

Impact of Cell Phone on Social Competency: A Case Study of Professional College Students in Haldwani Region

*Lalit Mohan Pant ** Dr Rekha Joshi *** Dr Atul Joshi

*Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, M.B.G.P.G College Haldwani

** Asst Prof. Department of Psychology, M.B.G.P.G College Haldwani

***Head & Dean, DSB Campus & Director IPSDR Kumaun University Nainital

Abstract

21st century can be called as the century of technology or technological revolution. This is the century where we are connected with our near & dear ones every-time & everywhere. Wireless technology is the main characteristic of 21st century which has become widespread all over the world. According to a research 90% people from developed countries and 32% people from developing countries were using cell phone in the world. For the last couple of years cell phone technology has changed drastically. Today cell phone doesn't mean of communication only but also a device to connect with the world through various applications. The uses of smart phone or cell phone can be understood by a research carried out by New-York Times. According to this report both teens and adults check their Smartphone 150 times per day (around every six times) and send averages 110 text per day. This research further revealed that around 46% of smart-phone users believe not to live without their phone and one in every three prefer to give their partner rather than smart-phone. The objective of this paper is to assess the effect of cell phone on the level of mental health & Social Competency of the professional college students. This paper would help the author as well as reader to understand the concept of mental health & social competence of the professional college students.

Keywords: Mental Health, Social Competence, Professional College Students

“Man should never work for the machine, machine should work for the men”

Amit Kalantri

Introduction

In ancient period, people used smoke, jungle drums, animal more specifically pigeons and semaphores to get in touch with their friends and relatives. This shows that communication was as important in that period of time as it important today though communication technology were not as advanced as it is today. Alexander Graham Bell was the first person who thought to have a device through which people could communicate with each other. He realized the relevance of communication and invented first communication device called as telephone in 1876. This invention revolutionized the daily lives of ordinary

people now they didn't have the requirement smoke, jungle drums, animal more specifically pigeons and semaphores to get in touch with their friends and relatives. The word 'Telephone' originated from Greek word "Tele" means 'afar', and 'phone' meaning 'voice or voiced' sound. Therefore telephone was defined as a device which helps to convey sound over a distance. Since its inception telephone evolved into many forms like, from the tin can telephones to the coin operated pay phone followed by pager to bulky mobile phone. However in modern time, a new device popularized called as Cellular phones which was easy to carry and easy to operate. Cellular phone is a type of wireless communication device which became familiar to mobile phone users. The invention of telephone and its up-gradation time to time fulfilled our need of association or connection with our friend and relatives. Now we can share emotions, our work or anything to anyone and anytime irrespective of place. Due to modern communication technology one does not need to stay at home for communication over telephone now one can communicate wherever he/she is residing means at home, park, cinema theater or etc. one does not need to have a communication device only to interact with other one. Due to tele-communication revolution now the world becomes borderless. The inventions of telephone or cell phone have made both positive as well as negative effects on our behaviour. Telephone once reduces the distance & makes the world borderless; on the other hand due to excess use of cell phone we are becoming mental patients too and this situation is becoming more serious due to the emergence of cell phone also called as virtual duniya which is far from real duniya. Today we are in a nuclear within nuclear for example a family of 4 members who all are engaged in virtual duniya, have no time to interact personally.

If any time they need to contact with each other they are communicating through virtual duniya. We remembered the time period when we used to dress to go somewhere we used to ask our brothers/sister or any family members about our looks but today we decide our looks by the comments or like we get in cell phone or virtual duniya. Our dependency over virtual duniya is making us mentally ill therefore now-a-days the problem of poor mental health and poor social competency is increasing day by day. These problems become more serious when we see the young India who are engaging into cell phone without any purpose and wasting their precious time. In the light of above problem the study of 'the impact of cell-phone on social competence' becomes relevant.

