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ABSTRACT

The objective of this research aims to understand the influence of social media sites on students’ academic performance behavioral aspects and the usage implications. Nowadays, youths are mostly using social media networking to have their presence and to have good relationship with their connections. Since social media has grown rapidly that has an impact both positively and negatively on the academic performance of student’s life. Students and other members of society are more addicted to the social networking sites. As students are aware of many social networking platform, they are much familiar with Facebook and they use different platform to learn and explore. This may results in waste of time or a serious impact over students learning and development personality. In particular, college students have adopted these forms of communication as the supreme way to keep in touch with family, friends and even colleagues. Social Networking websites and applications are the most popular hangout places for the students to spend their time. This research paper examines results of social media sites awareness and usage by students in Davangere city with a simple random sampling techniques taking 1000 respondents and obtained observations to derive effective result.
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Introduction

Today, Social networking sites are very much popular among college students, even companies are looking forward for a new a way to reach customers and attract to most of the target customers via advertisement and promotional campaign. Most of the people will be usually spending more time in surfing internet as entertainment and chat around with friends to keep themselves connected with one another. Some of the best features of social networking sites are user friendly, free of use, easy access, and other have definitely provided space for development and attributes of social networking sites like chatting, music sharing, video sharing etc. Since a decade, technology has grown immensely and has brought major changes globally. Social networking can be accessed throughout the world at anywhere and at any time. The huge technological development in social networking sites are becoming more and more popular among students. E-learning is an important tool for learner and interactive nature of online environments has expanded with social networks. There are different social networking sites such as
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Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and Snap Chat spending a long time on such sites. The expansion in technology has also affected internet software, thus leading to chatting sites known by the name “social media”. With social networking sites, one can send and receive messages almost instantly. However, lack of regulation of the internet has led to its excessive use. The sharing of information sorts from debates, gossips, feelings, opinions etc.

**Literature Review**

Detailed literature review has been done on the research idea to understand the research gap and relevance of conducting a research for the betterment of research work and its contribution. Below are the major studies conducted with observations.

**Won Kim and Sang-Won Lee (2009)** rightly pointed out that today the college students use numerous Social Networking Sites, to stay connected with their friends, discover new “friends” and to share users-created contents, such as photos, videos, blogs and etc. In order to explore factors affecting college students’ motive for using Social Networking Sites.

**Miller, Parsons and Lifer (2010)** conducted a survey among students, about the use of social networking sites and the appropriateness of the content that they post. The responses indicate that students routinely post content that is not appropriate for all audiences, especially potential employers. Considering how extensively the press has covered the negative impacts of inappropriate posting, the fact that students know of continuing the practice is surprising.

**Jackson (2011)** for a recent survey on the theoretical and empirical research on this type of broad social network. The surveyed research focuses on how social networks shape behavior and economic outcomes, in particular the role of social networks in markets and exchange, learning and diffusion, and network games, background on social network characteristics and measurements, models of network formation, models for the statistical analysis of social networks, as well as community detection.

**Parveen (2011)** explores the usage of Facebook in creating awareness among library and information science professionals. The study investigates purpose and main hurdles in using Facebook. It found that Facebook is the most used site, it uses for keep abreast with current news and information. Lack of time is main hurdle in using the way of Facebook.

**Hamat, Embi and Hassan (2012)** studied the use of social networking platform among undergraduate and post graduate students of Malaysian institutes of higher education. This qualitative research collected data on 6538 student’s respondents through a self-administered questionnaire and analyzed this data to make observations on the use of social networking sites among them. The study also collects opinion of students about the impact of social medium on their academic performance.

**Abu-Shanab and Al-Tarawneh (2013)** explored the advantages and disadvantages of Facebook utilizing university students. A sample of 206 students responded to a survey containing 10 advantages and 10 disadvantages of Facebook, and yielded interesting results. The study did not focus on students’ academic performance, but took the issue as a general view of social media influence. This study will explore the relationship between performance and SN use.

**Objectives of the Study**

- To study the influence of Social Networking Sites (SNSs) on Student’s life and to explore the impact of usage of Social Networking Sites by college students.
- The main purpose of this research is to determine if social media interfering with students academic lives.

