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## Full Title of the Paper

## Abstract

What is the problem? Clearly describe the objective problem, research questions, and hypotheses.  
What has been done? Explain the method used.  
What did you discover? Summarize the key findings and conclusions.  
What do the findings mean? Summarize the discussion and recommendations.  
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Note: Articles submitted in Spanish should always include title, abstract, and keywords in Spanish besides the English version.

## Introduction

Background and Justification:  
This study investigates the relationship between smartphone use and student attention in classrooms (Clarke & Hope, 2020; Wang et al., 2020).  
  
Objectives and Research Questions:  
- Main objective: Analyze how smartphone use affects student attention.  
- Research questions: Does smartphone use decrease student attention in classrooms?

## Literature Review

Review of Previous Work:  
Several studies have addressed distraction in classrooms due to electronic devices (Costello, 2010; Wey et al., 2020).  
  
Identification of the Gap:  
There is a lack of studies specifically addressing how smartphones affect attention in different educational contexts.

## Methodology

Research Design:  
Qualitative approach with semi-structured interviews.  
  
Sample:  
40 university students from various disciplines.  
  
Procedures:  
Interviews were conducted face-to-face and recorded for later transcription and analysis.  
  
Data Analysis:  
Thematic analysis was used to identify common patterns in participants' responses.

## Results

Data Presentation:  
Most students reported that smartphones are a significant distraction during classes (Monib & Amr, 2020). As shown in Table 1, the majority of respondents agreed that smartphone use negatively impacts their attention.  
  
Interpretation of Results:  
These findings suggest that device use policies in classrooms may need revisions.

## Discussion

Comparison with Previous Studies:  
Our results are consistent with previous studies indicating that electronic devices can be a source of distraction (Anthony, 2017).  
  
Theoretical and Practical Implications:  
The findings have implications for educational policies and classroom management.  
  
Limitations:  
The study is limited to a single university and may not be generalizable to other contexts.  
  
Future Recommendations:  
Future research should consider more diverse samples and other types of electronic devices.

## Conclusion

Summary of Findings:  
Smartphones negatively impact student attention in classrooms.  
  
Relevance and Contribution:  
This study contributes to understanding how mobile devices affect educational dynamics.

## Tables and Figures

Note: Always insert tables and figures within the text at appropriate points, not at the end of the manuscript. Each table and figure should be numbered and titled.  
  
Example of Table:  
  
Table 1: Impact of Smartphone Use on Student Attention  
  
| University | New Students | Graduating Students | Change |  
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------|  
| Cedar University | 110 | 103 | +7 |  
| Elm College | 223 | 214 | +9 |  
| Maple Academy | 197 | 120 | +77 |  
| Pine College | 134 | 121 | +13 |  
| Oak Institute | 202 | 210 | -8 |  
  
Example of Figure:  
  
Figure 1: Impact of Smartphone Use on Student Attention  
  
![Impact of Smartphone Use on Student Attention](https://example.com/figure1.png)  
  
Note: Include the source of the figure if applicable (Author, 2018).
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## Appendices

Supplementary Material:  
Include any additional material in separate files.