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ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CA : Communications Authority of Kenya
CCK : Communications Commission of Kenya
E-mail : Electronic mail
GO : Gratifications Obtained
GS : Gratifications Sought
ICT : Information and Communication Technology
IT : Information Technology
SNSs : Social Networking Sites
SPSS : Statistical Package for Social Sciences
U&G : Uses and Gratifications
USIU-A : United States International University-Africa
WWW : World Wide Web
ABSTRACT

Since its invention, a large portion of millennials now use Facebook as a means of communication. The popularity of Facebook among millennials has grown exponentially, albeit with little accompanying research to understand the motivators towards this engagement by millennials with this technology. The purpose of this study was to establish the uses and gratifications of Facebook among millennials in Kenya, with a focus on students of the United States International University-Africa. The specific objectives were to describe the uses of Facebook among millennials at USIU-A, to identify the underlying motivations for Facebook use among millennials at USIU-A, and to establish the consequences of Facebook use among millennials at USIU-A. The research problem was studied through descriptive research design. The target population was 6,700 students drawn from the four schools in USIU-A, and a sample size of 363 students was drawn using simple random sampling and stratified sampling technique. The collected data was coded and entered into Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 24.0. The study found that Facebook is largely used by millennials to connect with their friends, with other people, to upload short articles, videos, photos, and to share information forwarded by friends. The study also found that personal identity, surveillance, social capital/ social interactivity and diversion motivated most users of the Facebook platform. However, Facebook was found to have negatively affected users’ efficiency in completing class assignments and millennials felt tempted to check their Facebook accounts during class time, which was distractive. The study concluded that uses of Facebook had the greatest effect on Facebook behavioural usage, followed by underlying motivations to use Facebook, while consequences of using Facebook had the least effect on the Facebook behavioural usage among millennials. The study recommends that students should be encouraged to modify their personal time tables, avoid spending too much time on Facebook, and that there should be increased training for students and academic staff on how to use Facebook and the wide range of Internet services/resources available to enhance learning, teaching and research.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION
Social media platforms like Facebook, Myspace, LinkedIn, and Twitter are popular sites among millennials (Pew Reports, 2011). About two-thirds of the millennials around the world use different social media platforms to interact with friends and family members, with each of the social media sites fulfilling different needs that other tools cannot completely facilitate (Quan-Haase & Young, 2010). There are several reasons that motivate users to adopt social media platforms, the major reasons being to stay in contact with current friends and family members, and to maintain old friendships (Pew reports, 2011).

Millennials are individuals born after 1980, often characterized by heavy digital media usage and a unique preference for smart phones (Quan-Haase & Young, 2010). They are both experimental and experiential. They are quick to criticize and expect instant feedback. They spend more time on the social spaces on the Internet and increasingly, their work and play revolve around online platforms; essentially, the internet is their first port of call for all things (Wallace, 2013). Indeed, millennials use social media to gratify different needs. This could however present positive and negative consequences on an individual’s use of social media. Despite the fact that a number of studies have been done to establish how individuals utilize the media and the needs they gratify, most studies have tended to focus on the traditional mass media. Recently, similar studies focusing on social media have been on the increase. Unfortunately, many of these studies have been carried out in western nations such as the United States, thus posing a need for similar studies to be conducted in Third World countries, including Kenya. This study specifically focused on the reasons that motivate millennials to use Facebook, which is currently the most popular social media platform in Kenya.

1.1 Background of the Problem
Facebook has grown to become the most popular social media platform as a channel of communication among millennials, many of them college students (White & Pelling, 2009). In June 2017, Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg announced that the platform had reached 2 billion users, with most day 1 users capitalizing on the platform to connect with friends and family. This was an outstanding achievement since the launch of the platform
in 2004 (facebook.com), ultimately making it the world’s largest social media network (reuters.com). The findings from the Facebook annual report of the year 2016 indicated that there were close to 1.23 billion daily active users on the platform, which represented an increase of 18% compared to users in the year 2015. Kenyan Facebook users accounted for about 7.2 million users in December 2016, which represents a rise of about 21% in comparison with the same period in 2014. These findings provide a favourable benchmark and background for this study in the quest to establish uses and gratifications of Facebook among millennials in Kenya.

As a social media platform, Facebook is an Internet-based application that enhances the creation and sharing of content generated by its users (Haenlein & Kaplan, 2010). Currently, Facebook is one of the major social media platforms used by organizations to pass messages about their products, then used by friends to pass mass information to their groups and social circles. As a social network, Facebook provides an appropriate platform towards the optimization of communication among people like millennials with similar ideologies and interests, while bringing them to a common place despite their different geographical locations. Thanks to its instant communication capabilities, Facebook allows for real-time feedback, making it a suitable communication platform.

In many countries, millennials account for a significant section of the population, making them a notable age-group (White & Pelling, 2009). Millennials are described as people born approximately between 1982 and 2002. Besides being heavy users of Facebook, they are also strongly associated with heavy use of technology (Boyd & Ellison, 2008). In the United States, it is estimated that the population of millennials will be about 90 million by the year 2020 (Kaur & Kaur, 2015). In the Kenyan context, statistics from the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) indicate that millennials make up about 45.9% of the population, nearly half of the total population in Kenya (Mwangi, 2013). The increase in the number of millennials in Kenya has greatly influenced the use of the Internet in the country. Internet usage among millennials has grown tremendously, with recent studies indicating that Kenyan millennials incur a cost of about Ksh2.2 billion every year in buying Internet data from telecommunication industry providers so as to access social media platforms. The platforms include Facebook, Whatsapp, Instagram and Twitter, all of which they can conveniently access through their mobile phones. Over time, this has put Kenya in the leading position in East Africa in data usage (Consumer Insight, 2013).
Facebook has become a popular platform among millennials, many of whom are university students with an account on the vast networking platform (Abdullahi, Said, & Ibrahim, 2011). Initially, in the year 2005, Facebook was used for fun and to keep up with social activities, rather than instant messaging—which was adopted by university students to maintain and develop old and new relationships (Quan-Haase & Young, 2010). As the years went by, Facebook established itself as an alternative channel alongside traditional means of communication. This growing trend has prompted researchers to become interested and to investigate what motivates people to use Facebook and to establish how they have benefited from that usage, as well as why people use Facebook and their interaction with others. Although Facebook and other Social Network Sites (SNSs) have been used by people for well over a decade, it remains highly relevant to understand why people use them.

One of the most appropriate approaches to examine the questions of “how” and “why” individuals use Facebook comes from the perspective of the uses and gratifications (U&G) theory, which was originally developed to examine the uses of traditional media—radio, newspapers and television (Katz, Blumler & Gurevitch, 1974). The U&G theory is an audience-centred approach that seeks to answer the question of “what people do with the media available to them”. A central tenet of U&G theory is that people are not passive but are active in seeking and selecting media and their source of content to satisfy their needs (Swanson, 1992). More elaborately, people make choices about what they consume; their choices are guided by the uses they believe they can make of the media and the gratification they gain from media experiences (Arnett, Larson, & Offer, 1995).

The U&G theory is based on the notion that the media cannot influence an individual unless that person has some use for that media or its messages (Rubin, 2002). This marks a shift from the traditional viewpoint of “powerful-media-effects” theories in which an audience is depicted as passive and easily manipulated by media influences. According to Severin and Tankard (2001), the theory attempts to explain the uses and functions of the media for individuals, groups, and society in general. There are three key objectives in developing the uses and gratifications theory, which are also pertinent to this study: To explain how individuals use mass communication to gratify their needs; to discover underlying motivations for individuals' media use; and to identify the positive and the negative consequences of individual media use (Swanson, 1992). The theory affirms one
of the key assumptions of this study, namely, that people are not helpless victims of mass media, but use the media to get specific gratifications.

The social value that Facebook can offer may be different from one individual to another depending on their cultural backgrounds. The underlying assumption is that audiences are active and that they seek out that content which provides the most gratification. The level of gratification depends on the level of need or interest by the individual (Fawkes & Gregory, 2001).

According to Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974), the past few years have witnessed a revival of direct empirical investigation in regards to audience uses and gratifications. Each of these studies attempts to press towards a greater systemization and contribution to what is involved in conducting research within this field. Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch added that the U&G approach is concerned with the social and psychological origins of needs, which generate expectations of the mass media or other sources. This, then, leads to different patterns of media exposure (or engagement in other activities), resulting in the need for gratifications and other consequences—perhaps mostly unintended ones. This model informed the present study in the sense that millennials have social and psychological needs, which then determine the Gratifications Sought (GS) through Facebook; they also have expectations, which move them to access social media and engage in different online activities, resulting in Gratifications Obtained (GO) and other consequences (both positive and negative), mostly unintended. Despite Facebook’s growing popularity, there is limited research focusing on students’ use of Facebook and the gratifications derived from this medium (Ezumah, 2013).

1.2 Statement of the Problem
Since its invention, Facebook as a social networking site has changed from a few-user-based site into a nook for billions of users, all of whom can access the platform for different reasons. A large portion of millennials is using Facebook as a means of communication. Tentatively, the popularity of Facebook among millennials has grown exponentially, with little accompanying research to understand the motivators of millennials’ engagement with this technology (Kaur & Kaur, 2015). While a variety of individual-level factors—both stable and dynamic—may influence millennials in their
social media use, there is still a need to establish and understand the motivators of millennials’ engagement with this technology (Mwangi, 2013).

Given the ubiquity of social media in today’s environment, it should come as no surprise that students who are millennials in connected places are drawn to using the technologies, even when they should be doing other tasks (Block, 2008; & Young, 2008). A major drawback to this social media usage is the amount of time spent on the platforms (Wang, Chen, and Liang, 2011). The time students spend online has an impact towards their activities, and access to media is an indicator on the online platform’s usage patterns (Van Dijk, 2005). The most popular social networking site to date is Facebook (Rainie, Smith, & Duggan, 2013), followed by Twitter (Brenner & Smith, 2013), and LinkedIn (Duggan & Brenner, 2012). Facebook allows users to set up a profile and post updates, links, photos, conversations, and the like. Sponcil and Gitimu (2007) reported that 88.5% of users recognized Facebook as their preferred social media site (p. 7). Wang et al. (2011) reported that students spend roughly 100 minutes per day on Facebook. In 2007, 92% of college students reported that they had a Facebook account. Consequently, the use of social networking and social media technologies (SNT) has become pandemic among young people (Tess, 2013; Falahah & Rosmala, 2012), with more schools incorporating use of the Internet into daily school work for a good cause.

However, students have concerns about their Internet usage and balancing social life, extracurricular activities, and even part-time jobs. In particular, “70% reported that they stay online longer than they intend. This suggests that the ubiquity of and ease of access to the Internet are not without a potential downside (Christakis, Moreno, Jelenchick, Myaing, & Zhou, 2011). Students view social media as a way to release pressure from school assignments (Wang et al., 2011). However, a balance between social media use and academic effort is imperative to improve student grades (Brydolf, 2007; Capano, Deris, & Desjardin, 2014; Junco, Helbergert, & Loken, 2011).

Previous related local studies include Kinda (2007), who conducted a study on the uses and gratifications of the Internet among college students in Kenya in a case study of the Kenya School of Professional Studies. Njiiri (2011) also examined the usage of social networking sites and their effect on communication patterns of college students at the University of Nairobi. Warwimbo (2015) focused on the gratifications sought from social
media by Kenyan users and leverages for local ICT development, while Sikolia (2015) studied factors influencing the choice of social network sites among high school teenagers in Nairobi, Kenya.

Review of literature reveals that there is a dearth of information on the motivation behind millennials’ use of Facebook, particularly in Kenya. Social media has increased student engagement outside the classroom and they are creating new and innovative ways to learn (see Ivala & Gachago, 2012; Bynum, 2011). Review of literature further reveals that the use and effect of Facebook among millennials in Kenya has received limited scholarly attention. With the increased accessibility and availability of the Internet, the use of Facebook is on the rise among millennials in Kenya. It is therefore important to establish the primary needs fulfilled by millennials through the use of Facebook, how much time users spend on the site, and what gratifications they get from the platform. By utilizing the uses and gratifications theory, the aim of this study was to explore the uses and gratifications of Facebook among millennials in Kenya.

Considerable research work and news articles have been published regarding the uses and gratification of Facebook among millennials as a social networking site in developed countries, but there is a void in research that directly addresses Facebook use and gratifications and its social impact in developing countries—and in particular Kenya. This study was therefore useful in filling this gap in several aspects, and the results of the study would be useful in advancing theoretical developments of the uses and gratification theory. This study would also form a basis for future researches on Facebook as a social networking site and the impact of new media on the youth. The data collected and the results of the study will also be useful to millennials, parents and lecturers, who will be in a position to understand why Facebook has become so popular.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to establish the uses and gratifications of Facebook among millennials in Kenya, with a focus on students of the United States International University-Africa.

To achieve this purpose, the study set out to achieve the following objectives:
1.3.1 **Research Objectives**

i. To describe the uses of Facebook among millennials at the United States International University-Africa.

ii. To identify the underlying motivations for Facebook use among millennials at the United States International University-Africa.

iii. To establish the consequences of Facebook use among millennials at the United States International University-Africa.

1.4 **Research Questions**

RQ 1. What are the various uses of Facebook as a social networking site among millennials at the United States International University-Africa?

RQ 2. Which motivations trigger the use of Facebook among millennials at the United States International University-Africa?

RQ 3. How does Facebook use among millennials at the United States International University-Africa affect them, either positively or negatively?

1.5 **Significance of the study**

There is need to probe deeply into the gains being sought and the gratifications that lead to the Facebook craze, with hundreds of millions of minutes being spent on the application daily. The users and institutions—as well as the providers of technological solutions—can then have an informed basis of harnessing the benefits, mitigating risks, and emulating or replicating the areas of success. The study will also contribute towards the understanding of media in the lives of millennials.

Many Kenyan millennials spend an enormous amount of time on social media platforms, yet the reasons and intentions for this remain unknown; once this is known, it will be possible for ICT policy makers to initiate control measures on how social media is to be used to the benefit of users, especially students. This can be done at both organizational and regulatory levels.

Since there is barely any local literature on uses and gained gratifications from local Facebook usage, the proposed study endeavours to furnish and enrich the existing social
media literature in this particular area. It is a knowledge gap that deserves serious review owing to the existing large and growing subscriber base for Facebook. It will also contribute towards the body of knowledge on the use of social networking sites in developing countries. The results of the study will additionally be useful in advancing theoretical developments of the uses and gratification theory, and also form a basis for future researches on social networking sites and the impact of new media on millennials. Furthermore, it is envisaged that knowledge on and understanding of gratification factors influencing millennials’ choice of Facebook may provide insight into teenage online communication preferences. This will in the long run significantly alter online communication messages targeting teenagers.

1.6 Scope of the Study
The scope of the study was limited to students of USIU-A; this university was selected because it has a large number of students who are tech savvy and has a large number of Facebook users. According to the university marketing and communications department—which often interacts with university students—about 78% of students have Facebook accounts, with 67% constantly seeking news and trends on Facebook. USIU-A is committed not only to academic growth but also to students’ social and cultural growth. Facebook is ubiquitous on college campuses today. The millennial generation, of which college students are members, have the highest concentration of social media usage. This means that a survey was easy to conduct.

1.7 Definition of Terms

Facebook usage pattern
Facebook usage pattern refers to the frequency and length of Facebook visits by the individual users (Kaur & Kaur, 2015).

Use
Use means selectively using media expected to satisfy users’ needs (Chung, Koo, & Park, 2012).

