INTRODUCTION

“Technology is so much fun but we can drown in our technology. The fog of information can drive our knowledge.”

DANIEL J. BOORSTIN (New York Times, July 8, 1983)

The 21st century has opened new avenues and horizons of progress and development through advancement in technology, lifestyle, and social relationships all around the world. The internet is a global network connecting millions of computers. More than 100 countries are linked into exchanges of data, news, and opinions. According to Internet World Stats, as of December 31, 2011, there was an estimated 2.267,233,742 internet users worldwide [1]. This represents 32.7% of the world’s population. Reading is one of the oldest habits of human civilization. It has been the passion of the greatest personalities of all times [2]. One of the first documentary sources for reading was manuscript. The revolution in the mass media, telecommunication, and social networking with the emerging advancement in science and technology has made the drastic change in access and browse of the online information from the whole web using terminal at home [3].

The internet is a global linking of computers that allows information transfer. Due to the development and spread of cheaper and more user-friendly computer technology and software (e.g., portable computers, Microsoft Word, etc.), the use of the internet has increased dramatically [4].

Teenagers are among the most prolific users of social networking sites (SNSs) emerging studies find that youth spend a considerable portion of their daily life interacting through social media. SNSs have gained much popularity in the recent years, because of the opportunities they give people to connect to each other in an easy and timely manner, and to exchange and share various kinds of information [5]. However, these sites are architected based on a centralized paradigm, which limits the mobility of their users, and ultimately, their chances for establishing new relationships and benefiting from diverse networking services [6]. In this paper, we argue for a decentralized paradigm for social networking, in which users retain control of their profiles, and SNSs focus on the delivery of innovative and competitive services. Our position is that only in this environment will both the SNSs and their users be able to develop to their full potential [7].

According to the report, the number of mobile internet users increased to 87.1 million by December 2012 from 78.7 million users in October 2012, who accessed the internet through dongles and tablets PCs [8]. This is expected to grow further to 92.9 million (by March 2013), 130.6 million (by March 2014) [9], and 164.8 million by March 2015 [10]. There is an increasing concern from educators, psychologists, and parents about the negative effects of using the internet on the physical (e.g., information fatigue syndrome), cognitive (e.g., inability to discriminate between the real and cyber world) [10], and social development (e.g., identity confusion) of children (Cordes and Miller, 2000), among which, detriment to social development (hurting children’s skills and patience to conduct necessary social relations in the real world) is a paramount problem (Affonso, 1999) [12]. One of the most serious concerns regarding children’s social development involves the proliferation and easy accessibility of negative content on the internet, such as pornography, violence, hate speech, gambling, sexual solicitation, and so forth (Internet Advisory Board, 2001; ParentLink, 2004) [11]. It is easy to see how these types of negative content harm children and destroy their development [13].

Statement of the problem

“A STUDY TO ASSESS THE KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE OF ADOLESCENTS REGARDING THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL NETWORKING AT S.G.R.R. PUBLIC SCHOOL, PATEL NAGAR, DEHRADUN, UTTRAKHAND.”
The study results revealed that the highest percentage of students 75% was in 16–17 years. In gender wise, female is 65% and male is 35%. In religion wise, 80% of students were Hindu, 17.5% of students were Muslim, and 2.5% of students were Sikh. About 97.5% of students belongs to urban, 2.5% belongs to rural. About 57.5% of students belong to joint family, 37.5% of students were nuclear family, and 5% of students were extended family. About 47.5% of student fathers are private employee, 22.5% of student fathers are self-employee, 20% of student fathers are govt. employee, 7.5% of fathers are retired, and 2.5% of fathers are unemployed.

In parent’s education wise, 30% of parents had graduation or above, than 22.5% of parents were higher and secondary education, 15% of parents were primary education, and 10% of parents were no formal education. And in source of information shows that highest percentage 45% of students were having information from friends, 35% having information from mass media, 12.5% having information from family members and 7.5% of students having information from teachers regarding Social networking. Percentage wise distribution of students reveals that 100% of students are using social networking. Moreover, 55% of students start using social networking in 16–17 years of age, 30% students were in 14–15 years of age, 10% of students are in 17–18 years of age, and 5% of students are in 12–13 years of age.

The study results reveals that 2.5% of participants were having adequate knowledge. Moderate knowledge score was 92.5%. Inadequate knowledge score was 5%. Likert scale shows that 42% of adolescents are agree, 35.2% are strongly disagree, 28.8% are strongly agree, 28.4% are neutral, and 26.4% are disagree. Hence, the moderate knowledge score was 92.5% and in Likert scale highest percentage 42% of adolescents are agree so the attitude regarding adverse effects of social networking is positive.

The study proved that there was not significant association between knowledge score and selected demographic variables (age, gender, religion, area of living, type of family, father occupation, education of parents, source of information, using social networking, and what age face book account begin) at 0.05 level of significance.

CONCLUSION
The study results reveals that 2.5% of participants were having adequate knowledge. Moderate knowledge score was 92.5%. Inadequate knowledge score was 5%. Likert scale shows that 42% of adolescents are agree, 35.2% are strongly disagree, 28.8% are strongly agree, 28.4% are neutral, and 26.4% are disagree. Hence, the moderate knowledge score was 92.5% and in Likert scale highest percentage 42% of adolescents are agree so the attitude regarding reverse effects of social networking is positive.
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