Do children need humans or screen? Institutional-based cross-sectional study

Rajalakshmi M¹, Reenaa Mohan¹, *Kanimozhi T¹, Karthika Devi D S¹

Sri Lanka Journal of Child Health. 2023; **52**(3): 265-272 DOI: http://doi.org/10.4038/sljch.v52i3.10501

Abstract

Introduction: Screen exposure is on the rise and has been virtually unavoidable in the post-Covid era. Screen exposure during the critical period of brain development results in delayed language, learning and behaviour problems and subsequent sedentary lifestyle results in non-communicable disease later in life.

Objectives: To assess the burden of digital screen exposure and parental perceptions of its effects in children.

Method: This institution-based cross-sectional study was conducted among children aged 1-13 years in a tertiary healthcare centre in Puducherry, India, from April 2022 to June 2022. Data were collected using the Digital Screen Exposure Questionnaire (DSEQ), administered by trained Compulsory Rotatory Residential Internship (CRRI) after pilot testing.

Results: Our study shows that the prevalence of excessive screen exposure (>1 hour) was 25% during weekdays and 44.9% during weekends. The most common media used was television (TV) in 92.8%, closely followed by smart phones in 90%. Most frequently watched content (>5 times/ week) was random things for enjoyment in 57.8% followed by rhymes in 25.7%; 57.1% had no outside play during weekdays. Mother's education was the main predictor which influenced the duration of screen exposure in study participants.

Conclusions: Our study shows that the prevalence of excessive screen exposure (>1 hour) was 25%

¹Sri Manakula Vinayagar Medical College and Hospital, Pondicherry, India

*Correspondence: drkani88@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3075-6856

(Received on 09 February 2023: Accepted after revision on 24 March 2023)

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest

Personal funding was used for the project.

Open Access Article published under the Creative

Commons Attribution CC-BY

during weekdays and 44.9% during weekends. Common media used were TV in 92.8% and smart phones in 90%. Except for mother's education, no other socio-demographic factor influenced the duration of screen exposure in study participants. There was excessive screen exposure in children despite parental perception of its harmful effects

(Key words: Screen time, Digital media, Smartphone, TV, Video game)

Introduction

Children's exposure to digital media is increasing, which is a point of concern as screen time exposure has a major impact on the health of children and also affects the families. Children now have access to more screens and media than ever before, in their room as a television (TV), in their backpacks as tablets and in their hands as their caregiver's or their own smart phones¹. With the Covid-19 pandemic, children are spending even more time with screens for online learning, entertainment and socialization with friends virtually². Overall, screen time ranged from 0.9 to 3.5 hours/day among under-five year old children and 1-3.1 hours/day among school-aged children. Indian studies showed that children are exposed to screen-based media as early as 2 months of age with the median age of first exposure to screens at 10 months. There is greater use of smart phones (96%) than TV (89%) especially for games and videos³. Screen time during holidays (3.9 hours/day) is more than school days (2 hours/ day) among adolescents⁴.

Early childhood is the critical phase in development when the brain is more sensitive to the environment around them. Screens curtail the ability to control impulses and reduce empathy and the ability to read human emotion. It also detracts from activities that help boost their brain power like play and interaction with other children⁵. Hence, excessive screen exposure has been linked to delayed language, learning and behaviour problems⁶. It can cause sleep disturbances by suppressing and disrupting melatonin secretion⁷. Other problems include computer vision syndrome, refractive errors, headaches, body image perception disorders and drug abuse⁸⁻¹¹. Due to sedentary life style and the consumption of unhealthy food promoted by advertisements, excessive screen time is considered as one of the major role players in causing noncommunicable diseases (NCDs) and health risks later on in life^{12,13}.

As per recent Indian Academy of Paediatrics (IAP) guidelines, children below the age of 2 years should not be exposed to any type of screen with the exception of an occasional video call with relatives. Screen time for children between the age of 2 and 5 years should not exceed 1 hour, the less, the better. For older children and adolescents, other than online classes, there should be a maximum of 2 hours screen time. It is important to balance screen time with other activities that include an hour of physical activity (play time), adequate duration of sleep and time for schoolwork, meals, hobbies, and family time¹⁴. This is similar to World Health Organisation (WHO) and AAP guidelines for screen time^{15,16}. Parental awareness of screen time of their children and its effects are crucial to regulate screen media exposure in children.