Gratification
Gratification refers to a source of satisfaction or pleasure (McCauley, 2014). It refers to pleasure, especially when gained from the satisfaction of a desire (Hornby, 2010).
**Motivation**

The word motivation can be defined as those forces within an individual that push or propel him/her to satisfy basic needs or wants. In addition, motivation means stimulation and compensation that induces the use of media.

**Social Media**

Social Media refers to forms of electronic communication through which users create online communities to share information, ideas, personal messages and other content (Ezumah, 2013).

**Social Capital**

This is the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007).

**User**

A user is a person or thing that interacts with something (McCauley, 2015), in this context a person who interacts with Facebook.

**Social Media Platform**

Social media platforms are generally defined as Internet-based and persistent channels of mass-personal communication facilitating perceptions of interactions among users and deriving value primarily from user-generated content (Carr & Hayes, 2015).

**Facebook**

Facebook is an Internet-based application that enhances the creation and sharing of content generated by users (Haenlein & Kaplan, 2010).

**Facebook sharing**

This is the process of pushing information on products and their uses to customers through Facebook as a platform (Belch & Belch, 2015).
1.8 Chapter Summary

The chapter outlined the background of the study, and the statement of the problem in the context of uses and gratifications of Facebook among millennials. It further laid out the specific objectives of the research, the value and scope of the study, as well as the working definitions of specific terminology used. Chapter two covers the literature review in line with the research questions, while Chapter three details the research methodology used. Chapter four presents the research results and findings, while chapter five presents discussions, conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter presents literature related to the uses and gratification of Facebook among millennials. The theoretical framework that was used, followed by the literature review, conceptual framework, and summary are discussed in this section.

2.2 Theoretical Framework: Uses and Gratification Theory
Uses and gratification theory (UGT) is an audience-centred approach that focuses on what people do with media, as opposed to what media does to people (Blumler & Katz, 1974). Littlejohn and Foss (2008) add that the U&G approach focuses on the audience rather than the message. Media users play an active role in choosing and using the media. The theory takes the audience member to be active and goal-directed, and a discriminating user of media. Users take an active part in the communication process and are goal-oriented in their media use. The users are also able to get materials that would be useful to them and answer to their needs. The theorists say that a media user seeks out a media source that best fulfils the needs of the user (Haridakis, 2002). Largely, the audience is responsible for choosing media to meet their own needs. Media, according to U&G, is considered to be only one of the factors contributing to how audiences’ needs get met, and the audiences are assumed to have considerable agency—or in essence know their need and how to gratify those needs.

This study utilizes uses and gratification (U&G) theory as propounded by Blumler and Katz in 1974. Despite the fact that it was developed before the millenial term was coined, it offers a good background of the study. Uses and gratification assumes that the user has alternate choices to satisfy their need. According to Mull and Lee (2014), U&G assumes that media users take on an active role in their use of media, with a certain goal or objective in mind. The user is motivated to behave in a particular manner in order to reach this goal or objective. That is, the user’s specific motivations to consume the media are the driving force behind seeking the media out. The importance of traditional U&G research is on individual differences and active audience members. That is, gratifications obtained from the media are mostly based on a given user’s pre-existing needs, rather than on specific technological features of media (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). Since the
users have alternative choices they can use to satisfy their needs, it is favourable for social media to have concrete information that interests the consumers and hence satisfies their needs.

In this study, UGT was deemed relevant in understanding how we as individuals connect with the technologies around us. These technologies span everything from the Internet to video gaming to mobile phones. UGT research into mobile-phone usage has found that people seek a number of gratifications from their phones, including affection/sociability, entertainment, and mobility, among others. As another example of a contemporary technology, when using Facebook, users can be motivated by factors like a need to vent negative feelings, recognition, and cognitive needs.

Blumler and Katz (1974) believe that media consumers can choose the influence media has on them as well, as the idea that users choose media alternatives merely as a means to an end.

2.2.1 Historical Development of Uses and Gratification (U&G) Theory

The U&G perspective further relies on the school of thought that individual use of media is occasioned by various social and psychological needs. Generally, the U&G model involves factor analysis to group items with similar or shared meanings in order to identify the main motivational themes or dimensions. A number of studies suggest that there can be multiple motivational dimensions identified for each type of media. Some types of media may share these motivational dimensions or the dimensions may be unique identifiers for a specific type of media (Mull & Lee, 2014). In addition, McQuail (1983) proposes that there are four general gratifications obtained from using mass media that can be applied to all media: Entertainment, information, personal identity, and integration and social interaction.

Previous scholars of U&G theory have focused on social and psychological variables as determinants of motivation to use various media, with some focusing on the difference between gratifications sought and gratifications actually obtained through media use (Rubin, 2009; Palmgreen et al., 1985). The dominant belief appears to be that motives or needs drive the actual use or gratification obtained from different types of media (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). Subsequently, in U&G research, motives (constructs) reflect the
gratifications that people seek and potentially receive from using media (Rubin, 2009; Sundar & Limperos, 2013).

In an attempt to capture the social and psychological needs for mass media exposure, a classical research survey was done by some of the prominent scholars of U&G Theory (Katz, Haas, & Gurevitch, 1973). They classified these needs into five major areas relating to a user's need for information, knowledge, and understanding; aesthetic, pleasurable and emotional experience; credibility, confidence, stability, and status; contact with family, friends, and the world; and lastly, the needs relating to escape or tension-release. To achieve the purposes of their research, which was to gauge the important things for the audience in using different media, each category of needs was assessed against its corresponding user expectations—which could be the strengthening, weakening, or acquisition of the stated needs. Further, the analysis of the needs was subjected separately to various frames of reference, such as against self, family, friends, traditions, and others.

According to Stafford et al. (2004), uses and gratifications of media use by audiences could also be broadly classified as either content-centred or process-centred. Cutler and Danowski (1980), explain that “content gratifications” concern the messages carried by the medium, and “process gratifications” concern actual use of the medium itself. Drawing an analogy from the work of Hoffman and Novak (1996), they further state that internet users may be motivated by the enjoyment of the usage processes (recreational function) or specific site-related informational content (informative function). Hoffman and Novak also mention the social gratification function of the internet as an important need gratification area, too.

Quan-Haase and Young (2010) argued that in U&G theory a key distinction is made between gratifications obtained and gratifications sought. Quan-Haase and Young draw this distinction by arguing that “gratifications obtained (GO) refer to those gratifications that audience members actually experience through the use of a particular medium (p.352), whereas gratifications sought (GS), refer to those gratifications that audience members expect to obtain from a medium before they have actually come into contact with it (Quan-Haase & Young, 2010).
According to Rubin (2009), at the core of uses and gratifications is the concept of audience activity. This “audience activity” includes a range of meanings: (1) utility—motivations for communicating; (2) intentionality—purposive nature of communicating; (3) selectivity—communication choice based on prior interests; and (4) imperviousness to influence—audiences are obstinate. Therefore, all audience members are not equally active. This demonstrates why new media technologies may only initiate online actions for passive audiences but drive active audiences to engage in offline actions.

Song, Larose, Eastin and Lin (2004) found seven gratification factors specific to the Internet. These are virtual community, information seeking, aesthetic experience, monetary compensation, diversion, personal status, and relationship maintenance. From the foregoing arguments, it is quite clear that teens indeed seek a variety of gratifications from SNSs and in turn gain different satisfactions from the same. Dunne, Lawlor, and Rowley (2010) reinforce this by classifying gratifications sought as communication; friending; identity creation and management; entertainment; escapism and alleviation of boredom; information search; and interaction. This is seen against gratifications obtained, which include portrayal of one’s ideal image; peer acceptance; relationship maintenance; safety from embarrassment and rejection; and engagement in playground politics (Dunne, Lawlor, & Rowley, 2010).

2.2.2 Core Assumptions of the Uses and Gratification Theory

According to Katz and Blumler (1974), the assumptions of the U&G approach are outlined as follows: First, the audience is active, and thus mass media use is goal-directed; second, the initiative in linking need gratification with media choice lies mainly with the audience member; third, the media competes with other sources in the quest to satisfy needs; and fourth, the gratifications sought from the media include amusement and entertainment, in addition to information, all of which will vary according to the social roles and psychological nature of individual audience members (O’Donohoe, 1994).

Uses and gratifications scholars assume that audiences actively select their uses of media from the assortment of possibilities available in society. U&G also assumes that what drives this media use reflects each individual’s conscious or unconscious consideration of the usefulness of media in his or her life (Reinhard & Dervin, 2009). Broadly speaking, U&G is an audience-centred approach, which suggests that individuals have particular
needs that drive the selection of certain types of media (Rubin, 2009)—that is, people’s needs influence the media they choose, how they use the media, and what gratifications they receive from using the media. The theory emphasizes audience choice by assessing their reasons or motivations for using a certain type of media, as well as the various gratifications obtained from the media based on social and psychological requirements (Severin & Tankard, 1997). The ultimate goal of U&G research is to understand the interaction between the origins of media user needs and context (Palmgreen, Wenner, & Rosengren, 1985).

Uses and gratifications theory takes a more humanistic approach to looking at media use. The floodgate to a flurry of deliberate empirical enquiries on the uses and gratifications paradigm was opened by the pioneering works of Elihu Katz, Jay Blumler and Michael Gurevitch (Katz, 1979). Additionally, Blumler and Katz came up with the theory that suggested that media users play an active role in choosing and using the media. Uses and gratification theory assumes users take an active part in the communication process and are goal-oriented in their media use. The theorists say that a media user seeks out a media source that best fulfils the needs of the user. Uses and gratification assume that the user has alternate choices to satisfy their need (Blumler & Katz, 1974).

Blumler and Katz further believe that there is not merely one way that the populace uses media. Instead, they believe there are as many reasons for using the media as there are media users. According to the theory, media consumers have a free will to decide how they will use the media and how it will affect them. Blumler and Katz values are clearly seen by the fact that they believe that media consumers can choose the influence media has on them, as well as the idea that users choose media alternatives merely as a means to an end (Blumler & Katz, 1974). Uses and gratification is the optimist's view of the media. The theory takes out the possibility that the media can have an unconscious influence over our lives and how we view the world.

The core question for the theory concerns why people use media and what they use them for (McQuail, 2005). According to an analysis by Rossi (2002), based on Katz, Blunder, and Gurevitch’s Mass Communication Research book, the uses and gratification theory has five basic assumptions. The first assumption is that the audience is conceived as active. This idea focuses around the assumption that the media users are goal-oriented and
attempt to achieve their goals through the media source. This directly reflects and responds to the needs of the audience member in obtaining the media source. The second basic assumption is that "in the mass communication process, much initiative in linking need gratification and media choice lies with the audience member. This is encompassing the idea that people use the media to their advantage more often than the media uses them. The third basic assumption is that "the media competes with other sources of need satisfaction." This focuses on the idea that each individual has several needs. The fourth basic assumption points out that "many of the goals media uses can be derived from data supplied by the individual audience members themselves." This idea claims that people are aware of their motives and choices and are able to explain these verbally if necessary. The final basic assumption is that "value judgments about cultural significance of mass communication should be suspended while audience operations are explored on their own terms." The theorists believe that the audience can only determine the value of the media content. It is the individual audience members who make the decision to view the media; therefore, they place the value on it by their individual decision to view it. These basic assumptions provide a framework for understanding the exact correlation between the media and audience. In addition, it provides a distinction as to how the audience is more or less active and the consequences of their involvement in the media as a whole.

2.2.3 Criticisms of the Uses and Gratification Theory

U&G is both one of the most-often used and criticized theoretical frameworks. There are four major areas of critique: Conceptual ambiguity of motivations, needs, and uses; lack of a uniform way of measuring media use and heavy reliance on self-reports; problematic assumption related to awareness of needs by users and being too individualistic while disregarding other contextual and cultural influences; and limited explanatory power (Rayburn, 1996). Despite these limitations, the concept of understanding why people use media is an essential empirical question that continues to change with media development. While enhancing the framework’s relevance, the continued growth and diversification of ICTs brings the challenge of diminishing consistency across media types as well as the emergence of a new set of motivations and uses in light, expanding the U&G framework (Ruggiero, 2000). The ICT boom has also led to the reconciliation of some U&G assumptions, such as the assumption about the active nature of media
audiences given that ICT facilitates individualistic and active information seeking and selection (Anderson & Meyer, 1975; Chen, 2015).

Uses and gratification theory, like any other theory, has its own strengths. One of its strengths is that it emphasizes on the audience as active in the reception of media. Defleur and Lowery (1995) point out that as the magic bullet theory came into question, it began to be replaced with explanations that described the nature and behaviour of audiences in quite different terms. Uses and gratification theory addressed the important theoretical question as to why audiences deliberately seek out some kinds of media content and completely ignore others.

During the past several decades, uses and gratification researchers have continued to conceptually refine their perspective. Researchers have conceded that the uses and gratification theory is an intelligent splice of psychological motivations and sociological functions, but nonetheless noted that materialism, reductionism, and determinism—as well as foundational empiricism—are all firmly in place.

As Orlik (2009) points out, the strength of this theory is its ability to allow researchers to study mediated communication situations via single or multiple sets of psychological needs, psychological motives, communication channels, communication content, and psychological gratifications within a particular or cross-cultural context. What the theory does is to provide a framework for understanding the when and how of different media consumers’ involvement in the media.

Despite these criticisms, many scholars have found the theory to be promising. Ruggiero (2000) finds that U&G provides a benchmark base of data for other studies to further study media use. With the rapid expansion of communication technology, the range of possible topics where U&G can be applied multiples. This flexibility is particularly important as we enter an information age in which computer-mediated communication permeates every aspect of our individual and social lives (Ruggiero, 2000).

Further, researchers such as Rubin (2002) and Ruggiero (2000) note that the emergence of new media forms—and in particular the Internet—may have revived and indeed rejuvenated U&G theory. The Internet as a mass media form, especially, lends itself to a
U&G approach, in part due to its interactive nature (Grant, 2005; Rubin, 2002; Ruggiero, 2000).

2.2.4 Studies on the Uses and Gratification Theory
A lot of studies have been undertaken on uses and gratification of Facebook among millennials and college students. One such study was conducted by Brett Bumgarner (2007), who explored the uses and gratifications of Facebook among emerging adults and indicated that the most prevalent use of Facebook was as a social activity. Students reported using Facebook with friends to view and discuss other people's profiles. Essentially, Facebook appeared primarily as a tool for the facilitation of gossip.

Another study by Foregger (2008) on uses and gratification of Facebook found that the desire to communicate with others influences the amount of time spent on Facebook. Eight factors of Facebook use and gratification were analysed. These were: Pastime; connection; sexual attraction; utilities and upkeep; re-establishment/maintenance of old ties; accumulation; social comparison; and channel use.

Further, Raacke and Bonds-Raacke (2008) conducted a study on uses and gratification to explore friendship networking sites; the study indicated that the vast majority of college students were using these sites for reasons such as making new friends and locating old friends. Bryant (2009) also carried out a study, “Uses and Gratifications of Facebook: An Exploration of Facebook Use by College Students,” which aimed to determine if uses and gratification theory could be successfully employed to describe the use of the popular Internet site Facebook. To do so, the traditional uses and gratification categories of social utility, diversion and entertainment, planning and accomplishing tasks, communication, identity outlet, and surveillance, were augmented to fit the constraints of Facebook and tested for correlation with overall intensity of Facebook use. Results indicated that uses and gratification provides a valuable tool for understanding Facebook use.

