Exploring the Relationship Between Instagram Usage, Self-Identity and Friendship Quality

Oluwaleke Micheal Osude

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

Master of Arts
in
Communication and Media Studies

Eastern Mediterranean University
January 2021
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Director

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

Prof. Dr. Senih Çavuşoğlu
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.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aysu Arsoy
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aysu Arsoy

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sevilay Ulaş

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Raziye Nevzat

ABSTRACT

The study explores the impacts of Instagram usage on self-identity and friendship quality. Instagram is widely domiciled among young adults. Instagram users may likewise follow others on the stage without their endorsement and this may improve the social networks for the individuals who have restricted social ties outside of the application.

The study means to know the association between digital media, society, and personality development is considering in online media use. For this purpose, Instagram usage investigated to find out kinship quality and the relationship with a social personality.

The research adopted a quantitative survey method through the use of Google form to sample 400 young Nigerian Instagram users living in North Cyprus. Results therefore revealed that frequent use of Instagram has positive influence on the friendship quality of the respondents. It was also uncovered that recurrence of Instagram use has an important relationship on the self- personality of the respondents ($r = .28$).

Keywords: Self-identity, Friendship quality, Social Networking Sites, Instagram, Online friendship

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, Instagram kullanımının öz kimlik ve arkadaşlık kalitesi üzerindeki etkilerini araştırmaktadır. Instagram, genç yetişkinler arasında yaygın bir şekilde kullanılmaktadır. Instagram kullanıcıları, başka kişilerin onayı olmadan onları takip edebilmektedir ve bu durum, sosyal ağ kullanımı zayıf olan bireylerin sosyal bağlarını geliştirebilmektedir.

Çalışma, dijital medya, toplum ve kişilik gelişimi ile çevrimiçi medya kullanımı arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktadır. Ayrıca, Instagram kullanımının, çevrimiçi akrabalık ilişkisi, sosyal ve kişisel ilişkiler gibi çevrimiçi iletişim ile nasıl geliştiğini ortaya koymaya çalışmaktadır.

Araştırmanın kapsamının örneklemeni oluşturan Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta yaşayan 400 genç Nijeryalı Instagram kullanıcısı ile Google form kullanılarak anket çalışması benimsenmiştir ve nicel bir çalışma gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışmanın sonucunda Instagram'ın sık bir şekilde kullanılmasının, arkadaşlık kalitesi üzerine manidar bir etkisi olduğu görülmüştür. Bunun birlikte Instagram kullanımı ve kişilik arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir($r = .28$).

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öz kimlik, Arkadaşlık kalitesi, Sosyal Ağ Siteleri, Instagram, Çevrimiçi arkadaşlık

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to God almighty and my Family.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to acknowledge and thank God almighty for his support and providing me with the wherewithal to complete this task. I appreciate my parents, family and friends for their support before, during and after the academic process.

Quite importantly, I will like to appreciate my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aysu Arsoy for her support and for taking time to put me through the entire process. Your soothing, and gentle words went a long way to ease my psychological stress during the programme.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The advent and development of Web 2.0 have given a significant rise to the way people receive and consume information as well as their way of processing information from different angles. Social Networking Sites (SNS) has changed the way individuals perceive the attitude and actions of others. For instance, Hoffner and Rehkoff's (2011) study revealed that SNS is a major influence in swaying people's perceptions, attitudes, and reception of message. SNS has continued to portray itself as an important tool for self-portrayal. Asserted that SNS has become a tool for individuals to seek sympathy whenever they lose a loved one either directly or indirectly (Courbet & Fourquet-Courbet, 2014). For example, some fans of Michel Jackson used SNS as a tool to empathize during his loss (Sanderson & Cheong, 2010). With the advent of SNS, it has been discovered that individuals at different levels depend largely on the platforms for their daily activities (Bates et al., 2020). Also, users utilize SNS as a means of identifying with people in their social, political, or economic status. For example, users of SNS like Instagram may begin to post pictures of their preferred political parties or their choice candidate so as to identify and support them (Storsul, 2014).

Social Networking Sites which started as small personal web pages has witnessed unprecedented growth and popularity within recent years and has transformed into a

large communication network for information storing, sharing and dissemination. The SNS platforms have grown from only being used by tech-savvies to being user friendly to almost everyone. While the rate of SNS use and popularity continues to increase, users' interaction with the offline community tends to decrease, this means that socialization is gradually being restricted to the use of internet-enabled phone or computer (Perrin, 2015).

