An Assessment on the Cyber Human Values of EMU Students Based on their Behavior on Social Media

Maryam Saeed

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Information and Communication Technologies in Education

Eastern Mediterranean University
September 2019
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Information and Communication Technologies in Education.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun İşçioğlu
Acting Chair, Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technologies

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Information and Communication Technologies in Education.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun İşçioğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Mustafa İlkan

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun İşçioğlu

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatma Tansu Hocanın

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine the assessment on the cyber human values of EMU students based on their behavior on social media and how it differs according to gender, age, department and class level. The data collection tools used were quantitative research and survey method, Cyber Human Value (CHV) Scale which was applied to nine faculties (Faculty of Health Science, Faculty of Business and Economics, Faculty of Tourism, Faculty of Arts and Science, Faculty of Communication and Media Studies, Faculty of Pharmacy, Faculty of Architecture, Faculty of Medicine and Faculty of Engineering). The group of students who were part of this study include 271 registered bachelor, master and PhD students from these nine faculties at EMU who voluntarily participated in the survey. The descriptive analysis technique was used to analyze the data collected. Analyzing of the data was done using Percentage, T-test, one-way ANOVA and Frequency (f).

The discoveries indicated solid signs that dominant part of the EMU students showed essentially elevated levels of Cyber Human Values and there were no basic contrasts in the midst of Cyber Human Values as demonstrated by age and gender orientation.

Moreover, it was found that there is a difference between the class level of 1st year students and Cyber Human Value of EMU students which shows that 1st year students show high level of assessing Cyber Human Values.

Keywords: Social Networking Site, Cyber world, Human values, Cyber Human Values.

ÖZ

Bu çalışmada, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi (DAÜ) öğrencilerinin sosyal medyadaki davranışlarının siber insan değerleri üzerindeki etkilerinin, cinsiyet, yaş, bölüm ve sınıf düzeyine göre incelenmesi amaçlamaktadır. Kullanılan veri toplama aracı, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, İşletme ve Ekonomi Fakültesi, Turizm Fakültesi, Fen ve Edebiyat Fakültesi, İletişim ve Medya Çalışmaları Fakültesi, Eczacılık Fakültesi, Mimarlık Fakültesi, Tıp Fakültesi ve Mühendislik Fakültesi olmak üzere toplam 9 Fakültede okumakta olan öğrencilere uygulanmıştır. Çalışma Nicel bir araştırma olarak tasarlanmış, genel tarama modelinde Siber İnsan Değeri (KHD) ölçeği ile veriler toplanmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, yukarıda isimleri verilen dokuz fakülteye kayıtlı toplam 271 lisans, yüksek lisans ve doktora öğrencisin oluşturmaktadır. Toplanan verilerin analizi betimsel analiz teknikleri kullanılarak yapılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde Frekans (f), Yüzde, T testi ve tek yönlü ANOVA kullanılmıştır.

Çalışma sonucunda, DAÜ öğrencilerinin büyük bir bölümünün temelde yüksek Siber İnsan Değerleri seviyeleri gösterdiği, yaş ve cinsiyet değişkenleri açısından ise Siber İnsan Değerlerinin seviyesinde herhangi bir anlamlı farklılık bulunmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır.

Ayrıca, öğrencilerin sınıf düzeyleri bağlamında yapılan incelemede, 1. Sınıf öğrencilerinin Siber İnsan Değerlerinin diğer sınıflarda okuyan öğrencilerden daha yüksek seviyede olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Sosyal Ağ Sitesi, Siber Dünya, İnsani Değerler, Siber İnsani Değerler.

DEDICATION

To start with, I am grateful to Almighty Allah for providing me with the stamina, wisdom and resources to complete this uphill task successfully. To my family and friends who have drilled in me the passion for believing in myself My father Mr. Sohail Saeed who taught that the best kind of knowledge to have is that which is learned for its own sake and that even the largest task can be accomplished if it is done one step at a time. I am in dept. and extremely grateful to my mother, Mrs. Asma Saeed, for carrying out that vision with full devotion and constant supervision. I owe her everything for the person I am today. I am also thankful to my entire family for their support and understanding throughout.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I owe a great many thanks to a great many people who helped and supported me during my thesis. My worm personal appreciation and appreciation to my academic thesis supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun İşçioğlu for his patience, encouragement and expertise in seeking this dissertation safely into point. I cannot thank him enough for his continuous support throughout.

I would also like to thank my Institution (EMU) and the faculty members, special thanks to DR. Begüm ÇUBUKÇUOĞLU DEVRAN for her patience feedback on Chapter 1 and Chapter 3, Thanks to Isra Lawgali, Nasim Niksiar, Olasile Adedoyin, Siju Lawal, Mizanur Rahman and Bolouere Kikanwa Afenfia for all the support and assistance needed for Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 and for explaining the SPSS environment, without whom this thesis would have been a distant reality. I also extend my heartfelt thanks to my family and well-wishers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Inspiration is unavoidable and is a part of our lives. They are affected either by unequivocal or certain convincing messages each day. Broad media, including papers, radio, and TV, have been utilized as significant intends to convey powerful messages to buy items, and impact, or change our convictions (Lee, 2013).

With the development of versatile and inescapable processing, figuring advancements (computing technologies) and, products (e.g., email, web, fast Internet, PDAs, versatile applications, and others) have turned out to be unavoidable and are a fundamental piece of our lives. Consistently, they impact us expressly and verifiably. They have changed our method for living and our conduct, either purposefully or inadvertently. Since we started utilizing email, we don't compose letters all the time and visit the mail station significantly less much of the time than previously. After assortment of online visit programs wound up accessible, we have turned out to be increasingly agreeable visiting on the web than chatting on the telephone. Since on-request Internet video gushing is accessible, an expanding number of individuals are watching films on the Internet rather than leasing DVDs from the nearby store (Lee, 2013).

Communication that is the central instrument for socialization from past is the procedure of exchanging the planned importance to the recipient through the images and signs concurred before mutually. The correspondence has nonverbal oral and

composed sorts. Rehearsing the present Technologies into communication has upgraded the communication procedure in an assortment quintessence to the past, and the space has turned into an alluring region of speculation for the entrepreneur (Garrison and Kanuka, 2004).

In these ways, technologies have been influenced deliberately or unwittingly by registering advancements and products, and they have changed their practices (Lee, 2013).

The previous and present explanations behind the PCs and tablets as the last target item have as of late fallen behind being a communication instrument. This condition the electronic instruments open to themselves in communication makes web based life. Utilization of PCs as one of the crucial components of the data age they live in and the web that has created at an uncommon pace since 90s have kept on getting to be broad all around the globe. This advancement has changed the social orders. The instructive framework that needs to mirror the adjustments on the whole sub-frameworks making the general public to its body quickly has been in a battle for utilizing the PC and web based advancements usually and effectively (Garrison and Kanuka, 2004).

Proficient utilization of innovative devices and instruments incorporated into the instructive frameworks has uncovered new methodologies in showing techniques and methodologies. Online life is commonly utilized for communication, kinship, socialization, and sharing. Utilization of social media innovations in instruction has as of late turned into a current issue. Counting the web based life sites into the instructive procedures is astounding. Instructors can make a network with straightforward advances, and can set up correspondence offering to their understudies. All these give

accommodations for the clients. Then again, new qualities what's more, understandings show up in continually evolving world. As mentioned by Güngör (2000), innovation change influences our values, too.

Social networking is an electronic innovation that encourages in sharing our thoughts or data to each other utilizing web or gadgets, for example, tablet. The possibility of social media was gotten dependent on the presentation of Web 2.0 which achieved web networks and web intuitiveness whereby clients in a network could share and contribute different thoughts and substance (Nayak, 2016).

At this point when seen from a different perspective, there is also different life which is parallel to real life happening in the web. In matter of seconds, thousands of likes occurs, hundreds of comments are commented, many messages are exchanged and many calls are made. Thousands of information and data are exchanged which leads to transaction of thousands of dollars (PennyStocks, 2016).

As indicated by its easiest definition, digital human qualities are the counterparts of the qualities in the present data society (Huitt, 2004) to those in the internet made by the web.

When the speed of technological improvement is quicker than the speed of social advancement, at that point human qualities are conceivable to be referenced as being in risk. In this evolving procedure, they need to deal with the change without aggravating the system between our unmistakable also, vague qualities. In the event that can satisfy this, the procedure of human qualities as the primary focus of life will

be simpler, and will put our life principles on a more grounded base in the general public we live in (Tekin and Kara, 2017).

The Cyber world is per definition a world without physical fringes. Indeed, even with national and universal enactments, it is essentially worldwide furthermore, accordingly multilingual, multicultural, multi-religious, multilateral, regardless of whether patriot parties presently need to return to national personalities – additionally as a response to the staggering and ubiquitous worldwide Cyber Space. Therefore discussing about Cyber society which incorporates all angles of current society which are connected to the internet and are affected by it. Today, all segments of society around the world are as of now part of the cyber world, even without a PC or cell phone in private life. There are colossal desires and openings and in the meantime enormous feelings of trepidation and difficulties (Stuckelberger and Duggal, 2017).

Cyber morals goes for giving introduction about good and bad, great what's more, terrible, identified with the internet. It endeavors to apply and alter essential qualities and ideals to explicit new difficulties and circumstances emerging from digital advancements and digital society. As the internet impacts all pieces of society, cyber morals incorporates practically all morals areas (Stuckelberger and Duggal, 2017).

A workshop “HCI (Human Computer Interaction) in 2020” was held in where researchers from different countries agreed on the need to keep human qualities at HCI's center, they featured the certainty that our changing relationship with PCs implies that figuring out what these qualities may be and coming to comprehend them require more noteworthy artfulness than at any other time (Sellen, Rogers, Harper and Rodden, 2009).

Roblyer, McDaniel, Webb, Herman, and Witty (2010), did an examination with the point of deciding how employees and students see long distance connection and communication is being utilized in higher education. Their outcomes reasoned that employees and understudies both have diverse perspectives with regards to utilizing SNS with understudies being increasingly open to adjusting the utilization of Facebook and different SNS in the part of training as opposed to the employees.

Alwagait, Shahzad and Alim (2014) completed an investigation on 108 understudies over the term of three months and found that when web based life isn't utilized in abundance dependent on week by week levels, it positively affects understudies.

According to Tekin and Kara (2017), from the usage of social media by primary school students concluded that there were notable contrasts in online networking use propensities for the secondary education furthermore, their frames of mind towards apparent qualities as far as their recurrence of utilizing the informal communities. It was additionally inferred that female students had larger amount of duty esteem instead of the male students (Tekin and Kara, 2017).