Similarly, Park, Kee, and Valenzuela (2009) surveyed 1,715 college students in order to explore their participation of Facebook groups, the gratifications obtained from involvement in these groups, and their political and civic participation offline. The results discovered four key motives for participation in Facebook activities among groups—namely, information seeking, entertainment, self-status seeking, and socializing. In addition, the results revealed gender, hometown, and year-in-school differences in
demographics in terms of the gratifications obtained from involvement in Facebook group activities. Moreover, the study found a relationship between students’ motives and civic and political participation, whereas “informational uses were more correlated to civic and political action as to recreational uses.”

Dunne, Lawlor, and Rowley (2010) did a study on young people's use of online social networking sites—a uses and gratifications perspective. The findings indicate that the participants are actively using Bebo for their own personal motives and gratifications in terms of presenting and managing a certain identity and persona in a social context. Furthermore, the relatively impersonal nature of the online environment is seen to especially facilitate the young participants in negotiating the practicalities and difficulties that often arise in real life, in terms of forging identities and managing relationships.

In a more recent study of Facebook uses and gratifications, Valentine (2011) investigated the demographics of older-age Facebook users, from the age of 35 and above, who were inadequately represented in previous studies. She found five factors that motivated older people to engage in Facebook usage. The factors were interpersonal habitual entertainment, passing time, virtual companionship escape, information seeking, and self-expression. The results of this study also indicated that Facebook members and older users tend to use the site most often for communication with people in their network, which is also reflected in previous findings reported for younger audiences.

Additionally, the use of Facebook features emerged as an essential aspect to be investigated. Smock, Ellison, Lampe, and Wohn (2011) argued that these tools and features are diverse and previous studies did not focus on these issues. By addressing these concerns, they applied U&G perspectives to explore the motives for using certain features on Facebook among undergraduate students. Smock and his colleagues found that students’ motives for using Facebook is determined by their use of different features like wall posts, status updates, comments, private messages, groups, and chat. The results indicated different motives for different features. For instance, status updates is predicted by the expressing information-sharing motive, and writing on Facebook friends’ walls is positively predicted by social interaction, habitual pastime, and professional advancement.
Further, Sikolia (2015) studied factors influencing the choice of social network sites among high school teenagers in Nairobi, Kenya. Findings revealed that the independent variables of personal identity, surveillance, and social capital significantly influenced the choice of SNSs among high school teenagers. Specifically, high school teenagers’ choice of SNSs was motivated more by the need to bridge and maintain social capital than by bonding.

Basilisco and Kyung (2015) did a study on “Uses and Gratification Motivation for Using Facebook and the Impact of Facebook Usage on Social Capital and Life Satisfaction among Filipino Users.” Facebook is considered the leading social network that has attracted millions of users across countries. However, the motivations for using Facebook may differ with each country. This study was an attempt to examine the motives of Filipinos in using Facebook and the impact of their usage to their social capital and life satisfaction. The findings of the study suggest a significant degree on the identified motivations of seeking friends, entertainment, information, and convenience, social capital and life satisfaction aside from social support.

Sasha (2015) established how millennials engage in social media activism: A uses and gratifications approach. Millennials primarily gratify intrinsic needs for interaction and belonging by engaging in social media activism behaviours. So-called “slacktivism” behaviours were most common among millennials engaging in online activism. Similarly, online activism behaviours that require greater investment from millennials were a good predictor of activism behaviours that occurred offline. Results also demonstrate that, at an individual identification level, millennials’ self-perceptions as activists predicted engagement in both online and offline activism.

Nash (2015) looked at the sses and gratifications of sharing business Facebook page content. Users share business Facebook content in order to gratify the primary needs of diversion, information, and personal identity. The need for relationships, however, was such a strong driver that it functioned within these gratifications rather than independently when “sharing” business Facebook content.

McCauley, Gumbley, Merola, McDonald, and Do (2016) studied the use of Facebook in Vietnam with regard to uses, gratifications, and narcissism. An important component in this theory is the way in which Facebook allows posting of material related to the
enhancement of the “self”, which has the potential to satisfy ego-driven needs in the form of narcissism. In conclusion, the conceptual framework and analysis of the pilot data produced a number of interrelated constructs (e.g. socializing, social enhancement, and entertainment).

Mäntymäki and Islam (2016) placed social enhancement and interpersonal connectivity as positive gratifications, while exhibitionism and voyeurism were seen as negative gratifications for SNS use. Exhibitionism, interpersonal connectivity, and voyeurism, respectively, were the strongest predictors of SNS use, and so was the number of SNS friends. The researchers found that the main reason for using Facebook and MySpace in the United States were to “meet friends” and to seek information through Facebook and Myspace connection. The study identified six reasons for using Cyworld, a popular SNS in South Korea—namely, entertainment, self-expression, professional advancement, passing time, communication with friends and families, and trends. The findings of these studies illuminate the key motives for using Facebook.

Ozanne, Navas, Mattila, and Van Hoof (2017) undertook an investigation into Facebook liking behaviour, an exploratory study. The findings of the study reveal that the like may be used to acknowledge the gratifications obtained with the use of Facebook, to share information with others, and as a tool for impression management. Four categories of gratified usage motives influencing Liking behaviour with distinctly different preferences in each culture were found. The four categories that gratified usage motives are entertainment, information/discovery, bounding, and self-identification. Three types of underlying motives dominated the use of the Like to share information: presentation of the self, presentation of the extended-self and social obligations. Finally, the Like can be used as a self-protective tool for impression management.

### 2.2.5 Relevance of the Uses and Gratifications Theory to the Study

During the 1940s, research attempted primarily to describe behaviours and categorize responses. Early researchers rarely looked at correlations between observed gratifications and the psychological origins of the satisfied need (Ruggiero, 2000). During the late 1970s, theoretical development helped researchers recognize that affected or cognitive states influenced media usage. Stress and boredom resulted in contrasting choices of media, and research by Katz and Lazarsfeld (1956) suggested that selectivity in media
choice may actually "empower" media users. Uses and gratification research has made substantial contributions to our understanding of the mass communication process. Important elements and correlations of the psychological context in which exposure to mass media occurs have been brought to light by a great many uses and gratification studies. According to Ruggiero (2000), the emergence of computer-mediated communication has revived the significance of uses and gratifications. It also provided a cutting edge theoretical approach in the initial stages of each new mass communication medium: Newspapers, radio, television, and now the Internet. The uses and gratification approach, in which uses and gratifications refer to the motivations of specific uses and the satisfaction gained from these uses, has been widely applied to assess the users’ motivations for nearly all forms of media usage. With the aim of identifying what needs individuals can gain from using a new medium, this theory has been successfully used in studies related to newspaper, radio, magazine, television and the Internet (Na Shi et al, 2010).

According to Rob Nyland (2007), since its inception as a method, the uses and gratification approach has been applied to a variety of communications media—which encompass both mass and interpersonal media. The main thrusts of these studies have been to point out the individual gratifications that are obtained through the use of the particular medium. The theory seeks to explain the uses of media and the satisfactions derived from them in terms of the motives and self-perceived needs of the user.

A broad overview of the studies reveals a predominant concentration in the areas of media use or functions as well as programme choice. Some other studies have investigated relationships such as those existing between programme type or medium and uses, between specific needs and the extent of gratification, as well as between demographic and psychographic variables on the one hand, and viewing or reading habits on the other (Nnamdi, 1995).

Beyond providing an understanding of the motives for using Facebook, U&G has also been used to predict the frequency of site visits (Joinson, 2008). These Facebook studies explain the different motivations that predict general use of the site and, in the case of Joinson (2008), predict the amount of time users spend on the site.
2.3 Uses of Facebook as a Social Networking Site among Millennials

The uses and gratification theory suggests that millennials make a conscious choice about what they want to receive when they log on to Facebook. The highest motivator for millennials most likely lies in what McQuail (2005) defined as the need for integration and social interaction. They are able to connect with family and friends, to maintain regular conversations despite distances, and to reinforce their sense of belonging to peer groups. Further, Facebook can provide millennials with information about their friends, interests, and current events (Hargittai, 2007). Similarly, Facebook provides millennials with seemingly endless hours of active entertainment. In addition to social contacts, Facebook includes a plethora of games, applications, videos and music that can interest this generation. Valenzuela, Park, and Kee (2009) found that, in addition to the reasons stated above, “Facebook helps with personal identity construction—one of the key motives for media consumption—by enabling multiple channels for interpersonal feedback and peer acceptance” (p. 882). Millennials are active audiences on Facebook and catching their attention and keeping it is vital for many organizations. The theory will be used in this study to find ways to attract millennials into using Facebook.

In addition to investigating why college students use Facebook, uses and gratification studies generally examine how college students use these sites. Lampe, Ellison, and Steinfield (2007) investigated the amount of time spent on Facebook by college students and found that 91% of respondents used Facebook for an average of 10 to 30 minutes per day. Several studies have explored and reported consistent findings regarding frequent activities performed on social networking sites. Most frequent activities reported are reading and responding to messages, newsfeed posts or invitations; commenting and posting on the wall or homepage; browsing friends’ profiles, walls and pages; viewing and commenting on photos; updating the profile; and interacting with Facebook applications (Subrahmanyam, Reich, Waechter & Espinoza, 2008).

Research on social media broadly classifies users’ activities as either contribution (posting) or consumption (lurking or observing) activities (Shao, 2009); it suggests that most users consume rather than contribute to social media (e.g. Jones et al., 2004). There is general agreement on millennial’s frequent use of social media (high intensity of use, one of the two facets of social media use but not on their social media activities (i.e., the types of use facet). Some studies suggest that millennials actively contribute content,
creating and mashing (i.e., combining content from multiple sources); that they gravitate toward social media sites where they can participate (Dye, 2007); and that they prefer to stay connected and multitask through technology (Rawlins et al., 2008). On the other hand, studies of college students (a subset of Gen Y) suggest that they spend a considerable amount of time simply consuming content (Pempek et al., 2009), just like other generations. Moreover, Gen Y uses social media for the same purposes as other cohorts: For information, leisure, or entertainment (Park et al., 2009); for socializing and experiencing a sense of community (Valkenburg et al., 2006); and for staying in touch with friends (Lenhart & Madden, 2007).

Many people join and use Facebook for various functions; the main function, however, is communication and maintaining relations. Other popular activities include updating statuses to inform others what one is up to and where they are, reading others’ status updates to find out what is happening around the world, posting photographs as well as viewing other people photographs, sending messages privately, chatting with friends, and presenting an ideal image to others as you would want to be perceived. According to Childnet International report (2008), people use social networking services for countless activities. Among the most common uses of Facebook, however, are:

2.3.1 Posting messages—public & private
Facebook has a public and private messaging service. The public messaging is available as chat or instant messaging option, where members who are online at the same time can send each other messages with/without viewing by other users on Facebook (Rubin, 2009; Sundar & Limperos, 2013). The private messaging service works like an e-mail, where the message is sent to a user's inbox; mostly, these messages are meant for the sent person and not for the public, thus the settings (Quan-Haase & Young, 2010). Many services support public and private messaging—through message boards or in-service email. Facebook offers members an Instant Messaging system (Dunne, Lawlor, & Rowley, 2010).

2.3.2 Creating and customizing profiles
Profile pages are not just beneficial in providing information for the user, they give the user an opportunity to come up with ideal images of themselves to the world—in a sense, to enhance their public relations (Lewis & West, 2009). For instance, the option on the
profile for users to give their favourite music, movies, books and quotes gives the members a chance to give personal information, and for others to refer to if they want to know them at a higher level. Most SNSs give the users the right to modify their online profiles so as to feel a sense of ownership and right to the page (Caplan, 2007; Skoric et al., 2009).

2.3.3 Authoring and uploading your own content
Many members join Facebook so as to share information in the form of current affairs, messages, video or music (Wang, Chen, and Liang, 2011). In this sense, many young people are able to use these platforms to give their opinions, stands, and ideas on issues they would not have been able to share on other platforms. Facebook becomes ideal, then, for exercising individual rights of expression (Mull & Lee, 2014).

2.3.4 Adding and sharing third party content
This is mostly accessed in the form of links; for instance, for a news story in a content-based website or a video uploaded in a video hosting service, but is accessible on a user’s profile page. This type of dynamic content makes it easy and uncomplicated to move information, content and links that one deems important from one social networking site to another (Rubin, 2009; Palmgreen et al., 1985).

2.3.5 Collaborating with other people
Facebook has the option of creating groups; people with common interests join these groups to share ideas and also to link up with users with the same ideologies (Na Shi et al, 2010). The groups give an opportunity for members to hold discussions, share and comment on various issues (Subrahmanyam, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008).

2.3.6 Connecting with existing networks, making friendships/contacts
Many young people have a tendency to use Facebook to keep in touch with their connections as well as to socialize and reinforce their current social networks. Some young people, though, join Facebook to market themselves as well as to flaunt their popularity by attracting a massive following (Quan-Haase & Young, 2010).
2.3.7 Representing themselves online, creating and developing an online presence

Networking sites such as Facebook offer a platform for users to generate and come up with their own ideal online image by forming friendships, in addition to forming extensive networks (White & Pelling, 2009).

2.3.8 Viewing content/findininformation

Some users make use of Facebook to find the details of other users they may be interested in (Kaur & Kaur, 2015). This becomes an easy way of getting information that would have been difficult to ask another person, such as their marital status or date of birth (Baker & White, 2010).

2.4 The Underlying Motives for Facebook Use among millennials

The increased use of the Internet as a new tool in communication has changed the way people interact. This fact is even more evident in the recent development and use of friend-networking sites, Facebook included. The present study was conducted to evaluate: (a) why millennials used these friend-networking sites, especially Facebook; (b) what uses and gratifications were met by using Facebook; (c) the impact Facebook use has on face-to-face communication; and (d) the amount of time millennials spent on Facebook. This study, through the uses and gratifications perspective, was built on the assumption that Facebook users select Facebook as a medium that meets specific needs. The study acknowledges that social networking sites have become a major phenomenon, completely altering people's way of life, and Facebook has not been left behind.

In Kenya, it has become a new way of life. Facebook, in essence, has become the latest platform for most Kenyans who have joined the world's largest social networking site, which boasts of 300 million active monthly users. Today, users do not need to have a computer to interact on the site. With just a java-enabled phone and subscription to local mobile-phone service providers, users can access the site without looking over their shoulders or worrying about the boss and for this reason, “Facebooking” has become a trend among students in institutions of higher learning.

According to findings of a study by Clark et al. (2007) on college students' uses of Facebook, the social site allows users an opportunity to receive daily updates with friends who are near and far. Posted updates that appear on Facebook's site allow users to share information with all of their virtual friends without having to contact each of them
individually. These updates act as the thread that allows them to maintain distant relationships. In the study, respondents stated that they primarily used Facebook to stay in touch with friends and family, and also to pass time.

Pavica (2013) conducted a survey with 172 students at a large southern research university to see what students’ motives are for using Facebook, how individual differences relate to motives for Facebook use, and to what extent motives and individual differences can predict attitudinal and behavioural outcomes of Facebook use. In light of the uses and gratification theory, the study found that millennials go to Facebook to fulfil needs traditionally fulfilled by other media, but even more for their interpersonal communication needs (relationship maintenance). Women were more likely to go to Facebook to maintain existing relationships, pass time and be entertained. On the other hand, men were more likely to go to Facebook to develop new relationships or meet new people. In looking at the above studies on uses and gratifications of Facebook, a few common factors seem to emerge: The use for interpersonal communication through email, instant messaging, and chat programs; to maintain relationships; for information acquisition; to pass time; and for entertainment. Overall, these uses seem to match with those general gratifications of media use derived by McQuail et al. (1972), particularly those of diversion, relationships, and surveillance.