The above guidelines are updated regularly but are criticized as to be not completely evidence-based. In the outpatient department (OPD) waiting area and in the wards in our institution even after repeated sensitization of the parents, it has been noticed that the parents are voluntarily giving children phones to keep them silent. which emphasizes need-based counselling for the parents There is limited published data from India on the burden of screen exposure, especially its content and context and associated factors using standardized tools, the knowledge of which is essential to formulate policy for screen hygiene in children.

Objectives

We conducted the present study to assess the burden of digital screen exposure and parental perceptions of its effects in children.

Method

This was an institution-based cross-sectional study conducted in a tertiary healthcare centre in Puducherry, India, from April 2022 to June 2022. The institution has an in-patient capacity of 932 beds, with exclusive 100 critical care beds in different specialties.

Sample size and sampling: The sample size of 135 was calculated after considering that the prevalence of excessive screen time was 73%, absolute precision of 7.5% with 95% confidence Interval (CI) (calculated by Epi Info version 3.5.4)¹; consecutive sampling was applied.

Inclusion criteria: All children aged 1 to 13 years were included.

Exclusion criteria: Sick children and children whose parents were not willing to give consent were excluded.

Data collection: All eligible children in the age group one to 13 years were included in the study. The first participant was selected by simple random sampling technique and the following study participant was selected by systematic random sampling technique. Data were collected using the Digital Screen Exposure Questionnaire (DSEQ), administered by trained Compulsory Rotatory Residential Internship (CRRI) after pilot testing.

DSEQ is an 86-item caregiver reported questionnaire developed by Dr Madhu Gupta, Department of Paediatrics, Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research (PGIMER) from the Department of Community Medicine and School of Public Health, PGIMER, Chandigarh, India and it is freely available in the internet¹⁷. It is not copyright protected and permission was obtained from the author. It has five domains, sociodemographic, screen time exposure and home media environment, level of physical activity, media related behaviours and parental perceptions. It has good face and content validity, internal consistency and test-retest reliability¹⁷.

Ethical issues: Approval for the study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Sri Manakula Vinayagar Medical College and Hospital, Pondicherry, India (No. EC/21/2022). Written informed consent was obtained from parents of all participants in addition to oral consent for 8-11-year-old children and assent for 12-13-year-old children.

Statistical analysis: Data were entered in the Epi info software version 7.2 and analysis was done using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 24.0. Categorical variables were expressed in percentages and continuous variables in mean and standard deviation. Association between socio-demographic factors and excessive screen time was done by Chi square test. p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Table 1 gives the socio-demographic details of the 140 study participants. The mean age of the study participants was 6.09 years; 16(11.4%) attended day care for more than 3 days a week. Parents were the caregivers in 131 (93.5%) cases.

Table 2 gives the home media environment.