Social Competency: The concept of social competence was coined by White¹. According to White the concept of social competence is the outcome of interpersonal relation which becomes more relevant as the child grows and becomes young. Through social competence a person learns & develops the ability to understand and reflect appropriate behaviour. Roff, et al state that parents' cultural background plays a

¹ White (Eds.), Improving Competence Across the Lifespan: Building Interventions Based on Theory and Research, 117–133.

significant role in the emergence of social skills in early childhood. Gresham (1987) claimed that children identified as socially incompetent could have

- **Skill deficits**, which meant the child did not have the social knowledge or skills necessary to engage in social interactions;
- **Performance deficits**, which meant the child had knowledge and understanding of social skills but lacked the cognitive or physical ability to carry out the *necessary* behaviours,
- **Self-control skill deficits**, which meant that the child's excessive anxiety or impulsivity interfered with their ability to acquire appropriate skills or, if the skills were acquired, their ability to properly execute the appropriate behaviours or skills in social situations.

According to **Rubin & Rose-Krasnor² (1992)** social competence is "the ability to achieve personal goals in social interaction." **Schneider³** wrote the assessment of social competence usually entails the measurement of one or more social skills, the manifestation of social skills in overt behaviours, and their outcomes in terms of enhanced interpersonal relationships. Methods of assessment include information from children's peers (sociometric choice or socio-metric rating scales), direct observation, information directly obtained from the child, and ratings by teachers or parents. Social competence includes the following factors: Social Sensitivity, Social Maturity, Social Skills, Social Relations, Social Commitment, Social Appreciation Ability, Socio- Emotional Integrity, Social Involvement, Social Respect-Ability, Social Leadership, Social Cooperation & Compliance, Social Accept Ability, Social Tolerance, Social Competition, Social Authority, Adult-Resource exploitability, Social Participation and Pro-social Attitude etc

Literature Review

- **Stuckey⁴ (2004)** conducted a research in which he found five important dimensions namely imagination, appropriation, objectification, incorporation & conversion due to which students became addicted to cell phone. He further explained the importance of cell phone and took cell-phone as an influential technology. He said that the cell-phone influenced not only our social interaction but also our daily life. Cell-phone made the man individualistic and alienated him from society or converged a single language or set of norms.

² Rubin, K.H., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1992): Interpersonal Problem Solving and Social Competence in Children. In V.B. Van Hasselt and Michel Hersen, *Handbook of Social Development: A Lifespan Perspective*. New York: Plenum Press, 283-323.

³ Schneider, G. H., Attili, G., Nadel, J., & Weissberg, R. P. (2000): Social competence in developmental perspective, (pp. 371-386). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

⁴Stuckey J, 8-14,(2004), "The Mobile Connection: The Cell Phones Impact on Society" Ubiquity, Volume 5, Issue 28

- **Hakoama and Hakoyama⁵ (2011)** studied the dependency of teenagers upon cell phones. The study revealed due to excess use of cell-phone teens became cell-addicted. Now they were more depended on cell phone rather than parents or anyone else.
- **Short and Mc Murray⁶ (2009)** explored the link between the mobile phone use and harassment behaviors. Findings indicated that harassment by text more prevalent than other forms of off-line stalking and despite recipients reporting being distressed, there was still a higher level of acceptance of this form of harassment than other forms. Furthermore, responses to text harassment were associated with a high frequency of behaviours perceived as not actively discouraging further texts, therefore having the effect of prolonging unwanted contact.

Hypothesis: Social Competence

- H₀1: There is no significance difference between the user group & non-user group on Social Competence.
- H₀2: There is no significance difference between the User Group Boys & User Group Girls on the basis of Social Competence.
- H₀3: There is no significance difference between the Non-User Group Boys & Non-User Group Girls on the basis of Social Competence.
- H₀4: There is no significance difference between the User Group Boys & Non-User Boys on the basis of Social Competence.
- H₀5: There is no significance difference between the User Group Boys & Non-User Girls on the basis of Social Competence.
- H₀6: There is no significance difference between the User Group Girls & Non-User Group Boys on the basis of Social Competence.
- H₀7: There is no significance difference between the User Group Girls & Non-User Group Girls on the basis of Social Competence.