Also, Information and Communication Technology (ICT), through SNS has availed various users the opportunity to construct a digital identity as on Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, and so on, which led to social and cultural changes in the society (Candrasari, 2016), however, this identity and the increased online interaction has affected identity formation and the understanding of self. Building self-identity in recent have been unprecedented, especially with the advancement in technology and communication tools which include SNS platforms. Combined with this, the free flow of information which allows exposure to other people's cultures and customs around the world has affected how self-identity is established, maintained, and revised among the citizens (Hauben & Hauben, 1998). This is due to the different belief systems, values, and ideologies they come in contact with (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010).

Self-identity development is no doubt often rooted in the social construction of one's community and how one interacts within the community (Alruwaili, 2017). Even though there is still a controversy as to the meaning of identity, the basic components of identity are generally agreed upon. This is simply "the ways the self is perceived as the same or similar to its surroundings and contexts and ways in which the self is perceived as different or distinctive from these surroundings and contexts" (Alruwaili, 2017, p.2), this assertion is further affirmed by Hall (Hall, 1991).

Buckingham (2008) noted that studying identity has been a focal point among researchers of different fields such as sociology, psychology, cultural studies, and so on. He proceeded further that even though self-identity was initially considered to be a thing of growth from childhood to adulthood as it was critically explained in Erikson's (1968) theory of development, recently, the notion of identity has been perceived as being a process rather than accomplishment (Erikson, 1968). According to Erikson (1968), identity is perceived as being extended beyond the youth-related age range to being attributed to entire adulthood (Erikson, 1968). For this reason, identity is transformed from being static and fixed to an evolving issue that emerges through a nonstop interaction with others. Buckingham (2008) also explained the components of identity formation as related to different developmental and theoretical insights, he noted that an array of traditional theories present adolescence as an essential time in the formation of identity (Buckingham, 2008).

With the advancements and ubiquitous nature of SNS, the formation of identity is now being influenced by different social interaction and communication tools such as blogs, microblogs, SNS platforms, and so on. The significance of SNS and the frequency of use by the young generation are great predictors of the re-creation of identity or its formation (Alruwaili, 2017; Zhao, Yaobin, Bin, & Chau, 2017). This has also served as a replacement to the traditional factors used in distinguishing individuals by their age groups like adolescence or childhood to a new means of differentiation particularly along generational lines. Identity now includes membership in a particular group or pattern of SNS use within the members of the group rather than stages of growth. As such, individuals are able to identify with a group they belong to on SNS and thereafter make friends and increase the bond in their friendship.

Also, the connection between SNS, society, and identity formation is an essential factor worth considering in SNS use, especially in the educational realm (Alruwaili, 2017). As Davis, et al., (2015) asserted, the use of SNS platforms as tools for communication, interaction, and dissemination of information is incredibly increasing (Davis et al., 2015). They further noted that SNS platforms would advance as an integral part of individual and community identity building. While using SNS, identities that culturally vary can make known, individual's position, and interaction within the society.

1.2 Statement of Research Problem

Shapiro and Margolin (2014) studies have been conducted globally, researched to investigate the psychological developments that take place among SNS users (Shapiro and Margolin, 2014). Findings indicate that generally, both young and old users ultimately use SNS as a means of communication, establish and maintain friendships online (Shapiro and Margolin, 2014). The study also indicates that SNS has a different way of influencing users' self-esteem, psychological developments, and personality (Shapiro and Margolin, 2014). In a qualitative investigation by Delvoye and Tasker (2016), they sought to understand the interconnection of personal identity between parents and children, while investigating the parenting history (Delvoye and Tasker, 2016). Findings revealed that individuals engage in creating a personal identity of themselves based on their sexuality as well as parental upbringing (Delvoye and Tasker, 2016).

Nesi et al., (2018) studied the relationships on SNS by adults (Nesi et al., 2018). Findings in the research indicated that SNS influences the online relationships between individuals online in several ways (Nesi et al., 2018). The study expanded that SNS

amplifies existing relationships and creates new opportunities for establishing relationships of different kinds. Tasker and Delvoye (2015) argue that SNS is a strong platform to be considered in relationships while (Growiec & Growiec, 2014) opines that Social Networking Sites platforms are quite critical in building trust, social capital, and happiness among its users.