Characteristic Number (%) Age (years) 1 to <3 40 (28.5) 3 to <6 48 (34.2) 6 to 12 6 to 12 48 (34.2) 9 >12 04 (02.8) 6 Gender 67 (47.8) 67 (47.8) Boys 73 (52.1) 67 (47.8) Residence 99 (70.7) 7 Urban 99 (70.7) 7 Rural 41 (29.2) 7 Family type 64 (45.7) 9 Nuclear 43 (40.0) 3 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) 24 (17.1) Education of mother 5 5 School 64 (45.7) 0 Diploma 43 (40.0) 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) 5 Socio-economic status 0 0 14 (17.1) Upper 22 (15.7) 10 10 10 (28.5) Lower 37 (26.4) 21 (15.0) 10 10 (07.2) Primary caregiver <t< th=""><th colspan="4">Table 1: Socio-demographic details of study participants (n=140) Characteristic</th></t<>	Table 1: Socio-demographic details of study participants (n=140) Characteristic			
1 to <3 40 (28.5) 3 to <6 48 (34.2) 6 to 12 48 (34.2) >12 04 (02.8) Gender 04 (02.8) Boys 73 (52.1) Girls 67 (47.8) Residence 99 (70.7) Urban 99 (70.7) Rural 41 (29.2) Family type 64 (45.7) Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 5 School 64 (45.7) Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 22 (15.7) Upper middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Mother 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	Characteristic	Number (%)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				
6 to 12 $48(34.2)$ >12 $04(02.8)$ Gender $73(52.1)$ Boys $73(52.1)$ Girls $67(47.8)$ Residence $99(70.7)$ Urban $99(70.7)$ Rural $41(29.2)$ Family type $64(45.7)$ Nuclear $43(40.0)$ Joint family $24(17.1)$ Education of mother $64(45.7)$ School $64(45.7)$ Diploma $43(40.0)$ Graduate and above $22(15.7)$ Upper $22(15.7)$ Upper middle $40(28.5)$ Lower middle $20(14.2)$ Upper lower $21(15.0)$ Lower $37(26.4)$ Primary caregiver $7(26.4)$ Primary caregiver $118(84.2)$ Father $12(08.6)$ Other $10(07.2)$	-			
>12 $04 (02.8)$ Gender 73 (52.1) Boys 67 (47.8) Residence 99 (70.7) Urban 99 (70.7) Rural 41 (29.2) Family type 64 (45.7) Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 64 (45.7) School 64 (45.7) Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 22 (15.7) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver Mother Mother 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)				
Gender $(1, 0)$ Boys 73 (52.1) Girls $67 (47.8)$ Residence $(1, 29.2)$ Urban 99 (70.7) Rural 41 (29.2) Family type $64 (45.7)$ Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother School School $64 (45.7)$ Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status Upper Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 77 (26.4) Mother 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)				
Boys 73 (52.1) Girls 67 (47.8) Residence 99 (70.7) Rural 41 (29.2) Family type 64 (45.7) Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 5 School 64 (45.7) Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 24 (17.1) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Mother 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	>12	04 (02.8)		
Girls 67 (47.8) Residence 99 (70.7) Rural 41 (29.2) Family type 64 (45.7) Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 64 (45.7) School 64 (45.7) Diploma 64 (45.7) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 24 (17.1) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	Gender			
Residence 99 (70.7) Rural 41 (29.2) Family type 64 (45.7) Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 5 School 64 (45.7) Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 22 (15.7) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	Boys	73 (52.1)		
Urban 99 (70.7) Rural 41 (29.2) Family type 64 (45.7) Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 5 School 64 (45.7) Diploma 64 (45.7) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 24 (17.1) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	Girls	67 (47.8)		
Rural 41 (29.2) Family type 64 (45.7) Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 64 (45.7) School 64 (45.7) Diploma 64 (45.7) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 24 (17.1) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	Residence			
Rural 41 (29.2) Family type 64 (45.7) Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 64 (45.7) School 64 (45.7) Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 24 (17.1) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	Urban	99 (70.7)		
Family type $64 (45.7)$ Nuclear $43 (40.0)$ Joint family $24 (17.1)$ Education of mother $64 (45.7)$ School $64 (45.7)$ Diploma $43 (40.0)$ Graduate and above $24 (17.1)$ Socio-economic status $24 (17.1)$ Upper $22 (15.7)$ Upper middle $40 (28.5)$ Lower middle $20 (14.2)$ Upper lower $21 (15.0)$ Lower $37 (26.4)$ Primary caregiver $118 (84.2)$ Father $12 (08.6)$ Other $10 (07.2)$	Rural			
Nuclear 43 (40.0) Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 64 (45.7) School 64 (45.7) Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 24 (17.1) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	Family type			
Joint family 24 (17.1) Education of mother 64 (45.7) School 64 (45.7) Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 24 (17.1) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)				
Education of mother School 64 (45.7) Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 22 (15.7) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	Joint family			
School 64 (45.7) Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 22 (15.7) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)				
Diploma 43 (40.0) Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status 22 (15.7) Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)		64 (45.7)		
Graduate and above 24 (17.1) Socio-economic status Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)	Diploma			
Socio-economic status 22 (15.7) Upper 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)				
Upper 22 (15.7) Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)		_:((,,,))		
Upper middle 40 (28.5) Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)		22 (15.7)		
Lower middle 20 (14.2) Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)				
Upper lower 21 (15.0) Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)				
Lower 37 (26.4) Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Mother 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)				
Primary caregiver 118 (84.2) Mother 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)				
Mother 118 (84.2) Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)		57 (20.1)		
Father 12 (08.6) Other 10 (07.2)		118 (84.2)		
Other 10 (07.2)				

