

Creating Fake Identity and Pseudo Accounts on Social Media Among University Students in North Cyprus

Ümit Akdeniz

Submitted to the
Institution of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Communication and Media Studies

Eastern Mediterranean University
January 2018
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Communication and Media Studies.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Agah Gümüş
Acting Dean, Faculty of
Communication and Media Studies

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 Arts in Communication and Media Studies.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Aysu Arsoy
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bahire Efe Özad

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Aysu Arsoy

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Bahar Taşeli

ABSTRACT

The study investigates the attitudes of international university students in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus through users' creation fake identity on social media. This study aims to know if Facebook users check accounts if they are fake before they accept friend request, how Facebook users identify accounts as fake, if most Facebook active users create fake identity and create hyper real image of themselves. This study also seeks to know how users perceive other people who create fake identity on Facebook and if there is a statistical significant difference as to how male and female students perceive other people who create fake identity on Facebook. Through a survey conducted among seven hundred and sixty-seven international university students in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus; two hundred Eastern Mediterranean University students, one hundred and ninety-nine Near East University students, one hundred and ninety-two European University of Lefke and one hundred seventy-six Girne American University students enrolled in Fall 2017/2018 session.

Results show that majority of the respondents agree to a very great extent that they check any account if its fake once they get a friend request. Results also show that respondents agree that they believe that an account is fake when it has exaggerated biography, profiles without photo, accounts with no mutual friends, mutual friends but any of mutual friends knows the person, accounts with few friends (i.e. 10-15 friends), empty timeline (No sharing) and extremely gorgeous human photo (beautiful/handsome). Results show that most respondents don't create fake account and create hyper-real image of themselves. Results show that when respondents were asked how they perceive users who create fake identity, many respondents agree that

they view people who create fake identity on Facebook as fraudsters, people who suffer from poverty of ideas, with low self esteem, inferiority complex, high level of insecurity, who wants to be acceptable by the society and attention seekers.

Keywords: Social media, Facebook, Pseudo accounts, Hyper-real image, fake identity

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti'nde yaşayan uluslararası üniversite öğrencilerinin, sosyal medyada sahte kimlik oluşumu üzerindeki tutumlarını incelemektedir. Araştırma sosyal medya kullanıcılarının arkadaşlık isteklerini kabul etmeden hesabın sahte olup olmadığına bakıp bakmadığını, sahte hesapları nasıl tespit ettiklerini, sahte hesabı nasıl tanımladıklarını ve çoğu kullanıcının sahte hesap açıp kendilerinin hiper-gerçek imajını yaratıp yaratmadıklarını inceliyor. Aynı zamanda kullanıcıların sahte hesabı olan insanları nasıl algıladığını ve bu algının erkek ve kadın öğrencilerde dikkate değer istatistiksel farklılıklar gösterip göstermediğini inceliyor. Araştırma için uygulanan ankete Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti'nde, 2017/2018 Güz Dönemi için kayıtlı olan 767 uluslararası üniversite öğrencisi katılmıştır. Bu sayının 200'ü Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi'nde, 199'u Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi'nde, 192'si Lefke Avrupa Üniversitesi'nde ve 176'sı Girne Amerikan Üniversitesi'nde eğitim görmektedir.

Sonuçlar katılımcıların çoğunun arkadaşlık isteği aldığı anda hesabın sahte olup olmadığına baktıklarını göstermektedir. Öğrencilerin çoğu, sahte olan hesaplarda abartılmış biyografiler içeren, fotoğrafsız hesaplar, ortak arkadaş olmayan veya ortak arkadaşların arasında kimsenin kişiyi tanımadığı, az arkadaşla sahip hesap (örneğin 10-15 arkadaş), boş zaman tüneli olan (paylaşımı olmayan) ve son derece çekici insan fotoğrafı bulunan profiller olduğuna inanmaktadır. Sonuçlara göre katılımcıların çoğu sahte hesap açmıyor ve kendilerinin bir hiper-gerçek imajını yaratmıyorlar. Birçok katılımcıya göre Facebook'ta sahte kimliği olan insanlar sahtekar, kötü fikirleri olan,

kendine saygısı az olan, ařađılık kompleksi olan , kendine guveni olmayan, toplum tarafından kabul edilmek istenen ve ilgi çekmeye çalıřan insanlardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal medya, Facebook, Sahte hesaplar, hiper-gerçek resim, sahte kimlik

DEDICATION

To my family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my family for providing me necessary support and also for all their positive teachings. It is a precious feeling to have people who genuinely care and give you indescribable love and trust. Special thanks to Memet Akdeniz, Eskihan Akdeniz, Unal Akdeniz, Irmak Akdeniz avlak, Samet avlak, Uras avlak, Liya avlak.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Aysu Arsoy for her patience during the thesis process. She believed in me and whenever I stop, she pushes me strive. She also made it exciting to work on this thesis. Her support can't be paid. I'm forever indebted. It is evident that I wouldn't have completed this work without her encouragement.

Special thanks to Asst. Prof. Dr. Arif Akkeleş, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bahire Efe zad, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Agah Gümüő and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nurten Kara for their support throughout the process of writing this thesis and my Masters program as a whole.

My appreciation would be incomplete if I don't thank some good friends who helped me in completing this work. Special thanks to my amazing friends; Beste Demirelli, Adeola Abdulateef Elegu, Elin Erdem, Gamze Yücel, Mehmet zkan Kurőun, Burcu Yücel, Samet zkan, Asst. Prof. Dr. Nilüfer Türksöy, Karl Turgut Maloney Yorgancı, ağdaő Bozkurt and Can Bekcan. I would also like to thank all my friends who I couldn't mention and all Research Assistants of EMU's Faculty of Communication and Media Studies for been helpful at different times in the course of my program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Research Problem.....	2
1.2 Motivation for the Study.....	3
1.3 Purpose of the Study.....	4
1.3.1 Research Questions.....	5
1.4 Significance of Study	6
1.5 Limitations of the Study	7
1.6 Definition of Terms.....	8
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
2.1 Growth and Development of Social Media	10
2.2 Theoretical Framework	17
2.2.1 Social Identity Theory.....	17
2.2.2 Communication Theory of Identity	19
2.3 Brief Background of Self-Representation	20
2.4 Identity Formation on Social Networking Sites.....	21
2.5 Online Self Representation	23
2.6 The Internet as a Lens of Our New Reality	24
2.7 Facebook: An Overview	26

2.7.1 Research into Facebook in Eastern Mediterranean University	28
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	30
3.1 Research Methodology	30
3.2 Research Context & Design.....	31
3.3 Population and Sample	32
3.4 Data Collection Instrument.....	33
3.5 Research Procedures.....	33
3.6 Reliability and Validity of Research	34
4 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	35
4.1 Descriptive Statistics	35
4.1.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....	35
4.1.2 Summary of Frequency Distribution	68
4.2 Inferential Statistics.....	74
4.2.1 Gender Cross Tabulation.....	75
5 CONCLUSIONS	79
5.1 Summary of the Study	79
5.2 Conclusions Drawn from the Study	79
5.2.1 Theoretical Insights Drawn for the Empirical Findings of the Study.....	86
5.2.2 Conclusion of Gender Cross Tabulation.....	87
5.3 Highlights of the Study.....	87
5.4 Recommendations for Further Research	93
REFERENCES.....	94
APPENDICES.....	108
Appendix A: Nationalities.....	109
Appendix B: Survey on Social Media and Identity	111

Appendix C: Committee of Ethics..... 117

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Case Processing Summary	34
Table 2: Reliability Statistics	34
Table 3: Age	36
Table 4: Gender	36
Table 5: Respondents' University	37
Table 6: Nationality	38
Table 7: Total Monthly Expense	39
Table 8: How often do you use Facebook?.....	40
Table 9: On which device do you mostly use Facebook?.....	40
Table 10: How many hours do you use Facebook in a day?.....	41
Table 11: Do you check accounts if they are fake before you accept friend request on Facebook?	42
Table 12: Exaggerated biography.....	42
Table 13: Profiles without photo	43
Table 14: Accounts with no mutual friends	43
Table 15: Mutual friends but any of mutual friends know the person.....	44
Table 16: Accounts with few friends (i.e. 10-15 friends)	44
Table 17: Empty Timeline (No sharing).....	45
Table 18: Extremely gorgeous human photo (beautiful/handsome)	45
Table 19: Low number of likes	46
Table 20: If the photos I post don't get enough likes, I feel disappointed.....	46
Table 21: If the videos I share don't get comments, I feel people don't love me	47
Table 22: When I post happy photos, I mostly feel lonely	47

Table 23: When I post with expensive items (i.e. watch, car, bag, sunglasses) on social media, I feel upper-class (rich).....	48
Table 24: My posts doesn't reflect my real feelings sometimes	48
Table 25: If I get a lot of likes on any posts, it increases my confidence	49
Table 26: If so many people share my post, it makes me feel acknowledged	49
Table 27: When I write strong and powerful Facebook status, I feel weak.....	50
Table 28: I edit some parts of my body (i.e. thinner legs, bigger breast, flat belly) ..	50
Table 29: I use filters to change my look (i.e. thinner face, bigger eyes, colour, light)	51
Table 30: I have a specific angle for taking photo which I believe shows me better.	51
Table 31: I share the photos taken before like i just took them now (i.e. taking 10 photos at a place and share them next week like you just took those photos)	52
Table 32: I smile just for the sake of taking photos.....	52
Table 33: I take advantage of the light when I take photos to upload on Facebook ..	53
Table 34: If there is a mess (not clean), I clean everything in the photo frame before I shoot.....	53
Table 35: I use makeup just for the sake of taking photos.....	54
Table 36: I use accessories (Sunglasses, wristwatch and so on) just for the sake of taking photos for Facebook.....	54
Table 37: I change clothes just for the sake of taking photos	55
Table 38: I go to restaurant just to take photos for Facebook.....	55
Table 39: I go to the beach club just to take photos for Facebook.....	56
Table 40: I go to the gym just to take photos for Facebook.....	56
Table 41: I go to nightclub/pub/bar just to take photos for Facebook.....	57
Table 42: I go to the coffee shops/Cafes just to take photos for Facebook	57

Table 43: I visit the expensive hotels just to take photos for Facebook	58
Table 44: I engage in sport activity just to take photos for Facebook	58
Table 45: The things that I am shy or it`s show off to share on my timeline I don`t hesitate to share on my story	59
Table 46: I go to clothing stores and even I won`t buy, I try expensive clothes just to take photo	59
Table 47: I take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook	60
Table 48: My birth place information is different from my original one on Facebook	60
Table 49: I use a location different from where I am, when I share photo or write status	61
Table 50: I check-in a place when I am not there on Facebook	61
Table 51: I use a different work position from my actual one on Facebook	62
Table 52: I use a place of work different from my actual one on Facebook	62
Table 53: My hometown information is different from my actual one on your Facebook	63
Table 54: My current city information is different from my actual one on Facebook	63
Table 55: My educational information is different from my actual one on Facebook	64
Table 56: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as fraudsters.....	64
Table 57: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as who suffer from poverty of ideas	65
Table 58: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with low self esteem	65

Table 59: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with inferiority complex.....	66
Table 60: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with high level of insecurity	66
Table 61: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who wants to be acceptable by the society	67
Table 62: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as attention seekers .	67
Table 63: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people ...	68
Table 64: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about modern technology.....	68
Table 65: Frequency summary of participants' response to what makes them believe an account is fake	69
Table 66: Frequency summary of participants' response to creating hyper-real self image.....	69
Table 67: Frequency summary of participants' response to creation of fake identity	71
Table 68: Frequency summary of participants' response to perception of other respondents who create fake identity on Facebook.....	73
Table 69: Independent Samples T Test.....	74
Table 70: Gender * I edit some parts of my body (i.e. thinner legs, bigger breast, flat belly) Cross Tabulation.....	76
Table 71: Gender * I use filters to change my look (i.e. thinner face, bigger eyes, colour, light) Cross Tabulation.....	76
Table 72: Gender * I use makeup just for the sake of taking photos Cross Tabulation	77

Table 73: Gender * I use accessories (Sunglasses, wristwatch and so on) just for the sake of taking photos for Facebook Cross Tabulation.....	77
Table 74: Gender * I check-in a place when I am not there on Facebook Cross Tabulation	78
Table 75: Gender * I take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook Cross Tabulation	78

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Social media are internet platforms that allow users the opportunity to interact with one another, discuss work issues, and share multimedia contents such as music, photos and videos. Originally, social media was mainly used by individuals to connect with family and friends but overtime, the availability of internet and popularity of social media across the world changed the way humans communicate because social media became an integral part of the society. This widespread of social media is being credited to the extinction of space and time and persistently, these platforms continue to connect millions of individuals across the world (Zajmi – Rugova , 2015).

Social media consist of blogs, wiki's and social networking sites. Among these social networking sites are popular sites such as are Facebook, Twitter, My space etc. These networking sites websites are like online villages consisting of internet users from different parts of the world going about different activities. Some others engage in similar activities based on interest. A big part of all social networking sites is networking and socializing and this may be adding up new friends to discussing topics of interests in groups etc. According to boyd and Ellison (2007) "Since their introduction, social network sites (SNSs) such as MySpace, Facebook, Cyworld, and Bebo have attracted millions of users, many of whom have integrated these sites into their daily practices" (p.210).

Throughout history, it has been documented that life-changing technologies such as Gutenberg's Movable Type Press and Television was perceived to be good and dangerous and it is the same for social media. Majority of people acknowledge that it is a "blessing and a curse". According to Uduiguomen, Agwi, & Aliu (2014), many internet users participate in various internet activities on social networking sites on a daily basis. While so many of these activities falls on the advantageous side of the social media there are some other dangerous happenings on the social media; common among them are impersonation and fraud.

In recent times, the young adults use the media to represent themselves. In the older days, kids draw stick figures in the sand with a stick. To leave mark on a cave, stone age Australians blew ochre dust in the area their hands. To tell people their names, Vikings cut up runes on sticks. "Our grandparents kept diaries hidden in drawers. Today we post selfies to Instagram or Snapchat and write updates on Facebook or Tumblr. With social media, ordinary people share their self-representations with a larger audience than ever before." (Rettberg, 2017, p. 1).

1.1 Research Problem

Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) remains an important part of our everyday life and, it is increasingly becoming inevitable for the populace so, investigating identity on CMC tools such as social media and blogs will never be a stale topic because the world is never going back to a less-digital arena. Identity as concept has been specifically chosen in this thesis because it is a major issue in the discourse of social media that needs to be empirically revisited. As aforementioned, a number of studies have investigated this subject matter but it does need continuous

investigation because it has to do with “self” and as proven overtime, “self” is ongoing therefore any research on self also has to be ongoing.

Studies that addresses identity, self and social media have a lot of potentials and are extremely worthy of systematic investigation because of social media trends common among millennials. Over the past decade, it has become a major concern that so many young adults deliberately live a deceptive online life which doesn’t really resonate with their actual or offline life. This afore-discussed is just one variation of creating fake identity on social media. Another area is creating pseudo accounts on social media and it has also gained fair scholarly attention.

The present study goes a little step further to address the idea of falsification of self on a personal level by investigating perception of social media users’ idea of fake identity. We also engaged issues in and around expectations of social media users when they create a false self and if social media users create false identity because of self-projection or its just narcissism.

1.2 Motivation for the Study

This study was largely motivated by the final project submitted for Communication Studies Research Methods (COMM504) entitled “Fake Account On Social Network Sites in North Cyprus”. As established, majority of organically derived research topics start with one of two things or both in some situations; observation and/or questioning. The later was what this study started with. “Why do people create Fake social media accounts?” A question many have investigated (Krombholz, Merkl, & Weippl, 2012; Conti, Poovendran, & Secchiero, 2012) specifically informed the researcher about this study. As shown above, numerous studies have investigated this subject matter in a

comprehensive manner but fewer studies have researched into this subject matter like we aim to.