⁵ Hakoama.M and Hakoyama.S. (2011). "The Impact of Cell-phone use on Social Networking and development among college students" The American Association of Behavioral and Social Sciences Journal Vol-15

⁶ Short.K.E., McMurray.I. (November 2009)"Mobile Phone Harassment: An Exploration of Students Perceptions of Intrusive Texting behavior" Vol. 5(2) 163-180

Research Methodology: The aim of this research is to find out the impact of cell-phone on social competence on professional college students in Haldwani region. Therefore a list of all the professional college prepared. All the professional colleges were given a specific code and through a lottery system one college (Pal College of Technology & Management) selected for data selection. In present study total 60 students select as sample from a secondary schools of Haldwani later classify into two parts user & non-user group. Each part of user & non user had 30 samples later distributed into boys & girls. For each gender there were 15 samples. The samples plan of the research was planed as the following ways:

Table 1: Sample Plan (60)

User (30)		Non-User (30)	
Male	Female	Male	Non-Female
15	15	15	15

Social Competency Scale: Social Competency Scale is developed by Lalita Sharama & Punita Rani. Social competence scale has been designed for 16 & above years of age school and college students for the measurement of social competence.

Finding

H₀1: There is no significance difference between the user group & non-user group

Table 2: Comparison of User Group & Non-User Group.

Group	Total Students	Mean	SD	t-Test	Significance Level (0.05)
User Group	30	67.17	2.21	2.25	NS
Non-User Group	30	78.4.			

Table-2 shows that the mean of user group is 67.8 while the mean of non-user group is 78.4, standard deviation is 2.21. The t-table value 2.00 obtained at df 59 while calculated t- value is 2.25 which is greater than t table value. Therefore hypothesis (H₀1) is rejected.

H₀2: There is no significance difference between the User Group Boys & User Group Girls

Table 3: Comparison of User Group Boys & User Group Girls

Group	Total Students	Mean	SD	t-Test	Significance Level (0.05)
User Group Boys	15	71.13	2.02	1.98	Significance
User Group Girls	15	63.20			

Table-3 shows that the mean of user group boys is 71.13 while the means of user group girls is 63.20.

Standard Deviation is 2.02. Table value 2.042 was obtained at df 29 while calculated t- value was 1.98 which was less than the table value therefore there is a significant difference & Hypothesis is accepted.

H₀₃: There is no significance difference between the Non-User Boys & Non-User Girls

Table 4: Comparison of Non-User Boys & Non-User Girls

Group	Total Students	Mean	SD	t-Test	Significance Level (0.05)
Non-User Boys	15	79.63	2.25	1.05	Significant
Non-User Girls	15	76.93			

Table-4 shows that the mean of non-user group boys is 79.63 while the means of non-user group girls is 76.93. Standard Deviation is 2.25. Table value 2.042 was obtained at df 29 while calculated t- value was 1.05 which was less than the table value therefore there is a significant difference & Hypothesis is accepted.

H₀₄: There is no significance difference between the User Boys & Non-User Boys

Table 5: Comparison of User Group Boys & Non-User Group Boys

Group	Total Students	Mean	SD	t-Test	Significance Level (0.05)
User Group Boys	15	71.13	2.23	1.98	Significant
Non-User Boys	15	79.93			

Table-5 shows that the mean of user group boys is 71.13 while the means of non-user group boys is 79.93. Standard Deviation is 2.23. Table value 2.042 was obtained at df 29 while calculated t- value was 1.98 which was less than the table value therefore there is a significant difference & Hypothesis is accepted.