These studies and many others have established the use of SNS platforms in many different ways. However, few of these platforms have limited their scope to a more specific platform where a more descriptive and statistical understanding could be created of how Instagram influence friendships and personal identity. This research thereby identifies these as the important gaps in the literature that needs to be filled with empirical investigations.

1.3 Significance of the Study

The research of Hoffner & Rehkoff (2011), has shown that SNS usage has been closely linked to self-identity and establishing friendships among youngsters (Hoffner & Rehkoff, 2011). Platforms like Instagram have significantly been used by SNS users to create different forms of branding through the kind of content and pictures they post. Some users engage in posting the best of their pictures to enable other users to identify with them as top-class citizens, while others engage in posting other users' pictures to create an image of whom they are, thereby classifying those who interact with them online and forming friendships.

This research, therefore, is significant in many ways as it will investigate social networking sites (SNS) and more particularly Instagram to understand its use by in the formation of self-identity as well as establishing and selecting online friends. The

study will also help to understand how the frequency of Instagram usage will influence creating self-identity as well as lead to the creation of friends online.

The practical and theoretical implications of the research will help understand the para-social relationship among online users. The study is also significant as it will help in filling the research gap and thereafter provide practical suggestions to self-identity and online friendship on SNS.

1.4 Aims of the Study

The study sought to explore Instagram usage frequency and its relation on self-identity and friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus. The population for this study comprises of young males and females active Instagram users amongst Nigerians living in North Cyprus. The aims and objectives in here create a path for establishing the pattern and format in which the research had been directed. Therefore, this research is aimed at:

1. Investigate the frequency of Instagram usage on online friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus.

2. Find out frequency of Instagram use and online self-identity (personality) among Nigerians in North Cyprus

3. Explore if the frequency of Instagram use facilitates increased online friendship among Nigerians in North Cyprus

4. Find out if online self-identity enhances increased friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus

5. Explore if increased online friendship intensifies increased friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus

6.   Find out if (a) online self-identity (personality) and (b) increased online friendship mediate the relationship between frequency of Instagram and increased friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus.

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The study sought to explore Instagram usage frequency and its relation on self-identity and friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus. The population for this study comprises of young males and females active Instagram users amongst Nigerians living in North Cyprus. Hence, the following hypotheses were developed:

1.   Frequency of Instagram use is significantly associated with increased friendship quality.

2.   Frequency of Instagram use is significantly associated with self-identity.

3.   Frequency of Instagram use is significantly associated with increased online friendship.

4.   Self-identity is significantly associated with increased friendship quality.

5.   Increased online friendship is significantly associated with increased friendship quality?

6.   (a) self-identity online and (b) increased online friendship is a mediator between frequency of Instagram and increased friendship quality.

1.6 Research Questions

Research questions in a study help guide the entire study as the answers are expected to fill new research gaps and a new line of direction. The study population centres on Nigerians in North Cyprus, this will help the researcher in gaining more insight into the topic of study which focuses social identity and friendship quality.

Therefore, the following are the research questions in this study:

1. What is the frequency of Instagram usage influence on online friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus?

2. How does frequency of Instagram use predict the self-identity of Nigerians in North Cyprus?

3. How is the frequency of Instagram use's influence increased online friendship among Nigerians in North Cyprus?

4. How does online self-identity enhance increased friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus?

5. How does increased online friendship intensify increased friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus?

6. How does (a) self-identity online and (b) increased online friendship mediate the relationship between frequency of Instagram and increased friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus?

1.7 Methodology of the Study

The study adopted the quantitative survey method. This method is aimed at having access to large respondents to gather relevant data for the phenomenon under study. This study employed the use of questionnaire to survey the opinions of the respondents as regards the topic of study. The questionnaires are closed ended in nature so as to help in appropriately analysing the data with little or no subjectivity (Barbie, 2010).

1.8 Limitation of the Study

The research process is an all-encompassing process that requires commitment and dedication. This, therefore, makes it quite impossible not to encounter any form of challenges. These challenges pose as a form of limitation or another which ultimately hinders the success of the research, thereby becoming unable to completely research

without certain considerations. Therefore, the following are some of the limitations encountered during the research.

Time: Time in any research is never sufficient. However, data for this research was collected between 1st December 2020 and 23rd January 2021, as such, there was no enough time, thereby forming a limitation to this study. This is because of the need to carry out more tasks to improve the quality of the research as well as the need for several important activities to successfully execute the research.