The assumption made is that millennials’ choice of one or more of the five SNSs (Facebook, Twitter, Google+, LinkedIn, & Pinterest), is motivated by the four gratification factors of diversion, personal identity, surveillance and social capital.

2.4.1 Personal Identity

Personal identity is a critical variable in this study, considering that the importance of presenting a positive self-identity among millennials cannot be overemphasized. Harrison and Thomas (2009) defined identity as “the way in which users develop their online profiles and lists of friends to carry out important community processes” (Harrison & Thomas, 2009). They further outlined aspects of identity as follows: Impression management, which is concerned with personal identity formation; friendship management, which is linked to impression management in that users utilize publicly-displayed profiles of others to choose who they would like to include as friends on their lists; network structure, which relates to the roles that users play in the social community.
in which they participate; and bridging of online and offline social networks, which is concerned with the degree to which the SNS becomes an integral part of the users’ actual life while offline (Harrison & Thomas, 2009).

This is evidenced by Dunne and Lawlors’ (2010) study on young people’s use of online SNSs. Their study was carried out among girls aged 12 to 14 years and focused on one SNS, “Bebo”. Findings revealed an active use of Bebo for personal motives and gratifications in terms of presenting and managing a certain identity and persona in a social context. One respondent quoted in their findings stated, “Sometimes you look at people’s profile pictures and go, “Oh my god, what are they at”? Some of the stuff they say about themselves is exaggerated as well, they are trying to make themselves look cool (Dunne & Lawlor, 2010, p. 52). Chigona, Kamkwenda, and Manjoo (2008) echo this by arguing that among the process, gratifications sought by the millennials include the need for image, fashion, and status.

2.4.2 Surveillance
Severin and Tankard (1998) define surveillance as seeking information about things which may affect one or help in accomplishing given tasks. Surveillance is further defined as the desire to see what old contacts and friends are up to, how they look, and how they behave. This is echoed by Johnson (2008) as cited in Quan-Haase and Young (2010), who suggested that “keeping in touch” as a dimension of Facebook comprises surveillance and social searching.

McQuail, as cited in Brandtzæg and Heim (2009), argued that there are four main motivations for media use: Information, entertainment, social interaction, and personal identity. Leung (2007) echoes this by listing entertainment, surveillance, passing time, and escape as motivations for internet use. This is supported by Joinson’s (2008) argument that the surveillance and “social search” functions of Facebook may, in part, explain why so many Facebook users leave their privacy settings relatively open. Joinson (2008) further posits that, “If social searching is a public good, then reciprocity rules would dictate that by enabling a degree of surveillance of oneself, one would/ should also be able to engage in reciprocal surveillance of others” (Joinson, 2008, p. 1028). Although these motivations are observed from a broad perspective, it is clear that surveillance acts
as a motivation for Internet use. This information could be related to bridging and bonding social capital among millennials.

2.4.3 Social Capital/ social Interactivity

The concept of social capital draws a variety of definitions in multiple fields (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007). Broadly, though, some studies have defined social capital as the resources accumulated through relationships among people (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Valenzuela, Park, & Kee, 2009). This definition is reinforced by an assertion by Williams (2006) that it is loosely understood to operate like financial capital in that it creates more of it. However, instead of goods and services, the things being used and created are personal relationships and the benefits that come with them: Some social actors interact and form a network of individuals—a “social network”—resulting in positive affective bonds. These in turn yield positive outcomes such as emotional support or the ability to mobilize others (Williams, 2006, p. 594).

Valenzuela, Park, and Kee (2009) argued that unsafe disclosure of information, cyberbullies, addiction, risky behaviour, and contact with dangerous communities are among the popular concerns raised about the use of SNSs. They further posit that “other research shows that young people are motivated to join these sites to keep strong ties with friends and to strengthen ties with new acquaintances” (Valenzuela, Park and Kee, 2009, p. 876). This validates Williams’ (2006) argument that bridging and bonding social capital could be motivating factors influencing the choice of SNSs.

Williams (2006) splits social capital into “bonding” and “bridging”. He argues that bridging and bonding allow for different types of social capital to result when different norms and networks are in place. According to Putnam, these two types of social capital are related, but not equivalent. Bridging social capital is inclusive and occurs when individuals from different backgrounds make connections between social networks. By contrast, bonding can be exclusive. It occurs when strongly-tied individuals, such as family and close friends, provide emotional or substantive support for one another (Williams, 2006). Papacharissi and Mendelson (2008) argued that media audiences also seek to maintain social capital. They add that maintenance of social capital focuses on staying connected to groups from previous moments in one’s life. The question, however,
at this point is whether millennials’ choice of SNSs is motivated by the desire to “bridge”, “bond”, and “maintain” social capital.

It is known that Facebook provides users with an online arena for presenting their social identity, social connection, interactions and communication; the pattern of usage among various users varies significantly across cultures, and many previous researches discussed the relationship between motivations and usage of SNSs in the context of uses and gratification theory. There is also previous research that includes the relationship of Facebook use to wellbeing, self-esteem, social capital, and life satisfaction. Valkenburg (2014) found that the more people used social network services, the greater the frequency of interaction with friends, which had positive benefits on respondents’ self-esteem and ultimately their reported life satisfaction and social capital. There are a number of studies that have investigated the relationship of Facebook to life satisfaction; however, their research may not achieve the same outcome when applied to a Third World country such as the Philippines, where a majority of the population is struggling to survive for their daily needs. Usually, researchers equate life satisfaction and social capital with subjective happiness or personal contentment. According to existing research, it highlights that individuals’ life satisfaction and social capital are determined, in part, by their social ties (Reinhard & Dervin, 2009).

A study report, titled “E-Virus” (2011) by Lenana High School, Kenya, indicates that one of the reasons students in high schools and colleges get hooked to Facebook is because it raises their self-esteem, since one can create an ideal image in their personal profiles. One could even become an online celebrity by having a huge number of friends. The research also revealed that 44 per cent of students join social networks due to the desire to socialize and meet new people, 31 per cent because of peer pressure, while the rest enlist to either kill boredom and/or satisfy their curiosity. About 12 per cent of those interviewed said they joined social networks to access pornographic materials.

2.4.4 Diversion
Severin and Tankard (1998) categorize the variable of diversion as a gratification factor. They define diversion as escape from routine and problems. Quan-Haase and Young (2010) further outline the main reasons to use Facebook as: (a) to learn about social events; (b) to keep in touch with friends; and (c) as a diversion from school work. These
fit in well with the main objective of the present study, which sought to investigate user gratification factors influencing millennials’ choice of social networking sites.

Barker (2009) suggests that different genders could be motivated to use SNSs for totally different reasons. He notes that female motivations to use SNSs include communication with peer group members, entertainment, and passing time, whereas males use it in an instrumental way for social compensation, diversion from work, learning, and social identity gratifications which include the prospects to discover and identify with members who share similar characteristics.

2.5 Consequences of Facebook Use among Millennials

Facebook use by millennials has specific pros and cons. The excessive use of Facebook may affect academic performance, interpersonal communication, health, security/privacy issues, and cause Internet addiction.

2.5.1 Academic Performance

Online social networks (OSNs) have permeated all generations of Internet users, becoming a prominent communications tool, particularly in the student community. Thus, academic institutions and faculty are increasingly using social networking sites, such as Facebook and LinkedIn, to connect with current and potential students and to deliver instructional content. (Paul, Baker, & Cochran, 2012).

Some authors and researches disagree—such as Lenhart et al., 2010; Tiryakioglu & Erzurum, 2010; Chen & Bryer, 2010—and say that despite the popularity of Facebook for personal use, only a low percentage of students and faculty use such sites for academic practice. Online social networking (OSN) sites, such as Facebook, Twitter and Myspace, are used on a regular basis by many millions of people. The majority of this online networking community is made up of college students. In fact, a recent survey of 3,000 students from across the United States revealed that 90% of college students use Facebook and 37% use Twitter (Dahlstrom, de Boor, Grunwald, & Vockley, 2011).

Reynol (2012), in his article titled, “Too much face and not enough books: The relationship between multiple indices of Facebook use and academic performance,” found that that time spent on Facebook was negatively related to overall GPA, and time spent on Facebook is slightly negatively related to time spent studying. In addition, the ability of
time spent on Facebook to significantly predict overall GPA shows that there may be negative academic effects for students who use Facebook in certain ways.

In addition, Paul, Baker, & Cochran, in 2012 wrote an article named, “Effect of Facebook on student academic performance,” which revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between time spent by students on OSN sites and their academic performance. Time spent on OSN is shown to negatively impact academic performance. As time spent on Facebook increases, the academic performance of the students is seen to deteriorate. This ties in well with the findings presented in Kirschner and Karpinski (2010), which revealed that over-involvement or obsession with social networking by students can have a negative impact on academic performance.

Moreover, Rosen, Carrier and Cheever (2013) wrote an article titled, “Facebook and texting made me do it: Media-induced task-switching while studying.” They believe that this area is a technologically rich world, where multitasking is the norm and is more prominent among the youth and college students. In their research, they found out that students manage to do their work and also interact with the virtual environment effectively. Facebook has nearly a billion users worldwide (Smith, 2012), with more than 90% of teens (Common Sense Media, 2012) and college students (Junco, 2011) actively engaged.

However, as results, the authors found that participants who accessed Facebook one or more times during the study period had lower grade point averages—corroborating work on the impact of Facebook on academic performance. Furthermore, Junco (2011) discovered that sharing links and checking up with friends on Facebook more often predicted higher college grades; making status updates more often predicted lower grades; and that overall GPA dropped 12 points for every 93 min above the average of 106 min per day spent on Facebook.

2.5.2 Interpersonal Communication

Facebook facilitates interpersonal communication by providing channels for public and private communication, feedback, and peer acceptance. For example, there are three types of messaging services available through Facebook—the inbox, which works much like a private email system; the “wall,” which is a public area within a user’s profile where friends can leave comments; and the “live chat” function that operates much like an
instant messaging system. Also, a basic form of feedback within Facebook is whether or not a user accepts or rejects a “friend” invitation (Valenzuela, Park, & Kee, 2009).

To understand the role of online communication, some researchers have used the theoretical proposal that users of interactive online forums, including Facebook, are co-constructing their online environments. The co-construction model implies that a user’s online and offline worlds are psychologically connected. With this model, it is expected that users bring people and issues from their offline worlds into their online worlds (Subrahmanyam, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008).

Previous research on Facebook has indicated that these sites may be used to bridge online and offline social networks (Boyd & Ellison, 2007; Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2007). One study included a qualitative analysis of autobiographical essays written by college students (McMillan & Morrison, 2006) in which participants used the Internet to solidify their offline identities. The study stated that participants used their virtual online communities to sustain their “real life” communities that existed offline, such as using online tools to plan social events with their offline friends.

Lampe, Ellison, and Steinfield (2006) found students were using Facebook more for “social searching”—investigating information about someone they already knew offline—rather than “social browsing,” or finding people or groups they would like to connect with offline. The study found that the majority of users viewed their network as peers, instead of university or business-related, and so they constructed their profiles accordingly. This perception impacted how they used and identified with the site.

Subrahmanyam, Reich, Waechter, and Espinoza (2008) measured the overlap between face-to-face friends and online social network friends. Results showed that 49% of respondents’ top face-to-face friends were also their top Facebook friends, and 16% of the sample reported a 100% overlap between their top 10 face-to-face friends and top 10 Facebook friends. In addition, the majority of respondents in the study indicated that they only added people as friends in their Facebook account if they had met them at least once in person. This is consistent with findings by Pempek, Yermolayeva, and Calvert (2009), where the majority of respondents (77%) said that none of their Facebook friendships originated online, and 68% reported that some of their friendships started online.
2.5.3 Health effects

Nowadays, a health issue not only comes from the environment of the person, but also within the web 2.0 environment. In previous years, the main discussion issue was the addiction to television; today’s issues, however, deal with Internet addiction and the increased amount of time young people and adults spend on searching the Internet (Harrison & Thomas, 2009).

A positive outcome of Gen Y’s Facebook use is the formation and maintenance of social capital (Berthon et al., 2011; Ellison et al., 2007; Valenzuela et al., 2009). Social networks such as Facebook can boost young people’s social capital because their identities are shaped by what they share about themselves and, in turn, what others share and say about them (Christofides et al., 2009). Social media use may have additional salutary effects on Gen Y’s psychological and emotional wellbeing. For instance, it can strengthen family bonds (Williams & Merten, 2011) and nurture other supportive social relationships that enhance Gen Y’s self-esteem (Valkenburg et al., 2006).

The potential benefits of Gen Y’s social media usage extends to their physical wellbeing, because social media are efficient and effective in communicating health information to people (Hackworth & Kunz, 2010)—especially in developing countries with younger populations (dominated by Gen Y) who have limited access to healthcare. While much is yet to be learned, some research-based insights are available about effectively communicating health-related information to Gen Y. For example, based on a meta-analysis of health-communication studies, Keller and Lehmann (2008) suggest that, “Younger audiences prefer messages about social consequences over multiple exposures, whereas older audiences are more influenced by physical consequences, regardless of the number of exposures” (p. 126).

Healthcare—relating to both psychological and physical wellbeing—illustrates how social media use has individual-level consequences for Gen Y, as well as managerial (firm-level) and policymaking (societal) implications. Some studies have reviewed the impact of Facebook use on mental health. These effects include changes in self-esteem, sleep disorders, and a high percentage of depression among students.

With the role the Internet plays in the lives of today’s young adults, understanding its possible health implications is of clinical importance. In particular, problematic internet
use (PIU) is a new and growing health concern for adolescents and young adults. PIU lacks a standardized definition, but it has also been referred to as Internet addiction (Christakis & Moreno, 2009; Dell’Osso, Altamura, Allen, Marazziti, & Hollander, 2006).

Young adults may also be the population most at risk for the development of PIU. This is because adolescents and young adults have the highest rates of Internet use and frequency (Tokunaga, 2010). In fact, Harrison and Thomas (2009) revealed that excessive time on Facebook may lead to Internet addiction. Students around the world spend a lot of time on Facebook, which this leads to major consequences. Excessive time spent in this manner could lead to the problematic behaviour known as Internet addiction, which is viewed as a psychological dependence on or a behavioural addiction to the Internet, resulting in excessive usage (Griffiths, 2000).

In addition, many researchers have argued that the attractiveness of the Internet could lead to excessive use. Past research has described this phenomenon as Internet addiction (Soule et al., 2003; Widyanto and Griffiths, 2006). On the other hand, Young (1998) argued that the Internet itself is not addictive, but highly interactive applications like online chatting can be addictive.

Balakrishnan and Shamim (2013) wrote an article called, “Malaysian Facebookers: Motives and addictive behaviours unravelled.” In this research, Malaysians were reported to have the most number of Facebook friends, to spend the most time on Facebook, and to be possibly addicted to Facebook as well. Enthusiasm for Facebook is particularly apparent in Malaysia, as Malaysians are known to have the most number of friends on Facebook (The Star, 2010).

Even though Facebook is used to connect with people and improve the social lives of students, it was also noticed that excessive of Facebook use brings bad consequences. As a matter of fact, the term Facebook Addiction Disorder (FAD) was coined to refer to the negative consequences of excessive use of the social site (Fenichel, 2009).

The researchers revealed that students exhibit some addictive symptoms, namely, salience (both cognitive and behavioural), loss of control, withdrawal, relapse, and reinstatement. These symptoms matched some of the addictive components of Brown’s Addiction Behaviour Framework. The findings are similar to other studies that have revealed
addictive behaviour in using mobile phones (Balakrishnan & Raj, 2012; Walsh et al., 2010), online games (Charlton & Danforth, 2007) and the Internet (Charlton, 2002).