**Research Methodology**

In this research, an unnamed questionnaire was directed to collect data which was the standard survey collection method. An exploratory research technique is used to analyze the social networking sites and also usage pattern of students during college life. A pilot research has been adopted in research process to collect data. The responses were sought from the respondents at group or random at student’s available place like college, class room, cafeteria, parking area, hostel and so on. The nature of the questions avoided ambiguous responses from the respondents and a questionnaire consist of 30 questions for 1000 undergraduate and post graduate students of the Davangere city. The respondents were randomly selected and survey focused on social networking sites such as Facebook, twitter and Instagram etc.

**Data Analysis**

Table 1 depicts the five research hypotheses set in line with the research objectives. The responses obtained from the 1000 respondents has been carefully analyzed with SPSS by applying Chi-
Square test for the formed hypotheses. Below table depicts the list of set hypotheses for the research study with result. The level of significance is at 5%. If the Chi-square Sig. value is less than 0.05, then Null hypothesis is rejected. On the hand, if Sig. value is greater than 0.05, then Null hypothesis is accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Research Hypothesis (Ho)</th>
<th>Result p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>No statistical significance between Age and Addiction of SNS is a serious Problematic issue for academic life</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>No statistical significance between Age and Difficult to concentrate on my studying &amp; knowing SNS</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>No statistical significance between Can SNS be consider as effective communication application and you use SNS for academic purpose like Group discussion</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>No statistical significance between SNS distracts from studies and Difficult to concentrate on my studies</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>No statistical significance between I use SNS to facilitate academic activities And Importance of SNS in student’s life</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results Discussion and Major Findings

A Chi-square test was performed and relationship was found between respondents age and addiction of SNS is a serious Problematic issue for academic life, $X^2 (3, N = 1000) = 3.477, p = 0.324$. Therefore, as the $P$-value (0.324) is greater than the significance level (0.05), accept the null hypothesis. Similarly, all the above listed hypotheses (Table 1) have been analyzed by applying chi-square test and the results are highlighted. Approximately, 60% of the total set research hypotheses have been rejected and on the other hand, 40% of the hypotheses are accepted.

An analysis has been done for most of the questions represented in questionnaire, as the researcher intended to draw meaningful insights from the responses obtained from the students. The observations are recorded carefully and are presented below. The Chi-square results (along with cross tabulation) and the tables, SPSS extracts has been displayed in the annexure as a supplement document. It contains output for most of the probable questions asked for students through questionnaire and the findings with interpretation has been listed below for quick reference.

At the outset, 36% of the total respondents including male and female say due to SNS, they will have distraction in studies. In that, 43% male respondents and 30% female respondents are distracted from their studies due to Social Networking Sites (SNSs), around 37% male and female respondents say, not distracted from their studies and interestingly 34% of female respondents say that may be to some extent they have been distracted from studies due to SNSs. This clearly depicts that students will have distraction in studies through the use of SNS. 52% of the respondents use mobile as a mode of accessing SNS whereas 42% use laptop/computer. This clearly depicts that respondents will use different mode accessing SNS. 55% of the respondents has a view that addiction to SNS’s is a serious problematic issue that affects their academic life and 45% will not consider this to be true.

61% respondents aged between 18-20 years says that SNS is important in student’s life, 57% of them aged between 20-22 years, 69% of them aged between 22-24 years and 66% of them aged 24 years and above says SNS is important in student’s life. 57% respondents aged between 18-20 years reported addiction of SNS is a serious Problematic issue for academic life, 55% of them are aged between 20-22 years, 50% of them are aged between 22-24 years, 62% of them are aged 24 years and above reported that addiction of SNS is a serious Problematic issue for academic life. 53% aged between 18-20 years, 50% aged between 20-22 years, 53% aged between 22-24 years and 49% aged between 24 years and above are finding it difficult to concentrate on their studies. 40% of them know about LinkedIn as professional site and 60% are having no idea about the LinkedIn. 78% aged 24 years and above know LinkedIn. 41% of them browse Facebook less than an hour, 11% of them 1-2 hours a day, 21% of them 2-4 hours, 16% of them 4 hours in a day and around 11% of them have never used the Facebook. 46% of them aged 24 years and above browse 2-4 hours a day and 41% of them browse less than 1 hour a day. 35% of female respondents claim that their frequency of uploading picture is once in month and 26% male respondents claim that at least once a week to upload picture.

