

Digital Socialisation and Face-To-Face Socialisation Among Higher Secondary School Adolescents And Its Relation With Loneliness

***Anjana V.R Chandran**

Ph. D. Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Periyar University

***Dr. Sundara Raj. T**

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Periyar University

ABSTRACT

Socialization is a lifelong process in which individuals learn and interact with social standards, rules, and values. Media are a key socializing influence among other major agents of socialization. Media effects on socialization have been identified in research in developmental psychology, sociology, media and communication studies, and pedagogy. The present study investigates the digital socialisation, face-to-face socialisation and loneliness among higher secondary school students and its relation with gender, locale and stream of education. Data collected from 150 higher secondary school students using scale have been analysed with the help of statistical tool. Independent sample t-test and ANOVA were used to test the significance of difference. Study revealed that loneliness among higher secondary school students is not high and there is no significant difference in the digital socialisation, face-to-face socialisation and loneliness based on gender, locality of home and stream of education. Study discloses that there exist positive significant correlation between digital socialisation and loneliness. But, negative correlation is seen between face-to-face socialisation and loneliness. There exist negative correlation between digital socialisation and face-to-face socialisation and the correlation is significant.

KEY WORDS: loneliness, digital socialisation, face-to-face socialisation.

Date of Submission: 16-03-2021

Date of Acceptance: 31-03-2021

I. INTRODUCTION

Socialization is a process to learn one's cultural environment and also do examines how does people engage within it. Empirical evidences claimed that socialization is one of the important sources where human infants learn and unlearn the necessary skills required to perform as a functioning member of their society. Hence, it is the most influential learning process one can emulate through their life experiences. In the contemporary scenario of social media ecosystem, this process of socialization would face many subsequent changes in its functioning level. The largely dominate face-to-face social interactions had a paradigm shift to virtual social space. But this pattern of social media consumption may largely have negative impacts on the traditional pattern of socialization process. A few academic reviews reiterated that such virtual spaces would lead individuals to unrealistic or distorted portrayals of their own physical living existence. More over that it may also drive them to have a feeling of social isolation.

The term 'social media' refers to the various internet-based networks that enable users to interact with others, verbally and visually (Carr & Hayes, 2015). It is evident from the Pew Research Centre (2015) data that at least 92% of teenagers are active on social media in the global scenario. Besides to that almost three-quarters of adolescents aged 15 to17 use a Smartphone to access social media. According to Lenhart, Smith, Anderson, Duggan, and Perrin (2015) identified the 13–17 age groups as particularly heavy users of social media users, with 87% having access to a computer, and 58% to a tablet device.

Interestingly, a few academic studies have highlighted that adolescents are hugely vulnerable and they tend to devote a substantial portion of their daily lives on social networking sites (SNS). This trend of SNS content consumption pattern may adversely lead them to neglect academic, physical, and face-to-face social activities and gradually they would experience social isolation, cyber-bullying, and exploitation.

Undoubtedly, SNS as a communication medium, characterized mainly by interactions with acquaintances, is so common that it constitutes an important tool in managing and maintaining friendships (Bayindir & Kavanagh, 2018; Steinfield et al., 2012). This medium provides abundant opportunities to share content, communicate with others, design a private and public identity, develop and cultivate relationships, develop a reputation, create interactions with like-minded others, and identify available community resources. The studies of Bayindir &

Kavanagh (2018) and Boniel-Nissim, (2010) reemphasized that social networks make it possible to locate and connect to acquaintances from the past, and quickly remain abreast of events, schedule and document events, create interest groups, disseminate important information, perform marketing activities, and generate social interest.

The features of social network website use include anonymity and an absence of face-to-face contact. The study of Boniel-Nissim (2010) empirically observed the fact that SNS platform often create a free egalitarian gatherings that could not necessarily exist in the real world due to differences of religion, age, race, gender, geographic location, and other factors. Likewise, social media networks does not necessary protect privacy as it contains identifying images that often disclose more than do face-to-face interactions (Barak, 2006).