While researcher was picking up articles, books, relevant resources and also questioning friends and allies about fake identities on social media, a newer conversation on what is real and what is not emerged. Do Facebook videos, photos, location sharing truly portray who we are as individuals, what we are going through and where we are in life or there are simply products of the moments when they were uploaded? For example, most people on social media create a “happy” identity which is obviously false because we all aren’t happy. Also, majority of people of social media portray a neat and well-kept personality but it is most likely not the case in reality.

Self-projection and exceptional interest in and admiration for yourself are two important discourses that comes to play here. Do people create this images in these mind of others because that who they want to be or simply because they are exceptionally self-loving? All these questions became the major thrust of this study and also created a niche for the researcher to holistically investigate or explore creating fake identity on social media especially Facebook.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The aim of this study is to conduct a research in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus about international students’ attitude to creating fake identity on social media in the fall 2017/2018 academic session.

Over the past decade, advancements in the internet technology have become undoubtedly one of the greatest evolutions in human history. With this advancement comes so many vantages and weaknesses. In this study, we specifically aim to

understand identity on social media by investigating individual Facebook users' idea of self. As Eakin (2015) rightly puts it, "While the Facebook profile is doubtless the most characteristic form of identity expression on the Internet today, it is by no means the whole story" (Eakin, 2015, p. 18). This statement and more specifically, the very idea that what we see on Facebook profiles isn't the "whole story" is a major thrust of this study and we also aim to understand from the users' perspective why what we eventually see on these profiles come out the way they do i.e. the smiles, sharing location, photo cropping to mention but a few.

1.3.1 Research Questions

The research "Creating Fake Identity and Pseudo Accounts on Social Media Among University Students in North Cyprus" sets out to investigate the following research questions in 2017, in Eastern Mediterranean University in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus.

RQ1: What do Facebook users identify as fake?

RQ2: Do active Facebook users identify Facebook accounts without photo as fake?

RQ3: Do active Facebook users check accounts if they are fake before they accept friend request?

RQ4: Do active Facebook users replaces reality with hyper reality and create hyper-real self-image?

RQ5: Majority of Facebook users share something different from what they are presently involved in. (i.e. they post happy photos when lonely).

RQ6: Do most Facebook active users create fake identity?

RQ7: Is there a statistical significant difference as to how male and female students perceive people who create fake identity on Facebook?

The media impose a standard on us and we consciously or unconsciously try to meet up this standard. For example; we visit a nice place, we take photos and we share so that people can acknowledge us. (What media/society impose us about economics/status/beauty, we do this consciously/unconsciously (i.e. creating desired profile on SNS) to get acceptance from the society).

1.4 Significance of Study

At the generic level, studies like this help complete the full circle of administrative social media research therefore they are extremely important. They provide a unique window for researchers who are interested in this research purview or similar field to understand that not administrative social media studies appreciate social media. Some other studies such as this one question the status quo too.

This study is also extremely important because it is timely and topical. Over the past few years, discussions of false identification on social media has been coming to the fore front i.e. earning scholarly and media attention and, investigating what university students who are Facebook users expect when they fake “self” on social media is definitely a milestone.

Few comprehensive studies have enquired into social media identify and representation across the world especially in the western countries but this study is the first to investigate this topic in the Levant and specifically, Eastern Mediterranean

University; a public university in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus. So while this investigates such an important subject matter, it also increases learning about a global phenomenon in another perspective.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study are presented below;

- **Questionnaire Item:** The questionnaire used in this study focused on the four research questions of the study. For the purpose of brevity, all questions were made in a multiple-choice format. More open-ended questions would help provide an opportunity for respondents to express themselves in their own selected words and phrases. The questionnaire is structured based on researcher's experience, observation and related studies.
- **Time:** Another limitation is the time. As highlighted in the Methodological section of this paper, this research is a cross-sectional research which means that it is only conducted only once as opposed to a longitudinal research type.
- **Representation of Facebook population/sample size:** This study used a quantitative research method and through a survey conducted among international university students in four universities in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus. Each university was administered 200 questionnaires but 200 were retrieved in Eastern Mediterranean University, 199 were retrieved in Girne American University, 192 were retrieved from European University of Lefke and 176 from Near East University. As aforementioned, this study focuses primarily on Facebook users and our population was restricted to Facebook users in North Cyprus. For sampling, we focused on four local universities in four major cities (Famagusta, Nicosia, Lefke and Kyrenia) in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus.

- **Inability to control respondents' answers:** One major limitation of all research especially survey-based research is that researcher doesn't have the ability to control what respondents say. The answers are simply not 100% percent efficient because there are tens of items on the questionnaire and hundreds of respondents. Hence, it is extremely difficult to agree that all answers or responses of respondents are absolute.
- **Binary Scale:** To ascertain a precise answer from respondents, the researcher preferred binary scale (Yes/no). This to the researcher would provide direct answers rather than five or seven Likert scale questions.

1.6 Definition of Terms

This section identifies and discusses the jargons used in this research purview and, specifically this study, in a simple, clear and concise way. All terms examined are products of two keywords "Internet" and "real".

Internet: is an international network of computers (Probably billions of computers) around the world that enhance data circulation.

Social networking sites: are online websites that allow registered users to interact with others and also take part in other social activities on this public space. Through this platform, registered users could also join subgroups of interest such as music groups, mom groups, religious group or even a specific movie or TV series franchise group.

Facebook: is the most popular social networking site. It allows users to create an account and, upload and share multimedia contents such as photos, text and video. It

also allows registered users to send personal messages that can help gratify an array of needs; i.e. keeping in touch with family members, associates and allies.

Facebook profile: a short description or information about a registered Facebook users educational background, job history, marital status, interests, places you've lived, contact information and relationships.

Facebook user: is a registered Facebook person who logs into Facebook through a mobile device website or a Messenger app.

Pseudo: basically means counterfeit or not genuine. It could also mean “not actually but having the appearance of; pretended; false or spurious; sham”. (Dictionary.com, 2017, para 1). (Dictionary.com, 2018)

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter II reviews the primary aspects of the literature on social media as well as social networking sights. The chapter also examines two basic theories that best explain the concept behind creating or constructing an identity for an individual. It will explore the basic social media platform that this research focuses on which is Facebook.

2.1 Growth and Development of Social Media

The rapid growth in technology has activated the development in the uses and effects of social media in the 21st century. Social media has become a formidable force in promoting effectiveness and efficiency in all ramifications including professional and non-professional sectors. Social media has been regarded as a platform that enhances socialization at the macro and micro level due to the access it provide for a large and wide audience (Sivek, 2010). The advent of social media platform has brought a decline to the direct access of the mainstream media as a result of its accessibility and its ability to encompass all other forms of media on one platform (Holt, Shehata, Strömbäck, & Ljungberg, 2013).

Today, youths no longer run home in order to watch or listen to their favorite programmes on the television or radio as with a mobile phone and internet access they can access all forms of media. “For some, social media is defined by the key modalities and platforms like Facebook and Twitter which feature participatory, collaborative

user-created content (UCC). For others, social media is a recombination and a remediation of other, older forms of communication” (Hendry & Hjorth, 2015, p. 1).

With platforms like YouTube, Facebook, Instagram and internet radio streaming among others social media has become a convergence platform. Social media has created a platform where users can have one on one interaction, thereby serving as a platform that helps in establishing, sustaining and enhancing relationships in various forms. Social media has therefore grown to attract different interpretations and serve different gratifications among its users. Madianou (2015), supports this notion by stating that;

Defining social media and assessing their social uses can be challenging given they become so many things to different people. While for Gilbert Facebook is a way of dealing with loss, for Aira, a Filipina teenager, it is a way of finding the ideal distance in the relationship with her mother who works abroad (p. 1).

Social media has become an essential tool for interaction and communication (Hall, 2016). It has aided all forms of formal and informal interaction at the micro and macro level. Social media has changed the way and manner people receive, process and digest media content, thereby availing them the opportunity to inject and dissect information on the media (Tang & Cooper, 2017). It is quite pertinent to emphasize that social media has over its years of existence proved itself to become a dependable platform and medium of communication (Couldry, 2015); this is due to its unquantifiable inventions and innovation in enhancing effective communication patterns. With the invention of social media, accessing information has become easier (Ha, et al., 2016). For instance, social media has become a platform where individuals and organisations share daily information about their activities and organizational progress.

Also, news organisations have also created a platform where their fans and subscribers can get brief of the main news of the day. These encourage members of the audience seeking information to key into the platform and make it a news platform thereby gratifying their information needs. Social media has created a number of opportunities especially for their youths. It has created a platform where youths can get themselves gainfully employed and as such becoming a boss of themselves (Feuls, Fieseler, & Suphan, 2014). Youths have therefore keyed into this development and have now become social media content providers thereby making money through commercials or social media advertisements.

Social media has become a means through which individuals, groups and organizations boost awareness about their products and goods, thereby becoming a tool for effective marketing communication. This assertion is supported by Elmer (2015), “as he states that users have also embraced social media platform’s numerous opportunities to disclose, self-promote, and publicize” (p. 1). Furthermore, the managers of the various social media platforms have also engaged in the commodification of the contents on their platforms to big advertisers who want to reach out to a large, wide and scattered audience.

Social media platforms therefore track the contents and send out these advertisements to the indented audience “Recent scholarship has offered a modification to audience labour theory in the context of social media, suggesting that rather than merely working by watching advertisements, social media users also produce data, which is commodified by social media companies” (Fisher, 2015, p. 51). With the continuous developments in the social media industry, a significant number of the platforms have moved from being an ordinary text platform to a multimedia platform (Hochman,

2014). This is as a result of the use of graphics, pictures, videos and various ways of customization of messages to suit the intended purpose and to add aesthetical value to the message being sent and received. With platforms like Instagram messages are now significantly sent with the aid of pictures.

Social media has contributed significantly to the political scene. With its invention, politics has now become more people inclusive. Political parties and candidates now effectively use the platforms to engage and interact with their followers and supporters, thereby creating a platform for accountability and transparency (Nee, 2013). Electorates have now devised a means of confronting and challenging the government on their various programmes, policies and promises made to them during the electioneering campaigns. According to Shah (2015), “Social media, then, is not really about new kinds of sociality, but about a social that challenges the normative structures and shapes of regulation and governance of society that older models of mediation had established” (p. 1). On one hand, it is important to state that social media has been able to serve as a means of engaging politicians (Skoric, Zhu, Pang, & Goh, 2016). This has bridged the gap that exists between politicians and their supporters as well as allies. On the other hand, it has become a platform where political riots take place (Fuchs, 2012). The platform has encouraged hate speech among several political platforms and encouraged political bigotry.

Social media has provided an avenue for easy transmission of messages, as such, subscribers have the opportunity to freely express themselves and express their opinion without any form of censorship or fear of intimidation (Gray, 2015). This is unlike the mainstream media where government has monopoly and control over all categories of media. This puts a limit to what the people can say thereby limiting their freedom of

expression especially in cases where it opposes government of the day's views or policies. The development of smart phones has further given the use of social media a boost (Farman, 2015; Humphreys, 2015). Based on its portability and its multifunctional use, smart phones have given social media a boost in terms of use, thereby creating access for millions of users at a go. Based on its numerous functions and benefits Nielsen (2015), gives further explanation to what social media does.

Nielsen (2015) states that;

Social media as an imprecise term referring loosely to a very large and diverse set of relatively new technologies and practices with no natural edges that are evolving very rapidly, often intersect with each other and many other phenomena in complex ways, and are embedded in many very different settings seem to invite this kind of talk (1-2).

With the advent of social media, the virtual public sphere has been established and enhanced. This is as a result of the opportunities the various platforms have created by allowing users to form groups and communities for discussions, exchange of ideas, interactions and promotions. This is rightly supported by Felt (2016), "Social media have rendered the opinions and interactions among complex networks of individuals accessible and searchable" (p. 1). This has further given a boost to interpersonal communication (Hermida, Power Plays on Social Media, 2015). Social media has become a platform where news and information travels at the speed of light. With just one Facebook post, tweet or broadcast messages are sent to a large and scattered audience. Though the problem of truthfulness, authenticity or the realness of such messages are still issues to contend with. This has evidently shown that social media possess a lot of advantages to shape and reshape the people's mind (Hermida, Power Plays on Social Media, 2015). This advantages have been judiciously used by a number of people especially policy makers, organizations and individuals who use the platforms for self-presentation and identity formation.

Social media has continued to serve unquantifiable roles in the society, It has enhanced interactions, strengthened family bound and as well promoted global friendship (Deuze, 2015). “Long before “social media,” the Internet was used to do what Facebook’s mission statement promises: connecting with friends and family, discovering what is going on in the world, sharing and expressing what matters” (Baym, 2015, p. 1). Social media has been quite significant in helping professionals run their organisations and businesses effectively (Thomas & Akdere, 2013). As such, companies, governmental and non-governmental organizations have embraced the use of the various platforms in building and sustaining their brand. Social media has continued to grow, as such, other mainstream media also use the platforms in promoting their organization as well as their programmes. For instance, quite a number of TV stations have begun to make use of the Facebook live feature in transmitting some of their programmes to a large and wide audience. According to Moe , Poell, & Dijck (2016):

The rapid development of social media platforms has only heightened this interest, as they are all about participation and sharing. Not surprisingly, the integration of these media in television production, distribution, and reception has forced all media professionals and scholars to reconsider how they understand, stimulate, and measure audience engagement (p. 100).

The use of social media has continued to increase over time (Brooker, Barnett, & Cribbin, 2016). Recently in a report released by Facebook, the platform reported it has reached over one billion accounts on its platform (Arad, Barzilay, & Perchick, 2017). This shows a significant improvement in the use of the platform across board. Facebook as well as other social media platform have continued to serve very many purposes among which are linking up or re-uniting with old friends, making new friends and maintaining various kinds of relationships among others. Scholars have continued to study the uses and effects of social media, as such; this has increased the

quantum of works published in the area (Hayes, Carr, & Wohn, 2016). According to (Fusi & Feeney, 2016);

Social media tools allow two-way information exchange between individuals or groups via videos, images, texts messages, and podcasts, and include not only free applications such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, YouTube and Flickr but also feeddriven services such as Basecamp or Ning (p. 1).

Social media has also been able to play vital roles in times of averting crisis (Mäkinen & Kuira, 2008). For instance, it is used by security operatives to communicate among them as well as is a reliable tool when seeking relief in times of distress. Social media has become a powerful tool in mass mobilisation; this is in support of the mainstream media which has during its early era been used as a form of mass mobilisation (Graaf, Otjes, & Rasmussen, 2015). Today, social media is being used at different mobilisation points to seek support from various citizens on different government policies, organizational goals and human needs. Social media has enhanced its mode whereby issues can be raised and discussed. For instance, a number of platforms now have comment sessions where followers or subscribers can agree or disagree with news or issues being raised (Thevenot, 2007). As such, the medium has enhanced audience participation by allowing media audience to contribute to the issues being discussed. The depth of social media has grown beyond mere seeking information to becoming a means of gratifying certain needs including medical information and gratification. According to Milton (2014);

Social media is intertwined with ever-changing patterns of relating in myriad ways that people give and receive messages and concrete meaning in situation. Those who seek healthcare services and information regularly search online for medical information as well as seek support for health issues (p. 283).

Knowles, Lee, O’Riordan and Lazebnik (2014), state that “there are several positive aspects to social media; it can provide a venue of expression or a network to seek out

social support and connect with peers that share similar interests, backgrounds, or chronic illnesses” (p. 1). But, one of the major disadvantages of social media is its contribution to the propagation of social ills in the society. Social media has been used by terrorist groups and organizations to recruit and indoctrinate new members into their groups (Zeitzoff, 2017). For instance, social media has been predominantly used by prominent groups like al Qaida, ISIS, Boko Haram and other world known terrorist groups. This is due to the fact that social media is highly accessible, cost effective and fast (Lewallen & Behm-Morawitz, 2016). Today the major components are a smart phone and internet access. As such accessibility has become something not to be worried about. This is why recruiting members by terrorist groups has become quite easy.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

In this part of this research, I discuss the relevance and relationship of two theories that best explain the concept of this research namely Social Identity Theory and Communication Theory of Identity. These theories explain how individuals create an identity for themselves in a society. The theories justify the focus of this research which examines how social media is used to construct an identity that best represents them.