Among the respondents who are aware of LinkedIn, 27% browse less than 1 hour, 6% browse 1-2 hours, 7% browse 2-4 hours and 57% browse more than 4 hours in a day. Interestingly, 4% never used. 66% of the respondents aged between 18-20 years browse LinkedIn more than 4 hours a day. 29% of the respondents found their girlfriend/boyfriend through Facebook and that too interestingly, respondents aged less than 22 years equals to 29%. Around 11% are uploading pictures daily, 11% for every 2 days, 6%
between 2 to 5 days, 27% at least a week, 9% once in 15 days, 25% once in a month, and 11% never upload their picture in the Facebook. The respondents aged 24 years & above constitute 40% in uploading their picture in Facebook at least a week.

Around 25% of them are using Facebook since less than a year, 16% between 1 to 2 years, 24% between 2 to 3 years, 23% between 3 to 5 years and 12 % more than 5 years. The respondents aged 24 years & above are 51% using between 3 to 5 years and people aged between 18-20 years constitute to 31% using less than a year. 27% of them browse unknown profile frequently and send friend request anonymously.68% of the respondents got to know about Facebook by their friends, 10% by relatives, 10% by the newspaper/magazine/websites, 6% by the Facebook campaign and 7% by the invite sent by friends via Email. Around 74% respondents aged between 18-20 years got to know about Facebook by their friends.43% of respondents are Using SNS for their academic purpose and 26% use SNS only sometimes for the academic purpose. Interestingly, 43% respondents say faculty members give enough awareness about SNS in connection to academic purpose.51% of them are using SNS for personal or social but not be used for education and 58% respondents expressed that using SNS requires spending money & wastage of money and SNS are used for personal or social but not be used for education.43% of the respondents consider use of SNS as an effective communication application and 28% says only at times using SNS can be considered as an effective communication application. 54% of them say SNS can be considered as effective communication application and Use SNS for academic purpose like Group discussion. It implies that more than half of the total respondents are using SNS for improving their communication skill. 51% of them are finding it usage of SNS as difficult to concentrate on their studies and around 69% of them say SNS distracts from their studies and feeling difficult to concentrate on their studies.

67% of the respondents are using SNS for academic activities and they have considered SNS is very important in student's life. Only around 15% responded that SNS is not very important for student's life. The respondents who are browsing unknown profile and sent friend request anonymously are 47% and they are trusting all the information provided in SNS is true and fair. Similarly, 47% of respondents do not browse unknown profile and also they do not trust the information provided in SNS. 19% of the respondents prefer Facebook in making friends, 5% in searching and managing their old friends, 26% says SNS leads in breaking-down their relationship, only 6% are connected with faculties and 17% in keeping communication with Facebook. 13% of the respondents are influenced by political issues through Facebook, 23% towards social issues, 38% towards conflict with friend’s network and 7% by religious issues through Facebook. 66% of the respondents with an age group between 18-20 years use Facebook. Out of total respondents, 60% of the respondents using Facebook. This clearly depicts that majority of the students are using Facebook.

Conclusion

SNS have become popular in the modern days. Most of the people especially teenagers and students have been attached to SNS. SNS has become the source of a way to kill tediousness where people could spend their spare time in use for entertainment and educational purposes. Thus, the researchers conducted this study to find out more about the effect of SNS. The observations drawn from the data shows that students have started using Social networks for academic purposes. While some students perceived SNS’s as a distraction. The use of SNS gave them a sense of belonging to an academic community. The study has revealed that despite the benefits that come with a participation of students on SNS’s such as sharing information and ideas, improving reading skill etc. If not used properly, it could impact negatively on their academic performance. The beneficial results of this research shows that SNS’s has a significant influence in the academic performance of the students, yet the use of these networks has to be disciplined as it can lead to distraction from education. Therefore, SNS’s strive with academic work for student’s attention. It is therefore the responsibility of the students to make the right decision in relation to the use of SNS’s to bring about the positive outcome that is desired. The institutions or faculty members and interaction between the students favored academic learning and provides awareness about SNS’s. In the results acquired, it may be concluded that social media facilitates the academic experience with the majority of the participants but need to control and manage their time.
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Exhibit 1: Age and Addiction of SNS is a Serious Problematic Issue for Academic Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Addiction to SNS's is a serious problematic issue that affects my academic life</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 &amp; above</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.477a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 2: Age and Difficult to Concentrate on my Studying & knowing SNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Difficult to concentrate on my studies and knowing SNS’s Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 3: Can SNS be Considered as Effective Communication Application and you use SNS for Academic Purpose like Group Discussion