Place: One of the uniqueness of this research is the place where it is being carried out. However, the place is also a challenge as this study is limited to conducting the study only among Nigerians in North Cyprus. This therefore, confines the study researcher to sample only Nigerians in this part of the world. Though the placement of the research serves as a case study, it has further limited the research as the possibility of generalizing may be quite difficult. As such, the findings of this study may be peculiar to Nigerians, this may also be regarded as a limitation.

Platform: This research only adopted Instagram as SNS to be studied, thereby posing a serious limitation to the study. Unlike other studies that explore as many SNS platforms as possible, this research only focuses on Instagram as a SNS platform, therefore becoming a limitation to the study.

1.9 Definition of Key Terms

Social Networking Sites (SNS): Social networking sites are online applications that enable users to establish, build, and sustain communication, interaction, and friendships. SNS has gained a very rapid prominence over time and has become an

essential tool in communication and information technology, for example, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and so on.

Instagram: Instagram is an image and video based Social Networking Site where texts are not allowed as independent entries in posts.

Self-Identity: Self-identity is a process of creating a personal image and its identity about one's self. Individuals may be preferred to be known or in one word reckoned in another word their representation in a particular way either online or offline.

Online friendship: Online friendship may be regarded as the interpersonal or para-social relationship that exists between two people or more over the internet. However, online friendship may begin online and grow to continue offline.

Friendship Quality: Friendship quality may be categorized as the level of relationship and closeness between two people. Friendship quality may be high or low based on the frequency of interaction and the tie strength that exists between the online friends. Cordial interaction and friendship between two online friends, friendship quality may be said to be high, however, when it is otherwise, friendship quality may be regarded as low.

Fake Identity: This may be classified as a process whereby individuals do not present their real personality as they are, mostly online. This is to create a different kind of image. This is also sometimes referred to as 'pseudo account' (Akdeniz, 2018). Though there are several reasons for the creation of fake ID on SNS, however, this study investigates the phenomenon in relation to Instagram.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Background of Social Networking Sites

The rise in technology use and advancement has contributed greatly to the communication and interaction between people and groups through the different medium which includes SNS usage. SNS has become a new trend in communication prism. It has been able to accumulate for itself a strong user base, more than that of the mainstream media (Stieglitz & Linh, 2013). It has become the trend of getting any form of information within an online community. Every individual including a group with the aid of SNS has been able to interact better (Leonardi, Huysman, & Steinfield, 2013).

SNS is used to maintain an established social relationship; even citizens in diaspora can maintain contact with family and friends as well as their cultural activities while they are away (Komito, 2011). It promotes a certain degree of awareness which in the long run facilitate interaction among people of the world even when they are not together in the same geographical location.

People use SNS as a medium for sharing information and interaction. Information is cumulated, shared, consume and response is gotten back from people through SNS (Zafarani, Abbasi, & Liu, 2014). SNS has turned most people into citizen journalists, where they relied upon gathering information themselves without reliance on the

mainstream media and at the long share this message with the members of the SNS community for consumption. It has become an integral part of most people's lives, as most of their daily interaction and business is accompanied by SNS usage (Orsatti & Riemer, 2015).

SNS is a medium used mostly by the youth for different activities, which include political participation (Storsul, 2014). SNS has been successful in gathering people more than ever to be more involved and discuss political issues bothering a society. Dahlgren & Olsson (2017), also have the view that political participation is getting stronger on SNS with youth being the major user. This is to say there is more interaction between people on SNS and more engagement on the medium than before.

Whiting and Williams (2013), summarise the functions of SNS into seven categories which are; social relationship, inquiring, entertainment, relaxation, communication, loneliness, convenience. SNS is used by people to build a relationship with other members of the online community when they seek information that they require when they need to ease up stress or a busy day when they need to interact or communicate with people etc.

SNS has also enhanced business activities and transactions from the producer to the consumer level (Alves, Fernandes, & Raposo, 2016). People have been able to have first-hand access to a product or brand which enable them to analyse, process it, and check users' testimonies on SNS before entering into the transaction; with the ability to bargain more before going for a brand (Leung, Law, Hoof, & Buh, 2013). It allows a two-way flow of communication between an organisation and their customers

(Mangold & Faulds, 2009), this communication helps establish and maintain a good relationship, trust, and loyalty between the two parties involved (Jackson, 2011).