The cyber human value scale created centers around the digital qualities that shape people's practices in online networking (Kilicer, Coklar and Ozeke 2017). “The nature of human can be understood by understanding the human in its complex mode of his self-revealed existence as a center of perception, valuation, thoughts and action” (Werkmeister, 1967).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Most of the people are unaware of theirs and others values online. The main aim of the study is to gain the knowledge and awareness of cyber human values. People share, comment, send messages of all kind, mostly not thinking how will it affect them or even others and what will the consequences will be so there is always a need to improve the knowledge, awareness and also the behavior of students towards cyber human values; so that the students will not suffer the experience of disrespectful, no tolerance, lies, harm or loneliness. The study is to know the behavior of EMU students towards cyber human values and how to deal with the knowledge. The study will help to know about the behavior of students towards what the values are and how to respect those values.

1.2 Aim of the Study

The proposed thesis aims to investigate cyber human values (CHV) of Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU) Students based on their behaviors on social media along with the relationship between CHV and their age, gender, level of study through the questionnaire.

1.3 Research Questions

The purpose of this thesis will be to answer the related questions:

1. What are the cyber human values of EMU Students based on their behavior on social media?

2. Is there a significant difference in student's cyber human value in terms of their gender?

3. Is there a significant difference in student's cyber human value in terms of their age?

4. Is there a significant difference in student's cyber human value and their class level?

1.4 Significance of Study

The study represents an incredible importance to the exploration field, college, staffs and students. The investigation will be completed so as to assess students understanding on the cyber human values of students based on their behavior on social media and furthermore decide whether there is an association between CHV and student's age, sexual orientation and class level etc.

1.5 Limitation of Study

The study is being constrain to the time as the cyber human value survey is to be distributed to all the departments of Eastern Mediterranean University students (bachelors, maters and PhDs) and information is to be gathered and calculated in spring 2018-2019 semester all by researcher herself.

The other limitation was the method used, rather than quantitative research method, mixed method would have been preferable so that interviewing participants would have given an in depth idea of students' awareness of Cyber human Value.

1.6 Definition of Research Key Terms

Social Networking Sites: These are computerized environments that foster interactivity between people whereby they can engage in various conversations on different subject matters at the same time use it for socializing and meeting different people such as Facebook, YouTube, twitter, Myspace etc (Olamilekan, 2016).

Cyber world: also known as cyberspace, is something beyond the Web. It indicates the social communications which include a number of members bind together in an online domain and can influence and impact one another. Individuals connect in the internet using computerized media (Gosafeonline, 2015).

Human value: values are characterized as something which are necessary and deserving of regard for the wellbeing of their own. Human values are characterized as those qualities which help man to live in amicability with the world (Puyasa).

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Since ages, technology have played a vital role in the lives of humans. The era of technology, started in the mid 18's when the revolution in industrial, businesses and educational sector began along with the invention of machines. Due to technology our life has been revolutionized, evolved, and digitized. The literature review part of this thesis appropriate and essential work is directly related with social networking site, behavior on social media and cyber human values. In expansion, related research and discoveries gotten from specialists and are in writing are examined.

2.1 Social Networking Site

Nowadays there is a huge number of social networking sites which helps to communicate from one individual to another, which can result in sharing a single post on different social media. This can result in people communicating with each other without actually meeting or contacting them directly (Hendricks, 2013).

Human beings are social creatures and they like to communicate with each other, the greater the better hence social network is the best tool for it. With all kinds of upcoming new features in these sites, online networking will be interesting in the coming decade (Leigh, 2016).

Social network as explained by Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy and Silvestre (2011) is the fusion of both phone and internet-based technologies in order to facilitate better interaction and interactivity between users and to foster a sense of networking whereby

users can share their own ideas. The idea of social media was developed as the introduction of Web 2.0 which brought about web communities and web interactivity whereby users in a community could share and contribute various ideas and contents. Furthermore, web 2.0 brought about Social Networking Sites (SNS).

SNS are computerized environments that foster interactivity between people whereby they can engage in various conversations on different subject matters at the same time use it for socializing and meeting different people. Different social media sites or platforms exist such as Facebook, YouTube, twitter, LinkedIn etc (Murray & Waller, 2007) with Facebook as the most used SNS site for carrying out group discussions and YouTube for its educational videos. Although SNS tools seems like an appropriate form of integrating social network in learning, most of teachers and students disagree with this idea based on the fact that not all social media platforms are suitable for carrying out education. According to their research, Moran *et.al* stated that most faculty members and instructors have stated that the Facebook and twitter SNS have a high negative effect while being used in a classroom with over 53% against the use of Facebook and 46% against the use of twitter in classrooms. Their claims were made valid by stating how the use of these sites causes a loss of focus with students and how students pay little to no attention in the classroom because they indulge themselves with these social network sites for their own personal use rather that academic purposes.

Studies have shown that although teachers perceive that SNS have an influence on teaching, two dominant problems affect their views on the SNS sites regarding to the amount of time that is being expended. The first problem faced is that most teachers have reportedly stated that 80% of students assignments or projects that have been

given lack credibility and honesty in the sense that they copy off each other without trying to understand what is being taught and this can be seen as a key barrier in using social network for educational purposes. Another problem faced is that 70% of teachers have alerted that the privacy of the students is another barrier that limits the use of social network in learning in the sense that students post everything on social media thereby making themselves vulnerable and susceptible to all form of attacks. Another underlying problem is time management which implies that if students use social media at a moderate level without spending so much time on it per day the probability of the SNS affecting their grades will be relatively low.

The present computerized population have transferred their relationships in reality into the internet; which becomes virtual by means of steady correspondence with others; share genuinely exceptional issues with their companions by means of their PCs or cell phones; make new companions on the off chance that they need (Aytekin and Sütçü, 2012; Borca., 2015); fulfill their requirement for association in social network sites (SNS) (Lopez, 2017), even join online campaigns as digital activist (Stoch and Roodt, 2016).

2.2 Behavior on Social Media

The impact of social media on people and their behavior is vast. This effect is usually positive, however it must be borne as a primary concern that there are or might be negative angles also. Experiments with human do change their behavior so does with social media. The day to day use of social media has obviously increased so much so that it inflect in our behavior now. There are bad and good impacts of social media. Some of the bad impacts of social media are:

1. Face to face contacts which are fundamental for development of characters, learning social abilities and relational abilities, have been expelled from the lives of individuals, particularly younger age group. Kids are having a troublesome time connecting with others, which may prompt unsociable conduct.

2. People are more depressed with low self-esteem as social media has made comparison with others' lives very easy due to which people are unhappy with their current statuses.

3. As social media is connected with cyberbullying and cyber abuse, lack of privacy can lead to problems like low self-esteem.

4. There are many games which promote violence due to which young youth have the tendency of increasing violence in their behavior.

5. Not just games, negative rumors spread on social media causes violence in the society too.

6. With social media it has turned out to be very difficult to keep away from awful news and the negative influences on our lives. This can prompt strong mental repercussions and lead to thoughts of our world falling apart, stress and anxiety (Social Media: Impact on human behavior and society, 2018).

Apart from these negative impact there are many good impact of social media on people.

1. Creative thinking develops as people share their views, ideas and their work with others.

2. There are many kind of fears people have, with the help of social media, the fear of rejection have been minimized as people explore and get actively involved with others.

3. Social media have helped in improving children self-efficacy, boost their cognitive flexibility and self-control and also helped them how to deal with success and failure in life.

4. People now a days go abroad to study or to do a job, social media have made it safe for people as they can easily connect with their friends, family and some government safety organizations.

5. Social media such as LinkedIn has helped people to find their job of interest.

2.3 Human Value

Value is a word derived from Latine word "Valere" meaning 'to be of worth'. Value is "a concept explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristics of a group of those desirable traits which influence the selection from available modes and ends of action."

Human values are the advantage that guide us to consider human component when one collaborates with one other individuals. They are our affections for the human pith of others. It's both what we anticipate that others should do to us and what we intend to provide for other people (Srivastava, 2017).

The value which are viewed as essential inborn qualities in people incorporate truth, trustworthiness, dedication, love, harmony, and so on as they draw out the principal integrity of individuals and society at large. We as human, come across a lot of situations which test our patience, peace of mind. Without these values it would be very difficult to cop up with life. Values guide us in the right path, develop character, attain peace in life, give direction to life, help us learn and appreciate the importance

of certainty, promote peace and harmony and most importantly bring changes in behavior towards positive thoughts (Human Values in Ethics, 2016).

2.4 Cyber Human Value

Global values are more focused these days than values specific to cultures or societies. Digital world is the best example of this as it help users to connect with each other via internet. This has led to different opportunities like virtual communication (Communicating with people you do know as well as people you don't).

Cyber human values in other words, how valid or false human behavior is when communicating with other (Kilicer, Coklar and Ozeke 2017). It involves cyber harassment, cyber morals, network custom and behavior in virtual worlds. Netiquette, refers to a group of ethics which help people to correspond successfully online (Shea, 1997) and therefore learn, understand and communicate appropriately (Arouri and Hamaidi, 2017). The correct human values such as respectability, honesty, good friendship, to be responsible for one's action, tolerance and patience are also part of Cyber Human Values which are usually instigate negative behavior due to the factor of invisibility of cyber space; Moor (1985) has specifically pointed this out and due to incorrect information instigated by negative behaviors, crime such as cyber violence, racism, and cyber bullying are detected. To develop healthy virtual relationships, and negate the negativity in cyber space, awareness of good global human values in it must be promoted.

2.5 Related Research

To probe the relationship between internet technologies and values, different study was conducted on the nation's level of economic growth with respect to educational background, job age etc. Bagchi (2015) used the data from World Value Survey and

European Social Survey found no relationship between the value of power and success and internet use. Though a significant difference was found among the developed and developing countries regarding the use of internet. And it was found that there was no relationship between the values of compassion, humanity and internet use.

In this modern day and age, technology has digitized the whole scenario on how education is being carried out. Currently, technology has brought about the virtualization of educational information whereby students and tutors do not have to be in the same geographical location, the information can be transmitted through video and audio teleconferencing, virtual online classes, e-learning, m-learning, distance education learning and social media platforms (Moore & Kearsley, 2005).

Although many means exist whereby education can be carried out and educational materials distributed, Moran, Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2011) stated that the use of social media in higher education has yielded a high amount of success in student achievement and ease the workload of teachers with over 90% of the academicians and instructors incorporating it for teaching purposes inside the classroom and their own personal use outside the four-walls of a classroom.