2.2.1 Social Identity Theory

The social identity theory which was developed by Henri Tajfel stresses the categorization of human beings into different groups and forms where they would like to be associated (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). “Social identity theory is a unified conceptual framework that explicates group processes and intergroup relations in terms of the interaction of social cognitive, social interactive and societal processes,

and places self-conception at the core of the dynamic” (McKeown, Haji, & Ferguson, 2016 , pp. 13-14).

Social identity theory enables individuals to self-classify themselves, therefore, the individual is aware of the category or place he/she has been classified or categorized in the society (Stets & Burke, 2000). For example, individuals are able to create a space for themselves in the society, thereby giving them the opportunity to define who they are, who they associate with or who they want to be. Social identity theory therefore suggests a situation where individuals generate, create or develop a brand of the kind of personality they want to be identified as in the society (Stryker & Burke, 2000). Hogg (2001), explains further that; “Social identity theory originally focused on intergroup behavior in the context of large social categories: intergroup social comparisons, positive distinctiveness, stereotypes, discrimination, and intergroup relations” (p. 188).

Social identity theory also enables individuals to gain self-recognition, through the identity they have created for themselves, such individuals therefore promotes and lays emphasis on such brand they have created for themselves to properly establish themselves (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995). To give a clearer understanding and conceptualization of the Social Identity Theory, this research adopts the clarification Brown (2000), makes on the theory stating that;

SIT is concerned with the latter and starts from the assumption that social identity is derived primarily from group memberships. It further proposes that people strive to achieve or maintain a positive social identity "thus boosting their self-esteem and that this positive identity derives largely from favorable comparisons that can be made between the in-group and relevant outgroups (pp. 746-747).

The Social identity theory has therefore been able to establish the fact that creating an identity is significantly the duty of the individual or the personality itself. As such, individuals have been able to put up a structure for themselves through the social media. With the aid of various social media platforms and most significantly Facebook, various people have created a social image for themselves. This is done with their status display on the platforms thereby making the society in which they belong see them as they want to be seen. Though some individuals present themselves as they are, others create a totally different personality and identity for themselves with the aid of social media.

2.2.2 Communication Theory of Identity

Communication Theory of Identity is one of the efforts to help ease the understanding of identity formation among individuals and groups. Communication Theory of Identity is a further development to the Social identity theory which explains that the society in which one belongs influences the identity or personality on an individual. Hecht & Choi (2012), explain further that; “societal norms and practices are internalized in the form of social identities based on social categories (especially in/outgroup distinctions). CTI, however, sees influences beyond the group and the comparison process. Some of these emerge from identity theory”. (p. 138). The Communication Theory of Identity gives a better understanding how identities are formed and shaped by individuals at various levels and circles (Hecht, et al., 2002).

Communication Theory of Identity focuses on establishing an appropriate link between communication and identity formation. According to Jung and Hecht (2004);

The theory posits that social relations and roles are internalized by individuals as identities through communication. Individuals' identities, in turn, are acted out as social behavior through communication. Identity not only defines an individual but also reflects social roles and relations through communication.

Moreover, social behavior is a function of identity through communication (p. 266).

It is therefore important to state that the Communication Theory of Identity is quite significant to this study due to the fact that social media users find it quite important to create an identity for them. As such due to its role as a medium of communication, the identity that is being formed on the platform plays a significant role in the process of achieving the desired objective.

2.3 Brief Background of Self-Representation

The history of self-representation could be traced back to the era when auto biographic studies began. This is as a result of individuals writing about themselves and their most significant events while they live, thereby making attempt to describe and portray themselves in a desirous manner. Autobiographies have though been seen not to appropriately describe or represent an individual as there exists some aspects of life which might not be appropriately be captures, therefore, not producing the appropriate meaning for representation (Gilmore, 1994). Self-representation can also be traced to the eighteenth century, as Chatterjee (1998), discussed that;

What has gone unrecognized so far is that the Indian ‘nationalist’ historiography of the nineteenth century was preceded by a trend in the later eighteenth century, when the pre-colonial bureaucracy engaged in a similar contest for self-representation with the newly formed colonial state (p. 914).

Self-representation has also been seen to change and influence the way people behave or act as well as is a portrayal of how people truly behave or act (Yee & Bailenson, 2007). According to Zhu, Zhang, Fan, & Han, (2007);

east Asians emphasize the interconnectedness of human beings along with contingencies between the individual’s behavior and the thoughts and actions of others in the relationship (the interdependent self). However, it remains unknown how the cultural influence on self-representation is accomplished in the human brain (p. 1310).

To have a better understanding of the background of online self-representation, there is the need to have a clear cut understanding of the fact that this phenomenon could be traced to the cultural roots as culture had from inception encouraged self-transformation with the aid of the kind of dresses and make up they wear among others. This is in an attempt to create an identity for their people as well as the various individuals. This is supported by Yee and Bailenson (2007), who state that self-representation could be broadly categorised into two segments; "... minor alterations such as haircuts, makeup, and dressing up are seen as socially acceptable, if not socially desirable. On the other hand, the ability to truly transform oneself has been regarded in myths and legends as both dangerous and powerful" (p. 271).

2.4 Identity Formation on Social Networking Sites

Social networking sites like Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp amongst others have created a platform where people from diverse background and orientation can meet, interact and establish long lasting relationships. Social networking sites have made communication with friends, families and loved ones seamless and accessible. It has helped individuals create and maintain different forms of identities and created various forms of identification. With the aid of technologically inclined social networking platforms like Facebook, individuals have been able to create an online identity for them, thereby defining and establishing who they are and who they want to be. For instance "the introduction and rise of the social network site (SNS) Facebook has been one of the most important social trends of the past decade" (Caers , et al., 2013, p. 983). According to Bosch (2009); "Generally, research into Facebook falls into one of the following four categories (with occasional overlapping): social networking and social capital, identity construction, concerns with privacy, and the potential use of Facebook for academic purposes (including use by librarians)" (p. 188).

With the aid of social networking sites, individuals are also able to create who they want to be seen as by other users as a result of the kind of information they provide for public consumption as well as the kind of groups and people they interact with (Harrison & Thomas, 2009). Significantly, individuals who understand the need and use of identity formation are usually youth who have become adults and engage in various forms of socialization and interaction (Greenhow & Robelia, 2009). As such, identity formation can be referred as a social formation process where individuals establish who they want to be and how they want to be.

Social networking sites have helped in creating diverse identities for both individuals and organizations (Rasmussen, 2017). Identity formation can be referred to the act of an individual creating a personality form himself especially on the social media.

According to Xinaris (2016);

Identity formation is most commonly discussed as the individual's effort to define a distinct personality possessing certain characteristics that distinguish and establish one as an entity, as well as identifying one with a group or community. At the same time, the individual is formed in its social interaction with others in the form of participation in various social groups through activities which are often repeated, thus constituting it as the result of social processes (pp. 58-59).

Social networking sites have been used as a means of creating a desired identity by various individuals. For instance, the real owners of the Facebook, twitter, instagram, snapchat or WhatsApp account might be much more different to the person whose picture is displayed on the profile (Baert, 2017). "While particular systems may come and go, how youth engage through social network sites today provides long-lasting insights into identity formation, status negotiation, and peer-to-peer sociality" (boyd, 2007, p. 199). This is a common feature and attribute by various users of the platform as the objective and motive behind is different. Also at some instance, individuals

create a false identity on their Facebook status by providing untrue information about them so as to market themselves or create an impression for its users. This trend is quite common as some users use it for fraudulent acts, romantic reasons as well as a means to transact businesses in order to keep their identity or become uneasy to trace/locate. Facebook has given its users an opportunity to create an identity for themselves. According to Hoffmann, Proferes, & Zimmer, (2016);

Facebook's self-definitions are important because they constitute part of Facebook's strategies for stabilizing the meaning and potential uses of the platform; user identity is important as it involves the construction of a subjective position relative to Facebook (p. 2).

Though social media platforms have encouraged the use of having one online identity across board, this will helping in creating a brand for such individuals as well as make it easy to have a form of online identification (Dijck, 2003). For example, quite a lot of people make use of a common name or pseudo name online; this is to make identification possible. With the advent of social media, individuals have also been caught in the web of fake identities. This when individuals are seen using more befitting and upgraded pictures which distinguished them from their original personality. Social networking sites have promoted identity formations in various ways (Subrahmanyam, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008). Through chatrooms, individuals are able to identify people with similar ideas, believes and ideologies and thereby coming together to form a community of their own.

2.5 Online Self Representation

The online community has brought about a twist to the various ways and dimensions life events and activities take place. It has encouraged interactions at diverse levels even in relationships. For instance, according to Ellison, Heino Gibbs (2006), "the online dating arena represents an opportunity to document changing cultural norms

surrounding technology-mediated relationship formation and to gain insight into important aspects of online behaviour, such as impression formation and self-presentation strategies” (p. 415).

Self-representation has taken different forms especially in the on line world, this is as a result of the developments of technology. With technological innovations, individuals are able to create an image of themselves. Also with the latest trends in the social media world, users have the opportunity to customise their looks to give a representation of themselves and their expressions, this is through the aid of bitmoji avatars, emojis etc. instance, individuals are able to use graphical designs and social media innovations like black berry stickers, avatars and smiles to give a representation of themselves to other users, this has taken away the need to physically change how they look through surgeries thereby staying healthy and reducing expenses (Yee & Bailenson, 2007). Findings from a research conducted by Yee, Bailenson and Ducheneaut (2009), state that the online platform has great impact in influencing individuals in tilting their behaviour to represent the kind of person they want to be in the real life.

2.6 The Internet as a Lens of Our New Reality

Nooteboom (2013) notes that Jean Baudrillard, French theorist believes that “the impact of present information-and-communication technology, reality is replaced by hyper-reality. That simulates reality, offering an idealized, more exciting, ecstatic reality, a lie that is better than truth” (p.1).

According to Baudrillard (1983), reality is non-existent because the supposed correlation between “the real” and the representation of “the real” wasn’t real; in fact,

it was an image. For example, there is no distinction between the territory and the map, the actual and fictional, the original and the copy, the real and the simulation.

Baudrillard said that;

Abstraction today is no longer that of the map, the double, the mirror or the concept. Simulation is no longer that of a territory, a referential being or a substance. It is the generation by models of a real without origin or reality: a hyper real. The territory no longer precedes the map. Nor survives it. Henceforth, it is the map that precedes the territory – PRECESSION OF SIMULACRA – it is the map that engenders the territory (p. 2).

According to Introna (1997), In respect to cyberspace, scholars who focus on hyper-real argue that the idea of identity is seen as plastic. In his words, he said, many people on the cyberspace think that, ‘I can change my self as easily as I change my clothes’’. (p.1). Following Baudrillard, I base this research on the Intona’s explanation of Baudrillard’s idea using the analogy of clothes and plastics, however we extend this idea because we believe that many internet users or specifically Facebook as this study focuses on don’t consciously act in that manner. Mostly, most of them seek this “unrealness” for a variety of reasons, which some of them are highlighted in this study.

As cited in Miranti, (2017), Baudrillard also adds that hyper reality is predominantly used in science fiction or nostalgic related phenomenon. This is evident in our current world because we see that teenagers nowadays spend too much on social media e.g. Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. A good many of them stay online for as long as 24 hours, so technically, their world is their on-line. Miranti adds that “What the teenagers post on social media does not always reflect his/her real social life condition nevertheless. When the teenagers post their happy photos, it usually expresses their loneliness in real life” (p. 331).

2.7 Facebook: An Overview

The developments witnessed in the technological circle birthed the invention and development of the Facebook social media platform which has given millions of youths across the world an opportunity easy access to communication and interacting with their colleagues (Kumar, 2014). The invention of Facebook as a social media platform has further enhanced communication in different ramifications. “Since its inception in 2004, the social network site (SNS) Facebook has been adopted by a wide range of users who employ the site to achieve a variety of goals” (Ellison, Gray, Lampe, & Fiore, 2014, p. 1105). With its recent revelation on its number of accounts hitting over one billion accounts, Facebook has become the most subscribed, most used and most active social networking platform (Arad, Barzilay, & Perchick, 2017). Facebook has therefore been able to intrude into the lives of almost every house hole as one or more people have become an active user due to its vast features and advantages. Users are now able to access Facebook at any point in time due to its 2007 launch on the mobile platforms (Goggin, 2014).

Facebook initially served as a means of conveying messages, the platform further developed into a social networking media where its users can establish, maintain and sustain relationships. The platform began to gain popularity at the United States and within a short period of time, its tentacles spread to become a global platform (Barnett & Benefield, 2017). Today, it has become the most popular and most accessed social networking media platform. Cook & Hasmath (2014), states further that “although the Facebook web pages initially provided spaces for the founders of the sites to convey information about upcoming marches and rallies to interested parties, these pages have also become spaces for engagement with the central aims of the movement” (p. 976).

Facebook has moved from a platform for the youth only to becoming a platform for all categories of people, organizations and groups (Moreno, et al., 2014). This has also contributed to the boost in use and effects on its subscribers. Teachers use the platform to form a bond and establish more interactivity with the students where various forms of discussions and interactions can take place. Users of Facebook now find it quite easy and simple to upload any part of their live activities on the platform, thereby becoming an important tool in identity formation (Robards & Lincoln, 2016).

Facebook has generated lots of conversation in the academic field, as such its effects on both the active and passive users cannot be over emphasised (Tsay-Vogel, 2016). For instance, Facebook has inculcated certain habits on both the heavy and light users. Facebook has not only become an integral part of many of its users, it has become a major component in the sustenance of their social life (Brem, Spiller, & Vandehey, 2015) Facebook has become highly useful in dissemination of news. For instance, news has been seen to reach a wide number of people with the timely display Facebook give post, as such users are opportune to view and read through all the posts those whom they follow have made (Mathieu & Pavlíčková, 2017).

Facebook has become a platform where individuals can publicize various aspects and activities of their life to their followers (Brubaker & Haigh, 2017). Facebook has also increased the online presence of its users due to the urge of staying connected; thereby making it easy for its users to become addicted (Scherr & Brunet, 2017). Today, a lot of youths have become addicted to the social networking platform due to its various features such as keeping in touch, staying connected as well as access to timely new update. Political office holders have also continually used Facebook to establish a direct and one-on-one relationship with their supporters and followers (Gulati &

Williams, 2013). This gives the followers the opportunity to hear from their elected or would-be candidates, hold them accountable as well as builds confidence in them as a result of the unbroken and uninterrupted communication that exists between them.

Facebook also gives its users the opportunity to share their feelings as well as their current state of mind publicly, thereby giving a larger number of friends and families the opportunity to help in times when there is the need of public opinion (Wolfer, 2017). For instance, some Facebook users share their state of mind during their good and bad times, this mostly draws attention of other users thereby causing them to sympathise, empathise or rejoice with the user. With all the numerous and significant benefits of Facebook, it should be noted that the ulterior motive which is not quite clear to many of its users is to generate profit (Heyman & Pierson, 2015). This is done through advertisements as users' information are shared/distributed to advertisers.

2.7.1 Research into Facebook in Eastern Mediterranean University

Hundreds of studies have focused on Facebook around the world and only in Eastern Mediterranean University, couple of studies have highlighted different parts of Facebook. Sevük (2013) evaluated the impact of Facebook on interpersonal communication and through a survey among 200 respondents, findings reveal that respondents do not feel the need to engage in face to face communication when they are logged in to Facebook use.

Oyekan (2014) researched the perception of Eastern Mediterranean University students towards Multitasking on Facebook. The study adopts quantitative research method through a survey among 150 students enrolled at three faculties in Eastern Mediterranean university; Communication and Media Studies, Engineering and Architecture.

