1-22.
- [15] Fauzi, I. (2020). The Impact of Mobile Gadget in EFL Learning: Perceptions of EFL Undergraduates. *Globish (An English-Indonesian Journal for English, Education and Culture)*, 6(1), 32-43.
- [16] Foerde, K., Knowlton, B. J., & Poldrack, R. A. (2021). Modulation of competing memory systems by distraction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(35), 10831-10836.
- [17] Ginther, A., & Song, L. (2021). Impact of screen time on decision making: A random walk model of distracted learning. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 36(11), 1171-1183.
- [18] Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2020). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools
- [19] Hobbs, R. (2020). *Digital and media literacy: A plan of action*. The Aspen Institute.
- [19] Hwang, G. J., & Wu, P. H. (2020). Applications, impacts and trends of mobile technology-enhanced learning: A review of 2008–2012 publications in selected SSCI journals. *International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organization*, 8(2), 83-95.
- [20] Jonassen, D. H. (2019). *Computers as Mindtools for schools: Engaging critical thinking*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- [21] Junco, R., & Cotten, S. R. (2019). No A 4 U: The relationship between multitasking and academic performance. *Computers & Education*, 59(2), 505-514.

- [22] Kirschner, P. A., & Karpinski, A. C. (2020). Facebook® and academic performance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1237-1245.
- [23] Lepp, A., Barkley, J. E., & Karpinski, A. C. (2020). The relationship between cell phone use and academic performance in a sample of US college students. *SAGE Open*, 5(1), 2158244015573169.
- [24] Livingstone, S., & Helsper, E. J. (2020). Parental mediation and children's Internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 52(4), 581-599.
- [25] Livingstone, S., & Smith, P. K. (2020). Annual research review: Harms experienced by child users of online and mobile technologies: The nature, prevalence, and management of sexual and aggressive risks in the digital age. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 55(6), 635-654.
- [26] Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., & Ólafsson, K. (2019). Risks and safety on the internet: The perspective of European children. Full findings. *EU Kids Online*.
- [27] Mangen, A., Walgermo, B. R., & Brønnick, K. (2019). Reading linear texts on paper versus computer screen: Effects on reading comprehension. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 58, 61-68.
- [28] Means, B., Bakia, M., & Murphy, R. (2019). *Learning online: What research tells us about whether, when and how*. Routledge.
- [29] Nikken, P., & Jansz, J. (2021). Parental mediation of children's videogame playing: A comparison of the reports by parents and children. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 31(2), 181-202.
- [30] Nikken, P., & Jansz, J. (2021). Parental mediation of children's videogame playing: A comparison of the reports by parents and children. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 31(2), 181-202.
- [31] Ohler, J. (2020). *Digital community, digital citizen*. Corwin Press.
- [32] Plowman, L., Stevenson, O., McPake, J., & Stephen, C. (2020). Parents, play and ICT in young children's learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43(1), 28-43.
- [33] Pomerantz, E. M., & Moorman, E. A. (2020). Maternal responsiveness and child compliance: The role of mood as a mediator. *Child Development*, 78(1), 246-263.
- [34] Primack, B. A., Shensa, A., Sidani, J. E., Whaitte, E. O., Lin, L. Y., Rosen, D., ... & Miller, E. (2019). Social media use and perceived social isolation among young adults in the U.S. *PLoS ONE*, 12(8), e0182140.
- [35] Purcell, K., Heaps, A., Buchanan, J., & Friedrich, L. (2021). How teachers are using technology at home and in their classrooms. *Pew Research Center*.
- [36] Radesky, J. S., Christakis, D. A., Hill, D. A., Kyanko, K. A., & Zimmerman, F. J. (2019). Media and young minds. *Pediatrics*, 138(5), e20162591.
- [37] Rideout, V. (2019). *The Common Sense Census: Media Use by Kids Age Zero to Eight 2017*. Common Sense Media.
- [38] Rosen, L. D., Carrier, L. M., & Cheever, N. A. (2019). Facebook and texting made me do it: Media-induced task-switching while studying. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 948-958.
- [39] Seginer, R. (2020). Parents' educational involvement: A developmental ecology perspective. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 6(1), 1-48.
- [40] Silverman, D. (2019). *Qualitative research (5th ed.)*. Sage Publications.
- [41] Straker, L., Harris, C., Joosten, J., & Howie, E. K. (2022). Mobile technology dominates school children's IT use in an advantaged school community and is associated with musculoskeletal and visual symptoms. *Ergonomics*, 61(10), 1346-1360.
- [42] Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2022). Associations between screen time and sleep duration are primarily driven by portable electronic devices: Evidence from a cohort study of young adults. *Sleep Medicine*, 39, 37-42.
- [43] Vaala, S. E., & Hornik, R. C. (2020). Predicting US infants' and toddlers' TV/video viewing rates: Mothers' cognitions and demographic characteristics. *Journal of Children and Media*, 8(1), 83-101.
- [44] Wu, P. H., & Tsai, C. C. (2020). The effect of online summary practice and self-monitoring on 7th graders' science knowledge construction and self-regulation in web-based learning. *Computers & Education*, 76, 167-175.
- [45] Zheng, B., Warschauer, M., Lin, C. H., & Chang, C. (2020). Learning in one-to-one laptop environments: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1052-1084.