On the other hand, larger academic research activities taken place in respect of Internet use and psychological well-being, and found that over usage of internet adversely affect family communication. Interestingly, the empirical observations came out of the Home Net Project (Kraut et al., 1998) disclosed a significant correlation between participants who spend a significant share of their time online reported high levels of loneliness and stress during the day. Besides to that another study found that intensive Internet surfing was associated with a high risk of depression (Kraut et al., 2002). Researchers also found that loneliness and depression are associated with risky online behaviors (Ceyhan & Ceyhan, 2008) and regular social media usage (Hunt et al., 2018).

The studies of Chukwuere & Chukwuere (2017), Kontos et al., (2010); & Prensky (2001) reiterated the fact that SNS activities may lead to changes in modern attachment patterns in human society, that too specifically in the adolescent youth. The study of Mesch & Talmud (2010) also suggested the same view that the lack of eye contact, which is a prominent feature of the resulting social interactions, leads to high self-disclosure, as textual communications devoid of eye contact invite direct and relaxed conversations.

Social interactions through the virtual platforms like SNS having a lot advantages, which offers to emotional ventilation, reflection, and alleviates emotional conditions (Hawi & Samaha, 2017; Leung, 2002; Moody, 2001; Smyth, True & Souto, 2001), public exposure may also invite bullying and harassment (Chukwuere & Chukwuere, 2017; Fuchs, 2017; Hinduja & Patchin, 2008). It is quite evident from the reviewed studies that virtual friendship is pretty different from traditional face-to-face friendship pattern. The studies of Bonebrake (2002), Fuchs (2017) & Kraut et al., (1998) have made the empirical observations that preference of virtual friendship leads to a decline in social skills.

Another perspective of SNS based academic research works observed that individuals' personality traits affect online surfing outcomes. Extroverts experience an increase in community-based activities and a decline in loneliness (Kraut et al., 2002). Whereas this study also claimed the fact that introverts experience a decline in community-based activities and an increase in loneliness. Likewise a few other western studies also drew the similar observations like need for belonging and need for self-representation are two basic social needs that drive social media usage and consumption pattern.

Many researchers have invested their academic research expertise in finding the interrelationship between loneliness and SNS usage pattern. The common definition of loneliness is the difference between a person's desire for social relationships and her actual social relationships (Russell et al., 1980). On the other hand it is quite significant to differentiate social isolation and loneliness. Social isolation refers to the objective number of relationships in which one is involved, while loneliness reflects one's self-perceived social isolation (Masi et al., 2011).

The study of Green & Schleien (1991) signifies that the virtual social sphere will give access to people to keep up social interactions from the real world and develop them, and at the same time helps people who lack gratifying social ties to construct a social world by creating new friendship ties online. Besides to this many researchers have addressed the research problem that whether virtual social networks constitute an appropriate and satisfying resolution to the feeling of loneliness that teenagers and young adults frequently feel.

On this research argument, Hu (2009) found that young people express a statistically significantly greater degree of loneliness after —conversations on the Internet, compared with the degree of loneliness they express after face-to-face conversations. Dror and Gershon (2012) found a positive significant correlation between loneliness and a large number of social network conversations with virtual friends. Likewise many studies also reiterated and supported the view that virtual friendships may be less gratifying than face-to-face friendships. Virtual friendships constitute substitutes for real-life friends, or whether young adults' use of the virtual sphere is the cause of difficulties in creating real-life friendships (Ceyhan & Ceyhan, 2008; Dunbar, 2010).

Especially since last decade, many researchers invested their time to explore how virtual social spheres acts as cause or as consequence for the phenomenon of loneliness. . Such academic initiatives would help in contributing to the development of intellectual frame works to improve social skills and therapeutic

conversations with teenagers and young adults who experience loneliness. A recent study by Hunt (2018) found that limiting the exposure to social media may decrease loneliness and depression.