Can SNS’s be considered as an effective communication application * You use SNS’s for academic purpose like Group discussions Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can SNS’s be considered as an effective communication application</th>
<th>You use SNS’s for academic purpose like Group discussions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Can SNS’s be considered as an effective communication application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Can SNS’s be considered as an effective communication application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Can SNS’s be considered as an effective communication application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Can SNS’s be considered as an effective communication application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>59.771a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>59.961</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>58.463</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.62.
Exhibit 4: SNS Distracts from Studies and Difficult to Concentrate on my Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNS,s distracts from studies</th>
<th>Difficult to concentrate on my studies and knowing SNS’s</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within SNS,s distracts from studies</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within SNS,s distracts from studies</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be, to some extent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within SNS,s distracts from studies</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within SNS,s distracts from studies</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within SNS,s distracts from studies</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% within SNS,s distracts from studies</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within SNS,s distracts from studies</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within SNS,s distracts from studies</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>81.026a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>82.823</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>34.353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases 1000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 131.49.

Exhibit 5: I Use SNS to Facilitate Academic Activities and Importance of SNS In Student’s Life

I Use SNS’s to Facilitate Academic Activities and Coordinate with Classmates and Friends * Importance of SNS’s in Student’s Life Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I use SNS’s to facilitate academic activities and coordinate with classmates and friends</th>
<th>Importance of SNS’s in student’s life</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within I use SNS’s to facilitate academic activities and coordinate with classmates and friends</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within I use SNS’s to facilitate academic activities and coordinate with classmates and friends</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be, to some extent</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within I use SNS’s to facilitate academic activities and coordinate with classmates and friends</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within I use SNS’s to facilitate academic activities and coordinate with classmates and friends</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>43.811a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>42.157</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>39.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.86.

### Exhibit 6: Gender and SNS’s Distract from Studies Gender * SNS’s Distracts from Studies Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SNS’s distracts from studies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>May be, to some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>30.890a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>31.276</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>5.833</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 126.90.

### Exhibit 7: Gender and Mode of Accessing SNS Gender * Mode of Accessing SNS’s Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mode of Accessing SNS’s</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Laptop/Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.373a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.458</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>12.375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.26.
Exhibit 8: Gender and SNS are used for Personal or Social but cannot be Used for Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>These SNS's are used for personal or social but cannot be used for Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% within Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.721a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correctionb</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Casesb</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 230.30.
- b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Exhibit 9: Gender and SNS's be Considered as an Effective Communication Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can SNS's be considered as an effective communication application</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>21.424a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>21.548</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Casesb</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.49.

Exhibit 10: Gender and Important of SNS in Student's Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of SNS's in student's life</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 11: Gender and Addiction to SNS’s is a serious problematic issue that affects my academic life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Addiction to SNS’s is a serious problematic issue that affects my academic life</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.348a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>2.157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 211.03.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

### Exhibit 12: Gender and Difficult to concentrate on my studies and knowing SNS’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Difficult to concentrate on my studies and knowing SNS’s</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.419a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>8.055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>30.894a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correctionb</td>
<td>30.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>30.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>30.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>30.992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N of Valid Casesb     | 1000 |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 228.89. b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Exhibit 13: Gender and Do you have an idea about LinkedIn

Gender * Do you have an idea about “LinkedIn” Cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Do you have an idea about “LinkedIn”</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>45.080a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>46.488</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N of Valid Casesb | 1000 |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 51.23.