According to Besley (2008), there was a noteworthy relationship between internet use and TV used for entertainment. Besley used European Social Survey conducted in 30 European nations every 2 years since 2001 to a certain outlines, attitudes, values, behaviors, and believes of these nations to monitor the change in relation to media use such as TV entertainment vs news.

Becker and Connor (1981) conducted several studies regarding values of individual's vs media use and mass communication since 1970s especially connected to the time spend on magazines and newspapers and daily watching TV. According to them, people more into TV entertainment lived in euphoric state and they gave less importance to being talented or leading an exciting life.

McCarty and Shrum (1993) found a complex structure in their studies on value-behavior. In their study, they examined TV time plus types of program watched in relation to educational background, age, revenue, gender was studied with the structural equation modeling. They found that gender played an important role on the results for example, more women watched TV especially those indulging in comfort and pleasure than men. Moreover women valuing idolism watched more programs related to news.

Further studies on usage of Social Networking Sites on the relationship among people has led to the results of excessive usage of Facebook leading to negative situations like cheating, divorce, breakups by Clayton (2013).

Bergman (2011) put stress on the relationship between excessive usage of SNS and self-absorption, egoism. The high level of narcissism is due to social media addiction (Andreassen 2017) dues bring changes in human values.

To further this study Utz and Beukeboom (2011) found people with low self-respect used cyber platform to portray very idealistic image of themselves. They used self-respect as a search variable to evaluate the relation between jealousy and happiness in/with SNS.

When a study was conducted by Kilicer and Cokler (2015) on children age between 11 and 15 in relation to the excessive and multiple use of internet vs personality traits and human values. It was found that there was a negative outcome with the frequent use of internet and excessive time spend and with the decreased time spent on internet the human values score increased especially activities related to cyber gaming.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Method

This study is designed with quantitative research approach and the survey method or research. Quantitative approach underlines target estimations and the mathematical or numerical analysis of data gathered through surveys, statistical, questionnaires, and polls, or by controlling prior statistical data using computational procedures (Babbie, 2010). According to Ary, Jacobs, Irvine and Walker (2018), quantitative research approach includes the accumulation of numerical information through target estimation that requires a well-controlled setting for extending results for inquiries concerning phenomenon or test foreordained theory.

Quantitative technique anchoring is the utilization of mathematical information gotten from surveys, questionnaires and other factual strategies (Aliaga and Gunderson, 2000).

A descriptive attribute was used in the questionnaire application which is the survey method where the results and data were generalized and collected from a participant's sample. A survey is a way of gathering data from people with the same benefits (Kelley, Clark, Brown and Sitzia, 2003). A survey have two forms, a questionnaire and interview through which the attitude of the participants is determined.

3.2 Participants

The researcher tried to research 9 Faculties (Faculty of Health Science, Faculty or Business and Economics, Faculty or Tourism, Faculty of Arts and Science, Faculty or Communication and Media Studies, Faculty of Pharmacy, Faculty of Architecture, Faculty of Medicine and Faculty of Engineering) undergraduate, master and doctorate students, however, due to the use of convenience sampling technique from the nine faculties listed above 271 participants were participated to the study. Participants were well aware of the aim of the study. They were also aware of their consent which says that information given will be used for research purposely and it was anonymous.

Convenience sampling is known as opportunity sampling or coincidental or random sampling. Convenience testing are those for which the likelihood of choice is obscure (Dörnyei, 2007). The reason specialists use convenience test is on the grounds that they are anything but difficult to get. It comprises of members chose since they are accessible. In these testing strategy, a few individuals from the objective populace are chosen yet others are not on the grounds that they are absent when the example is being gathered accordingly the information gathered from an convenience test may not be relevant to the target group at all (Saumure and Given, 2008).

Table 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10 shows the gender, age range, study level, department, class level, internet access, access to social media, used social media hours spend on social media and knowledge of CHV of the participants are shown in the tables below.

Table 3.1: Gender of the Participants

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	116	42,8
Male	155	57,2
Total	271	100,0

In Table 3.1, the survey displays that 271 students contributed in the research out of which 42.8% (116 students) were female gender and 57.2 % (156 students) were male.

Table 3.2: Participants Age Range

Age Range	Frequency	Percent
18-20	51	18,8
21-25	118	43,5
26-30	63	23,2
31+	38	14,0
Total	271	100,0

In Table 3.2, after analyzing the results, it was found that 18.8 %(51 students) are of 18-20 age range, 43.5% (118 students) belonged to age range of 21-25, 23.3% (63 students) were in 26-30 year age range and 14% (38 students) were above 31+ of age.

Table 3.3: Study Level of the Participants

Study Level	Frequency	Percent
Bachelors	134	49,4
Masters	65	24,0
PhD	72	26,6
Total	271	100,0

Upon analyzing the results from the survey in table 3.3, it showed that 49.4% (134 students) were doing their bachelors, 24% (65 students) were in Masters and 26.6% (72 students) were in PhD.

Table 3.4: Departments of the Participants

Departments	Frequency	Percent
Faculty of Medicine	23	8,5
Faculty of Health Science	22	8,1
Faculty of Pharmacy	30	11,1
Faculty of Communication and Media Studies	13	4,8
Faculty of Arts and Science	29	10,7
Faculty or Business and Economics	33	12,2
Faculty of Architecture	24	8,9
Faculty of Tourism	15	5,5
Faculty of Engineering	82	30.3
Total	271	100,0

Table 3.4 shows the department of participants. 8.5% (23 students) were from Faculty of Medicine, 8.1% (22 students) were from faculty of Health Science, 11.1% (30 students) were from Faculty of Pharmacy, 4.8% (13 students) were from Faculty of Communication and Media Studies, 10.7% (29 students) were from faculty of Arts and Science, 12.2% (33 students) were from Faculty of Business and Economics, 8.9% (24 students) were from Faculty of Architecture, 5.5% (15 students) were from Faculty of Tourism and 30.3 % (82 students) were from Faculty of Engineering.

Table 3.5: Participants Class level

Class level	Frequency	Percent
1st	46	17,0
2nd	73	26,9
3rd	64	23,6
4th	58	21,4
other	30	11,1
Total	271	100,0

When examining the class level of the participants, the researcher was able to find out that 17% (46 students) were in their 1st year, 26.9% (73 students) were in their 2nd year, 23.6% (64 students) were in their 3rd year, 21.4% (58 students) were in their 4th year and 11.1% (30 students) were in their 5th, 6th or 7th year.

Table 3.6: Participants who have Access to internet

Access to internet	Frequency	Percent
yes	269	99,3
no	2	0,7
Total	271	100,0

Table 3.6 shows the participant who have access to internet. When these student participant was examined, 99.3% (269 students) have access to internet whereas 0.7% (2 students) don't have internet connection access.

Table 3.7: Participant who have Social Media Access

Social Media Access	Frequency	Percent
yes	267	98,5
No	4	1,5
Total	271	100,0

While participant who have social media access was examined in table 3.7, 98.5% (267 students) said they have social media access while 1.5% (4 students) said they do not have access to social media.

Table 3.8: Participant who used Social Media before

Used Social media before	Frequency	Percent
yes	260	95,9
no	11	4,1
Total	271	100,0

Table 3.8 shows participants who used social media before. 95.9% (267 students) said they used social media before whereas 4.1% (11 students) said they didn't use social media before.

Table 3.9: Hours Spent by Participant on Social Media

Spent Hours on Social media	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 hour	63	23,2
2-5 Hours	110	40,6
6-10 Hours	80	29,5
11 Hours +	18	6,6
Total	271	100,0

From Table 3.9 when the results were examined, 23.2% (63 students) answered they spent less than 1 hour on social media, 40.6% (110 students) spent 2-5 hours on social media, 29.5% (80 students) spent 6-10 hours and 6.6% (18 students) spent 11+ hours on social media.

Table 3.10: Participant who have heard about Cyber Human Values

Heard about CHV	Frequency	Percent
Yes	116	42,8
No	155	57,2
Total	271	100,0

Table 3.10 shows participants who have heard about Cyber Human Values. 42.8% (116 students) said they have heard about Cyber Human Values while 57.2% (155 students) said they haven't heard about Cyber Human Values.

3.3 Data Collection Tools

The two parts of proposed questionnaire will consist of, first the demographic section and second, the cyber human value scale. The researcher developed the demographic section and included 10 general questions such as gender, age, level of study etc. about the students. The second section cyber human value scale survey developed by Kilicer, Coklar and Ozeke (2017) which is established on Likert type scale fluctuating from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree) and of consist of 25 items used to measure the cyber human value under five subdivisions, truth, respect, solidarity, tolerance and

being peaceful. The being peaceful sub-division will consist of 6 items, 5 items in the truth sub-division, 5 items in solidarity sub-division, 5 items in respect sub-division and 4 items in tolerance sub-division. The reason this questionnaire was chosen because the items obtained were capable of discriminating the individuals in term of the features to be measured by the scale.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using descriptive analysis technique, one-way ANOVA and T test. Descriptive frequency and analysis was applied to show the secondary result in reference to each recommended research conversation starter variable while the T-test and ANOVA was applied to divide information that administers just two factors in the instance of T-test and numerous factors on account of ANOVA Frequency (f), T-test and one way ANOVA was applied for analyze the information.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

The reliability findings from the original research by Field in 2005 was specified as 0.90 proves that the scale was reliable (Field, 2005).

Table 3.11: Reliability Analysis of the Study

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
0,91	25

An internal consistency coefficient of CHV scale (Cronbach's alpha value of 25-items) was conducted and resulted as 0.91, thus, showing the values in the CHV scale are reliable.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Chapter 4 demonstrates the results obtained from the analyzed data. The details below presents the participants Cyber Human Value awareness according to their gender, academic class level and age.

4.1 Cyber Human Values of EMU Students based on their behavior on social media

As it tends to be found in Table 4.1, respect, truth, tolerance, peaceful and solidarity sub-measurements have 5, 5, 4, 6 and 5 items independently which are being evaluated on a Likert type scale including 5 items.

25 was determined as the average mean of respect, truth, and solidarity. While 20 was determined for tolerance and 30 for peaceful. A mean value that is widely larger than the normal average and is close by to the range with that of the most extreme mean value indicates that the mean value is independently great.

Table 4.1 illustrates the standard deviation and mean of the students awareness of Cyber Human Value based on 5 sub-dimensions.

Table 4.1: Cyber Human Value of EMU students.