Theoretical Background of the Study

Socialisation is a continuous and natural process of learning particular cultures' norms and values. Primary socialisation would largely help an individual to enable them to live in society, whereas secondary socialisation includes how to behave at work and public and interact with their fellow being. Everyday lives of adolescents are largely affected by the prevalence of social media, that too in the contemporary scenario of SNS driven digital media eco system. Hence, educators, parents, and scholars interested to examine and analyze how the social networks functions as a social space for adolescents.

George Herbert Mead designed a theory of 'social behaviourism' to explain how social experience develops an individual's personality. Mead's central concept is the self and the part of an individual's personality composed of self-awareness and self-image. Mead also emphasized that the self is not there at birth; rather, it is developed with social experience. Social behaviourism refers to the emergence of mind and self from the communication process between organisms. According to Mead, mind arises out of the social act of communication. The increased consumption pattern of digital media content tends to impact not only individuals, but also cultures as well. Digital socialisation begins in the effects of media influencing socio-cultural standards.

Social media usage may also have negative impacts on social isolation by substituting social media usage for face-to-face social interactions. According to Bowman there are three sociological approaches to loneliness in the contemporary society: decline in primary group relationship, an increase in family mobility and an increase in social mobility.

II. METHODOLOGY

Objectives of the study

1. To know the level of loneliness among higher secondary school adolescents in Kasaragod.
2. To find out the significance of difference in loneliness based on gender, stream of education and locale of home.
3. To find out the significance of difference in digital as well as face-to-face socialisation based on gender, stream of education and locale of home.
4. To find out the relationship between digital socialisation and loneliness among higher secondary school adolescents in Kasaragod.
5. To find out the relationship between face-to-face socialisation and loneliness among higher secondary school adolescents in Kasaragod.

As we penetrate our inquiry towards the Digital Socialisation, Face-to-face socialisation and loneliness, the subject under study is a survey type of research, because it is concerned with the collection of data for describing and interpreting existing conditions of Digital Socialisation, Face-to-face socialisation and loneliness. Socialisation and loneliness is most convincingly related with the adolescent population. Hence the population selected – the higher secondary students of Kasaragod is the most suitable population. A total of 150 higher secondary school adolescents from two schools in Kasaragod District, Kerala have been selected as the sample. For which three batches consisting of 50 students were randomly selected. To measure the loneliness among higher secondary school students, likert-type scale consisting of 10 statements were used as a tool for data collection. The tool was experimented to a small group of another school as a trial and corrective measures were used. Inferential statistics was used for summarizing the properties of a population from the known properties of the sample of the population.

III. RESULT

Preliminary analysis was done to identify loneliness, digital socialization and face-to-face socialization, its association with gender, stream of education and locality of the school. Data were collected from the 150 higher secondary school adolescents considering the gender, locale and stream of education. The profile of the students is presented in Table 1.

Table: 1 Profile of the respondents

Variable	Group	N	%
Gender	Male	53	35.3
	Female	97	64.7
Stream of education	Science	46	30.7
	Commerce	60	40.0

	Humanities	44	29.3
Locality of the school	Rural	80	53.3
	Urban	70	46.7
Total		150	100.0

It is evident from the above table that 35.3 percent of the students belong to male and the majority (64.7%) of the respondents belong to the female categories; 53.3% of the respondents belongs to rural and 46.7% belongs to urban categories. Stream of education shows that 30.7% students belong to the science category, 40.4% of students from commerce, and 29.3% students come to humanities category.