Teke (2011) compared and contrasted Facebook addiction between Social and Hard Sciences' Students in Eastern Mediterranean University and results reveal that the students of the both faculties use Facebook for interaction on a general note mostly to meet some of their social and human needs. Also the site's numerous interactive abilities have become an integral part of their lives.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section focuses on the methodological aspect of this thesis. This study discusses research methodology, research design, research context, population and sample, data collection instrument, research procedures and reliability and validity of research.

3.1 Research Methodology

This study used adopts a quantitative research method and through a survey conducted among students in four universities in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus. Each university were administered 200 questionnaires but in 200 was retrieved in Eastern Mediterranean University, 199 was retrieved in Girne American Univeristy, 192 was retrieved from European University of Lefke and 176 from Near East University.

A quantitative research method of inquiry can be defined as a “research that emphasizes the measurement of trends and their statistical implications” (Danesi, 2014, p. 245). Quantitative research numerical collects data and it also adopts mathematical or statistical kind of analysis. In addition, this data of inquiry allows researcher to compare and evaluate difference between variables (Williams, 2007). According to Creswell (2003), this method collects data through the evaluation of respondents’ attitude. Bryman (2012) adds that the research method that highlights a standard quantification analysis of data.

Quantitative research method is an empirical form of scientific research paradigm. The method highly invests in the validity of data through rigorous procedures or pilot study testing. This basically means that instrument is tested earlier to ensure with the help of experts studying in the field that the data is reliability, through the use of statistical tests. Statistical analysis can be grouped into the following categories; inferential, experimental and simulation approaches (Atieno, 2009).

The main purpose of this research method is to produce generalizable results. This study therefore adopts quantitative research methods because we aim to be able to generalize results on social media and creating fake identity, based on our investigation among a sample of university students.

3.2 Research Context & Design

This study is a case study and a cross-sectional study which means that it will be conducted at this single point in time (September, 2017 - January, 2018). Considering that this is a case study, in this section, we discuss the research setting to reveal an up-close, in-depth, and detailed examination of the time, people and location of this study.

Location: The present study was conducted in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus with local universities which are Eastern Mediterranean University in Famagusta, Near East University in Nicosia, European University of Lefke in Lefke and Girne American University in Kyrenia.

Time: Time is an integral part research context and as aforementioned, this study started in the last quarter of 2017 and ends in the first quarter of 2018. Following the calendar of the research location, which is Eastern Mediterranean university, this research falls in the Fall term of the 2017/2018.

People: North Cyprus houses predominantly Turkish Cypriots and the population amounts to about 300,000. The Island also houses hundreds of international students, researchers, academics from various parts of world. Notable among those are people from Turkey, Iran, Nigeria, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan and Cameroun to mention but a few.

3.3 Population and Sample

The target population of this study are tertiary students in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus. As at 2007, it was established that there was “Today, there are 40,000+ students, 25.000+ from Turkey and 4000+ from 65 different nationalities, studying at various universities in North Cyprus.” (Arslan, Güven, Center, & Famagusta, 2007, p. 4). Since then hundred more have enrolled in the nine active universities on the island. According to Aruoba and Civcir (2014), 20% out of the total population of Northern Cyprus are students, 62,726 of those enrolled only in 2014. Only 12,658 of these students are believed to be from the host country and the other 80% from different countries across the 7 continents. 34,858, 55 % of these international students are from Turkey.

Eastern Mediterranean University’s population amounts to 20,000 (Eastern Mediterranean University, 2018). Near East University population sums up to 22,000 (Near East University, 2018). European University of Lefke total population amounts to 9,000 (European University of Lefke, 2018) and finally, Girne American University population sums up to 18,000 (Girne American University, 2018).

For the purpose of this study, cluster sampling method have been applied to seven hundred sixty-seven students from four major local universities in Turkish Republic

of North Cyprus through cluster non-proportional random sample considering that according to Beins & McCarthy (2012) “a number of groups (or clusters) are identified in a population” (p. 99). Cluster is “sample selected from specific area as being represented of a population” (Coolican, 2014, p. 45). Eastern Mediterranean University in Famagusta, Near East University in Nicosia, European University of Lefke and Girne American University in Kyrenia.

3.4 Data Collection Instrument

This study adopts survey, and Danesi (2014) defines it as “sample survey statistical survey targeting a specific group of individuals, aiming to collect information on particular subjects, such as buying habits and program preferences” (Danesi, 2014, p. 259). He also added that survey examines respondents’ beliefs, attitudes, opinions by asking respondents in a direct manner. They are mostly used in audience-oriented studies to evaluate trends. This study employs a survey instrument with an in-house questionnaire developed by researcher with the help of the Supervisor.

3.5 Research Procedures

For the present study, a questionnaire was designed with the contribution of my supervisor and colleagues working in the field of social media. After the survey was confirmed to be good, twenty copies were piloted among twenty international students respectively. This pilot study took place on December 8th, 2017. The questionnaire was accessed and we found out that all questions were clear and concise. My supervisor reviewed it one more time and thereafter, it was sent to the Eastern Mediterranean University’s ethical committee to evaluate the questionnaire and hence, accredit it to be suitable for respondents. On January 3rd, 2018, distribution of questionnaire commenced and researcher approached students in all of these campuses and by words of mouth, he invited each of the respondents to fill the questionnaire

randomly. The data collection period spanned up until January 10th, 2017, a major part of the questionnaire was retrieved. Data was retrieved and entered into statistical package for social sciences SPSS. Descriptive and inferential analysis was thereafter conducted to present data and find the differences or relationships between variables.

3.6 Reliability and Validity of Research

For the validity of this study, the researcher conducted a pilot study on 20 international students and all questions were found to be understandable. To ascertain the reliability of this study, all binary “yes or no” questions measuring all major questions, a Cronbach Alpha analysis was conducted. The alpha coefficient conducted to ascertain reliability is found to be 0.841 which indicates a very high reliability.

Table 1: Case Processing Summary

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	767	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	767	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.841	53

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This section discusses the analysis and findings of this study. The chapter is divided into major parts. The first one is the descriptive statistics, for example; demographic characteristics and summaries about the sample and the measures of all items presented on the question. The second part is the inferential statistics to assess the probability of a suspected difference between groups.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are numbers presented to that synopsise the data collected with the aim of explaining what happened in the sample (Thompson, 2009). The section reveals all descriptive analysis.

4.1.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic characteristics of respondents analysed includes respondents age group, gender, and total monthly expense.

Table 3: Age

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 18-21	444	57,9	57,9	57,9
22-25	274	35,7	35,7	93,6
26-29	38	5,0	5,0	98,6
30-33	8	1,0	1,0	99,6
34+	3	,4	,4	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The Table-3 shows the age group of respondents. Results reveal that majority of the respondents are between age group 18-21 (57.9%). Those between age group 22-25 are 35.7%; 26-29 are 5.0%. Only 1.4% of the respondents are above 30 and above.

Table 4: Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Female	381	49,7	49,7	49,7
Male	385	50,2	50,2	99,9
Others	1	,1	,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The table reveals the respondents gender. Results reveal that respondents are almost equally distributed. Male respondents are 50.2% and female are 49.7%. Only one

respondent is other which means that respondent does not see himself as a man or woman.

Table 5: Respondents' University

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid EMU	200	26,1	26,1	26,1
NEU	199	25,9	25,9	52,0
EUL	192	25,0	25,0	77,1
GAU	176	22,9	22,9	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

In the table above, results show that the Eastern Mediterranean university students that participated in this research are 26.1% of the sample, Near East University students who participated are 25.9. Those who are students of European University of Lefke are 25.0% and Girne American University students are 22.9%.

Table 6: Nationality

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Turkish	542	70,7	70,7	70,7
Cypriot	74	9,6	9,6	80,3
Iranian	12	1,6	1,6	81,9
Nigerian	25	3,3	3,3	85,1
Others	114	14,8	14,8	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Results show that majority of the respondents are Turkish 70.7%, Cypriots are 9.6%, Nigerians are 3.3%, Iranians are 1.6% and the others are following:

Azerbaijanis are 0.5%, Sudanese are 1%, Turkmenistan's are 0.3%, Pakistanis are 1.2%. Respondents who are from Zimbabwe 1.3%. Those from Morocco are 0.5%. Yemenis are 0.1%, Iraqis are 0.7%, Syrians are 0.5% and Palestinians are 0.9%. Participants from Luxembourgish are 0.1%. Those from Uganda are 0.1%; those from Jordan are 1.6%. Saudi Arabians who are part of the sample are 0.4%. Kazakhs are 0.5% and Tajiks are 0.1%. Russians who participated in the study are 0.5%, Libyans are 0.9%, Ukrainians 0.1% and Austrians are 0.1%. Respondents from Egypt are 0.3%. Those from England are 0.1%, Albanians are 0.1% and Tanzanians are 0.4%. Respondents from Swaziland are 0.4%, Kenyans are 0.3%, South Africans are 0.1%,

Zambians are 0.3% and Namibians 0.3%. Those from Congo, Georgia, Germany, Kyrgyzstan and Kuwait are 0.4%, 0.1%, 0.1%, 0.3%, 0.1%, respectively (See Appendix C).

Table 7: Total Monthly Expense

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Less than 999TL	239	31,2	31,2	31,2
Between 1000-1999TL	381	49,7	49,7	80,8
Between 2000-2999TL	102	13,3	13,3	94,1
Between 3000-3999TL	36	4,7	4,7	98,8
4000TL +	9	1,2	1,2	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Majority of the respondents as presented in Table-7 are spend between 1000£ to 1999£ in a month. Those who spend less than 999£ are 31.2% of the sample. Those between 2000£ to 2999£ are 13.3%, between 3000£ and 3999£ are 4.7% and above 4000£ are 1.2%.

Table 8: How often do you use Facebook?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Rarely	355	46,3	46,3	46,3
Often	249	32,5	32,5	78,7
Always	163	21,3	21,3	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Results reveal that majority of the respondents are using Facebook rarely with 46.3% and second major group of respondents are using Facebook often with 32.5%. Only 21.3% of the respondents are always using Facebook.

Table 9: On which device do you mostly use Facebook?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Mobile phone	721	94,0	94,0	94,0
Laptop	36	4,7	4,7	98,7
Tablet	3	,4	,4	99,1
Desktop	5	,7	,7	99,7
Others	1	,1	,1	99,9
TV	1	,1	,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Table-9 shows that the big number of the respondents are using mobile phones for Facebook that is 94% and 4.7% using laptop, 0.7 using desktop computer, only 1 person using Facebook on TV and only 1 person do not specify the device.

Table 10: How many hours do you use Facebook in a day?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Less than 1 hour	429	55,9	55,9	55,9
1 to 3 hours	191	24,9	24,9	80,8
3 to 5 hours	82	10,7	10,7	91,5
5 to 7 hours	36	4,7	4,7	96,2
7 and above	29	3,8	3,8	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The Table-10 shows the respondents` daily Facebook using. 55.9% of the respondents are using Facebook less than 1 hour in a day and 24.9% using Facebook between 1 and 3 hours in a day. 10.7% of the respondents` are using Facebook 3 to 5 hours in a day. Total percentage of the respondents who is using Facebook 5 hours and above is 8.5%.

Table 11: Do you check accounts if they are fake before you accept friend request on Facebook?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	701	91,4	91,4	91,4
No	66	8,6	8,6	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The majority of the respondents, which is 91.4% check accounts if they are fake when they get a friend request on Facebook. Only 8.6% said no to this question.

Table 12: Exaggerated biography

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	386	50,3	50,3	50,3
No	381	49,7	49,7	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The Table-12 shows how people consider a Facebook account as fake and the results reveal that almost half of the respondents agree with considering a Facebook account as fake when they see exaggerated biography by 50.3%.

Table 13: Profiles without photo

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	617	80,4	80,4	80,4
No	150	19,6	19,6	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The majority of the respondents consider a Facebook account as fake when they see profiles without photo on Facebook with 80.4% as the Table-13 shows above. Only 19.6% of the respondents think opposite.

Table 14: Accounts with no mutual friends

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	464	60,5	60,5	60,5
No	303	39,5	39,5	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Table-14 shows that 60.5% of the respondents are consider a Facebook accounts as fake when they have no mutual friends and 39.5% do not consider as fake in same situation.

Table 15: Mutual friends but any of mutual friends know the person

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	559	72,9	72,9	72,9
No	208	27,1	27,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

As the Table-15 shows the respondents consider a Facebook account as fake even they have mutual friends but none of the mutual friends knows the person who own the account with 72.9% of the respondents and 27.1% of them not.

Table 16: Accounts with few friends (i.e. 10-15 friends)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	538	70,1	70,1	70,1
No	229	29,9	29,9	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Results show that 70.1% of the respondents consider a Facebook account as fake when the account owner has few friends and 29.9% do not agree with this reason to consider a Facebook account as fake.

Table 17: Empty Timeline (No sharing)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	581	75,7	75,7	75,7
No	186	24,3	24,3	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Table-17 shows that the majority of the respondents that is 75.7% consider a Facebook account as fake when they have empty timeline. 24.3% response opposite to the major group of the respondents.

Table 18: Extremely gorgeous human photo (beautiful/handsome)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	502	65,4	65,4	65,4
No	265	34,6	34,6	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The results of this table reveal that 65.4% of the respondents consider a Facebook account as fake when they see extremely gorgeous human profile photo and 34.6% of them do not take this reason as a measurement of considering fake accounts.

Table 19: Low number of likes

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	321	41,9	41,9	41,9
No	446	58,1	58,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Table-19 shows that 58.1% of the respondents thinks when the account has low number of likes, it is not a measurement of considering a Facebook account as fake and 41.9% of the respondents consider a Facebook account as fake when the account has low number of likes.

Table 20: If the photos I post don't get enough likes, I feel disappointed

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	354	46,2	46,2	46,2
No	413	53,8	53,8	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

53.8% of the respondents do not feel disappointed when they don't get enough likes for the photos they post and not big gap between two groups as the Table-20 shows above the respondents who say yes with 46.2%.

Table 21: If the videos I share don't get comments, I feel people don't love me

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	158	20,6	20,6	20,6
No	609	79,4	79,4	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The minority of the respondents feels that people don't love them when they don't get enough comments to the videos they share on Facebook with 20.6% and as the Table-21 shows obviously 79.4% of the respondents doesn't feel the same.

Table 22: When I post happy photos, I mostly feel lonely

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	301	39,2	39,2	39,2
No	466	60,8	60,8	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

60.8% of the respondents mostly do not feel lonely when they share happy photos but 39.2% of the respondents mostly feel lonely when they share happy photos.

Table 23: When I post with expensive items (i.e. watch, car, bag, sunglasses) on social media, I feel upper-class (rich)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	189	24,6	24,6	24,6
No	578	75,4	75,4	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The majority of the respondents that 75.4% don't feel upper-class (rich) when they post with expensive items on social media. 24.6% of the respondents feel upper-class (rich) when they do this action.

Table 24: My posts doesn't reflect my real feelings sometimes

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	474	61,8	61,8	61,8
No	293	38,2	38,2	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

As the Table-24 show that 61.8% of the respondents' posts doesn't reflect their real feelings sometimes. 38.2% of the respondents' posts does reflect their real feelings.

Table 25: If I get a lot of likes on any posts, it increases my confidence

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	464	60,5	60,5	60,5
No	303	39,5	39,5	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The results show that 60.5% of the respondents' confidence is increasing when they get a lot of likes on their any posts. 39.5% of the respondents disagree with it.

Table 26: If so many people share my post, it makes me feel acknowledged

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	329	42,9	42,9	42,9
No	438	57,1	57,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

57.1% of the respondents doesn't feel acknowledged when so many people share their posts and there is not a big difference with the group of the respondents who is not agree with them by 42.9%.