 Table 1: Socio-demographic details of study participants (n=140)

Table 2: Home	media	environment	
---------------	-------	-------------	--

Home media available	Number (%)
Television (TV) with cable/satellite connection available	130 (92.9)
Computers/Laptop available	21 (15.0)
Mobile phone with internet (smart phone) available	126 (90.0)
Mobile phone without internet available	57 (40.7)
Hand held devices to play videogames	15 (10.7)
Only children's channel allowed	11 (06.4)
No media gadgets 1 hour before sleep	07 (05.0)
Watches only under supervision of adults	17 (12.1)
Not allowed to sit near TV	11 (07.8)

Almost all participants had more than one digital media at home; 33 (23.5%) had TV in the room where child sleeps and 24 (17.1%) watched screen for more than one hour. Only 38 (27.7%) parents thought that placement of TV in bedroom increases screen time and only 20 (14.2%) parents restricted screen time for children at home. Most common gadget used by mothers was the smart phone (n=34, 24.2%) and the average duration of screen exposure was 1-5 hours in 57.8% and 0-1 hour in 24.2%. Average duration of screen usage by father was 1-5 hours in 39.2% (n=55) and 0-1 hour in 38.5% (n=54); 121 (86.4%) fathers spent less than 5 hours with children at home and 41.4% mothers spent

around 5-10 hours with children at home. Average duration screen exposure was more than 1 hour per day in 25% participants during week days and 44.5% participants during weekends. Most frequently viewed media (>5 times/week) was TV in 83 (59.2%) followed by smart phone in 59 (42.1%).

Table 3 shows the duration and frequency of digital media exposure in study participants. Average duration of outside play was less than one hour in 41 (29.2%) during weekdays and around 1-5 hours per day in 74 (52.8%). Around 80 (57.1%) had no outside play during weekdays.

Home media	Frequency	Number (%)
	Frequency /week	
	<5 times	44 (31.8)
	>5 times	83 (59.2)
	Never	03 (02.1)
Television (TV)	Average duration per day on school days	
	<1 hour	31 (22.1)
	>1 hour	35 (25.0)
	Average duration per day on weekends	· · · · ·
	<1 hour	67 (47.8)
	>1 hour	63 (44.9)
	Frequency /week	· · · · ·
	<5 times	69 (41.9)
	>5 times	59 (42.1)
	Never	08 (05.7)
Smart phone	Average duration per day on school days	· · ·
	<1 hour	24 (17.1)
	>1 hour	26 (18.5)
	Average duration per day on weekends	· · · ·
	<1 hour	90 (86.3)
	>1 hour	36 (03.5)
	Frequency /week	· · · ·
	<5 times	27 (19.24)
	>5 times	03 (02.1)
Other (video games)	Never	66 (47.1)
	Average duration per day on school days	· · · ·
	<1 hour	09 (06.4)
	>1 hour	05 (03.4)
	Average duration per day on weekends	· ·
	<1 hour	23 (22.7)
	>1 hour	15 (14.7)

 Table 3: Screen time exposure

The purpose of using digital media was commonly to watch random things for enjoyment like music, advertisements, baby TV, click photos etc. in 81 (57.8%) rather than for educational purposes; 29 (20.6%) used digital media for homework, 85 (70.7%) for video calling, 73 (52.1%) for learning rhymes, alphabets, 36 (25.7%) to learn mathematics, 106 (75.8%) to watch stories, 33 (23.6%) to learn various sciences online and 67 (47.8%) to watch adult programs (soap operas, news, movies). Around 18 (12%) talked to the characters on screen and 16 (11.4%) acted out story/ role play character while watching the screens.