Sub-Dimensions	Items	Item Mean	Sub-Dimensions Mean
Respect	Item 1	3.04	15.88
	Item 2	**3.44**	
	Item 3	3.39	
	Item 4	3.04	
	Item 5	**2.97**	
Truth	Item 6	**3.24**	17.15
	Item 7	3.49	
	Item 8	**3.53**	
	Item 9	3.50	
	Item 10	3.39	
Tolerance	Item 11	**3.05**	12.69
	Item 12	3.18	
	Item 13	**3.23**	
	Item 14	**3.23**	
Peaceful	Item 15	3.59	20.94
	Item 16	**3.66**	
	Item 17	**3.38**	
	Item 18	3.45	
	Item 19	3.40	
	Item 20	3.46	
Solidarity	Item 21	3.27	16.1
	Item 22	3.26	
	Item 23	3.20	
	Item 24	**3.09**	
	Item 25	**3.28**	
Average		3.31	16.55

The lowest and the highest values of each subdivisions were for respect 2.97 and 3.44, truth 3.24 and 3.53, tolerance 3.05 and 3.23, peaceful 3.38 and 3.66, solidarity 3.09 and 3.28.

The mean values of the respect, truth, tolerance, peaceful and solidarity values were 15.88, 17.15, 12.69, 20.94 and 16.1.

4.1.1 Cyber Human Values of EMU Students based on their behavior on social media with respect to the subdivision respect

In regards to Cyber Human Value, the respect factor illustrate the confidence level of all students based on 5 items.

Table 4.2: Students opinion on sharing's of social media users.

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 1	Strongly Disagree	45	16,6	3.04	1.31
	Disagree	56	20,7		
	Neutral	50	18,5		
	Agree	82	30,3		
	Strongly Agree	38	14,0		
	Total	271	100,0		

According to Table 4.2, great level of positivity was shown by 44.3% towards their confidence level in sharing on social media (120 students), whereas 37.3 % disapproved the idea (101 students). While 18.5 % were neutral about this suggestion (50 students).

Therefore, a mean approximation of 3.04 and a SD approximation of 1.31 indicates that, students utilize respect factor they display a normal state of trust in executing the basic functionalities.

Table 4.3: Students opinion on paying attention to social sensitivity while sharing something

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 2	Strongly Disagree	15	5,5	3.44	1.18
	Disagree	53	19,6		
	Neutral	58	21,4		
	Agree	88	32,5		
	Strongly Agree	57	21,0		
	Total	271	100,0		

Decisively, the outcome gotten from this finding demonstrates the exact assessment from the consequence of Schwartz (1992, 2012) think about which stipulated in the value model of value type of tradition.

Consequently, according to Table 4.3, a more noteworthy number of students feels positive in paying attention to social sensitivity while sharing. As a res. 21.4% had an impassive conclusion on the idea (58 students).

Moreover, an average approximation of 3.44 and SD of 1.18 were achieved, which demonstrates about the students sharing something on social media, they do give little courtesy to social sensitivity.

The study on social sharing of emotions by Bazarova (2015) the same thing and focuses that sensitive issues are limited to offline context with single and ‘rationally close target’.

Table 4.4: Students opinion on considering others sensitivity while sharing something

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 3	Strongly Disagree	20	7,4	3.39	1.18
	Disagree	45	16,6		
	Neural	68	25,1		
	Agree	86	31,7		
	Strongly Agree	52	19,2		
	Total	271	100,0		

As per Table 4.4, a larger piece of the students populace considerate others sensitivity while sharing something on social media. Therefore, 50.9% showed high level of optimistic towards the sensitivity of others (138 students). Whereas, 24% objected to

the idea of considering sensitivity of others (65 students), while 25.1% were unbiased to the thought (68 understudies).

Furthermore, mean estimation of 3.39 with a SD of 1.18 was determined, which shows that when students are sharing something on social media, they give priority to others sensitivity on social media but not as such as it should be given.

It is quite evident through the study by Bender (2012) that consideration to others sensitivity is a 'personal ability to perceive and understand' what others might go through. However it is realized that social sensitivity can lead to positive teamwork and growth.

Table 4.5: Students opinion on giving importance to users sharing's

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 4	Strongly Disagree	25	9,2	3.04	1.15
	Disagree	67	24,7		
	Neutral	82	30,3		
	Agree	64	23,6		
	Strongly Agree	32	11,8		
	Total	270	99,6		

In reference to Table 4.5, it tends to be concluded that a certain people of the respondents feel greatly certain on giving importance to users sharing. For which 35.4% show large amounts of energy towards what people share on social media (96 students). 33.9% disagreed with the idea and gave no importance to user's sharing's (92 students). While 30.3% had an indifference point of view (82 students).

In addition to their findings. An average estimate of 3.04 with a SD value of 1.15 shows that students have unbiased thoughts on giving importance to other users comments, photos, videos and so on.

The same is pointed out in a study by Baruah (2012). It further elaborates that the online sharing of information has basically changed the personality of social lives, both at personal and public level.

Table 4.6: Students opinion on giving value to all comments made

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 5	Strongly Disagree	27	10,0	2.97	1.15
	Disagree	74	27,3		
	Neutral	80	29,5		
	Agree	61	22,5		
	Strongly Agree	29	10,7		
	Total	271	100,0		

As per Table 4.6, 33.2% of students have extreme level of confidence when it comes to giving value to all the comments made by social network users. In disagreement to this 37.3% of students were not for the idea, stating that they don't give value to the comments made and 29.5% were unbiased about the idea.

Moreover, the mean score of 2.97 and SD value of 1.15 shows that students don't give much value to all the comments made by the social network users.

In contrast to this finding, Jaring (2017) study points out that social media is a rich source of information which promotes awareness especially in the educational research domain.

4.1.2 Cyber Human Values of EMU Students based on their behavior on social media with respect to truth

In regards to Cyber Human Value, the truth factor illustrate the confidence level of all students based on 5 items.

Table 4.7: Students opinion on not deleting their sharing's of any type

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 6	Strongly Disagree	18	6,6	3.24	1.14
	Disagree	60	22,1		
	Neutral	69	25,5		
	Agree	87	32,1		
	Strongly Agree	37	13,7		
	Total	271	100,0		

From Table 4.7, concluded 45.8% of students depict high level of confirmation on not deleting any of their sharing's. However 28.7% of students said they do delete some or all of their sharing's on social media, while 25.5% were unbiased. Consequently, total average score of 3.24 and SD of 1.14 was accomplished which demonstrates that participant's delete their sharing's on social media.

Table 4.8: Students opinion on not expecting approval of others on their thoughts

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 7	Strongly Disagree	9	3,3	3.49	1.08
	Disagree	47	17,3		
	Neutral	68	25,1		
	Agree	97	35,8		
	Strongly Agree	50	18,5		
	Total	271	100,0		

Madden (2013) in her study talks about diversified opinions for deleting the shared content. There is a set of people who are comfortable with 'leaving' their shared

material for everyone to view, while there are others who would either restrict people from viewing through setting privacy setting or delete people from their network.

In reference to Table 4.8, 54.3% of students agree on not expecting approval of others on their thought, while 20.6% of students don't agree with the statement. On the other hand 25.1% students were indifference. As a result, total mean score of 3.49 and SD of 1.08 was accomplished which shows that students do not expect approval of others on their thoughts.

In the study by Erin Vogel (2014), it is clear that people have low self-esteem when commented by the target person from a higher social circle rather than from a lower one.

Table 4.9: Students opinion on being the same person on social media

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 8	Strongly Disagree	18	6,6	3.53	1.17
	Disagree	38	14,0		
	Neutral	56	20,7		
	Agree	100	36,9		
	Strongly Agree	59	21,8		
	Total	271	100,0		

According to the Table 4.9, 58.7% students agree on not being a different person on social network, while 20.6% students disagree with not being a different person on social network. Whereas 20.7% students remained neutral.

With the mean score of 3.53 and standard deviation of 1.17 it is evident that students have the same personality as they have in real life.

Table 4.10: Students opinion on sharing exactly their thoughts

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 9	Strongly Disagree	15	5,5	3.50	1.14
	Disagree	43	15,9		
	Neutral	57	21,0		
	Agree	102	37,6		
	Strongly Agree	53	19,6		
	Total	270	99,6		

In the light of the Table 4.10, 57.2% students agree and 21.4% disagree. Whereas 21% remain neutral. The mean value of 3.50 with a SD of 1.14 it can be seen that students are neutral while sharing their thoughts on social media.

Table 4.11: Students opinion on having a sharing environment consist with each other

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 10	Strongly Disagree	19	7,0	3.39	2.05
	Disagree	38	14,0		
	Neutral	92	33,9		
	Agree	87	32,1		
	Strongly Agree	33	12,2		
	Total	270	99,6		

According to the Table 4.11, 44.3% students agree and 21 % students disagree. While 33.9% students remain neutral.

With the average score of 3.04 with a SD of 1.19 it is clear that students might or don't have a sharing environment consist with each other on social media.

This has been pointed out in the explanation of the previous tables that various studies have elaborated that people are open to sharing information with others to bridge the

gap of communication and gather information about things around. For this purpose they are open to sharing environment with each other.

4.1.3 Cyber Human Values of EMU Students based on their behavior on social media with respect to tolerance

In regards to Cyber Human Value, the tolerance factor illustrate the confidence level of all students based on 4 items.

Table 4.12: Students opinion on tolerating any comment made on their sharing's

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 11	Strongly Disagree	24	8,9	3.05	1.11
	Disagree	65	24,0		
	Neutral	75	27,7		
	Agree	84	31,0		
	Strongly Agree	21	7,7		
	Total	269	99,3		

As stated in the Table 4.12, 38.7 % students agree and 32.9% students disagree. While 27.7% students remain neutral.

With the mean score of 3.05 and standard deviation of 1.11 it is clear that students don't tolerate any kind of comments made, some might but mostly don't.

Vogel (2014) points out that people are likely to have open criticism from those who belong from a higher social circle rather than from a lower one.

Table 4.13: Students opinion on tolerating any sharing's on social media

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 12	Strongly Disagree	26	9,6	3.18	2.68
	Disagree	64	23,6		
	Neutral	85	31,4		
	Agree	73	26,9		
	Strongly Agree	21	7,7		
	Total	271	100,0		

Table 4.13 depicts that 34.6% students agree and 33.2% students disagree. While 31.4% students remain neutral.

The average score of 3.18 and SD of 2.68 it is clear that students have less tolerance level on social media when it comes to the other people's sharing.

Table 4.14: Students opinion on not judging friends on their opinion on social media

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 13	Strongly Disagree	18	6,6	3.23	1.15
	Disagree	62	22,9		
	Neutral	70	25,8		
	Agree	83	30,6		
	Strongly Agree	38	14,0		
	Total	271	100,0		

As shown in Table 4.14, 44.6% students agree and 29.5% students disagree. While 25.8% students remain neutral.