Digital Socialisation

Digital socialization refers to the way people communicate and what they use to do so. It is the customs, quirks and language unique to a culture. ... Internet **socialization** involves a huge number of people worldwide. For measuring the digital socialisation, the variables considered are Frequency of login social media communication, Period of using social media communication and Number of friends/ relatives communicated per day. The result of the frequency of digital socialisation is presented in Table

Table 2: Frequency of digital socialisation among higher secondary adolescents

Variable	Group	N	Percentage
Frequency of login social media communication	Many times a day	46	30.7
	Once a day	29	19.3
	Few times a week	22	14.7
	Once a week	40	26.7
	Rarely	13	8.7
Period of using social media communication	Below 1 year	20	13.3
	1 – 2 years	56	37.3
	2 - 3 years	43	28.7
	3 – 4 years	15	10.0
	Above 4 years	16	10.7
Number of friends/ relatives communicated per day	Below 25	67	44.7
	25 – 50	35	23.3
	Above 50	48	32.0

Frequency of login cyber media refers to the number of times login was done per day. The respondents were asked to mark one of the choices depending on their frequency of login cyber media as -many times in a day, once in a day, few times in a week, once in a week and rarely.

The highest proportion of higher secondary school students (30.7%) usually login cyber media many times in a day; 19.7% of students login once in a day; 14.7% login few times a week; 26.7% login social media once a week. Only 8.7% of the adolescents login social media rarely.

Period of using social media indicates that majority (37.3) of the respondents are using social media one to two years. Percentage of respondents using social media 2 to 3 year, 3 to 4 year and above 4 year are 28.7%, 10.0% and 10.7% respectively. Only 13.3 percentage of the respondents are using below one year.

Number of digital media communication discloses that 44.7% of the respondents communicating below 25 friends and relatives per day. The percentage of respondents who are communicating 25 to 50 friends and relative is 23.3 and 32.0 percentage communicating above 50.

For measuring the digital socialisation higher scores are given to the higher frequency of login social media, higher period of using social media and higher number of friends. The consolidated score is treated as the digital socialisation score.

Comparison of digital socialisation based on socio demographic variable

Digital socialisation among higher secondary adolescents was compared based on socio demographic variables viz., Gender of the adolescents, and locality of the home using independent sample t-test. Comparison based on stream of the course was done using analysis of variance and the results are presented in Table 5.

Table 3. Comparison of digital socialization based on socio demographic variable

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t/F-value	p-value
Gender	Male	53	8.88	1.73	1.771	0.079
	Female	97	8.39	1.58		
Locality of the home	Rural	80	8.37	1.67	1.529	0.128
	Urban	70	8.78	1.61		
Stream of the course	Science	46	8.50	1.60	0.669	0.514
	Commerce	60	8.75	1.57		
	Humanities	44	8.38	1.79		

The analysis on the basis of gender indicate that the average score of digital socialization of Male adolescents is 8.88 with standard deviation of 1.73 and that of Female adolescents is 8.39 with standard deviation of 1.58. Independent sample t-test shows that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of digital socialization of higher secondary school adolescents based on Gender ($t = 1.771, p = 0.097 > 0.05$).

Based on the location of the home, the average score of digital socialization of rural adolescents is 8.37 with standard deviation of 1.67 and that of urban adolescents is 8.78 with standard deviation of 1.61. Independent sample t-test shows that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of digital socialization of higher secondary school adolescents based on location of the home ($t = 1.529, p = 0.128 > 0.05$).

Analysis based on stream of education indicates that the average score of digital socialization of science, commerce and humanities students are 8.50, 8.75 and 8.38 with standard deviations of 1.60, 1.57 and 1.79 respectively. Analysis of variance discloses that there is no significant difference among the mean scores of digital socialization of higher secondary school adolescents based on stream of education ($F = 0.669, p = 0.514 > 0.05$).

Face-to-face socialisation

Face-to-face interaction is defined as the mutual influence of individuals' direct physical presence with his/her body language. **Face-to-face** interaction is one of the basic elements of the social system, forming a significant part of individual **socialization** and experience gaining throughout one's lifetime.