As a result, the study identified the addictive symptoms by using Facebook among the students; therefore, Facebook affects the health of users. Furthermore, Mekinc, Smailbegović, and Kokić in 2013, wrote an article titled, “Should we be concerned about children use of the internet?” Research by Young found that Internet overuse can bring health problems—a mental disorder which she named Pathological Internet Use, or PIU (Young, 1998). The American Psychological Association classified the overuse of Internet services as an addiction. Now we can include the PIU in the group of addictions—together with drug and alcohol addictions, addiction to video games, gambling, and some eating disorders (Bonacic, 2010).

As a result, Mekinc, Smailbegovic, and Kocic (2013) found the increased use of the Internet, Facebook profiles, and publication of personal data to be signs of Internet addiction among scholars in the upper grades. According to the results of this study, using Facebook increases the likelihood of addiction to the internet. While establishing new friendships and socializing, children through the Internet can satisfy their need for contact and for belonging; however, the excessive use of Facebook brings the risk of developing an internet addiction.

2.5.4 Security/Privacy Issues
Although Facebook use can enhance Gen Y members’ social capital, it can also have serious negative consequences if they disclose too much or sensitive personal information in their quest for social approval. Adolescents and college students who spend more time online disclose more information (Christofides et al., 2009; Christofides et al., 2012), which can distort intimate relationships (Lewis & West, 2009). "Need for popularity" is a strong predictor of information disclosure on Facebook (Ellison et al., 2007). Although people may be aware of the potential dangers of Facebook participation (such as stalking or cyber bullying), they have little control over access to their information on Facebook (Hundley & Shyles, 2010). In addition, individuals’ loss of privacy is linked to firm-level consequences (such as firms using information from Facebook in recruiting) and societal consequences (such as governments enacting public safety laws).
The social networking phenomenon is consuming the lives of millions of users around the world. Since the inception of the first social networking site, SixDegrees.com at 1997 (Boyd and Ellison, 2008), the social networking craze has grown beyond all expectations. Data privacy is a fundamental problem in today's information era. Enormous amounts of data are collected by government agencies, search engines, social networking systems, hospitals, financial institutions, and other organizations, and are stored in databases. This stored information is very crucial for individuals, yet people could misuse this information. The problems that exist in the real world such as theft, fraud, and vandalism also exist in online Web 2 environments from identity thieves.

New laws introduced by the Attorney General of Australia introduced jail terms of up to 10 years for individuals using networking sites such as Facebook to steal identities without having to wait for them to obtain money as a part of the fraud (Hildebrand, 2009). Social networking is becoming a necessity day by day. It is a phenomenon that is exploited by SNSs, which strive to transform relationships between people and groups of people that already exist into an online network which can be traversed and exploited. (Wu & Majedi, 2010)

Facebook has now transformed into social networking services (Wu & Majedi, 2010). People are eagerly signing up to these social websites which, apart from the attraction they have, also pose some hidden threats. In 2012, Asif and Khan wrote an article titled, “Users’ perceptions on Facebook privacy policies.” Facebook knows an immense amount about its users. A fully filled-out Facebook profile contains about 40 pieces of recognizably personal information, including name, birthday, political and religious views, online and offline contact information, gender, sexual preference, relationship status, favourite books and movies, educational and employment history, and finally a picture. Facebook then offers multiple tools for users to search out and add potential contacts. By the time one person fills information, Facebook has a reasonably comprehensive snapshot both of who they are and who they know.

With this information, people might use it for negative causes and damage a person’s life; however, if people read and understand the privacy and security options, they might be less exposed. Asif and Khan in 2012 found that people remain unaware of information-sharing policies, although these policies are clearly stated. And if they have read them,
they are not concerned about the effects. This study also shows that people do not know how their personal data can be shared. They end up sharing their private information with unauthorized people because of their ignorant attitude. In addition, the researchers noticed that the complexity of privacy settings and a lack of control provided to the user are equally responsible for unintentional information sharing.

In addition, O’Brien and Torres in 2012 wrote an article, “Social Networking and Online Privacy: Facebook Users’ Perceptions.” As a result, the researchers found that users are alert and cautious when using Facebook. However, Facebook users are not completely informed or aware of all activities concerning privacy on the social networking sites. However, low trust levels to date have not hindered activity on Facebook and membership continues to rise. Facebook users seem willing to push aside trust issues to achieve social interaction. The importance of trust in a social networking context is clearly questionable and perhaps different determinants for online activity exist in different online environments.

There are a number of barriers to trust in the online environment. These barriers include perceived risk, website design and content, the users themselves, and privacy concerns. Privacy concerns are considered the greatest barrier of them all because, “The Internet, by design, lacks unified provisions for identifying who communicates with whom; it lacks a well-designed identity infrastructure” (Leenes et al., 2008).

Privacy concerns include online information collection techniques such as cookie technology involving extreme surveillance. The use and analysis of data are also a concern due to unethical merging and data mining practices to profile customers. The instant recording and permanence of activity, and loss of control and ownership of data, also create barriers to online activity (Tavani, 2011). Social networking users claim to be concerned about risks to privacy, yet do little to safeguard their information (Dwyer et al., 2007). Often, users openly disclose detailed and personal information on these networks, comfortably living a part of their lives online (Rosenblum, 2007).

However, Facebook has continually introduced new features and services, including the Newsfeed, Facebook Beacon, Facebook Advertisements, and Facebook Platform, which subsequently leads to changes in the privacy settings and the privacy policy to achieve less privacy (Fletcher, 2010). With each additional expansion to the website has come a
growing level of discontent and concern, and a general feeling that “the company was eroding privacy and making substantial information public” (Rothery, 2010).

Users around the world—whether teens or college students—share personal information on Facebook. Most people disclose personal information on their profiles. Research on SNSs and other social media found a paradox, a discrepancy, between privacy concerns and actual privacy settings (Barnes, 2006). Analyses of profiles have found that SNS users provide a large amount of personal information on public profiles. Gross and Acquisti (2005) analysed the Facebook profiles of more than 4,000 students and found that only a small percentage had changed the default privacy settings (Lukas, 2006).

Users of Facebook are more likely to engage in risky behaviours than non-users (Fogel & Nehmad, 2009). For example, Zhu et al. (2012) found that online community participation leads individuals to make riskier financial decisions because they (mistakenly) believe that, if things go wrong, they will get help from the community, even if it consists of relative strangers. Whether and to what extent the Facebook use of Gen Y members increases their risk-proneness requires further study, especially since their risk-taking behaviours are important to firms (e.g., vis-à-vis purchase influence, brand trial) and to policymakers (e.g., vis-à-vis unhealthy/harmful/illegal behaviours).

### 2.5.5 Internet Addiction

A potential downside of Gen Y’s Facebook use is “Internet addiction” and its negative effects. Teenagers and college students report that they compulsively check Facebook profiles and updates (Lewis & West, 2009). Online activities can negatively influence adolescents’ school activities, sleep, and decrease their participation in important offline activities (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011). Moreover, internet addiction has been linked to depression, loneliness and social anxiety (Caplan, 2007; Skoric et al., 2009). Yet, a recent study of college students (Kittinger et al., 2012) found that only a minority reported frequent or occasional problems due to their online behaviour; other studies of teenagers and college students suggest that depression and loneliness may be both consequences and antecedents of Internet addiction (Sheldon et al., 2011; Tokunaga & Rains, 2010). In other words, Facebook use may serve as an effective coping mechanism in the short run (thereby leading to even more intense use) but exacerbates pre-existing problems of
psychosocially unhealthy individuals who may not realize the long-run costs (Sheldon et al., 2011).

According to the latest reports by CCK on internet service released in April 2012 for the end of quarter two of the 2011/2012 financial year, there were a total of 6.15 million internet subscriptions in the country, which represented an increase of 13.20 per cent from the previous period and 86.62 per cent compared to the same period of the previous year. Mobile data/internet subscriptions on GPRS/EDGE and 3G recorded the highest portion of the total internet/data subscriptions of 6.07 million subscriptions compared to 5.37 million subscriptions recorded during the previous period, which represents an increase of 13.04 per cent. This shows that there is an increase in the consumption of internet services via mobile phones, which are relatively accessible among Kenyans.

Although this can be received as good news, the Internet has also brought with it a new disease—internet addiction! It is taken as a serious issue as it appears to be a stronger addiction than that of drugs and alcohol abuse. According to Kuss and Griffiths (2011), due to their egoistic structure, SNSs allow individuals to positively portray their images, which could potentially elevate their morale and enhance their mood state as this is perceived as gratifying. This, then, may lead to affirmative experiences that could easily encourage and promote experiences that drive the progress of SNS addiction.

This makes it important to study the patterns of use of SNSs by college students, who are susceptible to getting addicted as they seek to present themselves positively to enhance their self-esteem on these sites; they most probably seek popularity from these sites, thus being constantly online to update their statuses, post photographs, check their friends’ updates, and generally make their presence felt. The ease of access and low cost of accessing these sites also make it convenient for the students to easily immerse themselves in the Internet world via SNSs, risking to get addicted.

Kuss and Griffiths (2011) conclude that behavioural addiction, such as SNS addiction, may thus be seen from a bio-psychosocial perspective. That, just like substance-related addictions, SNS addiction exhibits the likeness of the known addiction symptoms, namely mood modification (i.e., engagement in SNSs leads to a favourable change in emotional states), salience (i.e., behavioural, cognitive, and emotional preoccupation with the SNS usage), tolerance (i.e., ever increasing use of SNSs over time), withdrawal symptoms (i.e.,
experiencing unpleasant physical and emotional symptoms when SNS use is restricted or stopped), conflict (i.e., interpersonal and intra-psychic problems ensue because of SNS usage), and relapse (i.e., addicts quickly revert back to their excessive SNS usage after an abstinence period).

Echeburua and De Corral (2010) suggest that the extreme use and incorporation of recent technologies—and particularly Facebook—may be mainly addictive to the younger generation. They concur that those individuals addicted to using SNSs exhibit symptoms comparable to those experienced by those who suffer from substance or behavioural addictions. This, they note, has considerable implications for medical practice because unlike other addictions, the rationale of SNS addiction treatment cannot be total abstinence from using the Internet per se, since the Internet has become an integral component of today’s professional and leisure culture. Instead, the ultimate therapy aim is controlled use of the Internet and its respective functions, particularly social networking applications, and relapse prevention using strategies developed within cognitive-behavioural therapies (Echeburua & De Corral, 2010). In addition to this, the scholars have also hypothesized that young susceptible people with narcissistic tendencies are particularly prone to engaging with SNSs in an addictive way (La Barbera, 2009).

The chairperson of the Kenya Counselling Association, Catherine Gacutha (www.ITNewsAfrica.com) acknowledges that internet addiction is rapidly increasing in Kenya. The predicament is most outstanding in young people aged between 18 and 28; Internet addiction in Kenya, she says, is worse than substance abuse. Incidentally, the number of youths addicted to various internet sites surpasses that of those addicted to drugs and alcohol, because most of them are idle and the cost of accessing the Internet is much lower than that of drugs and alcohol. The bulk of internet addicts seeking rehabilitation say they cannot control their urge for pornography, entertainment, and social sites such as Facebook. The patients also find themselves addicted to online relationships.

2.6 Conceptual Framework
According to Jabareen (2009), a conceptual framework is a network of interlinked concepts that support each other to provide a comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon. The interlinked concepts in this study are the independent variables which
consist of the influence of uses of Facebook among millennials, underlying motives for Facebook use among millennials, and the consequences of Facebook use among millennials, while the dependent variable is Facebook behavioural usage.
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Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

### 2.7 Summary

This chapter looked at the review of the uses and gratification theory as applied in this research, review of general literature about the study objectives, and also the other studies done on the variables of study. It also developed the conceptual framework illustrating the concept of study and discussed the variables. The next chapter focuses on the research methodology that was used to carry out the study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
According to Creswell (2013), research methodology is a structure which guides in conducting research: It gives a guideline on how information relevant to the objective of a study would be collected. This chapter looks at the research design that was adopted, the target population, and the sampling techniques that were used to get the sample size for the study. It also has sections on the type of data the study collected, and how it was collected and analysed. The chapter has sections on the research and ethical considerations that were adhered to by the researcher during data collection.

3.2 Research Design
Cooper and Schindler (2008) define a research design as a structure by which a researcher carries out his study, giving a systematic order and direction in which the study investigation was carried out. There are various types of research designs. Bryman (2001) identifies three main types of study designs as exploratory, causal and descriptive study designs. Burns and Groove (2008) defined exploratory research as research conducted to gain new insights, discover new ideas, and for increase knowledge of a phenomenon. This type of research is done when the topic under investigation is relatively new. A causal research study is also known as hypothesis-testing or experimental studies, and involves testing hypotheses for causal relationships between variables. In essence, causality studies deal with causes and effects of the problems under study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

This research problem was studied through descriptive research design. A descriptive study is generally based on making findings concerning questions of who, what, where, when, or how much. Descriptive studies are always handled with investigative questions and they serve a number of objectives in the study (Cooper and Schindler, 2011). The researcher found it appropriate to use a descriptive research design for this study because it was concerned with assessing the uses and gratifications of Facebook among millennials in Kenya.
The study further adopted the quantitative approach. This enhanced the process of analysis. The quantitative approach allows for standardization of responses and collection of huge amounts of data within a short period.

### 3.3 Population and Sampling Design

#### 3.3.1 Population

According to Ngechu (2004), population is the total collection of elements with common observable characteristics about which some inferences can be made. In research, a large set of observable characteristics is referred to as a population, while a smaller set is referred to as a sample.

Based on data relayed from the university academic registrar’s office as of January 10, 2018, the students’ population of USIU-A was at 6,700. The population was drawn from four schools: the Chandaria School of Business, the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, the School of Science and Technology, and the School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences. Table 3.1 shows a breakdown of the population for each of the schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandaria School of Business</td>
<td>2,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Science and Technology</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3.2 Sample Design

##### 3.3.2.1 Sampling Technique

A study sampling technique is a method that researchers use to select an appropriate list of respondents from the entire study population (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). To come up with an appropriate study sample, the study utilized both the simple random sampling and stratified sampling techniques. The students were categorized into their schools, and each school formed a stratum, and then simple random sampling technique was used to give each member of the population an equal chance of inclusion in the study.
### 3.3.2.2 Sample Size

Sample size is a small section of subjects drawn from the larger population (Saunders et al., 2009). The question of an adequate size depends on a number of factors connected to the research which need to be borne in mind and weighed up by the researcher in the process of arriving at the sample (Denscombe, 2003). According to Fox and Bayat (2007), the choice of sample size is regulated by four parameters: The level of certainty of the collected data to be representative of the total population, the accuracy required as the basis for the estimates made for the sample, the type of analysis that was used as many statistical techniques have a minimum threshold of data cases for every variable, and the size of the total population from which the sample was drawn.