Table 27: When I write strong and powerful Facebook status, I feel weak

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	214	27,9	27,9	27,9
No	553	72,1	72,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Results show that 72.1% of the respondents doesn't feel weak when they write strong and powerful Facebook status but 27.9% feel weak when they write strong status.

Table 28: I edit some parts of my body (i.e. thinner legs, bigger breast, flat belly)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	182	23,7	23,7	23,7
No	585	76,3	76,3	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The majority of the respondents that 76.3% doesn't edit some parts of their body on the photos, 23.7 of the respondents edit some parts of their body before they share photos on Facebook.

Table 29: I use filters to change my look (i.e. thinner face, bigger eyes, colour, light)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	436	56,8	56,8	56,8
No	331	43,2	43,2	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

56.8% of the respondents use filters to change their look on the photos before they share on Facebook and 43.2% of the respondents doesn't use filters.

Table 30: I have a specific angle for taking photo which I believe shows me better

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	544	70,9	70,9	70,9
No	223	29,1	29,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

A big number of the respondents that 70.9% have a specific angle for taking photo, which they believe the same angle, show them better. 29.1% of the respondents doesn't have a specific angle for taking photo.

Table 31: I share the photos taken before like i just took them now (i.e. taking 10 photos at a place and share them next week like you just took those photos)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	409	53,3	53,3	53,3
No	358	46,7	46,7	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

As Table-31 reveals the result, 53.3% of the respondents share the photos they have taken before like they just took them. 46.7% of the respondents don't do this action.

Table 32: I smile just for the sake of taking photos

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	578	75,4	75,4	75,4
No	189	24,6	24,6	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Results show that 75.4% of the respondents smile just for the sake of taking photos and almost quarter of the respondent's don't smile just for the sake of taking photos.

Table 33: I take advantage of the light when I take photos to upload on Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	673	87,7	87,7	87,7
No	94	12,3	12,3	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The majority of the respondents take the advantage of the light by 87.7% and only 12.3% don't take the advantage of the light when they take photos to upload on Facebook.

Table 34: If there is a mess (not clean), I clean everything in the photo frame before I shoot

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	546	71,2	71,2	71,2
No	221	28,8	28,8	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

A significant number of the respondents that 71.2% cleans everything in the photo frame before taking photos if there is a mess. 28.8% of the respondents do not clean the mess, which is visible in the photo frame before they take a photo.

Table 35: I use makeup just for the sake of taking photos

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	201	26,2	26,2	26,2
No	566	73,8	73,8	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The Table-35 show that 73.8% of the respondents doesn't use make-up just for the sake of taking photo. 26.2% of the respondents use make-up just for the sake of taking photo.

Table 36: I use accessories (Sunglasses, wristwatch and so on) just for the sake of taking photos for Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	362	47,2	47,2	47,2
No	405	52,8	52,8	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Almost half of the respondents use accessories just for the sake of taking photos by 47.2% and more than half don't use accessories by 52.8%.

Table 37: I change clothes just for the sake of taking photos

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	319	41,6	41,6	41,6
No	448	58,4	58,4	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

58.4% of the respondents doesn't change clothes just for the sake of taking photos and 41.6% of the respondents doesn't change clothes just for the sake of taking photos.

Table 38: I go to restaurant just to take photos for Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	122	15,9	15,9	15,9
No	645	84,1	84,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

84.1% of the respondents doesn't go to restaurants just to take photos for Facebook and 15.9% of the respondents doing this action for Facebook.

Table 39: I go to the beach club just to take photos for Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	114	14,9	14,9	14,9
No	653	85,1	85,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Table-39 shows that 85.1% of the respondents doesn't go to beach clubs just to take photos for Facebook and low percentage of them are going to the beach clubs just to take photos by 14.9%.

Table 40: I go to the gym just to take photos for Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	76	9,9	9,9	9,9
No	691	90,1	90,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

A big number of respondents that 90.1% doesn't go to the gym just to take photos and very low number that 10% of the respondents go to the gym just to take photos.

Table 41: I go to nightclub/pub/bar just to take photos for Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	94	12,3	12,3	12,3
No	673	87,7	87,7	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Majority of the respondents doesn't go to the nightclubs, pubs or bars just to take photos for Facebook. 12,3% of them going to these places just to take photos for Facebook.

Table 42: I go to the coffee shops/Cafes just to take photos for Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	137	17,9	17,9	17,9
No	630	82,1	82,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

According to Table-42, the respondents who go to the cafes or coffee shops correspond to 17.9% and who doesn't go to the cafes or coffee shops just to take photos for Facebook is 82.1%

Table 43: I visit the expensive hotels just to take photos for Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	102	13,3	13,3	13,3
No	665	86,7	86,7	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

As the Table-43 shows that the majority of the respondents that 86.7% doesn't go to the expensive hotel just to take photos, 13,3% of them go to the expensive hotels just to take photos for Facebook.

Table 44: I engage in sport activity just to take photos for Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	94	12,3	12,3	12,3
No	673	87,7	87,7	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

This table reveals that really low number of the respondents engage in sport activity just to take photos to share on Facebook and 87.7% of them don't engage in sport activity just to take photos for Facebook.

Table 45: The things that I am shy or it's show off to share on my timeline I don't hesitate to share on my story

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	306	39,9	39,9	39,9
No	461	60,1	60,1	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

According to Table-45, what it talks about Facebook story feature, 39.9% of the respondents do not hesitate to share on their story what they shy to share on their timeline on Facebook and the majority of them that 60.1% not in this action.

Table 46: I go to clothing stores and even I won't buy, I try expensive clothes just to take photo

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	118	15,4	15,4	15,4
No	649	84,6	84,6	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Results show that 84.6% of the respondents do not go to clothing stores to try expensive clothes just to take photos for Facebook even they won't buy it. 15.4% of them trying expensive clothes and take photos just for Facebook and they won't buy it at the end.

Table 47: I take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	103	13,4	13,4	13,4
No	664	86,6	86,6	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

As the Table-47 shows that 86.6% of the respondents doesn't take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook. Only 13.4% of them take photos with expensive cars just to upload to Facebook.

Table 48: My birth place information is different from my original one on Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	121	15,8	15,8	15,8
No	646	84,2	84,2	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The majority of the respondents that 84.2% don't use different birthplace information from their original one on Facebook. 15.8% of the respondents use different information about their birth place on Facebook.

Table 49: I use a location different from where I am, when I share photo or write status

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	197	25,7	25,7	25,7
No	570	74,3	74,3	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

74.3% of the respondents doesn't use a location different where they are, when they share photo or write status on Facebook and 25.7% of them use different than where they are while they post on Facebook.

Table 50: I check-in a place when I am not there on Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	267	34,8	34,8	34,8
No	500	65,2	65,2	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

65.2% of the respondents do not check-in a place when they are not there on Facebook but 34.8% of them use different location from where they are when they check-in a place on Facebook.

Table 51: I use a different work position from my actual one on Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	84	11,0	11,0	11,0
No	683	89,0	89,0	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The big percentage of the respondents that is 89%, do not use different work position from their actual one on Facebook. Only 11% of them use different work position information on their Facebook.

Table 52: I use a place of work different from my actual one on Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	81	10,6	10,6	10,6
No	686	89,4	89,4	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

89.4% of the respondents do not use different place of work from their actual one on Facebook. Very small number of the respondents that 10.6% uses different information about their work place.

Table 53: My hometown information is different from my actual one on your Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	80	10,4	10,4	10,4
No	687	89,6	89,6	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Results show that 89.6% of the respondents use correct information about their hometown but 10.4% of them use different than actual one on Facebook.

Table 54: My current city information is different from my actual one on Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	83	10,8	10,8	10,8
No	684	89,2	89,2	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

As the Table-54 shows that 89.2% of the respondents use the actual current city information on their Facebook but 10.8% of them use different than actual one.

Table 55: My educational information is different from my actual one on Facebook

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	80	10,4	10,4	10,4
No	687	89,6	89,6	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

89.6% of the respondents do not use different educational information from their actual one but 10.4% of them use different than their actual one.

Table 56: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as fraudsters

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	620	80,8	80,8	80,8
No	147	19,2	19,2	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

According to Table-56, 80.8% of the respondents does view people who create fake identity on Facebook as fraudsters and 19.2% of them doesn't view them as fraudsters.

Table 57: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as who suffer from poverty of ideas

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	577	75,2	75,2	75,2
No	190	24,8	24,8	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

As the Table-57 shows that 75.2% of the respondents does view people who create fake identity on Facebook as who suffer from poverty of ideas. Only 24,8% of them does not think like that.

Table 58: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with low self esteem

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	603	78,6	78,6	78,6
No	164	21,4	21,4	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The majority of the respondents that 78.6% view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with low self esteem. The respondents who is not think they are people with low self esteem is 21.4%.

Table 59: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with inferiority complex

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	545	71,1	71,1	71,1
No	222	28,9	28,9	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

71.1% of the respondents does view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with inferiority complex. 28.9% of the respondents do not view them with inferiority complex.

Table 60: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with high level of insecurity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	626	81,6	81,6	81,6
No	141	18,4	18,4	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The majority of the respondents does view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with high level of insecurity as the Table-60 show the results as 81.6% and 18.4% of the respondents doesn't view them as people with high level of insecurity.

Table 61: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who wants to be acceptable by the society

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	495	64,5	64,5	64,5
No	272	35,5	35,5	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

64.5% of the respondents does view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who wants to be acceptable by the society. 35.5% of the respondents doesn't agree with it.

Table 62: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as attention seekers

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	558	72,8	72,8	72,8
No	209	27,2	27,2	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Results show that 72.8% of the respondent's view people who create fake identity on Facebook as attention seekers and 27.2% of them do not view them as attention seekers.

Table 63: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	219	28,6	28,6	28,6
No	548	71,4	71,4	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

The table shows that 71.4% of the respondents doesn't view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people. 28.6% of them thinks they are creative people.

Table 64: I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about modern technology

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	238	31,0	31,0	31,0
No	529	69,0	69,0	100,0
Total	767	100,0	100,0	

69% of the respondents doesn't view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about technology but 31% of the respondents thinks they are tech-savvy.

4.1.2 Summary of Frequency Distribution

Considering that this study evaluated most major questions or items based on "Yes" and "No" based on the fact that a direct answer is highly valued, we seek to summarise the frequency distribution of all items.

Table 65: Frequency summary of participants' response to what makes them believe an account is fake

I consider a Facebook account as fake when I see;	Yes F/(%)	No F/(%)
Exaggerated biography	386 (50.3)	381 (49.7)
Profiles without photo	617 (80.4)	150 (19.6)
Accounts with no mutual friends	464 (60.5)	303 (39.5)
Mutual friends but any of mutual friends knows the person	559 (72.9)	208 (27.1)
Accounts with few friends (i.e. 10-15 friends)	538 (70.1)	229 (29.9)
Empty Timeline (No sharing)	581 (75.7)	186 (24.3)
Extremely gorgeous human photo (beautiful/handsome)	502 (65.4)	265 (34.6)
Low number of likes	321 (41.9)	446 (58.1)

The table above show the results of the average derived from the summary of frequency distribution in respect to response to what makes them believe an account is fake reveals that majority of the respondents agree to most of the items in this category.

Table 66: Frequency summary of participants' response to creating hyper-real self image

	Yes F/(%)	No F/(%)
If the photos I post don't get enough likes, I feel disappointed	354 (46.2)	413 (53.8)
If the videos I share don't get comments, I feel people	158 (20.6)	609 (79.4)

don't love me		
When I post happy photos, I mostly feel lonely	301 (39.2)	466 (60.8)
When I post with expensive items (i.e. watch, car, bag, sunglasses) on social media, I feel upper-class (rich)	189 (24.6)	578 (75.4)
My posts doesn't reflect my real feelings sometimes	474 (61.8)	293 (38.2)
If I get a lot of likes on any posts, it increases my confidence	464 (60.5)	303 (39.5)
If so many people share my post, it makes me feel acknowledged	329 (42.9)	438 (57.1)
When I write strong and powerful Facebook status, I feel weak	214 (27.9)	553 (72.1)
I edit some parts of my body (i.e. thinner legs, bigger breast, flat belly)	182 (23.7)	585 (76.3)
I use filters to change my look (i.e. thinner face, bigger eyes, colour, light)	436 (56.8)	331 (43.2)
I have a specific angle for taking photo which I believe shows me better	544 (70.9)	223 (29.1)
I share the photos taken before like i just took them now (i.e. taking 10 photos at a place and share them next week like you just took those photos)	409 (53.3)	358 (46.7)

The table above show the results of the average discovered from the summary of frequency of participants' response to creating hyper-real self image. Results show

respondents on average, majority of the respondents disagreed to creating hyper-real self image.

Table 67: Frequency summary of participants' response to creation of fake identity

	Yes F/(%)	No F/(%)
I smile just for the sake of taking photos	578 (75.4)	189 (24.6)
I take advantage of the light when I take photos to upload on Facebook	673 (87.7)	94 (12.3)
If there is a mess (not clean), I clean everything in the photo frame before I shoot	546 (71.2)	221 (28.8)
I use makeup just for the sake of taking photos	201 (26.2)	566 (73.8)
I use accessories (Sunglasses, wristwatch and so on) just for the sake of taking photos for Facebook	362 (47.2)	405 (52.8)
I change clothes just for the sake of taking photos	319 (41.6)	448 (58.4)
I go to restaurant just to take photos for Facebook	122 (15.9)	645 (84.1)
I go to the beach club just to take photos for Facebook	114 (14.9)	653 (85.1)
I go to the gym just to take photos for Facebook	76 (9.9)	691 (90.1)
I go to nightclub/pub/bar just to take photos for Facebook	94 (12.3)	673 (87.7)
I go to the coffee shops/Cafes just to take photos for Facebook	137 (17.9)	630 (82.1)
I visit the expensive hotels just to take photos for Facebook	102 (13.3)	665 (86.7)
I engage in sport activity just to take photos for Facebook	94 (12.3)	673 (87.7)
The things that I am shy or it's show off to share on my	306 (39.9)	461 (60.1)

timeline I don't hesitate to share on my story		
I go to clothing stores and even I won't buy, I try expensive clothes just to take photo	118 (15.4)	649 (84.6)
I take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook	103 (13.4)	664 (86.6)
My birth place information is different from my original one on Facebook	121 (15.8)	646 (84.2)
I use a location different from where I am, when I share photo or write status	197 (25.7)	570 (74.3)
I check-in a place when I am not there on Facebook	267 (34.8)	500 (65.2)
I use a different work position from my actual one on Facebook	84 (11.0)	683 (89.0)
I use a place of work different from my actual one on Facebook	81 (10.6)	686 (89.4)
My hometown information is different from my actual one on your Facebook	80 (10.4)	687 (89.6)
My current city information is different from my actual one on Facebook	83 (10.8)	684 (89.2)
My educational information is different from my actual one on Facebook	80 (10.4)	687 (89.6)

Results show that in the evaluation of respondents' average as calculated through summary of frequency of participants, results show that majority of the respondents do not agree that they create fake identity. Only the following; "I smile just for the sake of taking photos", "I take advantage of the light when I take photos to upload on

Facebook”, and If there is a mess (not clean) and I clean everything in the photo frame before I shoot” has a level of agreeableness of average.

Table 68: Frequency summary of participants’ response to perception of other respondents who create fake identity on Facebook

I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as;	Yes F/(%)	No F/(%)
Fraudsters	620 (80.8)	147 (19.2)
Who suffer from poverty of ideas	577 (75.2)	190 (24.8)
With low self esteem	603 (78.6)	164 (21.4)
Inferiority complex	545 (71.1)	222 (28.9)
High level of insecurity	626 (81.6)	141 (18.4)
Who wants to be acceptable by the society	495 (64.5)	272 (35.5)
Attention seekers	558 (72.8)	209 (27.2)
Creative people	219 (28.6)	548 (71.4)
Knowing a lot about modern technology	238 (31.0)	529 (69.0)

The table above show the results of average derived from the summary of frequency of participants’ response to perception of other respondents who create fake identity on Facebook. Only respondents who disagrees are those who said that they view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people and people who know a lot about modern technology.