Table 4 shows the media related behaviour of study participants.

Characteristic	Frequency	Number (%)
	≤5 times	37 (26.4)
Child uses media for learning poems, rhymes, ABC etc. online	>5 times	36 (25.7)
	Never	64 (45.7)
	\leq 5 times	33 (23.5)
Child uses media to learns mathematics, numbers, tables, online	>5 times	03 (02.1)
	Never	104 (74.2)
	≤5 times	58 (41.3)
Child uses media to recognize shapes/ sounds/ colours when shown online	>5 times	33 (23.5)
	Never	43 (30.7)
	≤5 times	29 (20.6)
Child plays video-games	>5 times	33 (23.5)
	Never	78 (55.7)
	≤5 times	35 (24.9)
Child watches adult programs (soap opera, news, sports, movies etc.)	>5 times	32 (22.8)
	Never	73 (52.1)
Child uses media to watch random things for enjoyment (music,	≤5 times	46 (32.7)
advertisements, baby TV, click photos etc.)	>5 times	81 (57.8)
	Never	13 (09.2)

 Table 4: Media related behaviour of study participants

Table 5 shows the media literacy of parents. Enquiring about parental perceptions of the effect of digital media on children, 54.2% believe that it increases his/ her knowledge and 47.7% believe that it is good for growth and development. Only 11.4% think that it has no negative effects. Among the behaviour effects, 69.2% think that the child might become aggressive, 59.2% think that it might impair concentration and 46.4% think that the child might isolate himself.

Digital screen exposure	Number (%)	
Increases his/ her knowledge	76 (54.2)	
Starts imitating what he/she watches	65 (46.4)	
Might develop sleep problems	77 (55.0)	
Might start eating unhealthy food	43 (30.7)	
Might cause behaviour problems	95 (67.8)	
Might impair eye sight	44 (31.4)	
Has no negative effects	16 (11.4)	
Has no positive effects	42 (30.0)	

 Table 5: Media literacy of parents

Analysing the influence of sociodemographic factors on excessive screen time >1 hour shows that age, gender, residence and socioeconomic status had no influence. Only education of the mother was significantly associated with excessive screen time (p < 0.001).

Discussion

Our study shows that the prevalence of excessive screen exposure (>1 hour) was 25% during weekdays and 44.9% during weekends. The most common media used was TV in 92.8%, closely followed by smart phones in 90%. Most frequently watched content (>5 times/ week) was random things for enjoyment (57.8%) followed by rhymes (25.7%); 57.1% had no outside play during weekdays. Except for mother's education, no other socio-demographic factor influenced the duration of screen exposure in study participants.

The burden of excessive screen time was 10-93% in developed countries and 21-98% in developing countries¹⁸. Criteria for excessive screen time was >2 hours per day in some studies and >1 hour/day in a few studies. The prevalence was also higher during weekends (25-63%) than weekdays (10-48%). A recent study from Tamilnadu by Varadarajan S, et al^{1} showed that rates of excessive screen time in children aged less than 2 years was 73.3% and in those more than 2 years was 73%; 24.2% reported more screen time during weekends¹. Another study from Tamilnadu by Shirley SA, et al19 showed that 48.6% had a screen time between 60-120 minutes among 24-60 months of age and average daily screen time was 139.4 minutes. Most studies reported more screen time during weekends compared to weekdays. One study by Priya et al²⁰ reported that 10.6% had >5 hours screen time during weekends. In the study by Shirley SA, et al¹⁹ only 14.2% had screen time less than one hour as recommended by WHO and AAP19. In a study from Western India among 2-6-year-old rural children 17.2% had screen time less than one hour⁴.

TV and smart phones are the common media available in most studies similar to ours. Since screen viewing is totally unavoidable, emphasis is on high quality content that is age appropriate and co-viewed or under supervision. Only few studies have explored the content in detail like our study. In our study 57.8% used to watch random gadgets for entertainment; other common uses were for video calling and watching. This is similar to studies by Shah R, et al4 and Shirley SA, et al19. These studies also showed that screen media were commonly used to calm children. Even those meant as educational videos are not developed based on inputs from actual educators or paediatricians and cannot offer human interaction or develop complex thinking. As per IAP guidelines, screen time has to be balanced with physical activities but play time is very limited in our children especially during weekdays. However, this may not be totally attributable to screen exposure. In our study only 25.7% had a play area or garden near home.