For measuring the face-to-face socialisation, the variables considered are Number of face-to-face communication with friends and relatives per day, Time spend for face-to-face communication with friends and relatives per day and Number of friends communicated face-to-face per week. The result of the frequency of face-to-face socialisation is presented in Table

Table 4: Frequency of face-to-face socialisation among higher secondary adolescents

Variable	Group	N	Percentage
Number of face-to-face communication with friends and relatives per day	1 – 10	45	30.0
	10 – 20	23	15.3
	20 – 30	52	34.7
	30 – 40	16	10.7
	40 Above	14	9.3
Time spend for face-to-face communication with friends and relatives per day	0 – 1 hour	29	19.3
	1 – 2	71	47.3
	2 – 3	34	22.7
	3 – 4	8	5.3
	Above 4	8	5.3
Number of friends communicated face-to-face per week	1 – 25	90	60.0
	25 – 50	36	24.0
	Above 50	24	16.0

The highest proportion of higher secondary school students (34.7%) usually communicating face-to-face with 20 – 30 friends and relatives per day. It is also seen that 30.0% of students communicating 1 to 10 friends in a day; 15.3% communicating 10 to 20 friends and relative; 10.7% communicating 30 to 40 friends per day. Only 9.3% of the adolescents communicating above 40 friends and relatives per day.

Time spend for face-to-face communication with friends and relatives per day indicates that majority (47.3) of the respondents are spending 1 to 2 hours per day. Percentage of respondents spending time for face-to-face communication with friends and relatives 2 to 3 hours, 3 to 4 hours and above 4 hours are 22.7%, 5.3%

and 5.3% respectively. Only 19.3 percentage of the respondents are spending below one hour per day for face-to-face communication with friends and relatives.

Number of friends communicated face-to-face per week discloses that 60.0% of the respondents communicating below 25 friends and relatives per day. The percentage of respondents who are communicating 25 to 50 friends and relative is 24.0 and 16.0 percentage communicating above 50.

For measuring the face-to-face socialisation higher scores are given to the higher number of face-to-face communication, more time spend with friends and relative and number face-to-face communication with friends per week. The consolidated score is treated as the face-to-face socialisation score.

Comparison of face-to-face socialisation based on socio demographic variable

Face-t-face socialisation among higher secondary adolescents was compared based on socio demographic variables viz., Gender of the adolescents, and locality of the home using independent sample t-test. Comparison based on stream of the course was done using analysis of variance and the results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of face-to-face socialization based on socio demographic variable

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t/F-value	p-value
Gender	Male	53	6.75	1.91	0.52	0.597
	Female	97	6.57	1.98		
Locality of the home	Rural	80	7.10	1.74	3.17	0.002
	Urban	70	6.11	2.06		
Stream of the course	Science	46	6.61	1.69	0.354	0.703
	Commerce	60	6.51	1.97		
	Humanities	44	6.84	2.21		

The analysis on the basis of gender indicate that the average score of face-to-face socialization of Male adolescents is 6.75 with standard deviation of 1.91 and that of Female adolescents is 6.57 with standard deviation of 1.98. Independent sample t-test shows that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of face-to-face socialization of higher secondary school adolescents based on Gender ($t = 0.597, p = 0.597 > 0.05$).

Based on the location of the home, the average score of face-to-face socialization of rural adolescents is 7.10 with standard deviation of 1.74 and that of urban adolescents is 6.11 with standard deviation of 2.06. Independent sample t-test shows that there exist significant difference between the mean scores of face-to-face socialization of higher secondary school adolescents based on location of the home ($t = 3.17, p = 0.002 < 0.05$). Face-to-face socialization of rural adolescents (7.10) is significantly higher than urban adolescents (6.11).

Analysis based on stream of education indicates that the average score of face-to-face socialization of science, commerce and humanities students are 6.61, 6.51 and 6.84 with standard deviations of 1.69, 1.97 and 2.21 respectively. Analysis of variance discloses that there is no significant difference among the mean scores of face-to-face socialization of higher secondary school adolescents based on stream of education ($F = 0.354, p = 0.703 > 0.05$).