SNS is used for more interaction and engagement; companies use it as an engagement tool with their customers to practice the two-way symmetric relationship (Jackson, 2011). It is also used to carry out different activities to achieve the overall goal and objectives of the company such as awareness creation, branding, research.

Since this medium is basically about creating and sharing contents, the growth has helped in shaping people's relationship through the use of different SNS platforms (Colliander & Dahlen, 2011), the functions go beyond social interaction as reputation building and other opportunities can be achieved through the medium (Tang, Gu, & Whinston, 2012).

Inarguably, young adults of ages between 18 and 29 are the major users of SNS with 90% of the age group on one SNS or the other (Perrin, 2015). This age group most likely uses SNS to expand their circle of friends and acquaintances (Wiederhold, 2020). In addition, this age group is more interested in social interaction and having a lot of people to be known with, and this is facilitated through the use of various SNS platforms (Sponcil & Gitimu, 2013). These SNS platforms are made up of different people who exhibit different identities and profile to help them create and maintain connections with likely profiles (Kircaburun, Alhabash, Tosuntaş, & Griffiths, 2020).

Some of these SNS platforms have a profile of users that is more than the population of some countries, and collections of content which include photographs and videos on some SNS platforms are more than the world-famous museum with 300,000 object

collections (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). SNS has become like a country of its own with different online citizens with a series of identities and profiles shared with their mutual friends online (Salomon, 2013). There are also different content collections on these platforms that people have shared with others online; these contents they share online has a linkage with who they are and what activities they are likely to be involved in offline.

Different projects have been done as a result of joint commitment and contribution from different people on SNS and other online platforms, they can create some user-generated content, add to an existing one, remove unclear or uncertain ones, and share it with other people who make use of it at different works of life (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Different scholars have made contributions on the wiki, Twitter, and so on, to add to the existing knowledge in that field as a result of their field of experience. Students, researchers and many other individuals have benefitted from this movement, as they can consult and come across different scholarly materials to use for their assignment and work respectively.

SNS has come to be integral parts of our living, most especially in this century, people rely on SNS as their major source of information and update on any situation. The advent of SNS has helped boost the level of communication among peers as deep conversation can now take place without people even meeting physically, people make friends with people who are not even in their country nor continent, and communicate with them with ease without having to go down to their location. Truly SNS has made the world become a global village and the people there have become global humans because relationships and friendship have become easier with it.

According to Kaplan and Haenlein (2010), there exists a six-type identification scheme for SNS, which they also categorized according to low, medium, or high social presence, as well as low or high self-presentation score.

Collaborative projects: Collaborative projects refer to the text-based attributes of SNS that allow for text-based exchange between users, thereby make their social presence and self-presentation low. This allows for simultaneous generation of content by multiple end-users and their examples include wikis (Wikipedia) and social bookmarking applications. Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) explained that collaborative projects entail a collaborative effort among many users which would result in an outcome better than what a single user can produce alone. Additionally, collaborative projects such as Wikipedia have been taken by many users as the sole source of information, even though not all contents are credible enough.

Blogs and Micro-blogs: According to Kaplan and Haenlein (2010), blogs are categorized as having a high self-presentation score, however, with a low social presence due to their nature as a partial text-based and inclusion of personal contents. Blogs are regarded as one of the most ancient SNS platforms where user and source interaction is only enabled through the comment section after beneath the text. Also, corporate companies use blogs to keep their publics update and ensure transparent operations. Micro-blogs are similar to blogs but different from the restrictions to the number of characters thereby having a shorter space for texts. A popular example of microblog is Twitter which only allows for a maximum of 280 characters per tweet, stories, videos, audios and live broadcasts among many other features (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010).

Content Communities: Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) referred to this as having a moderate social presence but a low self-presentation score. Content communities are mainly used to distribute content among users while each user only reveals little information about themselves. Examples are YouTube which is a video sharing platform and Slide Share (for PowerPoint presentations) (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010).

Social Networking Sites: Social networking sites are platforms that allow for connection among users through the creation of personal user profiles, generated content, and the exchange of real-time messages. Social Networking Sites are rated to have a medium social presence but a high self-presentation score. Examples of popular Social Networking Sites include Instagram, Facebook, and so on. (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010).

Virtual Game Worlds: Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) contended that Virtual Game Worlds have high interactivity as they present a three-dimensional environment where user's appearances are in form of personalized images or avatars. The virtual worlds are made up of virtual game worlds and virtual social worlds. Virtual game worlds are rated as having a high social presence but low on self-presentation. An example is the World of Warcraft (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010).