With the mean score of 3.23 and standard deviation of 1.15 it is clear that students might not but mostly do judge their friends on their opinion they share on social media.

Table 4.15: Students opinion on tolerating criticisms on their sharing's

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 14	Strongly Disagree	22	8,1	3.23	1.08
	Disagree	43	15,9		
	Neutral	82	30,3		
	Agree	99	36,5		
	Strongly Agree	25	9,2		
	Total	271	100,0		

Table 4.15 reflects that 45.7% students agree and 24% students disagree. While 30.3% students remain neutral.

With the average score of 3.23 with SD of 1.08 it is clear that students have very less tolerance level on the critics made on their sharing's on social media.

Nitzburg and Farber (2013) explains in their research about putting up emotional status and emerging adults experiences that the advancement of the technologies will continue to widen the gap between the tolerance level of different age group people thus proving the above results.

4.1.4 Cyber Human Values of EMU Students based on their behavior on social media with respect to being peaceful

In regards to Cyber Human Value, the peaceful factor illustrate the confidence level of all students based on 6 items.

Table 4.16: Students opinion on avoiding sharing anything that could harm others

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 15	Strongly Disagree	15	5,5	3.59	1.19
	Disagree	40	14,8		
	Neutral	59	21,8		
	Agree	85	31,4		
	Strongly Agree	72	26,6		
	Total	271	100,0		

Table 4.16 states that 58% students agree and 20.3% students disagree. While 21.8% students remain neutral.

The average score of 3.59 and SD of 1.19 it is clear that students do make sure not to share anything on social media that could harm others.

Table 4.17: Students opinion on not sharing anything unrealistic about others

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 16	Strongly Disagree	29	10,7	3.67	1.37
	Disagree	34	12,5		
	Neutral	41	15,1		
	Agree	64	23,6		
	Strongly Agree	103	38,0		
	Total	271	100,0		

According to Table 4.17, 61.6% students agree and 23.2% students disagree. While 15.1% students remain neutral.

With the mean score of 3.67 and standard deviation of 1.37 it is clear that students do keep in mind about others thus they avoid sharing anything unrealistic about others on social media.

In a study by Amedie (2015) about bullying others claim that around 35% adolescents have been reported to be involved in such kind of act, causing others to have mental scars, emotional issues and suicides.

Table 4.18: Students opinion on taking part in social media environment away from tension and anger

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 17	Strongly Disagree	32	11,8	3.38	1.33
	Disagree	40	14,8		
	Neutral	64	23,6		
	Agree	63	23,2		
	Strongly Agree	72	26,6		
	Total	271	100,0		

As per Table 4.18, 49.8% students agree and 26.6% students disagree. While 23.6% students remain neutral.

With the average score of 3.38 and SD of 1.33 it is clear that students prefer to take part in social media environment that are away from tension and anger.

As for the study by Strickland (2014) it has been thoroughly explained that the effects of social media are different for each age group so not anything concrete can be said about it.

Table 4.19: Students opinion on not causing tension and anger in social media

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 18	Strongly Disagree	10	3,7	3.45	1.12
	Disagree	53	19,6		
	Neutral	66	24,4		
	Agree	90	33,2		
	Strongly Agree	52	19,2		
	Total	271	100,0		

In the light of Table 1.19, 52.4% students agree on not causing tension and anger in social media and 23.3% students disagree with it. While 24.4% students remain neutral.

The average score of 3.45 with SD of 1.12 it is clear that students avoid anything that could cause tension and anger in social media.

Table 4.20: Students opinion on not sharing anything to provoke users in social media

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 19	Strongly Disagree	21	7,7	3.04	1.19
	Disagree	38	14,0		
	Neutral	79	29,2		
	Agree	77	28,4		
	Strongly Agree	56	20,7		
	Total	271	100,0		

In reference to Table 4.20, 49.1% students agree on not sharing anything to provoke users in social media and 21.7% students disagree. While 29.2% students remain neutral.

With the average score of 3.04 with SD of 1.19 it is clear that students try not to but do share anything that could provoke users in social media.

Table 4.21: Students opinion on not sharing anything that provoke others

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 20	Strongly Disagree	9	3,3	3.46	1.08
	Disagree	47	17,3		
	Neutral	76	28,0		
	Agree	89	32,8		
	Strongly Agree	50	18,5		
	Total	271	100,0		

The Table 4.21 above, 51.3% students agree that they do not share anything while 20.6% students claim that they do so to provoke others. 28% students remain neutral.

Average score of 3.46 with SD of 1.08 it is clear that students disagree or are neutral while sharing anything that provoke others in social media.

In the research of overcoming the "Ideology of openness", Gibbs, Rozaidi and Eisenberg found out that engineers in a high-tech start-up organization faced pressures to share knowledge while managing their availability to others.

4.1.5 Cyber Human Values of EMU Students based on their behavior on social media with respect to solidarity

In regards to Cyber Human Value, the solidarity factor illustrate the confidence level of all students based on 5 items.

Table 4.22: Students opinion on trying to be in someone's else shoe to solve problems

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 21	Strongly Disagree	19	7,0	3.27	1.07
	Disagree	42	15,5		
	Neutral	87	32,1		
	Agree	93	34,3		
	Strongly Agree	30	11,1		
	Total	271	100,0		

As per Table 4.22, 45.4% students agree that they try to be in someone else's shoe to solve problems but 22.5% students disagree. While 32.1% students remain neutral about it.

With the mean score of 3.27 and standard deviation of 1.07 it is clear that students might think of others by trying to be in someone else's shoe trying to solve problems.

It is quite evident through the study by Bender (2012) that consideration to others sensitivity is a 'personal ability to perceive and understand' what others might go

through. However it is realized that social sensitivity can lead to positive teamwork and growth.

Table 4.23: Students opinion on sharing anything emphasizes the importance of social solidarity

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 22	Strongly Disagree	17	6,3	3.26	1.15
	Disagree	57	21,0		
	neutral	80	29,5		
	Agree	73	26,9		
	Strongly Agree	44	16,2		
	Total	271	100,0		

Table 4.23 explains that 43.1% students agree on sharing anything emphasizes the importance of social solidarity but 27.3% students disagree with it. While 29.5% students remain neutral.

Average score of 3.26 with SD of 1.15 it will be not wrong to say that students do not share anything that do emphasizes the importance of social solidarity in social media.

Table 4.24: Students opinion on providing active support for social solidarity in social media

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 23	Strongly Disagree	25	9,2	3.20	1.15
	Disagree	49	18,1		
	Neutral	77	28,4		
	Agree	86	31,7		
	Strongly Agree	34	12,5		
	Total	271	100,0		

Table 4.24 reflects that 44.2% students agree on providing active support for social solidarity in social media, on the other hand 27.3% students disagree with it. While 28.4% students remain neutral.

Average score of 3.20 with SD of 1.15 it is unfortunate that students do not provide active support for social solidarity in social media.

Table 4.25: Students opinion on providing active support in charity organization in social media

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 24	Strongly Disagree	24	8,9	3.09	1.11
	Disagree	55	20,3		
	Neutral	92	33,9		
	Agree	72	26,6		
	Strongly Agree	28	10,3		
	Total	271	100,0		

According to Table 4.25, 36.9% students agree on providing active support to charity organization on social media and 29.2% students disagree with it. While 33.9% students remain neutral.

The average score of 3.09 with SD of 1.11 it is obvious from the results of table 4.24 that students do not provide active support in charity organization in social media.

Table 4.26: Students opinion on providing help regardless of who asks for that help

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 25	Strongly Disagree	25	9,2	3.28	1.22
	Disagree	50	18,5		
	neutral	67	24,7		
	Agree	82	30,3		
	Strongly Agree	47	17,3		
	Total	271	100,0		

In Table 4.26, 47.6% students agree that they provide help regardless of who asks for help and 27.7% students disagree with it. While 24.7% students remain neutral on whether or not help in needed.

The average score of 3.28 with SD of 1.22 it is evident that students have negative opinion on providing help regardless of who asks is asking.

Wodzicki, Schwammlein and Moskaliuk (2012) examined the study-related knowledge exchange via StudiVZ, the German equivalent of Facebook. Results indicated that about one fifth of participants exchange study-related knowledge through StudiVZ and that students especially fresher's contact with other students and orientation.

4.2 Relationship between Cyber Human Values and Gender of Students

So as to decide whether Cyber Human Values of students of EMU differ definitely among genders, an autonomous example t-test was sorted out so as to analyze Cyber Human Values in male and female.

An importance gap doesn't occur in Cyber Human Values of male and female students for all the 25 items. Besides, the outcomes demonstrate that gender isn't viewed as a noteworthy basis on the Cyber Human Values of EMU students, subsequently, no connection between gender of EMU students and Cyber Human Values.

The discoveries in this examination is not quite the same as the discoveries of Lyons et al (2005) which hypothesized that respondents gender has an association with human values.

4.3 Relationship between Cyber Human Values and Age of Students

To find out and measure the impacts of age on CHV, ANOVA test was used in regard to individual age range (18-20, 21-25, 26-30 and 31+). Nonetheless, Cyber Human

Value did not vary fundamentally for the varied age groups in each of the 25 items ($p>0.05$).

Decisively, the outcomes show that the age group of EMU students isn't viewed as a critical determinant of their Cyber human values.

Subsequently, there is no connection exists between Cyber Human Values and age gathering of EMU students groups (18-20, 21-25, 26-30 and 31+). Besides, the discoveries of this research was equivalent to the discoveries of Lafontana and Cillessen (2010) study which set that respondents age group has no association with Cyber Human Values in individuals.

4.4 Relationship between Cyber Human Values and Class level of Students

For deciding the association between Cyber Human Values and class level, a One Way ANOVA test and a Post Hoc correlation were utilized to measure the effect of class level (first year, second year, third year, fourth year and other) on Cyber human Value. As a result, the ANOVA table showed that out of 25 items, a criticalness distinction exists for just 7 items with respect to EMU student's class level.

Table 4.27 shows the descriptive statistics table containing the frequency (N), Mean(X), and standard deviation of Item 3 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Values and class level.

Table 4.27: Students opinion on considering others sensitivity while sharing something

	Frequency (N)	Mean (X)	Std. Deviation
1st year	46	3,82	1,08
2nd year	73	3,32	1,08
3rd year	64	3,43	1,23
4th year	58	3,17	1,23
other	30	3,16	1,26

Table 4.28 illustrates the One Way ANOVA table containing the sum of squares, standard deviation, mean square, F, and significance difference (p) of Item 3 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Value and class level.