Loneliness

Loneliness is an unpleasant emotional response to perceived isolation. Loneliness is also described as social pain—a psychological mechanism which motivates individuals to seek social connections. ... As a subjective emotion, loneliness can be felt even when surrounded by other people; one who feels lonely, is lonely.

Loneliness among higher secondary adolescents was measured using 4-point likert’s scale using 10 statements. The results obtained is presented in Table

Table 6: Mean score of loneliness among higher secondary students

No	Statement	Mean	SD
1	How often do you feel that you are “in tune” with the people around you	2.46	1.08
2	How often do you feel that you lack companionship?	2.21	1.03
3	How often do you feel alone?	1.63	0.99
4	How often do you feel part of a group of friends?	2.22	0.92
5	How often do you feel that you are no longer close to anyone?	2.15	1.03
6	How often do you feel left out?	2.57	0.96
7	How often do you feel that your relationships with others are not meaningful?	2.17	1.03
8	How often do you feel isolated from others?	2.25	0.92

9	How often do you feel you can find companionship when you want it?	2.54	1.05
10	How often do you feel that there are people who really understand you?	2.41	1.04
	Loneliness	22.61	4.16

The analysis of statements regarding loneliness and consolidated score shows that the loneliness among higher secondary students is not significantly high.

Comparison of loneliness based on socio demographic variable

Loneliness among higher secondary adolescents was compared based on socio demographic variables viz., Gender of the adolescents, and locality of the home using independent sample t-test. Comparison based on stream of the course was done using analysis of variance and the results are presented in Table 5.

Table 7. Comparison of loneliness based on socio demographic variable

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t/F-value	p-value
Gender	Male	53	22.58	4.29	0.062	0.951
	Female	97	22.62	4.11		
Locality of the home	Rural	80	22.60	3.88	0.042	0.967
	Urban	70	22.63	4.47		
Stream of the course	Science	46	22.39	4.94	0.561	0.572
	Commerce	60	23.05	3.39		
	Humanities	44	22.25	4.25		

The analysis on the basis of gender indicate that the average score of loneliness of Male adolescents is 22.58 with standard deviation of 4.29 and that of Female adolescents is 22.62 with standard deviation of 4.11. Independent sample t-test shows that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of loneliness of higher secondary school adolescents based on Gender ($t = 0.062, p = 0.952 < 0.05$).

Based on the location of the home, the average score of loneliness of rural adolescents is 22.60 with standard deviation of 4.11 and that of urban adolescents is 22.63 with standard deviation of 4.47. Independent sample t-test shows that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of loneliness of higher secondary school adolescents based on location of the home ($t = 0.042, p = 0.967 < 0.05$).

Analysis based on stream of education indicates that the average loneliness score science, commerce and humanities students are 22.39, 23.05 and 22.25 with standard deviations of 4.94, 3.39 and 4.25 respectively. Analysis of variance discloses that there is no significant difference among the mean scores of loneliness of higher secondary school adolescents based on stream of education ($F = 0.561, p = 0.572 < 0.05$).

Correlation of Digital socialisation and face-to-face socialisation with loneliness

Correlation of Digital socialisation and face-to-face socialisation with loneliness was calculated using Pearson Correlation and the results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Correlation of Digital socialisation and face-to-face socialisation with loneliness

Variables	Digital socialisation	Face-to-face socialisation	Loneliness
Digital socialisation	1	-0.184* (0.024)	0.181* (0.027)
Face-to-face socialisation	-0.184* (0.024)	1	-0.018 (0.827)
Loneliness	0.181* (0.027)	-0.018 (0.827)	1

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Result shows that the correlation obtained between Digital socialisation and loneliness for the higher secondary adolescents is 0.181 and p-value is 0.027. It indicates that there exist positive correlation between Digital socialisation and loneliness ($r = 0.181$) and the correlation is significant ($p = 0.027 < 0.05$).