H₀₅: There is no significance difference between the User Group Boys & Non-User Girls

Table 6: Comparison of User Group Boys & Non-User Girls

Group	Total Students	Mean	SD	t-Test	Significance Level (0.05)
User Boys	15	71.13	2.02	1.69	Significant
Non-User Girls	15	76.93			

Table 6 shows that the means of User group boys is 71.13 while the means of Non-user girls is 76.93 similarly the standard deviation was calculated 2.02. Table value 2.042 was obtained at df 29 while calculated t- value was 1.98 which was less than the table value therefore there is a significant difference & Hypothesis is accepted.

H₀₆: There is no significance difference between the User Girls & Non-User Boys

Table 7: Comparison of User Group Girls & Non-User Group Boys

Group	Total Students	Mean	SD	t-Test	Significance Level (0.05)
User Girls	15	63.20	2.15	2.78	NS
Non-User Boys	15	79.93			

Table 7 shows that the means of user group girls is 63.20 while the mean of non-user boys is 79.93. Standard deviation was calculated 2.15. Table value 2.042 was obtained at df 29 while calculated t- value was 2.78 which was more than the table value therefore there is a significant difference & Hypothesis is rejected.

Ho7: There is no significance difference between the User Girls & Non-User Girls

Table 8: Comparison of User Group Boys & User Group Girls

Group	Total Students	Mean	SD	t-Test	Significance Level (0.05)
User Group Girls	15	63.20	2.19	2.50	NS
Non-User Girls	15	76.93			

Table 8 shows that the means of user girls is 63.20 while the means of non-user girl 76.93. Standard deviation was calculated 2.19. Table value 2.042 was obtained at df 29 while calculated t- value was 2.50 which was more than the table value therefore there is a significant difference & Hypothesis is rejected.

Findings & Conclusion: Cell-phone inevitably the need of 21st century. Nobody can denied or somewhere live without it because it help to be connected with our near & dear ones. Due to excess use of cell-phone we are becoming cell-phone addicted now. Due to technological revelation not only we can talk to our friend or relatives but also watch them live through facebook whatsapp or anyother social media application. According to this research it can be generalized that the number of cell-phone users was more than the non-user which proved its approachability. Around 80% of teenagers are smart phone users. Most of the teenagers are engage on their cell-phone all the time whether he/she is in school, or anywhere else. Approx 92% of teens go online daily, and 24 % say they are online “almost constantly.” It was found that a few students using cell-phone had better knowledge about the world compare to non-user of cell phone. The study revealed that due to excess use of cell-phone the students had some physical problem too.

Reference

- White (Eds.), *Improving Competence Across the Lifespan: Building Interventions Based on Theory and Research*, 117–133.
- Rubin, K.H., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1992): *Interpersonal Problem Solving and Social Competence in Children*. In V.B. Van Hasselt and Michel Hersen, *Handbook of Social Development: A Lifespan Perspective*. New York: Plenum Press, 283-323.
- Schneider, G. H., Attili, G., Nadel, J., & Weissberg, R. P. (2000): *Social competence in developmental perspective*, (pp. 371-386). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stuckey J, 8-14,(2004), “The Mobile Connection: The Cell Phones Impact on Society” *Ubiquity*, Volume 5, Issue 28

- Hammer R., Ronen M., Sharon A., Lankry T., Huberman Y., and Zamtsov V. (2010). “Mobile Culture in College Lectures: Instructors and Students Perspectives” Vol.6
- Hakoama.M and Hakoyama.S. (2011). “The Impact of Cell-phone use on Social Networking and development among college students” The American Association of Behavioral and Social Sciences Journal Vol-15
- Short.K.E., McMurray.I. (November 2009)“Mobile Phone Harassment: An Exploration of Students Perceptions of Intrusive Texting behavior” Vol. 5(2) 163-180
- Samayeen.N. ITJ (.2011). The Cellular City Embodiment of Cellular Technology, Informal Sector and Transformation in Urban Spaces Vol. 3(1)