Krejcie and Morgan (1979) formulated a table indicating respective sample sizes at different population sizes (Appendix I). The Krejcie and Morgan formula ensures that a researcher satisfies Fox and Bayat’s four parameters described above, making it the most preferred. Based on Mugenda (2003), this study selected a sample of 363 respondents.

\[
 n = \frac{X^2 \times N \times P \times (1-P)}{(ME^2 \times (N-1)) + (X^2 \times P \times (1-P))}
\]

Where:
- \( n \) = sample size
- \( X^2 \) = Chi-square for the specified confidence level at 1 degree of freedom
- \( N \) = Population Size
- \( P \) = population proportion (.50 in this table)
- \( ME \) = desired Margin of Error (expressed as a proportion)

These were distributed proportionately across different strata as shown in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sample Proportion</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandaria School of Business</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Science and Technology</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Data Collection Method
Chandran (2004) defines data collection as the assembly of empirical evidence in order to acquire new insights into a situation and answer all queries that have prompted the undertaking of the research. Primary data was collected from the respondents by the use of structured questionnaires. Questionnaires were structured as this provided an easy way of coding and gathering quantitative data.

The questionnaires used a 5-point Likert scale, where 1= No Extent, 2 = Little Extent, 3 = Moderate Extent, 4 = Great Extent and 5 = Very Great Extent; this was to show the extent of agreement of the respondents regarding the influence of social media advertisement on attitudes and intentions to buy, among millennials in Kenya. The questionnaires were divided into five sections. The first section handled demographic information about the respondents, while the second section dealt with the social media advertisement platforms used by millennials at USIU-A. The third section dealt with the factors influencing consumption of social media advertisements among millennials at USIU-A. The fourth section focused on factors affecting millennials’ attitude towards consuming social media advertisement at USIU-A. The last section addressed the challenges that millennials at USIU-A face in consuming social media advertisement. The Likert scale was consistent throughout the questionnaire.

3.5 Research Procedures
The researcher administered the questionnaires to USIU-A students as this minimized interruption in their day-to-day learning activities within the institution. The researcher allowed the respondents some time to fill the questionnaires before collecting them. The researcher used 10 research assistants to distribute the questionnaires to be completed by the selected respondents by hand. The research assistants were given practical training on handling the questionnaires and how to effectively interact with the interviewees before the actual collection of data. Upon completion, the research assistants collected the questionnaires and returned them. The researcher used this method so as to ensure a high response rate.

3.6 Pretesting of Research Instruments
The questionnaire was pretested before its administration to ensure validity and reliability of the data to be collected. According to Kothari (2004), the purpose of pre-testing the
data instrument is to ensure that the items in the instrument are stated clearly and have the same meaning to all respondents. It is only during pre-testing that the researcher is able to assess the ease of use of the instrument. Any sensitive, confusing or biased items were identified and modified or omitted. After development of the draft questionnaire, a pilot test was carried out with 36 students, 10% of the sample size, from Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT) undergraduate students to test for any inconsistencies, ambiguity and incomprehension. As suggested by Kothari (2004), the population selected for the pre-testing should be 10% of the total sample and should bear similar characteristics as the target population. Pretesting permits refinement before the final study (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). This helped the researcher to prepare and plan for the actual data collection process. The pre-test participants were not included in the actual survey to avoid pre-emption of the study at the actual area. In the process of piloting, the study ensured the rectification of any errors of ambiguity existing in the research instrument.

3.6.1 Validity
According to Bollen (2005) there are basically two ways of assessing content validity. The content of validity of the data collection instruments was determined through discussing the stated questions in the instruments with JKUAT undergraduate students selected for the pre-test. The students were expected to tick the questionnaires, which helped to establish their challenges in filling the questionnaires so that the same could be rectified before the final data collection (Orodho, 2003). To enhance validity of the questionnaires, the instruments were reviewed under the supervision of the research supervisor in order to ensure they captured valid and reliable information.

The study used both face and content validity to ascertain the validity of the questionnaires. Face validity is actually validity at face value. As a check on face validity, test/survey items are sent to the pilot group to obtain suggestions for modification (Lacity & Jansen, 1994). Content validity draws an inference from test scores to a large domain of items similar to those on the test content. To enhance content validity, the researcher consulted experts in the field of research and performed a thorough literature review on the topic of study. Validity is concerned with sample-population representation covered by the test items, that is, to be representative of the larger domain of knowledge and skills.
3.6.2 Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistence, stability, or dependability of the data. Whenever a researcher measures a variable, he or she wants to be sure that the measurement provides dependable and consistent results (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). To measure the reliability of the data collection instruments, an internal consistency technique is applied to the gathered data (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). A reliable measurement is one that if repeated a second time, would give the same results as it did the first time. If the results are different, then the measurement is unreliable (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The researcher selected a pilot group of 36 JKUAT undergraduate students to test the reliability of the research instrument. The aim was to correct inconsistencies arising from the instruments, which helped ensure that they measured what was intended. A construct composite reliability co-efficient (Cronbach alpha) of 0.7 or above, for all the constructs, is considered to be adequate for this study (Rousson, Gasser & Seifer, 2012). Reliability coefficient of the research instrument was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha (α) which is computed as follows:

\[ \alpha = \frac{k}{k-1} \times [1 - \frac{\sum (S^2)}{\sum S^2_{\text{sum}}} ] \]

Where:

\[ \alpha = \text{Cronbach’s alpha} \]

\[ k = \text{Number of responses} \]

\[ \sum (S^2) = \text{Variance of individual items summed up} \]

\[ \sum S^2_{\text{sum}} = \text{Variance of summed up scores} \]

3.7 Data Analysis Methods

Data analysis refers to analysing what has been collected and making deductions and inferences. It is extracting significant variables, detecting anomalies, and testing any assumptions (Kombo & Tromo, 2009). Data processing entails editing, classification, and tabulation of data collected so that they are amenable to analysts (Kothari, 2009). The questionnaires were checked for completeness and consistency; any gaps were edited and filled. The collected data was coded and entered into Statistical Package for Social
Science (SPSS) version 23.0. Factor analysis was also done to discover simple patterns in the pattern of relationships among variables (Anderson, 2004).

The inferential data analysis was done using multiple regression analysis. Multiple regression analysis was used to establish the relations between the independent and dependent variables. Multiple regression uses two or more independent variables to predict a dependent variable. Since there are four independent variables in this study, the multiple regression model generally assumed the following equation:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon \]

Where:
- \( Y \) = Facebook Behavioural usage
- \( \beta_0 \) = constant
- \( \beta_1, \beta_2 \) and \( \beta_3 \) = regression coefficients
- \( X_1 \) = Uses of Facebook among millennials
- \( X_2 \) = Underlying motives for Facebook use among millennials
- \( X_3 \) = Consequences of Facebook use among millennials
- \( \epsilon \) = Error Term

In testing the significance of the model, the coefficient of determination (R²) was used to measure the extent to which the variation in Facebook behavioural usage is explained by the variations of the affecting factors. F-statistic was also computed at 95% confidence level to test whether there was any significant relationship between Facebook behavioural usage and the determinants affecting it.

### 3.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter has described and justified the research methodology to be used for the research. The chapter has explained the research design; it has also explained the sampling design, including population, sampling technique, sampling frame, and sample size. The chapter has in addition defined the data collection method and detailed the research procedures. Lastly, it has considered the data analysis techniques used.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings obtained from the primary instrument used in the study. It discusses the characteristics of the respondents and their opinions on the uses and gratifications of Facebook among millennials in Kenya based on a case of USIU-A students. To clearly present the findings, the researcher provided tables that summarize the collective reactions of the respondents.

The researcher administered questionnaires to a sample population of 363 respondents, of the 363 questionnaires administered, only 278 questionnaires were filled and returned, giving a response rate of 76.6%. This is well within what Cooper and Schindler (2011) prescribed as a significant response rate for statistical analysis, which they established at a minimum value of 50%.

4.2 Uses of Facebook

From the findings, the respondents indicated that to a great extent, they use Facebook to track and connect with their friends and with other people, as indicated by a mean of 4.266; to upload short articles, videos and photos, as expressed by a mean of 4.104; to share information forwarded by friends, as illustrated by a mean score of 3.892; and most of the time they use Facebook to create and customize their profiles, as indicated by a mean of 3.662. The respondents, however, indicated that to a little extent, they use Facebook to view what other people post on their accounts, as indicated by a mean of 2.468. Based on the coefficient of variation, there was a consensus that most of the respondents use Facebook to create and customize their profiles.
Table 4.1: Statements on the uses of Facebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to track and connect with my friends with other</td>
<td>4.266</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to view what other people post on their accounts</td>
<td>2.468</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time I use Facebook to create and customize my profile.</td>
<td>3.662</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to upload short articles, videos and photos</td>
<td>4.104</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to share information forwarded by friends</td>
<td>3.892</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Underlying Motivations for Use of Facebook

Under this section, the researcher focused on the underlying motivations that trigger the use of Facebook such as personal identity, surveillance, social capital/social interactivity, and diversion.

4.3.1 Personal Identity

The respondents indicated that to a great extent, sharing significant experiences with their close friends on Facebook is important to their sense of who they are, as indicated by a mean of 4.446; that they use Facebook to brand themselves, as illustrated by a mean of 4.345; that to a great extent, people’s reaction to their posts on Facebook is important to their sense of who they are, as indicated by a mean of 3.971; and that engaging people on Facebook is important towards defining their sense of what they believe in, as expressed by a mean of 3.968.

However, the respondents insinuated that to a moderate extent, they use Facebook to keep online status updates to portray their progress in life by posting what they like and who they are, as indicated by a mean of 2.601. Moreover, as indicated by a coefficient of variation, sharing significant experiences with close friends on Facebook is important to the sense of who the respondents are.
Table 4.2: Personal identity statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to keep online status updates to portray my progress in life</td>
<td>2.601</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by posting what I like and whom I am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging people on Facebook is important towards defining my sense of what</td>
<td>3.968</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to brand my image</td>
<td>4.345</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People reaction to my posts on Facebook is important to my sense of who I</td>
<td>3.971</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing significant experiences with my close friends on Facebook is</td>
<td>4.446</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important to my sense of who I am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Surveillance

The respondents indicated that to a great extent, they use Facebook to find information about people and events, as indicated by a mean of 4.471; they use Facebook to see which of the people they know have joined Facebook, as indicated by mean of 4.309; and that Facebook enables them to receive trending news locally and worldwide, as expressed by a mean score of 4.234.

However, the respondents indicated that only to a little extent do they use Facebook to find information on products and services they want to buy, as indicated by a mean of 2.450; and that they use Facebook to see other people's pictures and videos and to get updated about their status, as indicated by a mean of 2.284. Nevertheless, it was clear that most of the respondents use Facebook to find information about events, as indicated by the coefficient of variation.
Table 4.3: Statements on surveillance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to find information about people and events</td>
<td>4.471</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook enables me to receive the trending news locally and world wide</td>
<td>4.234</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to find information on products and services I want to buy</td>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to see which of the people I know who joined the Facebook</td>
<td>4.309</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to see other people's pictures and video to get updated about their status</td>
<td>2.284</td>
<td>1.779</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 Social Capital/ Social Interactivity

From the findings, the respondents indicated that to a great extent, Facebook connects them with their friends, as indicated by a mean of 4.414, their motivation for using Facebook is to reconnect with friends, as indicated by a mean score of 4.396, and that they use Facebook to find someone to talk to so that they are not alone—especially when their friends are physically absent—as illustrated by a mean of 4.327.

The respondents also indicated that to a great extent, they use Facebook to communicate with parents /relatives back at home, as indicated by a mean of 4.097, and further that Facebook makes them feel like they belong to a group, as expressed by a mean of 3.863. The respondents, however, indicated that only to a little extent do they use Facebook to communicate with people in different time zones of the world, as illustrated by a mean of 2.763. Also, as indicated by a coefficient of variation, the respondents use Facebook to communicate with parents /relatives back home.
### Table 4.4: Social capital/ social interactivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook connects me with my friends</td>
<td>4.414</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to communicate with parents/relatives back at home</td>
<td>4.097</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to communicate with people in different time zones of the world</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to find someone to talk to so I won't be alone especially when my friends are physically absent</td>
<td>4.327</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook makes me feel like I belong to a group</td>
<td>3.863</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.4 Diversion

As per the findings, the respondents indicated that to a very great extent, they use Facebook to view inspirational videos that make them laugh, as indicated by a mean of 4.701. The respondents also indicated that they use Facebook as a place to have fun and pass the time, as indicated by a mean of 4.439; that Facebook enables them to escape from routine challenges, as indicated by a mean of 4.371, and that sometimes they use Facebook to play non-interactive games, as expressed by a mean of 3.763.

Further, the respondents indicated that to a little extent, they use Facebook when they are feeling stressed or depressed to make them feel better and to understand non-academic life issues about the youth, as indicated by a mean of 2.475. Again, as indicated by a coefficient of variation, a majority of the respondents use Facebook to view inspirational videos that make them laugh.
Table 4.5: Statements on diversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to view inspirational videos that make me laugh</td>
<td>4.701</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook when I am feeling stressed or depressed to make me feel better and to understand non-academic life issues about the youth</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes use Facebook to play non-interactive games</td>
<td>3.763</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook as a place to have fun and to pass the time</td>
<td>4.439</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook enables me to escape from routine challenges</td>
<td>4.371</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences of Using Facebook

This section presents findings on academic performance, interpersonal communication, health effects, security/privacy issues, and internet addiction.

4.4.1 Academic Performance

The respondents indicated that to a great extent, Facebook has constantly eaten into their study time, as indicated by a mean of 4.187; that Facebook use has negatively affected their efficiency in completing class assignments, as illustrated by a mean score of 4.083; and that they often feel tempted to check their Facebook accounts during class time and that this has been distractive, as illustrated by a mean score of 4.079.

However, the respondents indicated that to a little extent, Facebook use has to some extent negatively affected their performance as indicated by a mean of 2.371. Further, as indicated by a coefficient of variation, Facebook has constantly eaten into their study time.
Table 4. 6: *Statements on academic performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has constantly eaten into my study time</td>
<td>4.187</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook use has to some extent negatively affected my performance</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook use has negatively affected my efficiency in completing class assignments</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel tempted to check my Facebook account during class time and this has been distractive</td>
<td>4.079</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4.2 Interpersonal Communication**

As per the study findings, the respondents indicated that to a great extent, Facebook has decreased their face to face interactions with other people, as indicated by a mean of 4.360, and that Facebook has affected their interpersonal skills negatively, as indicated by a mean of 4.320.

However, the respondents indicated that to a little extent, Facebook usage has encouraged aloneness as indicated by a mean of 2.601. Moreover, as indicated by a coefficient of variation, Facebook has decreased my face-to-face interactions with other people.

Table 4. 7: *Statements on interpersonal communication*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has decreased my face-to-face interactions with other people</td>
<td>4.360</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has affected my interpersonal skills negatively</td>
<td>4.320</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook usage has encouraged my aloneness</td>
<td>2.601</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 Health Effects

From the findings, the respondents indicated that to a great extent, Facebook has affected their psychological perspectives, as indicated by a mean score of 3.978. Moreover, the respondents indicated that to a little extent, they feel depressed when they do not get access to Facebook, as indicated by a mean of 2.363; and that when they use Facebook for fun during leisure time, they rarely get involved in physical exercises as indicated by a mean of 2.241. Further, as indicated by the coefficient of variation, it was clear that Facebook has affected their psychological perspective.