Table 4.28: Cyber Human Value depending on class level of students for Item 3

Variable source		Sum of squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P	Significant Difference
Cyber Human Value	Between Groups	13,40	4	3,35	2,44	0,04	1st – 2nd
	Within Groups	364,91	266	1,37			1st – 4th
	Total	378,31	270				1st – other

To discover the connection between Cyber Human Value and class level, a One Way ANOVA test and Post Hoc correlation was run to decide and measure the impacts of class level on Cyber Human Value in regard to the distinctive class level (first, second, third, and fourth Year). As shown in Table 4.27, the arithmetic mean estimation of Cyber Value for changing class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year) for item 3 indicated different and additionally presented in the p value section of Table 4.28, there is an important class level difference on CHV of EMU students ($p<0.05$) for the 3 constraints [$F(4,266) = 2.44$, $p=0.04$].

For item 3, the results of post hoc test displays that the first Academic year students mean value (X= 3.82, SD = 1.08) is similar to 3rd year students (X= 3.43, SD= 1.23) but have a significant difference from the 2nd (X= 3.32, standard deviation= 1.08), 4th (X= 3.17, SD= 1.23) and other years students (X= 3.16, SD= 1.26). The 2nd year students is similar to the 4th year and other year's students. Similarly 3th year students are similar with 2nd, 4th and other year's students along with 4th year students being similar with other year's students with no significant difference.

Table 4.29 shows the descriptive statistics table containing the frequency (N), Mean(X), and standard deviation of Item 9 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Values and class level.

Table 4.29: Students opinion on sharing exactly their thoughts

	Frequency (N)	Mean (X)	Std. Deviation
1st year	46	3,84	1,09
2nd year	73	3,68	1,01
3rd year	63	3,30	1,26
4th year	58	3,31	1,18
Other	30	3,30	0,98

Table 4.30 shows the One Way ANOVA table containing the sum of squares, standard deviation, mean square, F, and significance difference (p) of Item 9 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Value and class level.

Table 4.30: Cyber Human Value depending on class level of students for Item 9

Variable source		Sum of squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P	Significant Difference
Cyber Human Value	Between Groups	13,82	4	3,45	2,72	0,03	1st – 3rd
	Within Groups	335,67	265	1,26			1st – 4th
	Total	349,50	269				1st – other 2nd – 3rd

To discover the connection between Cyber Human Value and class level, a One Way ANOVA test and Post Hoc correlation was run to decide and the impacts of class level on Cyber Human Value measurements in respect to the individual class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year). As illustrated in Table 4.29, the Cyber Value arithmetic mean estimation for changing class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year) for item 9 was different and moreover showed in the p value section of Table 4.30, there is an important difference of class level on CHV of EMU students ($p<0.05$) for the 4 limitations [$F(4,265) = 2.72$, $p=0.03$].

Accordingly, a post hoc test results shows that the mean value of 1st year students (X= 3.84, SD= 1.09) is similar to 2nd year students (X= 3.68, SD = 1.01) but have a significant difference with the mean of 3rd year students (X= 3.30, SD = 1.26), 4th year students (X= 3.31, SD = 1.18) and other year students (X= 3.30, SD = 0.98). In addition, the mean value of 2nd year students is similar to 4th year and other year students while having a significant difference to 3rd year students. Furthermore, the mean value of 3rd year students is similar to the other year students and lastly the mean value of 4th year student is similar with 3rd and other years, with no significant difference with the mean value of any year.

Table 4.31 shows the descriptive statistics table containing the frequency (N), Mean(X), and standard deviation of Item 11 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Values and class level.

Table 4.31: Students opinion on tolerating any comment made on their sharing's

	Frequency (N)	Mean (X)	Std. Deviation
1st year	46	3,02	0.99
2nd year	73	3,41	1,03
3rd year	64	2,90	1,28
4th year	57	2,91	1,09
Other	29	2,75	0,87

Table 4.32 shows the One Way ANOVA table containing the sum of squares, standard deviation, mean square, F, and significance difference (p) of Item 11 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Value and class level.

Table 4.32: Cyber Human Value depending on class level of students for Item 11

Variable source		Sum of squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P	Significant Difference
Cyber Human Value	Between Groups	14,41	4	3,60	3,03	0,01	2nd – 3rd
	Within Groups	313,95	264	1,18			2nd – 4th
	Total	328,37	268				2nd – other

To discover the connection between Cyber Human Value and class level, a One Way ANOVA test and Post Hoc correlation was run to decide and find out the impacts of class level on CHV in relation to the distinctive class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year). As explained in Table 4.31, the arithmetic mean estimation of Cyber Value for changing class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year) for item 11 demonstrated different and furthermore showed in the p value section of Table 4.32, there is a significance difference of class level on Cyber Human Value of EMU students ($p<0.05$) for the 3 constraints [$F(4,264) = 3.03$, $p=0.01$].

As per the post hoc results the mean value of the 1St year students (X= 3.02, SD= 0.99) is similar to 3rd year students (X= 2.90, SD= 1.28), 4th year students (X= 2.91, SD=

1.09) and other year students (X= 2.75, SD= 0.87). The mean value of 2nd year students (X= 3.41, SD= 1.03) is similar to only the 1st year students however having a significant difference with the mean value of 3rd year students (X= 2.90, SD= 1.28), 4th year students (X= 2.91, SD= 1.09) and other year students (X= 2.75, SD= 0.87). The mean value of 3rd year students is similar with the other year students and the mean value of 4th year students is similar with both 3rd year and other year's students, with no significant difference among any years.

Table 4.33 shows the descriptive statistics table containing the frequency (N), Mean(X), and standard deviation of Item 15 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Values and class level.

Table 4.33: Students opinion on avoiding sharing anything that could harm others

	Frequency (N)	Mean (X)	Std. Deviation
1st year	46	4,23	0,89
2nd year	73	3,65	1,12
3rd year	64	3,37	1,27
4th year	58	3,37	1,22
Other	30	3,26	1,11

Table 4.34 shows the One Way ANOVA table containing the sum of squares, standard deviation, mean square, F, and significance difference (p) of Item 15 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Value and class level.

Table 4.34: Cyber Human Value depending on class level of students for Item 15

Variable source		Sum of squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P	Significant Difference
Cyber Human Value	Between Groups	28,38	4	7,09	5,37	0,00	1st – 2nd
	Within Groups	351,33	266	1,32			1st – 3rd
	Total	379,71	270				1st – 4th 1st - other

To discover the connection between Cyber Human Value and class level, a One Way ANOVA test and Post Hoc correlation was run to decide and measure the impacts of class level on Cyber Human Value in regard to the distinctive class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year). As demonstrated in Table 4.33, the arithmetic mean estimation of Cyber Value for changing class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year) for item 15 demonstrated different and furthermore showed in the p value section of Table 4.34, there is a significance difference of class level on Cyber Human Value of EMU students ($p<0.05$) for the 4 constraints [$F(4,266) = 5.37$, $p=0.00$].

Subsequently, as illustrated in Table 4.33, and Table 4.34 and the Post Hoc test result for item 15, the mean value of the 1St year students (X= 4.23, SD= 0.89) varied significantly with 2nd year students (X= 3.65, SD= 1.12), 3rd year students (X= 3.37, SD= 1.27), 4th year students (X= 3.37, SD= 1.22) and other year students (X= 3.26, SD= 1.11). However the mean value of 2nd year students is similar with 3rd, 4th and other year students with no significant difference. Furthermore 3rd year mean value is similar to other year students while the 4th years mean value is similar to both 3rd and other year students.

Table 4.35 shows the descriptive statistics table containing the frequency (N), Mean(X), and standard deviation of Item 16 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Values and class level.

Table 4.35: Students opinion on not sharing anything unrealistic about others

	Frequency (N)	Mean (X)	Std. Deviation
1st year	46	4,28	0,95
2nd year	73	3,73	1,25
3rd year	64	3,35	1,54
4th year	58	3,53	1,39
Other	30	3,36	1,49

Table 4.36 shows the One Way ANOVA table containing the sum of squares, standard deviation, mean square, F, and significance difference (p) of Item 16 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Value and class level.

Table 4.36: Cyber Human Value depending on class level of students for Item 16

Variable source		Sum of squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P	Significant Difference
Cyber Human Value	Between Groups	27,57	4	6,89	3,80	0,00	$1^{st} – 2^{nd}$
	Within Groups	481,51	266	1,81			$1^{st} – 3^{rd}$
	Total	509,08	270				$1^{st} – 4^{th}$ 1^{st} - other

To discover the connection between Cyber Human Value and class level, a One Way ANOVA test and Post Hoc correlation was run to decide and measure the impacts of class level on Cyber Human Value in regard to the distinctive class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year). As demonstrated in Table 4.35, the arithmetic mean estimation of Cyber Value for changing class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year) for item 16 demonstrated different and furthermore showed in the p value section of Table 4.36, there is a significance difference of class level on Cyber Human Value of EMU students ($p<0.05$) for the 4 constraints [$F(4,266) = 3.80$, $p=0.00$].

As shown in Table 4.35, 4.36 and Post hoc test, the mean value of 1^{St} year students (X= 4.28, SD= 0.95) a significant difference with the mean value of 2^{nd} year students (X= 3.73, SD= 1.25), 3^{rd} year students (X= 3.35, SD= 1.54), 4^{th} year students (X= 3.53, SD= 1.39) and other year students (X= 3.36, SD= 1.49). Moreover the mean value of 2^{nd} year students is similar to 3^{rd} year students (X= 3.35, SD= 1.54), 4^{th} year students (X= 3.53, SD= 1.39) and other year students (X= 3.36, SD= 1.49), while mean value

of 4th year is similar with other years and other years mean value is similar with 3rd years student.

Table 4.37 shows the descriptive statistics table containing the frequency (N), Mean(X), and standard deviation of Item 19 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Values and class level.

Table 4.37: Students opinion on not sharing anything to provoke users in social media

	Frequency (N)	Mean (X)	Std. Deviation
1st year	46	3,82	1,21
2nd year	73	3,60	1,05
3rd year	64	3,26	1,21
4th year	58	3,12	1,17
Other	30	3,10	1,21

Table 4.38 shows the One Way ANOVA table containing the sum of squares, standard deviation, mean square, F, and significance difference (p) of Item 19 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Value and class level.

