

Controlling the cyber-conduct of young people

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



Controlling the Cyber-conduct of Young People Paper Topic: Controlling the cyber-behavior of youngsters a. It is unwise to monitor and control the cyber-conduct of young people because the children whose use of technology is closely monitored do not learn to use new technologies responsibly in other contexts.

b. This work argues that children are not mature enough to act rationally in real life and cyber world, and hence, they need to be observed and controlled in the cyber-world.

c. The evidence supports the claim fully because it shows that children in real life are controlled by social norms and that they need to be under observation and control to behave properly. Moreover, it becomes evident that the brain of young people is not fully developed and that they are more likely to act on impulses.

Thesis statement

While some people claim that monitoring and controlling the cyber-conduct of young people regularly is an irrational proposition, this work claims that regular monitoring is an essential element of real-life society and that both online and offline activities of young people require regular observation and control due to various social, psychological, and biological factors.

Opposition's arguments

To begin with, the opposition claims that it is necessary to keep observers away from the activities of children. To illustrate, Bristow opines that “Allowing children their freedom means keeping the regulators out of what is, after all, Their Space” (par. 8). This claim highlights the fact that monitoring the activities of children online will negatively affect their freedom, and

hence, development. In addition, there is the argument that restricting children's internet access has a negative effect, as it will adversely affect their decision-making abilities. For example, Paton claims that "Restricting pupils' access to websites may actually impair their judgment, making them more vulnerable to pedophiles on-line" (par. 1). This argument supports the view that internet observation and controlling will deter children's ability to judge and act independently. Moreover, Bristow points out that "Just as the stranger at the swimming pool is highly unlikely to abduct our children, mobile phones are not about to lure them into the great unknown" (par. 3). Here, the claim is that internet does not pose any more threat than real life does. In total, the opposition seems adamant on the argument that observation and control of children's activities on the net is an irrational proposition.

My arguments

Firstly, young people's brain is not fully developed to facilitate rational and cognitive thinking every time, and hence, are more vulnerable to err when there is freedom. For instance, American Psychological Association points out, "Neuropsychological research demonstrates that the adolescent brain has not reached adult maturity" (9). This finding makes the very foundation for the claim that young people do not deserve total freedom. Moreover, as their brain is not fully developed, young people are more likely to act impulsively or to fall prey to temptations. To illustrate, American Psychological Association points out that "Adolescence is a period in which character is forming and often involves heightened risk-taking and even criminal conduct which are moderated or eliminated by the individual in

adulthood” (5). This claim is vital because it shows young people are more likely to commit crime than adults are in total freedom and that young people deserve to be controlled. Therefore, young people are not biologically prepared to enjoy total freedom.

Furthermore, in the real-life, the activities of young people are under regular observation and influences, and these factors have a great role in controlling their conduct. To begin with, family has an important role in forming and controlling the behavior of children. For example, Mahalihali indicates, “ families, especially parents, play a fundamental role in forming the values of children” (par. 5). This finding supports the role of social conformity in controlling the behavior of children. Moreover, a certain amount of fear of observation and punishment is necessary for people to act properly. For example, Cialdini writes, “ Most organizations would cease to operate efficiently if deference to authority were not one of the prevailing norms” (596). This scholar makes it clear that monitoring and punishment has been a part of the real society; not just for children but also for adults. Thus, it becomes evident that social conformity has a great role in shaping and controlling the behavior of all.

Additionally, this work will argue that the best way to control the cyber-behavior of children is to imitate the real life authority in the virtual world. For instance, Cialdini claims that “ social norms have been found to influence a range of behaviors in a myriad of domains, including recycling, littering, and tax evasion” (597). This shows that social norms can be used to manage cyber-behavior as well. Moreover, only the existence of strict cyber-norms, giving no chance for latitude, can ensure proper cyber-conduct of young

people. For example, Sacconi and Faillo point out that “ the agent’s willingness to conform with a shared social norm depends on reciprocal expectations concerning what the other agents will do” (3). These scholars make it clear that imposing the real life social norms and hierarchy in the virtual world will make children behave properly. Thus, expecting children to take wise decisions and act rationally in the virtual-world with total freedom is odd.

Conclusion

In total, the work will prove that children are likely to exhibit anti-social behavior in both real and virtual world in the absence of social norms, conformity, and deference to authority. Therefore, the work argues it is necessary to replicate the norms and hierarchy of the real world in the cyber-world to control the cyber-behavior of children.

Works Cited

“ Briefing for the American Psychological Association and the Missouri Psychological Association as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondent.” Roper v. Simmons. No. 03-633. Supreme Court of the United States. 19 July 2004. PDF file.

Bristow, Jennie. “ Children should be Allowed Their Freedom.” Spiked. Spiked Ltd., n. d. Web. 19 Feb. 2014.

Cialdini, Robert B., and Noah J. Goldstein. “ Social Influence: Compliance and Conformity.” Annual Review of Psychology 55 (2004): 591-621. ProQuest. Web. 19 Feb. 2014.

Mahalihali, Kwambota. “ Family Influences on the Development of a Child’s Behavior.” URC. Undergraduate Research Community, n. d. Web. 19 Feb.

2014.

Paton, Graeme. " Stop Blocking Internet Access, Schools Told." The Telegraph 10 Feb. 2010. Web. 19 Feb. 2014.

Sacconi, Lorenzo, and Marco Faillo. " Conformity, Reciprocity and the Sense of Justice how Social Contract-Based Preferences and Beliefs Explain Norm Compliance: The Experimental Evidence." SSRN Working Paper Series Jul. 2008: 1-46 ProQuest. Web. 20 Feb. 2014.