Table 4.8: Statements Health Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel depressed when I do not get access to Facebook</td>
<td>2.363</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has affected my psychological perspective</td>
<td>3.978</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I use Facebook for fun during leisure time, I rarely get involved</td>
<td>2.241</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in physical exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 Security/Privacy Issues

The findings indicate that to a great extent, Facebook has compromised the privacy of the respondents, forcing them to change their passwords often, as indicated by a mean score of 4.054, and that they feel like Facebook places them at risk of being judged when they post their opinions about issue being discussed, as indicated by a mean of 3.752. However, the respondents indicated that to a little extent, they feel that Facebook has provided private information about some students who ended up being kidnapped, as illustrated by a mean score of 1.270. Moreover, the respondents indicated that Facebook has compromised their privacy, forcing them to change their passwords often, as indicated by the coefficient of variation.
Table 4. 9: Statements on Security/Privacy Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has compromised my privacy, forcing me to change my passwords often</td>
<td>4.054</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like Facebook places me at risk of being judged when I post my opinion about issues being discussed</td>
<td>3.752</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook exposes users to the risk of kidnapping, especially children</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.5 Internet Addiction

From the findings, the respondents indicated that to a great extent, they often spend too much time on Facebook—usually more than they originally intend—as indicated by a mean of 4.284, and that their friends or family have commented that they spend too much time on Facebook, as indicated by a mean of 4.076. However, the respondents indicated that to a little extent they would find it very difficult if they could not access their Facebook account for an entire day, as indicated by a mean of 2.468.

Table 4. 10: Statements on Internet Addiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Rank of CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often spend too much time on Facebook—usually more than I originally intend</td>
<td>4.284</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would find it very difficult if I could not access my Facebook account for an entire day</td>
<td>2.468</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends or family have commented that I spend too much time on Facebook</td>
<td>4.076</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a systematic, statistical procedure used to uncover relationships among several variables. This procedure enables numerous correlated variables to be condensed into fewer dimensions, known as factors. The purpose of factor analysis is to discover simple patterns in the pattern of relationships among variables (Anderson, 2004). In the context of this research, the variables are the degree of agreement with various specific
perception statements, while the factors are the general underlying constructs. In its procedure, rotation is applied to identify meaningful factor names or descriptions.

4.5.1 Communalities
The table as shown on appendix 1 helps to estimate the communalities for each variance. This is the proportion of variance that each item has in common with other factors and shows how much of the variance in the variables has been accounted for by the extracted factors. For example, the statement, “I use Facebook to track and connect with my friends and with other people,” has 92.5% communality or shared relationship with other factors.

**Total Variance Explained**
In Table 4.15, the Kaiser Normalization Criterion is used, which allows for the extraction of components that have an eigenvalue greater than 1. In analysis, the average eigenvalue will be 1, so having an eigenvalue greater than 1 indicates that the factor value is higher than average, which helps determine the factors to retain. The principal component analysis was used and four factors were extracted. As the table shows, these four factors explain 90.354% of the total variation. Factor 1 contributed the highest variation of 74.294%. The contributions decreases as one moves from one factor to the other, up to factor 44.

4.5.3 Scree Plot
In order to determine the number of factors to retain, the factors with eigenvalue greater or equal to one were retained. This was further illustrated by using the scree plot, which indicates that the scree started to tee-off after factor 44, showing that the factors explain the Facebook behavioural usage (Figure 4.4 ).
4.5.4 Component Matrix
The initial component matrix was rotated using Varimax (Variance Maximization) with Kaiser Normalization. The results allowed for the identification of which variables fall under each of the 4 major extracted factors. A variable is said to belong to a factor to which it explains more variation than any other factor. All items in the four factors identified had factor loadings above the cut-off value (0.4) impressing their importance and meaningfulness in the light of recommendations by Hair et al. (1998).

4.6 Regression Analysis
In addition, the researcher conducted a multiple regression analysis so as to test the relationship among variables (independent) on the dependent. The researcher applied the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS Version 24) to code, enter, and compute the measurements of the multiple regressions for the study.

4.6.1 Model Summary
The findings show that the independent variables significantly influenced the dependent variable, as indicated by an Adjusted R Square = 0.927. The output indicates that the strength of association between the variables is very high (Adjusted R Square = 0.927). The three independent variables that were studied (uses of Facebook, underlying motivations to use Facebook, and consequences of using Facebook), collectively explain
only 92.7% of Facebook behavioural usage as represented by the Adjusted R Square. This, therefore, means that other factors not studied in this research contribute 7.3% of the variation in Facebook behavioural usage among millennials.

Table 4.11: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.963a</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>.75454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 ANOVA Results

In view of the results in Table 4.18, the significance value is 0.000 (which is less than 0.05), indicating that the overall model is statistically significant in predicting how uses of Facebook, underlying motivations to use Facebook, and consequences of using Facebook affect Facebook behavioural usage. The F critical at 5% level of significance from the Standard F-tables was 2.6049. Since the F calculated (value = 1170.584) is greater than the F critical, this shows that the overall model was a good fit.

Table 4.12: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1999.342</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>666.447</td>
<td>1170.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>155.996</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2155.338</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.3 Regression Coefficients

Table 4.19 presents results of the beta coefficients as well as the p-values for each independent variable. The regression function extracted using the unstandardized betas is as follows:

\[ Y = -4.698 + 0.819X_1 + 0.183X_2 + -0.230X_3 \]

According to the regression function, holding all factors constant at zero (uses of Facebook, underlying motivations to use Facebook, and consequences of using Facebook), the coefficient for Facebook behavioural usage among millennials will decrease by 4.698. The findings further indicate that taking all other independent variables at zero, a unit increase in the uses of Facebook leads to a 0.819 increase in Facebook behavioural usage among millennials; a unit increase in underlying motivations
to use Facebook leads to a 0.183 increase in Facebook behavioural usage among millennials if all other factors are held constant, and a unit increase in the consequences of using Facebook leads to a 0.230 decrease in Facebook behavioural usage among millennials, taking all other independent variables at zero.

Overall, all the variables were significant, since their p-values were less than 0.05 (uses of Facebook (0.00), underlying motivations to use Facebook (0.000) and consequences of using Facebook (0.000). Further uses of Facebook had the greatest effect on Facebook behavioural usage, followed by underlying motivations to use Facebook, while consequences of using Facebook had the least effect on Facebook behavioural usage among millennials.

Table 4. 13: Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-4.698</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses of Facebook</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to use Facebook</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of using Facebook</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the results and findings of the study. Findings are presented in frequency tables and histograms. The presentation is aligned to the research questions and covers the uses and gratifications of Facebook among millennials in Kenya based on a case of USIU-A students. The next chapter presents the summary and discussion of findings, conclusion and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the discussion of key data findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations. The conclusions and recommendations drawn were focused on addressing the objectives of the study.

5.2 Summary of Findings

5.2.1 Uses of Facebook
The study established that Facebook users to a great extent get on the platform to track and connect with their friends; to connect with other people; to upload short articles, videos and photos; to share information forwarded by friends; and most of the time to create and customize their profiles. The study found that to a little extent (mean of 2.468), Facebook is used to view what other people post on their accounts.

5.2.2 Underlying Motivations for Use of Facebook
The study revealed that personal identity motivates most Facebook users to get on Facebook. In this case, it was clear that most users share significant experiences with their close friends on Facebook, as this is important to their sense of who they are; express their thoughts and opinions on Facebook; and share photos and videos on Facebook, which is important in portraying to people what they like and who they are. Further, the study indicated that users gauge people’s reaction to their posts on Facebook, since this is important to their sense of who they are, and engage people on Facebook as it is important towards defining a sense of what they believe in.

On surveillance as an underlying motivation to use Facebook, the study established that to a great extent (mean of 4.471), millennials use Facebook to find information about people and events, to receive trending news locally and worldwide, to see which of the people they know have joined Facebook, and because it is easy, to meet new people on the platform. Millennials also to a little extent (M= 2.450), use Facebook to find information on products and services they want to buy and to see other people's pictures and videos to get updated about their status.
On social capital/social interactivity, the study found that Facebook connects users with their friends and that their motivation for using Facebook is to reconnect with friends. They also use Facebook to find someone to talk to so they won't be lonely, especially when their friends are physically absent. It was also clear that millennials use Facebook to communicate with parents/relatives back at home, and that Facebook makes them feel like they belong to a group. It was also revealed that millennials to a little extent (M=2.763) use Facebook to communicate with people in different time zones of the world.

On diversion, the findings indicate that most users prefer Facebook as it enables them to escape routine challenges, to view inspirational videos that makes them laugh, and to play non-interactive games. The study further found that to a little extent (M=2.457), millennials use Facebook to make them feel better when stressed or depressed, and to understand non-academic life issues in regards to the youth.

5.2.3 Consequences of Using Facebook

On academic performance, the study revealed that Facebook has constantly eaten into the respondents’ study time, has negatively affected their efficiency in completing class assignments, and that millennials feel tempted to check their Facebook accounts during class time and this has been distractive. The study also found that Facebook use has to some extent (M=2.371) negatively affected millennials’ academic performance.

On interpersonal communication, the study established that to a great extent (M=4.360), Facebook has decreased millennials’ face-to-face interactions with other people, and this has affected their interpersonal skills negatively. The study also revealed that Facebook usage has encouraged aloneness (M=2.601).

On health effects, the study revealed that to a great extent (M=3.978), Facebook has affected millennials’ psychological perspectives. Moreover, the study established that to a little extent (M=2.363), millennials feel depressed when they do not get access to Facebook and that when Facebook is used during leisure time, millennials rarely get involved in physical exercises.

Further on security/privacy issues, the study made it clear that to a great extent (M=4.054), Facebook compromises individual privacy, and that Facebook can enhance judgemental risk for those who post their opinion about issues being discussed. Also, to a
little extent (M=1.270), Facebook provides private information about some students, who may end up being kidnapped.

Finally, on internet addiction, the study found that to a great extent (M=4.284), millennials often spend too much time on Facebook—usually more than they originally intend, and that overall, millennials spend too much time on Facebook.

5.3 Discussion of the Findings

5.3.1 Uses of Facebook

The study established that Facebook can be used to a great extent to track and connect with friends, as well as with other people. This concurs with Asif and Khan (2012) who argue that networking sites such as Facebook offer a platform for users to generate and come up with ideal online images of themselves by forming friendships, in addition to extensive networks.

It was also revealed that Facebook can be used to upload short articles, videos and photos, as well as to share information forwarded by friends. This concurs with Mull and Lee (2014), who noted that many young people are able to use these platforms to give their opinions, standpoints, and ideas on issues they would not have been able to share on other platforms. Facebook becomes ideal, then, for the exercise of individual rights of expression.

Moreover, the study established that most of the time, Facebook is used to create and customize user profiles. This correlates with Lewis and West (2009), who argues that profile pages are not just beneficial in providing information for the user, but that they also give the users an opportunity to come up with ideal images of themselves to the world—in a sense, to enhance their public relations. For instance, the option on the profile for users to give their favourite music, movies, books and quotes gives the members a chance to give personal information for others to refer to if they want to know them at a personal level.

The study found that to a little extent, Facebook is used to view what other people post on their accounts. This corresponds to Wang, Chen and Liang (2011), who argue that many members join Facebook so as to share information in form of current affairs, messages,
videos or music. In this sense, many young people are able to use these platforms to give their opinions, standpoints, and ideas on issues they would not have been able to share on other platforms. Facebook once again becomes ideal, then, for the exercise of individual rights of expression.

5.3.2 Underlying Motivations for Use of Facebook

The study revealed that personal identity motivates most Facebook users to use the platform. In this case, it was clear that most users share significant experiences with their close friends on Facebook, as it is important to their sense of who they are; express their thoughts and opinions on Facebook; and share photos and videos on Facebook, as it is important to them in portraying to people what they like and who they are.

Further, the study indicated that users gauge people’s reaction to their posts on Facebook, since this is important to their sense of who they are, and engagement with people on Facebook is important towards defining their sense of what they believe in. These findings concur with Harrison and Thomas (2009), who noted that impression management—which is concerned with personal identity formation—as well as friendship management—which is linked to impression management—are important in that users publicly viewed profiles of others to choose who they would like to include as friends on their lists. The network structure relates to the roles that users play in the social community in which they participate, and this leads to bridging of online and offline social networks, which are concerned with the degree to which the SNS becomes an integral part of the users’ actual life while offline.

On surveillance as an underlying motivation to use Facebook, the study established that to a great extent, millennials use Facebook to find information about people and events, to receive the trending news locally and worldwide, to see which of the people they know have joined Facebook, and because it is easy, to meet new people on the platform. Additionally, millennials, to a little extent, use Facebook to find information on products and services they want to buy, to see other people's pictures and videos, and to get updated about the status of others. These findings concur with McQuail as cited in Brandtzæg and Heim (2009), who argued that there are four main motivations for media use: Information, entertainment, social interaction, and personal identity. Leung (2007) echoes this by listing entertainment, surveillance, passing time, and escape as motivations
for internet use. This is supported by Joinson’s (2008) argument that the surveillance and “social search” functions of Facebook may, in part, explain why so many users leave their privacy settings relatively open. Joinson (2008) further posits that “if social searching is a public good, then reciprocity rules would dictate that by enabling a degree of surveillance of oneself, one would/should be also be able to engage in reciprocal surveillance of others.

On social capital/social interactivity, the study found that Facebook connects users with their friends—and their motivation for using Facebook is to reconnect with friends and to find someone to talk to so they won't be alone, especially when their friends are physically absent. It was also clear that millennials use Facebook to communicate with parents/relatives back home, and that Facebook makes them feel like they belong to a group. It was also revealed that millennials, to some extent, use Facebook to communicate with people in different time zones of the world. This conforms to Valenzuela, Park, and Kee (2009), who argued that unsafe disclosure of information, cyberbullies, addiction, risky behaviour, and contact with dangerous communities are among the popular concerns raised about the use of SNSs. They further posit that, “Other research shows that young people are motivated to join these sites to keep strong ties with friends and to strengthen ties with new acquaintances.” Valkenburg (2014) found that the more people used social network services, the greater the frequency of interaction was with friends, which had positive benefits on respondents' self-esteem and ultimately their reported life satisfaction and social capital.

On diversion, the study made it clear that most users find Facebook enables them to escape from routine challenges, to view inspirational videos that make them laugh, and to play non-interactive games. The study further found that to a little extent, millennials use Facebook to make them feel better when stressed or depressed, and to understand non-academic life issues about the youth. These findings correspond to Barker (2009), who suggests that different genders could be motivated to use the SNSs for totally different reasons. He notes that female motivations to use SNSs include communication with peer group members, entertainment and passing time, whereas males use it in an instrumental way for social compensation, diversion from work, learning, and social identity gratifications—including the prospects to discover and identify with members who share similar characteristics.
5.3.3 Consequences of Using Facebook

On academic performance, the study revealed that Facebook has constantly eaten into the study time of millennials, has negatively affected students’ efficiency in completing class assignments, and that millennials feel tempted to check their Facebook accounts during class time, thus making the platform distractive. The study also found that Facebook use has to some extent negatively affected millennials’ performance. These findings correlate with Reynol (2012), who in his article titled, “Too much face and not enough books: The relationship between multiple indices of Facebook use and academic performance,” found that time spent on Facebook is negatively related to overall GPA, and time spent on Facebook is slightly negatively related to time spent studying. In addition, the ability of time spent on Facebook to significantly predict overall GPA shows that there may be negative academic effects for students who use Facebook in certain ways. This was however beyond the scope of this study and shall be suggested for further research.

Further, on interpersonal communication, the study established that to a large extent, Facebook has decreased millennials’ face-to-face interactions with other people, and that it has affected their interpersonal skills negatively. The study also revealed that Facebook usage has encouraged aloneness. These findings are in line with Lampe, Ellison, and Steinfield (2006), who found that students use Facebook more for “social searching”—investigating information about someone they already knew offline—rather than “social browsing,” or finding people or groups they would like to connect with offline. The study found that the majority of users viewed their networks as peers, instead of university or business-related, and so they constructed their profiles according to peer-related content. This perception impacted how they used and identified with the site.