Correlation obtained between face-to-face socialisation and loneliness for the higher secondary school adolescents is -0.018 and p-value is 0.827. It indicates that there exist negative correlation between face-to-face socialisation and loneliness ($r = -0.018$) and the correlation is not significant ($p = 0.827 > 0.05$).

The result also discloses that the correlation obtained between digital socialisation and face-to-face socialisation among the higher secondary school adolescents is -0.184 and p-value is 0.024. It implies that there

exist negative correlation between digital socialisation and face-to-face socialisation ($r = -0.184$) and the correlation is significant ($p = 0.024 < 0.05$).

IV. DISCUSSION

Study reveals that loneliness among higher secondary schools adolescents is not significantly high. There is no significant difference in the loneliness of higher secondary schools adolescents based on Gender ($t = 0.062$, $p = 0.952 > 0.05$), location of the home ($t = 0.042$, $p = 0.967 > 0.05$) and stream of education ($F = 0.561$, $p = 0.572 > 0.05$).

The analysis shows that there is no significant difference in the face-to-face socialization of higher secondary school adolescents based on Gender ($t = 0.597$, $p = 0.597 > 0.05$) and stream of education ($F = 0.354$, $p = 0.703 > 0.05$). There exists significant difference in the face-to-face socialization of higher secondary school adolescents based on location of the home ($t = 3.17$, $p = 0.002 < 0.05$). Face-to-face socialization of rural adolescents (7.10) is significantly higher than urban adolescents (6.11).

The analysis point out that there is no significant difference in the digital socialization of higher secondary school adolescents based on Gender ($t = 1.771$, $p = 0.097 > 0.05$), location of the home ($t = 1.529$, $p = 0.128 > 0.05$) and stream of education ($F = 0.669$, $p = 0.514 > 0.05$).

Present study reveals that there exists positive significant correlation between digital socialisation and loneliness ($r = 0.181$, $p = 0.027 < 0.05$). Supporting the empirical observations came out of the Home Net Project (Kraut et al., 1998) disclosed a significant correlation between participants who spend a significant share of their time online reported high levels of loneliness and stress during the day.

Negative correlation is seen between face-to-face socialisation and loneliness ($r = -0.018$) and the correlation is not significant ($p = 0.827 > 0.05$). There is negative correlation between digital socialisation and face-to-face socialisation ($r = -0.184$) and the correlation is significant ($p = 0.024 < 0.05$). The study conducted by Kraut points out that the Extroverts experience an increase in community-based activities and a decline in loneliness (Kraut et al., 2002). The study also claimed the fact that introverts experience a decline in community-based activities and an increase in loneliness.

Implication of the study

It is essential to give proper awareness to the higher secondary school students regarding the pros-cons of digital socialisation, cyber world and judicial way of practice in the cyber world. Necessary guidelines may be provided to make use of face-to-face method of communication and its psychological benefits. Students may be made aware about the cyber world and cyber misuses and immediate action need to be taken to rescue from such situations.

V. CONCLUSION

The study investigates the digital socialisation, face-to-face socialisation and loneliness among higher secondary school students and its association with gender, locality of home and stream of education. Study reveals that majority of higher secondary school students have login cyber media many times a day or once a day. Study reveals that there is no significant difference in digital socialisation, face-to-face socialisation and loneliness based on gender, locality of home and stream of education. Study discloses that there exist positive significant correlation between digital socialisation and loneliness. But, negative correlation is seen between face-to-face socialisation and loneliness. There exist negative correlation between digital socialisation and face-to-face socialisation and the correlation is significant.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Bayindir, N., & Kavanagh, D. (2018). The latest social media trends to know in 2019. (Social: GlobalWebIndex's flagship report on the latest trends in social media), Flagship Report 2018.
- [2]. Barak, A. (2006). Youngsters and the Internet: The psychology of —kind ofl and —likel. *Panim*, 37, 48-58.
- [3]. Boniel-Nissim, M. (2010). Want to be my friend? On youngsters' friendships and violence on Facebook. *Et Hasadeh*, 5, 21-27.
- [4]. Borys, S., & Perlman, D. (1985). Gender differences in loneliness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 11(1), 63-74.
- [5]. Barker, C. (1999). *Television, globalization and cultural identities*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- [6]. Bonebrake, K. (2002). College students' Internet use, relationship formation, and personality correlates. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 5(6), 551-557.
- [7]. Bowman, C.C. (1955). Loneliness and Social Change. *American Journal of Psychiatry*.112, 194-198