The growth in the rate of SNS users, coupled with the advancements in information and communication technologies in recent years and the ease of access to network connectivity have been a viable platform for social interaction which encourages a wide range of activities such as real-time chats, profile updates, sharing of user-generated contents, etc.

2.2 Self Identity and Social Networking Sites

The world has become a global village and with the advent of SNS, the inhabitants have become global humans; where communication and interaction have become easy for people even in a different world. SNS has become successful in helping people who have a similar goal establish a relationship and maintain that relationship through constant interaction (Zhao, Yaobin, Bin, & Chau, 2017). Although, the level of interaction that an individual input in a SNS activity will depend on his perception about his identity (Ray, Kim, & Morris, 2014) also the way members of that SNS community perceive his identity.

Self-Identity as described by Carter and Grover (2015) is when an individual wonder what makes them different from others, and what features other people possess that make them unique. An individual must recognize their self-identity, so they can understand what differentiates them from the world. According to Erin et al. (2014), people use SNS as a means of comparison between themselves and other categories of people. They use it as a monitoring tool to know if the people above them are doing something great they can emulate or if people below them are doing an activity to catch up to their level.

The way people present themselves on SNS is in a way that will help them get good recognition and respect from their counterparts on SNS. People present themselves in a certain way on SNS to help create and manage a good impression with others (Gonzales & Hancock, 2011). Although, in most cases, the identity people display online s different from who they are offline, which is to say identity on SNS is not in existence but rather it is created through active participation on SNS (Orsatti &

Riemer, 2015). Most people online carryout or talk about activities they will naturally not do offline; Gonzales and Hancock (2011) describe the reason for this kind of presentation to either be for pride or to boost their confidence.

People construct their profile and identity on SNS in a way that they only want to be perceived as the best or not perceive as invaluable. However, there used to be a behavioral gap between the attitudes exhibited offline and that which they are known for online; with the offline attitude and behavior known to be the main driver of the person's personality. This is because people want to have a good reputation with members of the SNS community which allows them to behave in a certain way online that they naturally would not have done offline, neither are they known for that behavior offline.

Self-identity is an important element on SNS as people feel the need to emphasize certain profiles of them that fit into their social situation and the audience they are relating with (Storsul, 2014). The profile or identity an individual attributed to themselves online will be as a result of the kind of situation they find themselves in and the kind of audience on their profile that can get their message. It may be a decision to make to view you as an upper class beyond those on your profile or people should view you as one who cares about the society, all will depend on the kind of audience you have and the expected societal role from you.

People are concern about the way they are perceived online as this contributes to their self-esteem level, self-confidence, and their self-identities (Chua & Chang, 2016). It has become a platform where self-presentation among users of SNS has been used to construct the standards that everyone wants to meet (Meier & Gray, 2014). People now

present themselves online through different means which include posting pictures to make a comparison between their lives and the lives of others (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010).

People are very cautious of the kind of identity they communicate to people; they can be very selective on what they want people to see about them. People are fond of presenting themselves on SNS and by so doing; they portray an identity that is overrated. The profile themselves in such a way that will demand respect from their online friends; all their achievements and good plans will be added to their online profile leaving out their setbacks or their major challenge about life. There is more of fake identity or fake profiling which is generally known as fake life exhibited on SNS, which is different from their offline personality or life (Akdeniz, 2018).

The provision of feedback route by SNS during real-time communication with peers creates room for a young adult to be easily affected by the use of SNS platforms. SNS platforms avail each user the opportunity to take an active role in their process of socialization and construction of personal identity. The creation of a personal profile by each user on their timeline allows them to include their most desired details about themselves which include their best pictures and sometimes videos (Sponcil & Gitimu, 2013). Digital evolution has also paved the way for users to post information, both personal and non-personal. This way of creating an online profile is a stepping stone for individual users to craft their own identities and how they want to be perceived. Also, creating a fascinating personal profile on an individual's timeline for the admiration of others is one of the ways to boost self-concept (Sponcil & Gitimu, 2013).

