

Revised manuscript

From: MORIS MORISSAN (morissan@yahoo.com)

To: hash@ukm.edu.my

Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 at 09:38 AM GMT+7

Dear Dr. Hasrul Hashim

Please find enclosed my revised article and the revision form following your decision dated May 27, 2020, via this email regarding my submission to Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication that I have to resubmit my article. I have highlighted the changes in the word document by using red-colored text. The revised manuscript has also been uploaded to your OJS. Thanks

Morissan, PhD

Pada Rabu, 27 Mei 2020 20.48.15 WIB, Dr Hasrul Hashim <hash@ukm.edu.my> menulis:

Dear Moris Morissan:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication, "RELATIONSHIP OF SMARTPHONE USE AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AMONG STUDENTS".

Our decision is to: Resubmit for Review

Dr Hasrul Hashim
Centre for Research in Media and Communication
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities
The National University of Malaysia
hash@ukm.edu.my

Reviewer A:

Article Title:
RELATIONSHIP OF SMARTPHONE USE AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AMONG STUDENTS

Technical requirements:

Word count is between 5000 - 7000 words (excluding abstract, biodata, and references)

:

Word count requirements met

Abstract is between 200 and 250 words:
Abstract meets word requirements

Five keywords are included:
Yes

Part 1: Reviewer's comments. Please write comments in the spaces provided.

Introduction

:

ok

Literature Review:

ok

Methodology:

the methods of taking respondents need to be explained in more detail. and using whose method?

Findings & Interpretations:

I have not found the novelty of this research

Discussion:

researchers should focus on things that have not been found by other researchers

References/ Bibliography (APA system):

ok

Title, Abstracts & Keywords (articles written in Bahasa Melayu must also include abstract & keywords written in English):

ok

Additional Comments:

the article title should include the location of the study

Part 2: Overall evaluation. Please rate the article based on the following scales.

Originality

:

Good

Coherence:

Good

Scholarly Contribution:

Fair

Technical Quality:

Good

Relevancy:

Good

Language quality:

Good

Reviewer B:

Article Title:

Relationship of smartphone use and academic performance among students

Technical requirements:

Word count is between 5000 - 7000 words (excluding abstract, biodata, and references)

:

Word count requirements met

Abstract is between 200 and 250 words:

Abstract meets word requirements

Five keywords are included:

Yes

Part 1: Reviewer's comments. Please write comments in the spaces provided.

Introduction

:

See file

Literature Review:

See file

Methodology:

See file

Findings & Interpretations:

See file

Discussion:

See file

References/ Bibliography (APA system):

See file

Title, Abstracts & Keywords (articles written in Bahasa Melayu must also include abstract & keywords written in English):

See file

Additional Comments:

See file

Part 2: Overall evaluation. Please rate the article based on the following scales.

Originality

:

Fair

Coherence:

Fair

Scholarly Contribution:

Fair

Technical Quality:

Fair

Relevency:

Good

Language quality:

Fair

Reviewer C:

Article Title:

RELATIONSHIP OF SMARTPHONE USE AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AMONG STUDENTS

Technical requirements:

Word count is between 5000 - 7000 words (excluding abstract, biodata, and

references)

:

Word count requirements met

Abstract is between 200 and 250 words:

Abstract meets word requirements

Five keywords are included:

Yes

Part 1: Reviewer's comments. Please write comments in the spaces provided.

Introduction

:

First, the title only mentions "students", but it's not until page 6 of the article it is indirectly stated that the said students refer to university students. Please note that there are some huge differences between K-12 students and university students. The authors should make it clear from the beginning.

Second, it is bothering me that the authors discussed SES, Self and Academic Efficacy, and Relationship Status in the introduction, but did not provide the same level of discussion for Smoking Habit, which interestingly becomes the most significant moderator variable in their model. More discussion on this matter, both in introduction and in the discussion of the findings, is required.

Third, "addiction" is a strong word and should be used very carefully. I honestly don't see anything in the article that warrants the use of such a strong word, especially since the data about smartphone use were self reported. If anything, the article can only say something like "excessive use" instead of making a bold claim about addiction.

Literature Review:

The literature review section needs the most improvement. Most of the literature cited are rather obsolete as they were from the pre-current smartphone era (note that iOS and Android were released in 2007 and 2008 respectively and it took a couple years before they became popular in Indonesia, partly thanks to the popularity of Blackberry and the abundance of affordable featured phones). The authors should not simply equate a smartphone with a regular cell phone as the two have some huge differences in its features and in how their owners make use of these devices. While cell phones are more specific for making and receiving phone calls and texting (i.e., a communication device), smartphones offer apps where their owners spend most of their time on, instead. In other words, smartphones are personal computing devices albeit not at the same level as regular computers like desktops or laptops. There are many good articles that discuss the ownership and use of smartphone among students and adolescent as well as its implication that were published in the past 3 years (i.e. 2018 to 2020), some of them are studies from Indonesia, too. The authors need to refer to their findings (especially the ones from Indonesia) to see the state of the art in this research topic.

Methodology:

What is the point of combining the current/last semester GPA and the cumulative GPA? Why not treat them separately as the current academic performance and the long term academic performance? Combining both into one will end up with some missing pieces of information. For example what is the difference between a student who just had a bad semester albeit relatively good cumulative GPA overall with another one who is the exact opposite and just started getting a better GPA in the last semester despite a still relatively low cumulative GPA overall?

Findings & Interpretations:

The authors need to focus more on the interesting findings and provide a

clear and coherence interpretations on them instead of simply reporting everything.

Discussion:

The authors spent too much pages on reporting the results along with all steps to achieve them instead of discussing them. For an article that is almost 7000 words long, I expected a much deeper discussion than what is presented by the authors.

References/ Bibliography (APA system):

Looks good to me.