Table 4.38: Cyber Human Value depending on class level of students for Item 19

Variable source		Sum of squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P	Significant Difference
Cyber Human Value	Between Groups	19,73	4	4,93	3,65	0,00	1st – 3rd
	Within Groups	359,42	266	1,35			1st – 4th 1st – other
	Total	379,15	270				2nd – 4th 2nd - other

To discover the connection between Cyber Human Value and class level, a One Way ANOVA test and Post Hoc correlation was run to decide and measure the impacts of class level on Cyber Human Value in regard to the distinctive class grades (first,

second, third, and fourth Year). As demonstrated in Table 4.37, the arithmetic mean estimation of Cyber Value for changing class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year) for item 19 demonstrated different and furthermore showed in the p value section of Table 4.38, there is a significance difference of class level on Cyber Human Value of EMU students ($p<0.05$) for the 6 constraints [$F(4,266) = 3.65$, $p=0.00$].

From the results of post hoc test, the mean value of 1St year students (X= 3.82, SD= 1.21) is similar to 2nd year students (X= 3.60, SD= 1.05) and varied significantly from 3rd year students (X= 3.26, SD= 1.21), 4th year students (X= 3.12, SD= 1.17) and other year students (X= 3.10, SD= 1.21). However, the mean value of 2nd year students is similar with 3rd year students but have a significant difference with the mean value of 4th year students (X= 3.12, SD= 1.17) and other year students (X= 3.10, SD= 1.21). The mean value of 3rd year is similar to the 4th and other year while 4th year mean value is similar with only other year students.

Table 4.39 shows the descriptive statistics table containing the frequency (N), Mean(X), and SD of Item 22 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Values and class level.

Table 4.39: Students opinion on sharing anything emphasizes the importance of social solidarity

	Frequency (N)	Mean (X)	Std. Deviation
1st year	46	3,73	1,10
2nd year	73	3,19	1,07
3rd year	64	3,25	1,25
4th year	58	3,08	1,09
Other	30	3,03	1,09

Table 4.40 shows the One Way ANOVA table containing the sum of squares, standard deviation, mean square, F, and significance difference (p) of Item 22 which shows the relationship between Cyber Human Value and class level.

Table 4.40: Cyber Human Value depending on class level of students for Item 22

Variable source		Sum of squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P	Significant Difference
Cyber Human Value	Between Groups	14,19	4	3,55	2,76	0,02	$1^{st} – 2^{nd}$
	Within Groups	341,72	266	1,28			$1^{st} – 3^{rd}$
	Total	355,91	270				$1^{st} – 4^{th}$ 1^{st} - other

To discover the connection between Cyber Human Value and class level, a One Way ANOVA test and Post Hoc correlation was run to decide and measure the impacts of class level on Cyber Human Value in regard to the distinctive class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year). As demonstrated in Table 4.39, the arithmetic mean estimation of Cyber Value for changing class grades (first, second, third, and fourth Year) for item 22 demonstrated different and furthermore showed in the p value section of Table 4.40, there is a significance difference of class level on Cyber Human Value of EMU students ($p<0.05$) for the 4 constraints [$F(4,266) = 2.76$, $p=0.02$].

According to post hoc test results, the mean value of 1^{St} year students (X= 3.73, SD= 1.10) differs from that of 2^{nd} year students (X= 3.19, SD= 1.07), 3^{rd} year students (X= 3.25, SD= 1.25), 4^{th} year students (X= 3.08, SD= 1.09) and other year students (X= 3.03, SD= 1.09). Furthermore, the mean estimation of 2^{nd} year students is similar to 4^{th} and other year students. In addition, 3^{rd} year students mean value matches the mean value of 2^{nd} year students (X= 3.19, SD= 1.07), 4^{th} year students (X= 3.08, SD= 1.09)

and other year students (X= 3.03, SD= 1.09). Lastly 4th year students mean value is similar to other year students with no significant difference among any years.

In addition, out of 25 items, 18 items had no significant difference among the class levels while 7 items had a significant difference between class levels of EMU students. In reference to the 3 items with significant differences, 1st year students had highest mean values and other year students had the lowest mean values.

According to these findings, the outcome shows that there is a major difference of class level on Cyber Human Value. Individually, the outcomes propose that class level of EMU students is viewed as a major factor of their assessment on Cyber Human Value, thus, a connection exists between Cyber Human Value and class grades of 1st year EMU students henceforth demonstrating that 1st year EMU students have high level for Cyber values.

As per Maria, Dan and Jessica, 1st year students are more emotional connected to Facebook than higher level in their research thus the results collected from this research is similar to the results Cyber Human Value research.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

This study showed the assessment on the cyber human values of EMU students based on their behavior on social media and how it differ according to gender, age, department and class level. The data collection tool used were quantitative research and survey method Cyber Human Value (CHV) Scale which was applied to nine faculties (Faculty of Health Science, Faculty or Business and Economics, Faculty or Tourism, Faculty of Arts and Science, Faculty or Communication and Media Studies, Faculty of Pharmacy, Faculty of Architecture, Faculty of Medicine and Faculty of Engineering). The group of students who were part of this research comprised to 271 registered bachelor, master and PhD students from nine faculties at EMU who voluntarily participated in the survey. Analyzing of the data collected was done using descriptive analysis techniques. Frequency (f), Percentage, T-test and one-way ANOVA was used for analyzing the data.

Descriptive analysis and frequency was used to show the derived result in reference to each posed research question variable while the T-test and ANOVA was used to analyze data that deals with only two variables like the relationship between gender and Cyber Human Value in the case of T-test and more than two variables such as the relationship between age and cyber human value, also the relationship between departments and cyber human value in the case of ANOVA.

The results shows that students have high level of adoption towards Cyber Human Values of EMU Students based on their behavior on social media with respect to solidarity, truth, being peaceful, tolerance and respect. The lowest and the highest values of each subdivisions were for respect 2.97 and 3.44, truth 3.24 and 3.53, tolerance 3.05 and 3.23, peaceful 3.38 and 3.66, solidarity 3.09 and 3.28.

As expressed in this investigation, Cyber Human Values of EMU student isn't distinctive depending on the age of the participant, subsequently demonstrating that age isn't viewed as a critical factor furthermore, accordingly has no association with the Cyber Human Values of Emu students.

Moreover, the research likewise demonstrated that EMU students Cyber Human Values is also not distinctive relying upon the gender of the participant, in this manner demonstrating that male and female sentiments have no association with Cyber Human values of EMU students.

Nevertheless, the investigation discoveries proposed that the Cyber Human Value varied according to EMU student’s class level. In conclusion, first year students have a relationship with CHV.

REFERENCES

Aliaga, M., & Gunderson, B. (2000). Introduction to Quantitative research. *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications*, 1-11.

Alwagait, E., Shahzad, B. and Alim, S. (2014*). Impact of Social Media Usage on Students Academic Performance in Saudi Arabia.* Computers in Human Behavior, 51, 1092-1097.

Amedie, J. (2015). The Impact of Social Media on Society. *Pop Culture Intersections*.

Andreassen, C.S., Pallesen, S. and Griffiths, M.D. (2017), "The relationship between addictive use of social media, narcissism, and self-esteem: findings from a large national survey", Addictive Behaviors, Vol. 64, pp. 287-293, available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.03.0

Arouri, Y.M. and Hamaidi, D.A. (2017), "Undergraduate students' perspectives of the extent of practicing netiquettes in a Jordanian southern university", International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 84-97.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. (2018). *Introduction to research in education*. Cengage Learning.

Aytekin, Ç. and Sütçü, C.S. (2012), "New media and network generation: sample of Turkey", The Journal of Marmara Social Research, Vol. 3, pp. 1-13.

Babbie, Earl R. *The Practice of Social Research*. 12th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage, 2010; Muijs, Daniel. *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*. 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publications, 2010.

Becker, B.W. and Connor, P.E. (1981), "Personal values of the heavy user of mass media", Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 37-43.

Bagchi, K.K., Udo, G.J., Kirs, P.J. and Choden, K. (2015), "Internet use and human values: analyses of developed countries", Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 50, pp. 76-90, available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.03.05

Baruah, T. D. (2012). Effectiveness of Social Media as a tool of communication and its potential for technology enabled connections: A micro-level study. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Volume 2*.

Bazarova, N., Choi, Y. H., Sosik, V.S., Cosley, D. and Whitelock, J. L. (2015). Social Sharing of Emotions on Facebook. *the 18th ACM Conference.*

Bender, L., Walia, G., Kambhampaty, K., Nygard, K.E. and Nygard, T. (2012, September). Social sensitivity correlations with the effectiveness of team process performance: an empirical study. *Social Sensitivity Team Performance*.

Bergman, S.M., Fearrington, M.E., Davenport, S.W. and Bergman, J.Z.(2011), "Millennials, narcissism, and social networking: what narcissists do on social networking sites and why", Personality and Individual Differences, Vol. 50 No. 5, pp. 706-711.

Besley, J.C. (2008), "Media use and human values", Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, Vol. 85 No. 2, pp. 311-330.

Borca, G., Bina, M., Keller, P.S., Gilbert, L.R. and Begotti, T. (2015), "Internet use and developmental tasks: adolescent's point of view", Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 52, pp. 49-58, available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.05.029

Clayton, R.B., Nagurney, A. and Smith, J.R. (2013), "Cheating, breakup, and divorce: Is Facebook use to blame?", Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, Vol. 16 No. 10, pp. 717-720.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Research methods in Applied Linguistics. New York: Oxford University Press.

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Saga London.

Garrison, D.R. and Kanuka, H.(2004). Blended Learning: . *Uncovering its Transformative Potential in Higher Education, Internet and Higher Education*.

Gibbs, J. L., Rozaidi, N. A., & Eisenberg, J. (2013). Overcoming the "ideology of openness": Probing the affordances of social media for organizational knowledge sharing. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *19*(1), 102-120.

Gosafeonline (2015) About the Cyber World. Retrieved from ICT CONNECTION: *https://ictconnection.moe.edu.sg/cyber-wellness/cyber-wellness-101/about-the-cyber-world*

Güngör, E. (2000). *Ahlâk Psikolojisi ve Sosyal Ahlâk. İstanbul:Ötüken Yayınları,*

Hendricks, D. (2013). *Complete History of Social Media: Then And Now*

Huitt, W. (2004), *"Moral and character development"*, available at: www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/morchr/morchr.html

Human Values in Ethics. (2016). Retrieved from GKTODAY: https://www.gktoday.in/gk/human-values-in-ethics/

Jaring, P. and Bäck, A. (2017, August). How Researchers Use Social Media to Promote their Research and Network with Industry. *TIM Review.*

Kelley, K., Clark, B., Brown, V., & Sitzia, J. (2003). Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, Vol. 15(3), pp. 261–266

Kietzmann, J. H., Hermkens, K., & P., M. I. (2011). Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media. *Business Horizons, 11*. Retrieved 2018

Kılıçer, K. and Çoklar, A.N. (2015), "Examining human value development of children with different habits of internet usage", Hacettepe University Journal of Education, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 163-177.