- [8]. Carr, C. T., & Hayes, R. A. (2015). Social media: defining, developing, and divining. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 23(1), 46–65.
- [9]. Ceyhan, A. A., & Ceyhan, E. (2008). Loneliness, depression, and computer self-efficacy as predictors of problematic internet use. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11(6), 699-701.
- [10]. Chukwuere, J. E., & Chukwuere, P. C. (2017). The impact of social media on social lifestyle: a case study of university female students. *Gender and Behaviour*, 15(4), 9966-9981.
- [11]. Dror, Y., & Gershon, S. (2012). *Israelis in the digital age*. RishonLezion: The College of Management.
- [12]. Dunbar, R. (2010). How many friends does one person need?: Dunbar's number and other evolutionary quirks.
- [13]. Fuchs, C., (2017). *Social media: A critical introduction*. Sage. Givertz, M., Wozidlo, A., Segrin, C., & Knutson, K., (2013). Direct and indirect effects of attachment orientation on relationship quality and loneliness in married couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(8), pp.1096-1120.
- [14]. Green, F., & Schleien, S. (1991). Understanding friendship and reaction: A theoretical sampling. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 25(4), 29-40.
- [15]. Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Personal information of adolescents on the Internet: A quantitative content analysis of MySpace. *Journal of Adolescence*, 31(1), 125-146.
- [16]. Hawi, N. S., & Samaha, M. (2017). The Relations Among Social Media Addiction, Self-Esteem, and Life Satisfaction in University Students. *Social Science Computer Review*, 5(5), 576-586.
- [17]. Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukophadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, 53(9), 1017.
- [18]. Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J., Helgeson, V., & Crawford, A. (2002). Internet paradox revisited. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(1), 49-74.
- [19]. Kontos, E. Z., Emmons, K. M., Puleo, E., & Viswanath, K. (2010). Communication inequalities and public health implications of adult social networking site use in the United States. *Journal of health communication*, 15(sup3), 216-235.
- [20]. Lenhart, A., Smith, A., Anderson, M., Duggan, M., & Perrin, A. (2015). *Teens, technology and friendships*.
- [21]. Leung, L. (2002). Loneliness, self-disclosure, and ICQ ("I Seek You") use. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 5, 241-251.
- [22]. Moody, E. J. (2001). Internet use and its relationship to loneliness. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 4(3), 393-401.
- [23]. Masi, C. M., Chen, H. Y., Hawkey, L. C., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2011). A meta-analysis of interventions to reduce
- [24]. Mesch, G., & Talmud, I. (2010). *Wired youth: The social world of adolescence in the information age*. New York: Routledge.
- [25]. Pew Research Centre (2015). *Teens, social media & technology overview 2015*.
- [26]. Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6.
- [27]. Russell, D., Cutrona, D., Rose, E., & Yurko, J. K. (1984). Social and emotional loneliness: An examination of Weiss's typology of loneliness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6(46), 1313-1321.
- [28]. Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(3), 472-480.
- [29]. Smyth, J. M., True, N., & Souto, J. (2001). Effects of writing about traumatic experiences: The necessity for narrative structuring. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 20, 161-172.
- [30]. Steinfield, C., Ellison, N., Lampe, C., & Vitak, J. (2012). Online social network sites and the concept of social capital. In *Frontiers in New Media Research*, 15, 115.