On health effects, the study revealed that to a great extent, Facebook has affected millennials’ psychological perspective. Moreover, the study established that to a little extent, millennials feel depressed when they do not get access to Facebook and that when the platform is used for fun during leisure time, millennials rarely get involved in physical exercises. Christakis and Moreno (2009) agree with the findings by arguing that internet use plays a major role in the lives of today’s young adults, and therefore understanding possible health implications is of clinical importance. In particular, problematic internet use (PIU) is a new and growing health concern for adolescents and young adults. PIU lacks a standardized definition, but it has also been referred to as internet addiction.
Further, on security/privacy issues, the study made it clear that to a great extent, Facebook compromises individual privacy and can enhance judgemental risk for those who post their opinions about issues being discussed. Also, to some extent, Facebook provides private information about some students, who might end up being kidnapped. Leenes et al. (2008) noted that there are a number of barriers to trust in the online environment; these barriers include perceived risk, website design and content, the users themselves, and privacy concerns. Privacy concerns are considered the greatest barrier of them all, because “the internet, by design, lacks unified provisions for identifying who communicates with whom; it lacks a well-designed identity infrastructure”.

Finally, on internet addiction, the study found that largely, millennials often spend too much time on Facebook—usually more than they originally intend. Again, it is clear that millennials can benefit from staying for a while without accessing their Facebook accounts. According to the latest reports by CCK, the precursor of the Communications Authority of Kenya (CA) on internet service released in April 2012 for the end of quarter two of the 2011/2012 financial year, there were a total of 6.15 million internet subscriptions in the country, which represented an increase of 13.20 per cent from the previous period, and an 86.62 per cent increase compared to the same period of the previous year. Mobile data/internet subscriptions on GPRS/EDGE and 3G recorded the highest portion of the total internet/data subscriptions of 6.07 million, compared to 5.37 million recorded during the previous period, which represents an increase of 13.04 per cent. This shows that there is an increase in the consumption of internet services via the mobile phones, which are relatively accessible among Kenyans.

5.4 Conclusion
The study concluded that most millennials today use Facebook to track and connect with their friends; to connect with other people; to upload short articles, videos and photos; to share information forwarded by friends; and most of the time to create and customize their profiles.

The study concluded that that personal identity motivates most Facebook users to use Facebook, where the users are able to share significant experiences with their close friends as this is important in defining their sense of what they believe in. The study also deduced that surveillance motivates the use of Facebook, since it is possible to use
Facebook to find information about events and to see which of the people one knows have joined Facebook. Further, the study deduced that social capital/social interactivity can also trigger the use of Facebook, since it connects users with their friends and makes communication with parents/relatives back home easier. Finally, the study deduced that there is diversion, where Facebook use enables people to escape from routine challenges and to view inspirational videos that make them laugh, serving as a motivation to use Facebook.

The study concluded that although Facebook can be useful, it has diverse consequences. In this case, it was made clear that Facebook constantly takes up study time, negatively affects efficiency in completing class assignments, decreases millennials’ face-to-face interactions with other people, and provides private information about some students—who may end up being kidnapped. The study also deduced that Facebook compromises individual privacy and increases personal risk for those who post their opinions about issues being discussed. It was also deduced that since millennials feel out of touch when they haven’t logged onto the site for long, making Facebook addictive.

5.5 Recommendations

Facebook has become a very powerful mass media tool, especially among college students—who formed the population for this study. Many academic institutions continue to provide free Internet services to their students, making it possible for students to misuse/overuse Facebook. Based on the findings of the study, the following suggestions are recommended to improve the use of Facebook among college students:

i. Students should be encouraged to modify their personal time tables and allocate more time for their studies in order to avoid spending too much time on Facebook. This would go a long way in ensuring that students make time for their academic work, thus ensuring that their overall academic performance is not affected.

ii. With respect to diversion, university administrations should provide students with internet user accounts so as to limit any excessive use of the Internet on Facebook. Such accounts would operate in such a way that once a student exhausts his/her account (that is, time allocated to use the Internet in a semester) then he/she cannot use the internet services provided by the university. This will be a measure
geared to controlling the sort of internet-related diversion that negatively affects students at USIU.

iii. When it comes to sharing information with friends, the university communication department and library should creatively market the e-resource links, so that there is increased awareness among students and they can share educational information on Facebook. This will encourage the use of Facebook as a tool for sharing educational resources rather than using it for entertainment purposes.

iv. There should be increased training of students on Facebook sharing. This ensures that students are keen on what information they share out, while cautiously considering the consequences involved with sharing too much personal information. Incidents of kidnapping have occurred when students shared their location details, and online bullying has taken place when they share their opinions. However, this can be reduced through Facebook training.

v. On issues of surveillance, students should be empowered in sourcing for information and conducting research through Facebook, as it is a hub of content on different topics. This way, they can stay up-to-date with informative trends, get information about people and products they may be interested in, follow influential people with value, and add content, rather than simply logging onto the Facebook platform to pass time.

vi. In terms of interpersonal communication, students should be discouraged from watching or uploading unnecessary videos and posts through their Facebook accounts. Instead, they should be encouraged to take part in face-to-face games and activities that improve their interaction with friends, thus reducing cases of Facebook-related depression.

In general, all strategies should be taken to educate students and academic staff on best practices for Facebook. This is critical in ensuring that the disadvantages and negative effects associated with Facebook usage are well handled.
5.5.1 Areas for Further Research

The respondents for this study were drawn from the millennials in USIU-A. It would be interesting to see if these results would change when looking at an older population in the same university—and perhaps the University faculty, who play an important role in influencing millennials.

Further studies could also be carried out in rural counties, where the rate of Facebook usage may differ. Millennials in urban universities like USIU-A may have access to better data service providers and internet resources, thus checking how this usage differs in rural-based universities may provide for good research grounds. Studies could equally be done on both urban and rural counties to establish whether the gratification factors will vary.

A similar study could be conducted but with focus on a comparison of uses and gratifications of Facebook versus other social networking sites such as Instagram, Twitter, graduate.com and snapchat, which are fast becoming popular social media sites among millennials in Kenya.

On interpersonal communication and online interactions with others on Facebook, research on how much Facebook has affected face-to-face communication, encouraged aloneness, propelled social conversation, and the changing dynamics in social relationships and structures, is much needed.

As new technologies continue to land in the hands of the youth, so will the need to understand them and their implications on young people; therefore, further study could be done on the impact and implications of Facebook on the youth in Kenya. It would also be interesting to have a study on the consequences of time spent on Facebook on students’ overall GPA, in the quest to investigate just how much the use of Facebook affected students’ academic work. Concerning millennials using Facebook to find products, it would be interesting to conduct research that would explore Facebook as an effective advertising and marketing platform.
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## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Table of Communalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to track and connect with my friends with other people</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to view what other people post on their accounts</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time I use Facebook to create and customize my profile.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to upload short articles, videos and photos</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to share information forwarded by friends</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to keep online status updates to portray my progress in life by posting what I like and whom I am</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging people on Facebook is important towards defining my sense of what I believe in</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to brand my image</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People reaction to my posts on Facebook is important to my sense of who I am</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing significant experiences with my close friends on Facebook is important to my sense of who I am</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to find information about people and events</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook enables me to receive the trending news locally and worldwide</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to find information on products and services I want to buy</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to see which of the people I know who joined the Facebook</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to see other people's pictures and video to get updated about their status</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook connects me with my friends</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to communicate with parents /relatives back at home</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to communicate with people in different time zones of the world</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to find someone to talk to so I won't be alone especially when my friends are physically absent</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook makes me feel like I belong to a group</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Usage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to view inspiration videos that makes me laugh</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook when I am feeling stressed or depressed to make me feel better and to understand non-academic life issues about youth</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes use Facebook to play non-interactive games</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook as a place to have fun and pass the time</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook enables me to escape from routine challenges</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has constantly eaten into my study time</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook use has to some extent negatively affected my performance</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook use has negatively affected my efficiency in completing class assignments</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes use Facebook to play non-interactive games</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook as a place to have fun and pass the time</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook enables me to escape from routine challenges</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has constantly eaten into my study time</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook use has to some extent negatively affected my performance</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook use has negatively affected my efficiency in completing class assignments</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel tempted to check my Facebook account during class time and this has been distracting</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has decreased my face to face interactions with other people</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has affected my interpersonal skills negatively</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook usage has encouraged my aloneness</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel depressed when I do not get access to Facebook</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has affected my psychological perspective</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I use Facebook for fun during leisure time, I rarely get involved in physical exercises</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook has compromised my privacy, forcing me to change my passwords often</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like Facebook places me at risk of being judged when I post my opinion about issue being discussed</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook exposes users to risk of kidnapping especially children</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often spend too much time on Facebook - usually more than I originally intend</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would find it very difficult if I could not access my Facebook account for an entire day</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends or family have commented that I spend too much time on Facebook</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Table of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.689</td>
<td>74.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>6.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.434</td>
<td>5.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>4.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>2.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
### Appendix 3: Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to track and connect with my friends with other people</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to view what other people post on their accounts</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time I use Facebook to create and customize my profile.</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to upload short articles, videos and photos</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to share information forwarded by friends</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to keep online status updates to portray my progress in life by posting what I like and who I am</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging people on Facebook is important towards defining my sense of what I believe in</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to brand my image</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s reaction to my posts on Facebook is important to my sense of who I am</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing significant experiences with my close friends on Facebook is important to my sense of who I am</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook is important to my sense of who I am</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook enables me to receive the trending news locally and worldwide</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to find information on products and services I want to buy</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to see which of the people I know have joined Facebook</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use Facebook to see other people's pictures and videos to get updated about their status</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook connects me with my friends</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I use Facebook to communicate with parents /relatives back at home
I use Facebook to communicate with people in different time zones of the world
I use Facebook to find someone to talk to so I won't be alone, especially when my friends are physically absent
Facebook makes me feel like I belong to a group
I use Facebook to view inspirational videos that make me laugh
I use Facebook when I am feeling stressed or depressed to make me feel better and to understand non-academic life.
I sometimes use Facebook to play non-interactive games
I use Facebook as a place to have fun and pass the time
Facebook enables me to escape from routine challenges
Facebook has constantly eaten into my study time
Facebook use has to some extent negatively affected my performance
Facebook use has negatively affected my efficiency in completing class assignments
I often feel tempted to check my Facebook account during class time and this has been distractive
Facebook has decreased my face-to-face interactions with other people
Facebook has affected my interpersonal skills negatively
Facebook usage has encouraged my aloneness
I feel depressed when I do not get access to Facebook
Facebook has affected my psychological perspective
When I use Facebook for fun during leisure time, I rarely get involved in physical exercises
Facebook has compromised my privacy, forcing me to change my passwords often
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like Facebook places me at risk of being judged when I post my</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinion about issues being discussed</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook exposes users to the risk of kidnapping, especially children</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often spend too much time on Facebook—usually more than</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I originally intend</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would find it very difficult if I could not access my Facebook account</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for an entire day</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends or family have commented that I spend too much time on</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Questionnaire

Introduction

I am Sheila Waruuru Kimani, a Masters of Communications student at the United States International University, currently conducting research on: Uses and Gratification of Facebook Among Millennials in Kenya: A Case of United States International University-Africa Students.

The information you provide will be treated with strict confidence and will only be used to completed academic research. Kindly answer the following questionnaire in regards to your Facebook usage. The survey data will be reported in a summary fashion only and will not identify any individual person. Feel free to ask for clarification should need arise.

Instructions

This questionnaire is grouped in five major sections: Section I: Deals with demographic data; Section II: Questions on Adoption of Facebook; Section III: Questions on use of Facebook among Millennials; Section IV: Questions on underlying motivations for Millennials use of Facebook; Section V: Consequences of Millennials use Facebook.

SECTION I: Demographic Data

Kindly answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge

1. Kindly indicate your gender Male Female

2. Kindly indicate your age group

17-20 years 21-24 Years 25-28 Years 29-35 years
3. Indicate which faculty you belong to at USIU-A?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Tick as appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandaria School of Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Science and Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION II: Facebook Behavioural usage

How many times do you log into Facebook in a day (tick one)

1. 1 -5 times a day [ ]
2. 6—10 times a day [ ]
3. More than 10 times a day [ ]

Kindly use the Likert scale to indicate your level of agreement with the following statement. 1= strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I use Facebook all the days of the week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rarely does a week end without using Facebook to connect with friends and relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I always use Facebook to indicate my location and status before lecture starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Most of my daily internet data bundles are used through Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION III: Uses of Facebook

Kindly tick (✓) where appropriate. Use the following Likert scale to answer the following questions: 1= No Extent, 2= Little Extent, 3=Moderately Extent, 4= Great Extent, 5= Very Great Extent.
### SECTION IV: Underlying Motivations for Use of Facebook

Kindly use the Likert scale in section I to answer the following questions. 1= No Extent, 2= Little Extent, 3=Moderately Extent, 4= Great Extent, 5= Very Great Extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I use Facebook status updates to portray my progress in life by posting what I like and whom I am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Engaging people on Facebook is important towards defining my sense of what I believe in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I use Facebook to brand my image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>People reaction to my posts on Facebook is important to my sense of who I am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sharing significant experiences with my close friends on Facebook is important to my sense of who I am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Surveillance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I use Facebook to find information about people and events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Facebook enables me to receive the trending news locally and world wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I use Facebook to find information on products and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services I want to buy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I use Facebook to see which of the people I know who joined the Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I use Facebook to see other people's pictures and video to get updated about their status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Interactivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Facebook connects me with my friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I use Facebook to communicate with parents/relatives back at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I use Facebook to communicate with people in different time zones of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I use Facebook to find someone to talk to so I won't be alone especially when my friends are physically absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Facebook makes me feel like I belong to a group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I use Facebook to view inspiration videos that makes me laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I use Facebook when I am feeling stressed or depressed to make me feel better. Use Facebook to understand non-academic life issues about youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I sometimes use Facebook to play non-interactive games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I use Facebook as a place to have fun and pass the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Facebook enables me to escape from routine challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION V: Consequences of using Facebook

Kindly use the Likert scale in section I to answer the following questions. 1= No Extent, 2= Little Extent, 3=Moderately Extent, 4= Great Extent, 5= Very Great Extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Facebook has constantly eaten into my study time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Facebook use has to some extent negatively affected my performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Facebook use has negatively affected my efficiency in completing class assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I often feel tempted to check my Facebook account during class time and this has been distractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Facebook has decreased my face to face interactions with other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Facebook has affected my interpersonal skills negatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Facebook usage has encouraged my aloneness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I feel depressed when I do not get access to Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Facebook has affected my psychological perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>When I use Facebook for fun during leisure time, I rarely get involved in physical exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security/Privacy Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Facebook has compromised my privacy, forcing me to change my passwords often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I feel like Facebook places me at risk of being judged when I post my opinion about issue being discussed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I feel like Facebook has provided private information about some students who ended up being kidnapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet Addiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I often spend too much time on Facebook - usually more than I originally intend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I would find it very difficult if I could not access my Facebook account for an entire day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>My friends or family have commented that I spend too much time on Facebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The End

Thank you for taking time to answer the questions.
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You are advised to report to the Vice Chancellor, United States International University-Africa, the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Nairobi County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

GODFREY P. KALERWA MSc., MBA, MKIM
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The Vice Chancellor
United States International University-Africa.

The County Commissioner
Nairobi County.