Jiang, Bazarova, and Hancock (2011) contended that SNS users take part in a form of selective self-presentation on various platforms and as such their appearance is that which is to impress others. Also, several SNS users seek popularity which makes them connect with a lot of friends and present themselves as being more admired. Scholars have also found out that most young generations often create an online identity where they present an ideal self to impress others (Hanckel, Vivienne, Byron, Robards, & Churchill, 2019). This way of improving self-identity and appearance helps to boost their self-esteem both virtually and physically (Jiang, et al., 2011).

SNS self-identity and disclosure is not a one-off communication practice, rather it also relies on other users' interpretations of these identities and disclosures combined with the proceeding communication behavior. Also, social reports from other SNS users affect the individual perception of self (Lui & LaRose, 2008). The social support received from peers on SNS helps individuals to sustain existing relationships and improve identity construction. Good affirmations (likes, comments & share) on posts gives the users a feeling of satisfaction of self-desires (Chen, 2018).

Furthermore, SNS sites give users the liberty to create unprecedented identities which either be authentic or deceptive depending on the users' desires (Broberg, 2017). Identity creation on SNS requires no verification, hence, giving the chance to present a different version of self, whether 'actual', 'ideal' or 'ought' with the absence of verification on most online platforms, interaction with a genuine identity can be quite difficult. Hu, Zhao, and Huang (2015) contend that online identities make users escape from real-word-restraints such as social norms, legislation, and responsibilities.

2.3 Background of Instagram

Since the advent of the internet that led to having a different SNS, where people communicate with others with ease through the profile and identity they have created for themselves. Instagram is one of the SNS) with a growing number of users around the world. Among all visual platforms, Instagram is seen as the most growing SNS platform (Lalancette, & Raynauld, 2019).

Instagram has placed its focus on contemporary visual communication, where millions of its users upload visual materials like pictures, videos, artworks among others, and share with their mutual friends (Manovich, 2017). The sharing of these visual contents goes beyond Instagram alone but can be linked to other SNS platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and so on, (Hoffman & Schwartz, 2012). The visual materials can be edited before publishing them online to get 'likes' and 'comments', as well as share experience or story behind the visual content.

'Likes' is a social construct on SNS that decode acceptance and approval of the contents or materials people put on SNS (Hoffman & Schwartz, 2012); since it is an indicator of interest when people get small likes on SNS, they perceive that their content is unable to get attention and acceptance by their friends and followers (McPartland, 2013). According to Tyer (2016), women who are the most users of SNS want acceptance and approval from their followers, they tend to upload materials that will make people regard them as 'Ideal Women' (Tyer, 2016).

This application has become the major medium where most celebrities connect with their fans to give them update about their life and what they are up to, therefore they push out contents that will help them get more followers (Tyer, 2016); in this

contemporary world, the higher the number of followers one have on SNS is correlated to influence one will have in the line of profession and expertise (Smith & Anderson, 2018).

Instagram has up to one billion active users (Tankovska, 2021), while most of the users are educated; the female gender is also the most active on the SNS (Huang & Su, 2018). The age range of most users of Instagram is 18-24 with 71%, while 55% of 25-29 years old are the second most age range users of the application (Smith & Anderson, 2018). According to Smith and Anderson (2018), this means the major users of Instagram are youth who are majorly female.

Instagram is one of the most used SNS among young individuals, they use the medium to get attention and gain acceptance online. They check celebrities with large followers whether they are their role models or not, and one way or the other try to exhibit their doings (Smith & Anderson, 2018). Since Instagram is the major SNS platform that celebrities connect with fans, a very high percentage of their fans and other followers look up to them to imitate how they behave, dress, talk, think, and also go with their ideology on this same platform.

While a majority of users on Instagram upload content to their friends and followers to compare themselves with their relevant counterparts; the users have little tolerance for getting critic rather than the likes and comments they quest for (Alter, 2017). Since the platform is where people go for validation and acceptance; which is why even after taking hundredth of pictures, users tend to share the one they thought of as the best with their followers, and anything aside from that will be regarded as criticizing

(Huang & Su, 2018), only when they get this acceptance and validation will they have a feeling of satisfaction and fulfilling.

Even though Instagram was launched in 2010, it has so far witnessed steady growth and strength with over 75 million daily users and about 16 billion posts (pictures and videos) uploaded and shared on the platform (Cohen, Slater & Newton-John, 2017). Solomon (2013) asserted that Instagram has a wide coverage within the young minds and it appeals to a more heterogeneous audience than other SNS platforms. Casalo and Sanchez (2020) argued that the young generation of today spend more time on Instagram than several SNS platforms.