Many studies have analysed the factors influencing excess screen time in children. Systematic review shows age of introduction of screen, sedentary life style, eating in-front of screen, parent screen time and perceptions, large number of devices, socioeconomic status and lock down all influence screen time of children^{21,22}. Older children and boys were reported to have more screen time by Shah R, et al4 and Priya et al²⁰. Shah R, et al⁴ and Varadarajan S, et al^1 reported that increased screen usage by mothers influenced the screen time in children. In our study, only mother's education had a significant influence similar to the study by Priya *et al*²⁰. In our study, age, gender, residence and socioeconomic status had no influence on screen time. This is similar to studies by Shirley SA, et al19 and Varadarajan S, *et al*¹.

Parental knowledge and perceptions on the effect of screen time highly influences screen time behaviour in children. In a study by Shirley SA, $et al^{19}$ on the

attitude and awareness among parents, majority of parents seemed to be concerned about screen time of children²³. Majority were aware of the adverse effects on behaviour, sleep, social interaction and life style related problems similar to that reported in our study; 91.8% believed that establishing screen time limits was important and 89.6% believed that increasing awareness among children was important. This is in contrast to the study by Meena P, *et al*³ in children between 15-18 months where 72% were not concerned about screen time in children. In our study, only 11.4% believed that it has no negative effects.

Using a validated questionnaire is a strength of the study as it gives a robust estimate of screen media exposure in children. Limitations of the study are that it is an institution-based cross-sectional study and temporarily cannot be maintained; because of the smaller sample size, the findings cannot be generalised. This study has also captured only parental perceptions and not the actual effects of screen exposure in children

The results of our study show that screen media exposure is widely prevalent in our region. As tech free zone is virtually impossible, paediatricians need to impart need-based counselling on screen time guidelines and its implications on health and behaviour in children. Interventional strategies like individualizing screen time, discussing with children, home based rules regarding TV turn off time, co-viewing/ co-sharing and supervising the content might promote healthy screen behaviour. Parents also should follow healthy media usage as they model children. Longitudinal studies exploring content and context across various age groups and effect of interventional strategies are required to update guidelines and promote screen hygiene in children.

Conclusions

Our study shows that the prevalence of excessive screen exposure (>1 hour) was 25% during weekdays and 44.9% during weekends. Common media used were TV in 92.8% and smart phones in 90%. Except for mother's education, no other socio-demographic factor influenced the duration of screen exposure in study participants. There was excessive screen exposure in children despite parental perception of its harmful effects

References

 Vardarajan.S, Venguidesvarane AG, Ramaswamy KN, Rajamohan M, Krupa M, Christadoss SBW. Prevalence of excessive screen time and its association with developmental delay in children aged <5 years: A population-based cross-sectional study in India. *PLoS One* 2021; **16**(7): e 0254102. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0254 102 PMid: 34228768 PMCid: PMC8259964

- 2. Health issues. Give Your Child's Eyes a Screen-Time Break: Here's Why, Available from: https://www.healthychildren.org/English/h ealthissues/conditions/eyes/Pages/What-Too-Much-Screen-Time-Does-to-Your-Childs-Eyes.aspx
- Meena P, Gupta P, Shah D. Screen time in Indian children by 15-18 months of age. *Indian Pediatrics* 2020; 57: 1033-6. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13312-020-2031-3 PMid: 32788425

 Shah RR, Fahey NM, Soni AV, Phatak AG, Nimbalkar SM. Screen time usage among preschoolers aged 2-6 in rural Western India: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care* 2019; 8(6): 1999-2002. https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_206_ 19 PMid: 31334169 PMCid: PMC6618175