Title, Abstracts & Keywords (articles written in Bahasa Melayu must also include abstract & keywords written in English):

Some changes in the way of the abstract is written can improve the quality of this article.

Additional Comments:

An interesting article overall, but I would highly recommend some major revisions before it can get published.

Part 2: Overall evaluation. Please rate the article based on the following scales.

Originality

:

Good

Coherence:

Fair

Scholarly Contribution:

Fair

Technical Quality:

Fair

Relevency:

Good

Language quality:

Fair

Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication

<http://ejournal.ukm.my/mjc>



MANUSCRIPT JKMJC.docx

122.1kB



JKMJC - Revision Form.doc

45.5kB

JURNAL KOMUNIKASI: MALAYSIAN JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION

Revision Form

Please copy and paste reviewer's comments into this form and state the revisions made/ your responses to the comments.

No.	Reviewer's Comments	Revision/ Response by Author
1	<p>Technical requirements</p> <p>Reviewer A:</p> <p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>Reviewer C:</p>	
2	<p>Title, Abstract & Keywords</p> <p>Reviewer A: OK</p> <p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>Reviewer C: Some changes in the way of the abstract is written can improve the quality of this article.</p>	<p>Revised. Abstract has been revised</p>
3	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Reviewer A: Ok</p> <p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>Reviewer C: First, the title only mentions "students", but it's not until page 6 of the article it is indirectly stated that the said students refer to university students. Please note that there are some huge differences between K-12 students and university students. The authors should make it clear from the beginning. Second, it is bothering me that the authors discussed SES, Self and Academic Efficacy, and Relationship Status in the introduction, but did not provide the same level of discussion for Smoking</p>	<p>Revised. Several lines have been rewritten to emphasize the difference between university students dengan students in general.</p> <p>Revised. The discussion on smoking habit is presented in the first part of Introduction and updated. Separate subtitle is not made. The early part of introduction addresses smoking habits in general.</p>

	<p>Habit, which interestingly becomes the most significant moderator variable in their model. More discussion on this matter, both in introduction and in the discussion of the findings, is required.</p> <p>Third, "addiction" is a strong word and should be used very carefully. I honestly don't see anything in the article that warrants the use of such a strong word, especially since the data about smartphone use were self reported. If anything, the article can only say something like "excessive use" instead of making a bold claim about addiction.</p>	<p>Addiction revised. Several 'addiction' replaced with 'excessive use'.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Literature Review</p> <p>Reviewer A:</p> <p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>Reviewer C:</p> <p>The literature review section needs the most improvement. Most of the literature cited are rather obsolete as they were from the pre-current smartphone era (note that iOS and Android were released in 2007 and 2008 respectively and it took a couple years before they became popular in Indonesia, partly thanks to the popularity of Blackberry and the abundance of affordable featured phones). The authors should not simply equate a smartphone with a regular cell phone as the two have some huge differences in its features and in how their owners make use of these devices. While cell phones are more specific for making and receiving phone calls and texting (i.e., a communication device), smartphones offer apps where their owners spend most of their time on, instead. In other words, smartphones are personal computing devices albeit not at the same level as regular computers like desktops or laptops.</p>	<p>Revised. Cell phones have been replaced with smartphones.</p>

	<p>There are many good articles that discuss the ownership and use of smartphone among students and adolescent as well as its implication that were published in the past 3 years (i.e. 2018 to 2020), some of them are studies from Indonesia, too. The authors need to refer to their findings (especially the ones from Indonesia) to see the state of the art in this research topic.</p>	<p>Several latest articles on ownership and use of smartphone have been added in the literature review especially articles from Indonesia</p>
5	<p>Methodology</p> <p>Reviewer A: the methods of taking respondents need to be explained in more detail. and using whose method?</p> <p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>Reviewer C: What is the point of combining the current/last semester GPA and the cumulative GPA? Why not treat them separately as the current academic performance and the long term academic performance? Combining both into one will end up with some missing pieces of information. For example what is the difference between a student who just had a bad semester albeit relatively good cumulative GPA overall with another one who is the exact opposite and just started getting a better GPA in the last semester despite a still relatively low cumulative GPA overall?</p>	<p>Revised.</p> <p>Revised. This study use only the cumulative GPA. The current/last semester GPA was removed from the calculation.</p>
6	<p>Findings & Interpretations</p> <p>Reviewer A: I have not found the novelty of this research</p> <p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>Reviewer C: The authors need to focus more on the interesting findings and provide a clear and coherence interpretations on them instead of simply reporting everything.</p>	<p>Revised. The novelty was mentioned in the discussion section.</p>

7	<p>Discussion</p> <p>Reviewer A: researchers should focus on things that have not been found by other researchers</p> <p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>Reviewer C: The authors spent too much pages on reporting the results along with all steps to achieve them instead of discussing them. For an article that is almost 7000 words long, I expected a much deeper discussion than what is presented by the authors.</p>	<p>Revised.</p> <p>Revised. More discussions added pertaining novelty and the differences with other similar studies</p>
8	<p>References (APA system)</p> <p>Reviewer A: Ok</p> <p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>Reviewer C Looks good to me</p>	
9	<p>Additional comments</p> <p>Reviewer A: the article title should include the location of the study</p> <p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>Reviewer C: An interesting article overall, but I would highly recommend some major revisions before it can get published.</p>	<p>Revised. The title is changed to incorporate location and also research objectives.</p> <p>Revisions have been made</p>

Please highlight the changes in your word document by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, please upload it to OJS (user guide available here: <http://ejournals.ukm.my/mjc/pages/view/userguide>) and attach this revisions form in your notification email to the Section Editor. The editorial board kindly requests that you follow these instructions closely. Submissions that do not comply may be delayed in processing. Thank you.