4.2 Inferential Statistics

In this study, we use inferential statistics (T test) to try to make judgments of the probability that an observed statistical significance difference between groups is a reliable one.

Table 69: Independent Samples T Test

	f	Sig	t	df	p
I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as fraudsters	2.891	.089	-.849 -.849	764 762. 899	.396
I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as who suffer from poverty of ideas	.452	.502	-.336 -.336	764 763. 989	.737
I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with low self esteem	.536	.464	-.366 -.366	764 763. 950	.715
I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with inferiority complex	2.977	.085	-.863 -.863	764 763. 739	.389
I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with high level of insecurity	.484	.487	.348 .348	764 763. 267	.728
I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who wants to be acceptable by the society	13.42 0	.000	- 1.858 - 1.858	764 763. 295	.064
I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as attention seekers	.401	.527	-.317 -.317	764 763. 999	.752
I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people	27.84 9	.000	2.640 2.641	764 758. 981	.008
I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about modern technology	27.64 8	.000	2.648 2.649	764 760. 375	.008

$p < 0.05$; $p < 0.01$

T test results show that there is a significant difference in the scores male and female when “I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people” was accessed. For female (M=1.76, SD=0.43) and Male (M=1.67, SD=0.47) $t(767) = 2.64, p = .008$. Results show that there is a significant difference in the scores male and female when “I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about modern technology” was accessed. For female (M=1.73, SD=0.44) and Male (M=1.65, SD=0.48) $t(767) = 2.64, p = .008$.

To ascertain if there is a statistical significance difference in the perception of Facebook users who fake their identity as responded to by the participants, we checked group statistics box and results show that for “I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people” and “I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about modern technology” female respondents accessed more items more than male therefore female respondents agree that they don’t view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people more than male respondents. Also, female respondents don’t view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about modern technology more than male participants.

4.2.1 Gender Cross Tabulation

Cross tabulations are tables that reveals the findings of the group of respondents and for the purpose of this study, we conducted Cross tabulations to enable the researcher examine the relationships within Gender data set. This is evidently invisible in the frequency distributions available.

Table 70: Gender * I edit some parts of my body (i.e. thinner legs, bigger breast, flat belly) Cross Tabulation

			I edit some parts of my body (i.e. thinner legs, bigger breast, flat belly)		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender	Female	Count	123	258	381
		% within Gender	32,3%	67,7%	100,0%
	Male	Count	59	326	385
		% within Gender	15,3%	84,7%	100,0%
	Others	Count	0	1	1
		% within Gender	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	182	585	767
		% within Gender	23,7%	76,3%	100,0%

Results show that 23.7% of the respondents edit some parts of their body before they share photos on Facebook and 32.3% of them are female while 15.3% of them are male.

Table 71: Gender * I use filters to change my look (i.e. thinner face, bigger eyes, colour, light) Cross Tabulation

			I use filters to change my look (i.e. thinner face, bigger eyes, colour, light)		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender	Female	Count	251	130	381
		% within Gender	65,9%	34,1%	100,0%
	Male	Count	185	200	385
		% within Gender	48,1%	51,9%	100,0%
	Others	Count	0	1	1
		% within Gender	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	436	331	767
		% within Gender	56,8%	43,2%	100,0%

Results show that 56.8% of the respondents are using filters to change their look on the photos before they share on Facebook. 65.9% of them are female and 48,1% of them are male.

Table 72: Gender * I use makeup just for the sake of taking photos Cross Tabulation

			I use makeup just for the sake of taking photos		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender	Female	Count	166	215	381
		% within Gender	43,6%	56,4%	100,0%
	Male	Count	35	350	385
		% within Gender	9,1%	90,9%	100,0%
	Others	Count	0	1	1
		% within Gender	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	201	566	767
		% within Gender	26,2%	73,8%	100,0%

Results show that 26.2% of the respondents use make-up just for the sake of taking photos and 43.6% of them are female and 9.1% of them are male students.

Table 73: Gender * I use accessories (Sunglasses, wristwatch and so on) just for the sake of taking photos for Facebook Cross Tabulation

			I use accessories (Sunglasses, wristwatch and so on) just for the sake of taking photos for Facebook		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender	Female	Count	180	201	381
		% within Gender	47,2%	52,8%	100,0%
	Male	Count	182	203	385
		% within Gender	47,3%	52,7%	100,0%
	Others	Count	0	1	1
		% within Gender	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	362	405	767
		% within Gender	47,2%	52,8%	100,0%

Results show that 47.2% of the respondents use accessories just for the sake of taking photos. Female and male students almost equal, 47.2% female, 47.3% male.

Table 74: Gender * I check-in a place when I am not there on Facebook Cross Tabulation

			I check-in a place when I am not there on Facebook		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender	Female	Count	133	248	381
		% within Gender	34,9%	65,1%	100,0%
	Male	Count	134	251	385
		% within Gender	34,8%	65,2%	100,0%
	Others	Count	0	1	1
		% within Gender	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	267	500	767
		% within Gender	34,8%	65,2%	100,0%

Results show that 34.8% of the respondents check-in a place when they are not there on Facebook and 34.9% of them are female, 34.8% of them are male.

Table 75: Gender * I take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook Cross Tabulation

			I take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender	Female	Count	33	348	381
		% within Gender	8,7%	91,3%	100,0%
	Male	Count	70	315	385
		% within Gender	18,2%	81,8%	100,0%
	Others	Count	0	1	1
		% within Gender	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	103	664	767
		% within Gender	13,4%	86,6%	100,0%

Results show that 13.4% of the respondents take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook and 8.7% of them are female, 18.2% of them are male.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

This section discusses three major conclusive points. First it summarizes the whole study. Secondly, it draws conclusions from the study and then interprets the results following research questions of the study and finally, the chapter discusses recommendations for further research.

5.1 Summary of the Study

The research entitled “Creating Fake Identity and Pseudo Accounts on Social Media Among University Students in North Cyprus” attempts to investigate the idea of creating a fake reality on social media among international university students. Through a survey conducted among seven hundred and sixty-seven international university students in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus; two hundred Eastern Mediterranean University students, one hundred and ninety-nine near East University students, one hundred and ninety-two European University of Lefke and one hundred seventy-six Girne American University students enrolled in Fall 2017/2018 session. The study aims to ask these major questions; do Facebook users check any account if its fake once they get a friend request; what do Facebook users identify as fake; if they create identity and how they perceive other users who create fake identity.

5.2 Conclusions Drawn from the Study

The research “Creating Fake Identity and Pseudo Accounts on Social Media Among University Students in North Cyprus” sets out to investigate the following research questions.

RQ1. What Do Facebook Users Identify as Fake?

When asked the kind of Facebook account various users consider as fake and why they consider such as fake, the discussed below were found and of importance is the fact that majority of the respondents skim through the profile and page of users who send them friend request to find out if such account is fake or not. According to the findings of the study significant number of Facebook users consider the account as fake when there is exaggerated biography by the user. The study also helped to emphasis importance in the use of profile picture as other users may consider such accounts fake when they see profiles without photo on Facebook. Also the study has been able to reveal that the existence of mutual friends between two Facebook users is quite vital as many users see the need for one or more mutual friends before believing in the originality of such account and even there are mutual friends but if none of mutual friends knows the person, they consider it as fake.

When an account owner has few friends or when the timeline of such a person is empty, quite a number of Facebook users believe that the account may be fake, this is as a result of the believe that the account is highly in active and therefore not a real account. Many users also believe that when a Facebook picture is highly gorgeous, such account is fake. The respondents do not consider the account as fake when there are low number of likes by other users.

RQ2: Do active Facebook users identify Facebook accounts without photo as fake?

In the inquiry about what Facebook users identify as fake when they see a friend request. This study asks about that majority of active Facebook users identify Facebook accounts without photo as fake and we found that most of the respondents consider those accounts as fake.

RQ3: Do active Facebook users check accounts if they are fake before they accept friend request?

One of the main inquiries of this study is questioning if active Facebook users check accounts if they are fake before they accept friend request and the findings of the study show that a remarkable number of respondents check accounts if they are fake when they get a friend request on Facebook. Considering that it is evident through the big number of Facebook users check the accounts if its fake when they get friend request.

RQ4: Do Facebook users replaces reality with hyper reality and create hyper-real self-image?

The core inquiry of this study is asking if majority of Facebook users replaces reality with hyper-reality. The findings show that most of the respondents do not feel disappointed when they don't get enough likes for the photos they post. The minority of the respondents feels that people don't love them when they don't get enough comments to the videos they share on Facebook. Also, the majority of the respondents doesn't feel like upper-class when they post with expensive items on social media.

For creating fake identity, the results show that majority of the respondents' confidence increases when they get a lot of likes on their any posts. Majority of the respondents doesn't feel acknowledged when so many people share their posts and there is not a big difference with the group of the respondents who do not agree with them. While the majority of the respondents doesn't edit some parts of their body on the photos. Some respondents do edit their parts of body and the implication is discussed under important contributions of this study. Majority of the respondents use filters to change their look on the photos before they share it on Facebook. A big number of the respondents have a specific angle for taking photo, which they believe the same angle, show them better. Also, majority of respondents share photos taken

before like they just took them now.

RQ5: Do majority of Facebook users share something different from what they are presently involved in (i.e. they post happy photos when lonely)?

This study specifically aims to know if majority of Facebook users share something different from what they are presently involved in. Results show that majority of the respondents mostly do not feel lonely when they share happy photos. Results also show that majority of the respondents' posts doesn't reflect their real feelings sometimes. When the idea was specified, results show that majority of the respondents' don't feel weak when they write strong and powerful Facebook status.

RQ6: Do most Facebook active users create fake identity?

Inquiring into if respondents create fake identity is one of the core questions of this study and results show that majority of the respondents smile just for the sake of taking photos and almost quarter of the respondent's don't smile just for the sake of taking photos. The majority of the respondents take the advantage of the light but few respondents don't take the advantage of the light when they take photos to upload on Facebook. A significant number of the respondents cleans everything in the photo frame before taking photos if there is a mess. Majority of the respondents do not clean the mess, which is visible in the photo frame before they take a photo. According male and female numbers majority of the respondents doesn't use makeup just for the sake of taking photos but few respondents do not. Almost half of the respondents use accessories just for the sake of taking photos by but majority of respondents do not. While majority of the respondents' don't change clothes just for the sake of taking photos a significant number of them changing clothes before taking photos.

Results also show that majority of the respondents' don't go to restaurants just to take photos for Facebook, only few involve in this action for Facebook. Majority of the

respondents' don't go to beach clubs just to take photos for Facebook and low percentage of them are going to the beach clubs just to take photos. A big number of respondents that don't go to gym just to take photos and less than 10% of the respondents go to the gym just to take photos. Majority of the respondents doesn't go to the nightclubs, pubs or bars just to take photos for Facebook. On the other hand, few of them going to these places just to take photos for Facebook.

According to results, the respondents who go to the cafes or coffee shops but a high percentage of them don't do this action just to take photos for Facebook. Majority of the respondents do not go to expensive hotel just for taking photos, few do go to the expensive hotel just to take photos to share on Facebook. Majority of the respondents doesn't engage in sport activity just to take photos for Facebook. When talking about Facebook story feature, almost half of the respondents do not hesitate to share on their story what they shy to share on their timeline on Facebook and the majority of them do not involve in this action.

Majority of the respondents doesn't use a location different where they are, when they share photo or write status on Facebook and some of them use different than where they are while they post on Facebook. Majority of the respondents do not check-in a place when they are not there on Facebook but few of them use different location from where they are when they check-in a place on Facebook.

Self-projection is an issue that has been talked about a lot lately in the discourse of social media and, for the solidification of this study as a milestone study, we inquire into the creation of fake identity for self-projection and we found that majority of the respondents do not go to clothing stores to try expensive clothes just to take photos for

Facebook even they won't buy it. On the other hand, important number of them trying expensive clothes and take photos just for Facebook and they won't buy it at the end.

Majority of the respondents doesn't take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook. Only few of them take photos with expensive cars just to upload to Facebook. The majority of the respondents that don't use different birthplace information from their original one on Facebook. Majority of the respondents use different information about their birth place on Facebook. The big percentage of the respondents do not use different work position from their actual one on Facebook. Only few of them use different work position information on their Facebook.

Majority of the respondents do not use different place of work from their actual one on Facebook. Very small number of the respondents uses different information about their work place. Results show that majority of the respondents use correct information about their hometown but few of them use different than actual one on Facebook. Most of the respondents use the actual current city information on their Facebook but few of them use different than actual one. Majority of the respondents do not use different educational information from their actual one but few of them use different than their actual one.

RQ7: Is there a statistical significant difference as to how male and female students perceive people who create fake identity on Facebook?

To answer if there is a statistical significant difference as to how male and female students perceive people who create fake identity on Facebook, first of all, this study has to answer an important question which is “how do users perceive other respondents who fake their identity on Facebook”?

Results reveal that majority of the respondents' view people who create fake identity

on Facebook as fraudsters and few respondents don't view them as fraudsters. Most of the respondents' view people who create fake identity on Facebook as who suffer from poverty of ideas. Only a few of them do not think like that. The majority of the respondents' view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with low self-esteem. Those who not think they are people with low self-esteem were few Most of the respondents' view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with inferiority complex. Only few of them do not view them with inferiority complex.

The majority of the respondents' don't view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people with high level of insecurity as the and only few didn't agree. Majority of the respondents' view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who wants to be acceptable by the society. A remarkable number of the respondents' don't agree with it. Results show that majority of the respondent's view people who create fake identity on Facebook as attention seekers and only few of them do not view them as attention seekers. The results show majority of the respondents' don't view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people. Only few 28 of them thinks they are creative people. Majority of the respondents' don't view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about technology but a remarkable of the respondents thinks they are tech-savvy.

To ascertain if there is statistical significant difference as to how male and female students perceive people who create fake identity on Facebook, this study conducted a T test and results show that there is a significant difference in the scores male and female on two items; "I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people" and "I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about modern technology".

According to Group Statistics Box and results show that for “I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people” and “I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about modern technology” female respondents accessed more items more than male therefore female respondents agrees that they don’t view people who create fake identity on Facebook as creative people more than male respondents. Also, female respondents don’t view people who create fake identity on Facebook as people who knows a lot about modern technology more than male participants.

5.2.1 Theoretical Insights Drawn for the Empirical Findings of the Study

Following the two theories adopted in the study, Social Identity Theory and Communication Theory of identity, we found that there are empirical evidences derived from this study that buttresses the core statements of this theory. One of the core assumption of Social Identity Theory is that when people create identity through the recognition, they emphasize and talk about what they have created and this is pivotal because in this study, although many people didn’t go to clothing stores to try expensive clothes just to take photos for Facebook even they won’t buy it, we found that a significant number of them try expensive clothes and take photos just for Facebook. Considering that Social identity theory posits that creating identity enables individuals to gain self-recognition, we conclude that this small number of respondents create this identity to gain self-recognition.

Communication Theory of Identity highlights the significance of the communication process to identity formation and from the findings of this study, we found in the inquiry of creating fake identity that majority of the participants smile just for the sake of taking photos and almost quarter of the respondent’s don’t smile just for the sake of taking photos. Following this theory, this study shows that it is evident that the

communication process is important to creating a presentable or kind persona or identity which smiling in photos could be responsible for.

5.2.2 Conclusion of Gender Cross Tabulation

Results show that female Facebook users who edit some parts of their body are two times more than male Facebook users. Female group using filters to change their look is almost one and half times more than male group. The significant difference between female and male Facebook users for using make-up just for the sake of taking photo, female group is five times more than male group. Female and Male group are equal for the following actions, who use accessories just for the sake of taking photos for Facebook and who check-in a place when they are not there on Facebook. Male group who is taking photos with expensive cars two times more than Female group.