- 5. UNICEF babies need human not screens Available from: https://www.unicef.org/parenting/childdev elopment/babies-screen-time.
- Li C, Cheng G, Sha T, Cheng W, Yan Y. The relationships between screen use and health indicators among infants, toddlers and pre-schoolers: A meta-analysis and systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2020; **17**(19): 7324. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17197324 PMid: 33036443 PMCid: PMC7579161
- Harrison K, Cantor J. Tales from the screen: Enduring fright reactions to scary media. *Media Psychology* 1999; 1: 97-116. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532785xmep010 2_1
- Computer vision syndrome. Accessed November 5, 2021. Available from: https://www.aoa.org/healthy-eyes/eyeand-vision-conditions/computer-visionsyndrome?sso=y

- Perloff RM. Social media effects on young women's body image concerns: Theoretical perspectives and an agenda for research. Sex Roles 2014; 71: 363-77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-014-0433-1
- Kulkarni MM, Kamath VG, Kamath A, Lewis S, Bogdonovica I, Bains M, et al. Exposure to tobacco imagery in popular films and the risk of ever smoking among children in southern India. Tobacco Control 2021; 30(5): 560-6. https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol201 9-055353 PMid: 32900918 PMCid: PMC8394755
- 11. Stautz K, Brown KG, King SE, Shemilt I, Marteau TM. Immediate effects of alcohol marketing communications and media portrayals on consumption and cognition: a systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies. *BMC Public Health* 2016; **16**: 465.

https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3116-8

PMid: 27278656 PMCid:PMC489992

12. Kaur N, Gupta M, Maini P, Grover S. Screen time in under-five children. *Indian Pediatrics* 2019; 56: 773-88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13312-019-1638-8
PMid: 31638012

 Qutteina Y, Backer CD, Smits T. Media food marketing and eating outcomes among pre-adolescents and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obesity Reviews* 2019; 20: 1708-19. https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12929 PMid: 31468652

- 14. Gupta P, Shah D, Bedi N, Galagali P, Dalwai S, Agrawal S *et al.* Indian Academy of Pediatrics Guidelines on Screen Time and Digital Wellness in Infants, Children and Adolescents. *Indian Pediatrics* 2022; 59(3): 235-44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13312-022-2477-6
 PMid: 34969943
- World Health Organization. Guidelines on physical activity, sedentary behaviour and sleep for children under 5 years of age: summary. World Health Organization, 2019. Accessed November 10,2021. Available from:

https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/325 147

- 16. Council on communications and media. Media and young minds. *Pediatrics* 2016; 138: e20162591. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-2591 PMid: 27940793
- Kaur N, Gupta M, Kiran T, Malhi P, Grover S. Development and evaluation of the digital-screen exposure questionnaire (DSEQ) for young children. PLoS ONE 2021; 16(6): e0253313. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253 313 PMid: 34157053 PMCid: PMC8219135
- Lin LY, Cherng RJ, Chen YJ, Yang HM. Effects of television exposure on developmental skills among young children. *Infant Behavior and Development* 2015; **38**: 20-6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2014.12.0 05 PMid: 25544743
- Shirley SA, Kumar SS. A study on screen time use in children between 24 to 60 months of age in Tamil Nadu, India. *International Journal of Contemporary Pediatrics* 2019; 6: 2582-6. https://doi.org/10.18203/23493291.ijcp20 194738
- 20. Priya PR, Veena Kumari M. Screen-time in primary school children and its associations: a cross sectional study *International Journal of Contemporary Pediatrics* 2021; **8**(9): 1528-38. https://doi.org/10.18203/23493291.ijcp20 213314
- Paudel S, Jancey J, Subedi N, Leavy J. Correlates of mobile screen media use among children aged 0-8: A systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2017; 7: e014585. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014585
 PMid: 29070636 PMCid: PMC5665287
- Duch H, Fisher EM, Ensari I, Harrington A. Screen time use in children under 3 years old: a systematic review of correlates. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity 2013; 10: 102.

https://doi.org/10.1186/1479-5868-10-102 PMid: 23967799 PMCid: PMC3844496 Shirley SA, Kumar SS. Awareness and attitude among parents of primary school students towards screen time in children. *International Journal of Contemporary Pediatrics* 2020; 7(1):107-11. https://doi.org/10.18203/23493291.ijcp20 195736