Kilicer, K., Coklar, A. N. and Ozeke, V. (2017). Cyber human values scale (i-value): the study of development, validity and reliability. *Internet Research, 27*(5), 1255-1274.

Lee, D. (2013). *Models and a framework for cyber human persuasion*.

Leigh. (2016). The History of Social Media: Social Networking Evolution!

Lopez, M., Sicilia, M. and Moyeda-Carabaza, A.A. (2017), "Creating identification with brand communities on Twitter: the balance between need for affiliation and need for uniqueness", Internet Research, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 21-51.

Maria K., Dan C, and Jessica M (2011). The Relationship Between Facebook and the Well-Being of Undergraduate College Students. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking VOL. 14, NO. 4* .

McCarty, J.A. and Shrum, L.J. (1993), "The role of personal values and demographics in predicting television viewing behavior: implications for theory and application", Journal of Advertising, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 77-101.

Madden, M., Lenhart, A., Cortesi, S., Gasser, U., Duggan, M., Smith, A. and Beaton, M. (2013, May). Teens, Social Media, and Privacy.

Moor, J.H. (1985), "What is computer ethics?", Metaphilosophy, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 266-275, available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9973.1985.tb00173.x (accessed May 14, 2013).

Moore, M. G., & Kearsley, G. (2005). *Distance Education:A system View of Online Learning* (3rd ed.). Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Moran, M., Seaman, J., & Tinti-Kane, H. (2011). *Teaching, Learning, and Sharing:How Today's Higher Education Faculty Use Social Media.* Pearson. Retrieved 2018

Murray, K. E., & Waller, R. (2007). Social networking goes abroad. *International Educator, 16*(3), 56-59.

Nayak, S. (2016). *Effects of Social Media on Education*.

Nitzburg, G. C., & Farber, B. A. (2013). Putting up emotional (Facebook) walls? Attachment status and emerging adults' experiences of social networking sites. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *69*(11), 1183-1190.

Olamilekan, M. A. (2016). Impact of social media on christian youths" Faith and their lifestyle.

PennyStocks (2016), *"The internet in real-time"*, available at: http://pennystocks.la/internet-in-real-time/

Puyasa, M. (n.d.). *Human Values: Meaning, Nature and Types.* Your Article Library.

Roblyer, M. D., McDaniel, M., Webb, M., Herman, J. and Witty, J.V. (2010). *A Comparison of College Faculty and Student Uses and Perceptions of Social Networking Sites.* The Internet and Higher Education, 13, 134-140. .

Saumure, K., and Given, L. M. (2008). Convenience Sample. In SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sellen, A., Rogers, Y., Harper, R.H.R. and Rodden, T. (2009). *Reflecting human values in the digital age*

Shea, V. (1997), Netiquette (Online Edition), Albion Books, San Francisco, CA, available at: www.albion.com/netiquette.

Social Media: Impact on human behavior and society. (2018). Retrieved from career2nextorbit: https://www.indibrain.com/article/547/social-media-impact-on-human-behavior-and-society

Srivastava, J. (2017). What is the definition of human values? What are some examples? *quora*.

Stoch, L. and Roodt, S. (2016), "The net generation's perceptions of digital activism", The 3rd European Conference on Social Media Proceedings of International Conference Caen, Academic Conferences and Publishing International Limited, France, Reading, pp. 369-403.

Strickland, A. (2014). Exploring the Effects of Social Media Use on the Mental Health of Young Adults. *HIM 1990-2015. 1684.*

Stuckelberger, C. and Duggal, P. (2017). Cyber Ethics 4.0, *Serving Humanity with Values.*

Tekin, H. and Kara, A. (2017). *The Investigation of Human Values Perceived from the Use of Social Media of Secondary School Student*.

Utz, S. and Beukeboom, C.J. (2011), "The role of social network sites in romantic relationships: effects on jealousy and relationship happiness", Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 511-527.

Vogel, E., Rose, J.P., Roberts, L. and Eckles K. (2014). Social comparison, social media, and self-esteem.

Werkmeister, W.H. (1967). Man and Their Values. . *Lincoln,Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.*

Wodzicki, K., Schwämmlein, E., & Moskaliuk, J. (2012). "Actually, I Wanted to Learn": Study-related knowledge exchange on social networking sites. *The Internet and Higher Education, 15*(1), 9-14.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Demographic Survey

Dear Student,
To answer the questions in this section please, please put a tick"√" in the appropriate box that best suits the answer you have selected.
Note: Only one answer can be selected for a question.

PART 1: Demographics

1. Gender:
☐ Female
☐ Male

2. Age range:
☐ 18-20
☐ 21-25
☐ 26-30
☐ 31+

3. What is your level of study?
☐ Bachelors
☐ Masters
☐ Doctorates

4. What is your academic class level (grade)?
☐ 1st Year
☐ 2nd Year
☐ 3rd Year
☐ 4th Year
☐ Others
Please mention: _____

5. Do you have access to internet connection?
☐ Yes
☐ No

6. Do you have access to social media sites?
☐ Yes
☐ No

7. Have you used social media site before?
☐ Yes
☐ No

8. How many hours do you spend on social media site?
☐ Less than 1 hour
☐ 2-5 hours
☐ 6-10 hours
☐ 11 hours +

9. Have you heard of cyber human value before now?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Appendix B: Cyber Human Value Scale

Below are the statements regarding the behaviors demonstrated by users in social media. Please read each statement attentively and mark one option (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree) that best defines you. Please, respond to all the questions without skipping any	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I respect all the sharing's of social media users (comments, photos, videos, and so on)					
2	I pay attention to social sensitivities while sharing something in social media					
3	I consider others' sensitivities while sharing something un social media					
4	I give importance to sharing's of all social media users					
5	I give value to all the comments made by social media users					
6	I stand behind all my sharing's in social media, and I don't delete any of them					
7	I don't expect others to approve my thoughts in social media					
8	I am the same person in social media as in daily life					
9	My sharing in social media completely reflects my real thoughts					
10	My sharing's in all social media environments are consist with each other					
11	I tolerate any kind of comment made in relation to my sharing's in social media					
12	I tolerate any kind of sharing's in social media					
13	I don't judge my friends due to their opinions and sharing's in relation to the current agenda in social media					
14	I show tolerance towards criticisms regarding my sharing's in social media					
15	I avoid sharing anything that could harm others in social media					
16	I don't share anything that includes unrealistic information about others in social media					

17	I prefer to take part in social media environment that are away from tension and anger					
18	Whatever there is on the agenda, I don't cause any tension and anger in social media					
19	Whatever there is on the agenda, I don't share anything that could provoke users in social media					
20	I don't share anything that could provoke others in line with the tendencies of my community in social media					
21	I first try to be in someone else's shoes to solve the problems I encounter in social media					
22	In case of a natural disaster or an event that deeply influences the society, I share anything that emphasizes the importance of social solidarity in social media					
23	When there is a need for social solidarity, I provide active support in social media together with others in my close					
24	I provide active support in charity organizations in social media					
25	When I am asked for help regarding any issue in social media, I try to provide help regardless of who asks for that help					

Appendix C: Consent Form

Dear Students,
I am currently a master's student in the Information Communication Technology in Education program in Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology currently undergoing my thesis on Cyber Human Value of Eastern Mediterranean University students based on their behavior on social media.
The aim of this thesis is to investigate cyber human values of Eastern Mediterranean University Students based on their behaviors on social media along with the relationship between CHV and their age, gender, level of study through the questionnaire. The democratic information such as age, gender. Level of study, academic class level, and some other simple question to know if the participant have an idea on the topic.
The purpose of this thesis will be to answer the related questions:
1. What are the cyber human values of EMU Students based on their behavior on social media with respect to being peaceful, truth, solidarity, respect and tolerance?
2. Is there any relationship between cyber human value and the gender?
3. Is there any relationship with age in consideration with cyber human value?
4. Is there any relationship with cyber human value and students of different departments?
5. Is there any relationship with cyber human value and student class level?

Please, sincere answers are required and it is of major importance that all questions and blank spaces be filled in reference to the importance of this thesis.
The questionnaire consists of two parts and will take approximately 5 minutes of your time to answer all the questions. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time. After reading the questions carefully, please tick the most approximate box. The time allocated is for you to fill out this survey honestly. All data you have provided will be kept confidentially and will only be used for research. For further information or complaints, you can contact me or my thesis supervisor without any hesitation.

Thank you for your time and participation.

Maryam Saeed
M.Sc Candidate
Information and Communication Technologies in Education
Department of CITE
Eastern Mediterranean University
Email: maryamsaeedzaman@gmail.com
Phone: 05338812930

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun ISCIOGLU
Thesis Supervisor
Department of CITE
Eastern Mediterranean University
Email: ersun.iscioglu@emu.edu.tr
Phone: 03926303123

I have read and understood this form. I have asked my necessary questions and received answers to my question. I accept to participate in this survey voluntarily.

Name and surname of participant:

Date:

Signature:

Appendix D: Ethics Committee Approval Letter

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi
"Erdem, Bilgi, Gelişim"
Eastern Mediterranean University
"Virtue, Knowledge, Advancement"
99628, Gazimağusa, KUZEY KIBRIS / Famagusta, North Cyprus, via Mersin-10 TURKEY
Tel: (+90) 392 630 1995
Faks/Fax: (+90) 392 630 2919
E-mail: bayek@emu.edu.tr
Etik Kurulu / *Ethics Committee*

Reference No: ETK00-2019-0104 26. 04.2019

Subject: Application for Ethics.

RE: Maryam Saeed

Faculty of Education

To Whom İt May Concern:

On the date of **26.04.2019**, (Meeting number **2019/13-10**), EMU's Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee (BAYEK) has granted, Maryam Saeed from the, Faculty of Education to pursue with her MA thesis work **"Assessment on the Cyber Human Values Of EMU Students Based On Their Behavior On Social Media"** under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun İşçioğlu. This decision has been taken by the majority of votes.

Regards,

Prof. Dr. Fatma Güven Lisaniler

Director of Ethics Committee

FGL/ns.

Appendix E: Originality Report

Turnitin Originality Report

Thesis_V04 by Maryam Saed

From Maryam_Saed (SCHOOL OF COMPUTING AND TECHNOLOGY)

- Processed on 19-Aug-2019 12:28 +03
- ID: 1161377070
- Word Count: 16938

Similarity Index

14%

Similarity by Source

Internet Sources:

9%

Publications:

6%

Student Papers:

12%