5.3 Highlights of the Study

The findings of the study evidently show that majority of the respondents don't indulge in some of the activities that the items of the questionnaire seeks to know i.e. in the item "I edit some parts of my body (i.e. thinner legs, bigger breasts, flat belly), results show that 76% said that they don't edit some parts of their body. 23.7% of the respondents agree that they edit some parts of their body when they take photos to post on Facebook which is almost one out of every four Facebook users (See Table-28). This is significant for this study and this section seeks to highlight some findings of the study.

Majority of respondents said that they identify a Facebook account as fake when the profile photo of the account is extremely gorgeous human photo (beautiful/handsome). This is highlighted because one would question why as many as 502 out 767 respondents would identify an extremely beautiful photo as fake (See Table-18). That

should be a study by itself to find what makes them to think that, they may not see themselves acceptable/enough for the beauty level what society/media emphasized. The researcher experienced that people tell all of their friends when they get a friend request or message from the accounts which has beautiful/handsome profile photo in the way they proof that they are acceptable and increases their confidence. Also, 546 out of 767 respondents said that they clean the mess or not clean around the person (i.e. room) they clean whatever visible in the photo frame before they shoot the photo, so what we see in the frame may not be natural, it may be fiction like a movie scene, so the moment we see in the photo doesn't reflect the real moment. The reality is out of the frame, the fake is in the frame with %71,2, seven out of every ten respondents. This is also worth enquiring into (See Table-34).

The next section highlights more of these important contribution of this study. All of these highlights are described based on the number of respondents after out of the whole i.e. two out of every five respondents; one out of every four respondents; one out of every three respondents; one out of every two respondents one out of every seven respondents; one out of every seven respondents; one out of every six respondents; one out of every eight respondents and one out of every ten respondents.

Two out of every five respondents: Results show that two out of every five respondents share happy photos when they feel lonely (See Table-22). The researcher experienced that when some of his friends break-up with their romantic partner, they try to show that they are powerful while they are crying at the moment. Also, two out of every five respondents change clothes just for the sake of taking photos (See Table-37). They may want to show that they have many clothes or well-groomed even if they are at home. Two out of five respondents don't hesitate to share the things on their Facebook

story (See Table-45). This may be because the story shows for only 24 hours and then disappears, so people may think that they don't seem like a show-off person. They may want to show their life (i.e. what they eat, wear, drink. This may also include where they go, who they are with and how they spend) or class. According to Baudrillard as cited in Noteboom (2013), this is the representation of the society as a replacement of the reality with hyper-real.

One out of every four respondents: Results show one out of every four respondents that feel upper-class when they post with expensive items like watch, bag, car, sunglasses which are expensive brands and that's to show the economic status (See Table-23). Almost one out of four respondents edit some parts of their body before they share a photo i.e. thinner legs, bigger breast, flat belly as earlier stated. This is how the media and/or society emphasize the beauty standards, it is cheaper, faster and easier than plastic surgery and they may want to show them almost perfect on the social media.

Results show one out of every four respondents use make-up just for the sake of taking photo (See Table-35). They may not want to show their natural face or skin; this is same as beauty standards. Results show that one out of every four respondents use a different location from where they are when they share photos or write status (See Table-49). This may be because some respondents want others to know that they travel a lot and apparently this translate to economic affluence.

One out of every three respondents: Facebook allows you to check-in a place like restaurant, hotel, city, country when you are there but one out of every three respondents check-in a place when they are not there (See Table-50). They are

physically not there and they are existing there on social media which is a fake and/or hyper-real activity according to Baudrillard as cited in Noteboom (2013).

One out of every two respondents: Results show that one out of every two respondents use accessories (sunglasses, wristwatch, cap, hat, scarf, neckless and so on) just for the sake of taking photos for Facebook (See Table-36). There may be two reasons of it; one of them is economic status if the brand visible and the other one is they may want to hide their faces if they are not comfortable while taking the photos. One out of every seven respondents: As seen from the findings of the study, one out of every seven respondents take photos with expensive cars (See Table-47). As the results show that male group doing this action more than female group and male group may want to charm opposite sex and it is signifier of power and status (such as economical status and so on).

One out of every six respondents: As seen from the findings of the study, one out of every six respondents go to clothing stores and even they won't buy, they try expensive clothes just to take photos (See Table-46). The reason may be that they may not go shopping just to buy what they need. As the outfit shows the economic status, they go to take photos with expensive clothes if the products are so expensive and they can't buy it. This interesting finding may also show that they already buy it to take photo and show their economic status, so, they take the photo at the store without buying it.

One out of every six respondents use different birth place information than actual one (See Table-48). Respondents who didn't use their original location may use a different birth place such as in Europe or America's because respondents may not be satisfied about where they are from. In addition, the city or country you born may be a label in the society, it may be important for first impression or get idea about the person. The

researcher experienced that one of his friends was telling different birth place according to friend groups of the person. The person was telling to female friends where he lives (west) and to male friends where he born (east).

For the group of items (I go to restaurants, beach club, nightclub, pub, bar, coffee shops, cafes, expensive hotels just to take photos for Facebook. Results show that the average is one out of every six respondents engage in the act (See Tables-38,39,41,42,43). They may be doing this to show what they consume, their economic class and this may be hyper-reality because considering that the photo was not taken when they are there, they are going there for the purpose of taking the photo.

One out of every eight respondents: As seen in the findings of the study, results show that one out of every eight respondents engage in sport activity just to take photos for Facebook (See Table-44). One out of every ten respondents: As seen in the findings of the study, one out of every ten respondents go to the gym just to take photos for Facebook (See Table-40). These actions about sports may be about showing lifestyle and they try to reach the level of beauty standards as the media/society emphasized in a rich way. Use different work position and work place (See Table-51,52). Also, one out of every ten respondents use different current city, hometown and educational information than actual one on Facebook (See Tables-53,54,55).

For most of the items that had two categories; general and specific. The researcher found inconsistencies in the answer. For instance, when asked, if respondents posts reflect their real feeling, majority of them said that their posts don't reflect their real feelings but when specifically asked if they post happy photos when they mostly feel lonely, majority of them said no. This also applies for the item, "when I write strong

and powerful Facebook status, I feel weak”. So it is evident that when it is specific, respondents` answers reduces (See Tables-22,24,27).

One of the researcher`s friends whose name is Beste was helping to the researcher to distribute the questionnaire and Beste saw her friend in the campus and gave one questionnaire to her friend and while she was filling the survey she was thinking loudly and share the answers with Beste. Because of Beste knows her friend very well, she said that whatever she do in her life she said `no` in the survey. After 1 month they meet in other country and spend time together and then whatever she said no in the survey she was doing it and told Beste that: `Beste, I said no for this question in the survey you gave me but I do it right?` and she do something else again and she said the same again. The researcher says that; `People don`t escape from the researcher or the questionnaire, they escape from their selves.` As the researcher experienced while distributing surveys that many people loved the questions, even some of them draw heart icon on the survey and some of them said that `These questions make me to face myself` but unfortunately some of them might not give the real answer.

Respondents may not be aware whether the actions they do is fake. They may normalize their activities after some time. They may not know the difference between the fake account and fake identity. We asked if they do this even once and even some results not significant, we try to find out that they do these actions, we try to show that there are some people who do these actions just for Facebook or social media, even there is one person who do these fake activities, it is important for this study.

5.4 Recommendations for Further Research

Considering that in this study, I investigated creating fake identity among university students through a survey among seven hundred and sixty-seven university students in Turkish Republic of North Cyprus; two hundred Eastern Mediterranean University students, one hundred and ninety-nine Near East University students, one hundred and ninety-two European University of Lefke and one hundred seventy-six Girne American University students enrolled in Fall 2017/2018 session. Based on observations during administration of questionnaire, the researcher strongly believes that for studies like this, in-depth interview seems well suited because to a very large extent despite that responses contradicts the supposition of this study, majority of young adults engage in creating fake identity, hence future studies should conduct same study with a small sample and therefore conduct in-depth interview with respondents.

REFERENCES

- Arad, A., Barzilay, O., & Perchick, M. (2017). The Impact of Facebook on Social Comparison and Happiness: Evidence from a Natural Experiment.
- Aruoba, C., & Civcir, I. (2014). Social and Environmental Awareness of Foreign Students in North Cyprus. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 56-71.
- Arslan, K., Güven, H., Center, C. P., & Famagusta, N. C. (2007). Universities in North Cyprus and the Right to Education. *38th International Congress of Asian and North African Studies, (ICANAC)*, (pp. 10-15).
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity Theory and the Organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Atieno, O. P. (2009). An analysis of the strengths and limitation of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 13 (1), 13-38.
- Baert, S. (2017). Facebook Profile Picture Appearance Affects Recruiters' First Hiring Decisions. *New Media & Society*, 1-20.
- Barnett, G. A., & Benefield, G. A. (2017). Predicting international Facebook ties through cultural homophily and other factors. *New Media & Society*, 19(2), 217-239.

- Baudrillard, J. (1983). *Simulations*. United States of America: Semiotext(e)
- Baym, N. K. (2015). Social Media and the Struggle for Society. *Social Media + Society*, 1–2.
- Beins, B. C., & McCarthy, M. A. (2012). *Research Methods and Statistics*. Boston: Pearson.
- boyd, d. (2007). Why Youth Social Network Sites: The Role of Networked Publics in Teenage Social Life. *Youth, Identity, and Digital*, 119-142.
- boyd, d. m., & Ellison, N. B., (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-230.
- Bosch, T. E. (2009). Using online social networking for teaching and learning: Facebook use at the University of Cape Town. *Communicatio*, 35(2), 185-200.
- Brem, M. J., Spiller, L. C., & Vandehey, M. A. (2015). Online Mate-Retention Tactics on Facebook Are Associated With Relationship Aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(16), 2831–2850.
- Brooker, P., Barnett, J., & Cribbin, T. (2016). Doing social media analytics. *Big Data & Society*, 1-12.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social Identity Theory: Past Achievements, Current Problems and Future Challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 634-667.

- Brubaker, P. J., & Haigh, M. M. (2017). The Religious Facebook Experience: Uses and Gratifications of Faith-Based Content. *Social Media + Society*, 1–11.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research method*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Caers, R., Feyter, T., Couck, M., Stough, T., Vigna, C., & Bois, C. (2013). Facebook: A Literature Review. *New Media & Society*, 15(6), 982–1002.
- Conti, M., Poovendran, R., & Secchiero, M. (2012). Fakebook: Detecting fake profiles in on-line social networks. . In *Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM), IEEE/ACM International Conference on IEEE*, (pp. 1071-1078).
- Coolican, H. (2014). *Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology*. Hodder & Stoughton.
- Couldry, N. (2015). Social Media: Human Life. *Social Media + Society*, 1-2.
- Chatterjee, K. (1998). History as Self-Representation: The Recasting of a Political Tradition in Late Eighteenth-Century Eastern India. *Modern Asian Studies*, 32(4), 913–948.
- Cook, J., & Hasmath, R., (2014). The discursive construction and performance of gendered identity on social media. *Current Sociology*, 62(7), 975–993.

- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design qualitative, quantitative. and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Danesi, M. (2014). *Dictionary of Media and Communications*. Armonk: Routledge.
- Deuze, M. (2015). A Call for Compassion in Social Media Studies. *Social Media + Society*, 1-2.
- Dijck, J. (2003). ‘You have one Identity’: Performing the Self on Facebook and LinkedIn. *Media, Culture & Society*, 35(2), 199–215.
- Eakin, P. K. (2015). Self and Self-Representation Online and Off. *Journal of Literary Studies*, 28 (1), 11–29.
- Ellison, N. B., Gray, R., Lampe, C., & Fiore, A. T. (2014). Social capital and resource requests on Facebook. *New Media & Society*, 16(7), 1104–1121.
- Ellison, N., Heino, R., & Gibbs, J. (2006). Managing Impressions Online: Self-Presentation Processes in the Online Dating Environment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11, 415–441.
- Elmer, G. (2015). Going Public on Social Media. *Social Media+ Society*, 1(1), 2056305115580341.
- Farman, J. (2015). Infrastructures of Mobile Social Media. *Social Media + Society*, 1–2.

- Feuls, M., Fieseler, C., & Suphan, A. (2014). A social net? Internet and Social Media use during Unemployment. *Work, Employment and Society*, 28(4), 551–570.
- Felt, M. (2016). Social media and the social sciences: How researchers employ Big Data analytics. *Big Data & Society*, 1–15.
- Fisher, E. (2015). ‘You Media’: Audiencing as Marketing in Social Media. *Media, Culture & Society*, 37(1), 50–67.
- Fuchs, C. (2012). BEHIND THE NEWS Social media, riots, and revolutions. *Capital & Class*, 36(3), 383–391.
- Fusi, F., & Feeney, M. K. (2016). Social Media in the Workplace: Information Exchange, Productivity, or Waste? *American Review of Public Administration*, 1-23.
- Gilmore, L. (1994). *Autobiographics: A Feminist Theory of Women's Self-Representation*. NY : Cornell University Press.
- Goggin, G. (2014). Facebook’s Mobile Career. *New Media & Society*, 16(7), 1068–1086.
- Graaf, A., Otjes, S., & Rasmussen, A. (2015). Weapon of the weak? The social media landscape of interest groups. *European Journal of Communication*, 31(2), 120–135.

- Gray, M. L. (2015). Putting Social Media in Its Place: A Curatorial Theory for Media's Noisy Social Worlds. *Social Media + Society*, 1–3.
- Greenhow, C., & Robelia, B. (2009). Identity in Online Communities: Social Networking Sites and Language Learning. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34(2), 119–140.
- Gulati, G. J., & Williams, C. B. (2013). Social Media and Campaign 2012: Developments and Trends for Facebook Adoption. *Social Science Computer Review*, 31(5), 577-588.
- Ha, L., Xu, Y., Yang, C., Wang, F., Yang, L., Abuljadail, M., & Hu, X. (2016). Decline in News Content Engagement or News Medium Engagement? A Longitudinal Analysis of News Engagement Since the Rise of Social and Mobile Media 2009–2012. *Journalism*, 1-22.
- Hall, J. A. (2016). When is social media use social interaction? Defining mediated social interaction. *New Media & Society*, 1-8.
- Harrison, R., & Thomas, M. (2009). Identity in Online Communities: Social Networking Sites and Language Learning. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies & Society*, 7(2), 109 – 124.
- Hayes, R. A., Carr, C. T., & Wohn, D. Y. (2016). It's the Audience: Differences in Social Support Across Social Media. *Social Media + Society*, 1-12.

- Hecht, M. L., Faulkner, S. L., Meyer, C. R., Niles, T. A., Golden, D., & Cutler, M. (2002). Looking through Northern Exposure at Jewish American Identity and the Communication Theory of Identity. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 852-869.
- Hecht, M. L., & Choi, H. (2012). *The Communication Theory of Identity as a Framework for Health Message Design. Health Communication Message Design: Theory and Practice.*
- Hendry, N., & Hjorth, L. (2015). A Snapshot of Social Media: Camera Phone Practices. *Social Media + Society*, 1-3.
- Hermida, A. (2015). Power Plays on Social Media. *Social Media + Society*, 1-2.
- Heyman, R., & Pierson, J. (2015). Social Media, Delinguistification and Colonization of Lifeworld: Changing Faces of Facebook. *Social Media + Society*, 1-11.
- Hochman, N. (2014). The Social Media Image. *Big Data & Society*, 1-15.
- Hoffmann, A. L., Proferes, N., & Zimmer, M. (2016). "Making the World More Open and Connected": Mark Zuckerberg and the Discursive Construction of Facebook and its Users. *New Media & Society*, 1-20.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A Social Identity Theory of Leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(3), 184-200.

- Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(4), 255-269.
- Holt, K., Shehata, A., Strömbäck, J., & Ljungberg, E. (2013). Social Media use on Political Interest and Participation: Do Social Media Function as Leveller? *European Journal of Communication*, 28(1), 19–34.
- Humphreys, L. (2015). Mobile social media: Future challenges and opportunities. *Mobile Media & Communication*, 1(1), 20–25.
- Introna, L. (1997). On cyberspace and being: identity, self and hyperreality. *Philosophy in the Contemporary World*, 4(1,2), 16-26.
- Jung, E., & Hecht, M. L. (2004). Elaborating the Communication Theory of Identity: Identity Gaps and Communication Outcomes. *Communication Quarterly*, 52(3), 265-283.
- Krombholz, K., Merkl, D., & Weippl, E. (2012). Fake identities in social media: A case study on the sustainability of the facebook business model. *Journal of Service Science Research*, 4(2), 175.
- Kumar, N. (2014). Facebook for Self-Empowerment? A Study of Facebook Adoption in Urban India. *New Media & Society*, 16(7), 1122–1137.

- Knowles, M., Lee, S. H., O’Riordan, M., & Lazebnik, R. (2014). Risk of Social Media for Teens in an Urban Setting. *Global Pediatric Health*, 1–4.
- Lewallen, J., & Behm-Morawitz, E. (2016). Pinterest or Thinterest?: Social Comparison and Body Image on Social Media. *Social Media + Society*, 1–9.
- Mäkinen, M., & Kuira, M. W. (2008). Social Media and Postelection Crisis in Kenya. *Press/Politics*, 13(3), 328-335.
- Madianou, M. (2015, April–June). Polymedia and ethnography: Understanding the social in social media. *Social Media + Society*, 2(2)
- Mathieu, D., & Pavlíčková, T. (2017). Cross-Media within the Facebook Newsfeed: The Role of the Reader in Cross-Media Uses. *Convergence*, 23(4), 425–438.
- McKeown, S., Haji, R., & Ferguson, N. (2016). *Understanding Peace and Conflict Through Social Identity Theory Contemporary Global Perspectives*. Switzerland : Springer.
- Milton, C. L. (2014). Ethics and Social Media. *Nursing Science Quarterly*, 27(4), 283–285.
- Miranti, A. (2017). Visual Hyper Reality of Teenagers in Social Media With Photographs as Communication Media. *KnE Social Sciences*, 2(4), 329-333.
Chicago

- Moe , H., Poell, T., & Dijck, J. (2016). Rearticulating Audience Engagement: Social Media and Television. *Television & New Media*, 17(2), 99–107.
- Moreno, M. A., Stewart, M., Pumper, M., Cox, E., Young, H., Zhang, C., & Eickhoff, J. (2014). Facebook Use During a Stressful Event: A Pilot Evaluation Investigating Facebook Use Patterns and Biologic Stress Response. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 34(3-4), 94–98.
- Nee, R. C. (2013). Social TV and the 2012 Election: Exploring Political Outcomes of Multiscreen Media Usages. *Electronic News*, 7(4), 171-188.
- Nooteboom, B. (2013). Baudrillard. 1-7. <https://www.bartnooteboom.nl/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Baudrillard.pdf>
- Nielsen, R. K. (2015). Social Media and Bullshit. *Social Media + Society*, 1-3.
- Oyekan, T. (2014). *Attitudes of Tertiary Students towards Multitasking on Facebook: A Comparative Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11129/2037>
- Rasmussen, J. (2017). ‘Welcome to Twitter, @CIA. Better late than never’: Communication professionals’ views of social media humour and implications for organizational identity. *Discourse & Communication*, 11(1), 89–110.
- Rettberg, J. W. (2017). Self-Representation in Social Media. In J. Burgess, A. Marwick, & T. Poell, *SAGE Handbook of Social Media* (pp. 1-30). Sage.

- Robards, B., & Lincoln, S. (2016). Making It “Facebook Official”: Reflecting on Romantic Relationships Through Sustained Facebook Use. *Social Media + Society*, 1–10.
- Scherr, S., & Brunet, A. (2017). Differential Influences of Depression and Personality Traits on the Use of Facebook. *Social Media + Society*, 1–14.
- Sevük, T. (2013). *The influence of Facebook on interpersonal communication (Published Masters Thesis)*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11129/1496>
- Shah, N. (2015). When machines speak to each other: Unpacking the “social” in “social media”. *Social Media+ Society*, 1(1), 2056305115580338
- Sivek, S. C. (2010). Social Media Under Social Control: Regulating Social Media and the Future of Socialization. *Electronic News*, 4(3), 146-164.
- Skoric, M. M., Zhu, Q., Pang, N., & Goh, D. (2016). Social media and citizen engagement: A meta-analytic review. *New Media & Society*, 18(9), 1817–1839.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(3), 224-237.
- Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2000). The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(4), 284-297.

- Subrahmanyam, K., Reich, S. M., Waechter, N., & Espinoza, G. (2008). Online and Offline Social Networks: Use of Social Networking sites by Emerging Adults. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 29*, 420–433.
- Tang, T., & Cooper, R. (2017). The Most Social Games: Predictors of Social Media Uses During the 2016 Rio Olympics. *Communication & Sport, 1-23*.
- Teke, R. (2011). *A Comparison of Facebook Addiction between Social and Hard Sciences' Students*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11129/50>
- Thevenot, G. (2007). Blogging as a social media. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 7*(3/4), 282–289.
- Thomas, K. J., & Akdere, M. (2013). Social Media as Collaborative Media in Workplace Learning. *Human Resource Development Review, 12*(3), 329–344.
- Thompson, C. B. (2009). Descriptive Data Analysis. *Air medical journal, 28*(2), 56-59. Retrieved from [http://www.airmedicaljournal.com/article/S1067-991X\(08\)00297-6/pdf](http://www.airmedicaljournal.com/article/S1067-991X(08)00297-6/pdf)
- Tsay-Vogel, M. (2016). Me versus them: Third-person effects among Facebook users. *New Media & Society, 18*(9), 1956–1972.
- Uduiguomen, U. C., Agwi, U. C., & Aliu, N. F. (2014). Social Networks: A Curse or a Blessing?(A Case Study of Selected Students from Auchu Polytechnic). *Transactions on Networks and Communications, 2*(4), 130-137.

- Williams, C. (2007). Research Methods. *Journal of Business & Economic Research*, 5(3), 65-72.
- Wolfer, L. (2017). No Sex, Cursing and Politics: Adult Views of Inappropriate Facebook Posts. *Journal of Human Values*, 23(2), 116–128.
- Xinaris, C. (2016). The individual in an ICT World. *European Journal of Communication*, 31(1), 58–68.
- Yee, N., & Bailenson, J. (2007). The Proteus Effect: The Effect of Transformed Self-Representation on Behavior. *Human Communication Research*, 271–290.
- Yee, N., Bailenson, J., & Ducheneaut, N. (2009). The Proteus Effect: Implications of Transformed Digital Self-Representation on Online and Offline Behavior. *Communication Research*, 271–290.
- Zajmi – Rugova , I. (2015). Online identity. *Thesis*, 2, 331-341.
- Zeitsoff, T. (2017). How Social Media Is Changing Conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1-22.
- Zhu, Y., Zhang, L., Fan, J., & Han, S. (2007). Neural Basis of Cultural Influence on Self-Representation. *NeuroImage*, 34, 1310–1316.

- (2018). Retrieved from Eastern Mediterranean University:
<https://ww1.emu.edu.tr/tr/dau-hakkinda/kibris-universiteleri-icinde-en-iyisi/699>
- (2018). Retrieved from Near East University: <https://neu.edu.tr/ydu-hakkinda/ydu-tarihi/?lang=tr>
- (2018). Retrieved from European University of Lefke: <http://www.eul.edu.tr/en/our-university/rectors-message/>
- (2018). Retrieved from Girne American University:
<http://www.gau.edu.tr/en/homepage/history>
- (2018). Retrieved from Dictionary.com: <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/pseudo>

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Nationalities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Turkish	542	70,7	70,7	70,7
	Cypriot	74	9,6	9,6	80,3
	Iranian	12	1,6	1,6	81,9
	Nigerian	25	3,3	3,3	85,1
	Azerbaijani	4	,5	,5	85,7
	Sudanese	8	1,0	1,0	86,7
	Turkmenistani	2	,3	,3	87,0
	Pakistani	9	1,2	1,2	88,1
	Zimbabwean	10	1,3	1,3	89,4
	Moroccan	4	,5	,5	90,0
	Yemenian	1	,1	,1	90,1
	Iraqi	5	,7	,7	90,7
	Syrian	4	,5	,5	91,3
	Palestinian	7	,9	,9	92,2
	Luxembourgish	1	,1	,1	92,3
	Ugandan	1	,1	,1	92,4
	Jordanian	12	1,6	1,6	94,0
	Saudi Arabian	3	,4	,4	94,4
	Kazakh	4	,5	,5	94,9
	Tajik	1	,1	,1	95,0
	Russian	4	,5	,5	95,6
	Libyan	7	,9	,9	96,5
	Ukrainian	1	,1	,1	96,6
	Austrian	1	,1	,1	96,7
	Egyptian	2	,3	,3	97,0
	English	1	,1	,1	97,1
	Albanian	1	,1	,1	97,3
	Other	3	,4	,4	97,7
	Swazi	3	,4	,4	98,0
	Kenyan	2	,3	,3	98,3
	South Africa	1	,1	,1	98,4
	Zambian	2	,3	,3	98,7
Namibian	2	,3	,3	99,0	
Congolese	3	,4	,4	99,3	
Georgian	1	,1	,1	99,5	
German	1	,1	,1	99,6	
Kyrgyz	2	,3	,3	99,9	

	Kuwait	1	,1	,1	100,0
	Total	767	100,0	100,0	

Appendix B: Survey on Social Media and Identity

Dear respondent,

Thank you for accepting to participate in this important study entitled “Creating Fake Identity and Pseudo Accounts on Social Media Among University Students in North Cyprus”. Your participation in survey is completely voluntary. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous. You may stop filling this questionnaire whenever you want. Questions you choose not to answer can be exempted.

NB: Please note that this inquiry (All questions) is designed for you to answer positively even if you have acted just once about a question. E.g. do you EVER wear a new cloth just to take photo? If you even did only once in the past, please tick YES.

If you have any questions about this research, feel free to contact with me;
Ümit Akdeniz [akdenizumit@gmail.com]
Thank you.
Sincerely yours,

Ümit Akdeniz

1. Age

- a) 18-21 b) 22-25 c) 26-29 d) 30-33 e) 34+

2. Gender

- a) Female b) Male c) Other

3. Nationality

- a) Turkish b) Cypriot c) Iranian d) Nigerian e) others, please specify.....

4. Total Monthly Expense

- a) Less than 999TL b) Between 1000-1999TL c) Between 2000-2999TL
d) Between 3000-3999TL e) 4000TL +

PART A

5. I have; (Own in Cyprus)	Yes	No	How many?
Car			
Motorbike			
Bicycle			
Flat			
Villa			
Mobile Phone			
Laptop			
Tablet			
Desktop computer			

PART B ----- **Background information on Facebook --**

6. Do you use Facebook?

- a) Yes b) No

7. How often do you use Facebook?

- a) Rarely b) Often c) Always d) Never

8. On which device do you **mostly** use Facebook?
 a) Mobile phone b) Laptop c) Tablet d) Desktop
 e) Other, please specify.....
9. How many hours do you use Facebook in a day?
 a) Less than 1 hour b) 1 to 3 hours c) 3 to 5 hours d) 5 to 7 hours
 e) 7 and above
10. Do you check accounts if they are fake before you accept friend request on Facebook?
 a) Yes b) No

NB: Say YES even if you engaged in the act only once in the past EVER (Even if you did it once)

PART C

	I consider a Facebook account as fake when I see;	Yes	No
11.	Exaggerated biography		
12.	Profiles without photo		
13.	Accounts with no mutual friends		
14.	Mutual friends but any of mutual friends knows the person		
15.	Accounts with few friends (i.e. 10-15 friends)		
16.	Empty Timeline (No sharing)		
17.	Extremely gorgeous human photo (beautiful/handsome)		
18.	Low number of likes		

NB: Say YES even if you engaged in the act only once in the past EVER (Even if you did it once)

PART D

		Yes	No
19.	If the photos I post don't get enough likes, I feel disappointed		
20.	If the videos I share don't get comments, I feel people don't love me		
21.	When I post happy photos, I mostly feel lonely		
22.	When I post with expensive items (i.e. watch, car, bag, sunglasses) on social media, I feel upper-class (rich)		
23.	My posts doesn't reflect my real feelings sometimes		
24.	If I get a lot of likes on any posts, it increases my confidence		
25.	If so many people share my post, it makes me feel acknowledged		
26.	When I write strong and powerful Facebook status, I feel weak		
27.	I edit some parts of my body (i.e. thinner legs, bigger breast, flat belly)		
28.	I use filters to change my look (i.e. thinner face, bigger eyes, colour, light)		
29.	I have a specific angle for taking photo which I believe shows me better		
30.	I share the photos taken before like i just took them now (i.e. taking 10 photos at a place and share them next week like you just took those photos)		

NB: Say YES even if you engaged in the act only once in the past EVER (Even if you did it once)

PART E

		Yes	No
31.	I smile just for the sake of taking photos		
32.	I take advantage of the light when I take photos to upload on Facebook		
33.	If there is a mess (not clean), I clean everything in the photo frame before I shoot		
34.	I use makeup just for the sake of taking photos		
35.	I use accessories (Sunglasses, wristwatch and so on) just for the sake of taking photos for Facebook		
36.	I change clothes just for the sake of taking photos		
37.	I go to restaurant just to take photos for Facebook		
38.	I go to the beach club just to take photos for Facebook		
39.	I go to the gym just to take photos for Facebook		
40.	I go to nightclub/pub/bar just to take photos for Facebook		
41.	I go to the coffee shops/Cafes just to take photos for Facebook		
42.	I visit the expensive hotels just to take photos for Facebook		
43.	I engage in sport activity just to take photos for Facebook		
44.	The things that I am shy or it's show off to share on my timeline I don't hesitate to share on my story		
45.	I go to clothing stores and even I won't buy, I try expensive clothes just to take photo		
46.	I take photos with expensive cars just for Facebook		
47.	My birth place information is different from my original one on Facebook		
48.	I use a location different from where I am, when I share photo or write status		
49.	I check-in a place when I am not there on Facebook		
50.	I use a different work position from my actual one on Facebook		
51.	I use a place of work different from my actual one on Facebook		
52.	My hometown information is different from my actual one on your Facebook		
53.	My current city information is different from my actual one on Facebook		
54.	My educational information is different from my actual one on Facebook		

PART F

	I view people who create fake identity on Facebook as;	Yes	No
55.	Fraudsters		
56.	Who suffer from poverty of ideas		
57.	With low self esteem		
58.	Inferiority complex		
59.	High level of insecurity		
60.	Who wants to be acceptable by the society		
61.	Attention seekers		
62.	Creative people		
63.	Knowing a lot about modern technology		
64.	Other(s), please specify.... (you can write many)		

Appendix C: Committee of Ethics

 Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi "Uluslararası Kariyer İçin"	Mediterranean University "For Your International Career"	via Mersin-10 TURKEY Tel: (+90) 392 630 1995 Faks/Fax: (+90) 392 630 2919 bayek@emu.edu.tr
Etik Kurulu / Ethics Committee		
Sayı: ETK00-2018-0017 Konu: Etik Kurulu'na Başvurunuz Hk.		02.01.2018
Sayın Ümit Akdeniz İletişim Fakültesi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi		
Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu'nun 18.12.2017 tarih ve 2017/51-12 sayılı kararı doğrultusunda, Social Media and Identity Constructed Representation of Self adlı çalışmanızı, Yrd. Doç. Dr. Aysu Arsoy'un danışmanlığında araştırmanız, Bilimsel ve Araştırma Etiği açısından uygun bulunmuştur.		
Bilginize rica ederim.		
		
Doç. Dr. Şükrü Tüzmen Etik Kurulu Başkanı		
ŞT/sky.		
www.emu.edu.tr		