This is because young users are mostly obsessed with taking photographs with their mobile gadgets and sharing them with their virtual friends instantly (Casalo & Sanchez, 2020). For this reason, picture sharing rather than texts have brought about fascinating and convenient communication between and among like minds who are diverse but share the same interests.

Ismail and Arshah (2016) asserted that growing advancement in information and communication technologies has brought about a new information exchange trend where the connection exists between individuals regardless of time and place constraints. One of the online platforms that make the development of online presence and identity easy is Instagram, giving room for effective corporate, business, and personal communication. This attribute, combined with the ease of use and ability to share posted information has made the dissemination of information easier. As a result, different organizations have adopted the services of SNS platforms like Instagram to communicate with their publics and potential publics more efficiently. Instagram is

also of essential use in other industries like academics, medicals and so on (Salomon, 2013).

According to the study of El Ouirdi et al. (2015), Instagram is a platform that allows the dissemination of user-generated content with availability on Android and IOS. From the main menu, Instagram can be easily navigated by users to access a pool of images posted by their followers, pictures of other popular users and influencer can also be explored through searches by hashtags and/or usernames while different affirmations are given via likes and comments. This image-oriented platform allows the individual user to be updated with recent issues surrounding them through the use of hashtags and other features such as the explore (Waterloo et. al., 2018).

Instagram also has a 'bio'-biography section which allows the users to write their profiles on their timeline, this avails other users with necessary but brief information about a particular user, however, may be made private to followers alone depending on the choice of the user's account setting. User contents are often categorized into the following, self-portraits (also known as selfies), friends, activities, captioned photos (like memes), food, gadgets, fashion, and pets. The use of hashtags – a metadata tag, usually resonates with correlating hashtags which are easily viewed and shared by other accounts through the 'programming'.

Regramming simply means the act of sharing a post with the information of the originator included in the comment section or as a text box placed on the original content (Veletsianos & Stewart, 2016). Instagram users are also at liberty to make their timeline public, to allow access to their postings by every other user, comments and

likes, or leave their profile private thereby limiting the account to authorized users only (Instagram, 2018).

2.4 Instagram and Self-Identity

People's personalities are part of their virtual activity in the new media (Veletsianos & Stewart, 2016). The rationale behind sharing video and pictures on any SNS is to express one's feelings and share one's experience with receivers of the content and establishing one's identity (Villaespesa & Wowkowych, 2020). SNS is now a new form of expressing one's identity (Yılmaz & Kocabalkanlı, 2021). Instagram, being one of the most popular SNS with many young adults on it (Cortese, et al., 2018). It deals with pictures that can be filtered (Cortese, et al., 2018). Though pictures are seen as normal by people, it is an important aspect of self-identity (Cortese, et al., 2018). According to Corteses at al. (2018), females take more pictures than the male which is mostly based on appearance (Cortese, et al., 2018). Using pictures is a faster method of receiving immediate gratification from those receiving the picture (Cortese, et al., 2018). It also influences both the person taking the pictures and the receivers of the pictures (Cortese, et al., 2018). The ability to share one location on the new media has made it easier to express one's personality by sharing pictures and videos on their SNS account (Yılmaz & Kocabalkanlı, 2021).

People tend to display their identity on Instagram with filtered pictures or videos they wish to share and or using hashtags to give meanings to these pictures or videos (Yılmaz & Kocabalkanlı, 2021). This chosen data is favorable to them online (Yılmaz & Kocabalkanlı, 2021). Instagram makes use of texts, pictures, videos, and hashtags to connect people with similar content (Granger et. al., 2001). All of these represent people's identity and culture. It is also used to promote a culture which to a large extent

is part of a person's identity (Granger et. al., 2001). Uploading pictures on Instagram enlarges people's narratives and enjoin them to respective social groups that express their identities properly (Granger et. al., 2001).

Micro celebrity and brand influencers are also an aspect of online self-identity which is portrayed to be stress-free when indeed it is not and is influenced by gender (Duguay, 2019). Instagram's self-identity is focused on increasing followers for attention and positive gains like making sales, financial gains, and a larger audience for performance (Duguay, 2019). There are three ways of presenting one's self on Instagram (Duguay, 2019). They include intimate affective labour; deals with being conscious of the personal information let out to people, development aesthetic labour; describes the skills used to attain appearance and attention, aspiring relational labour; the attempt to build relationships with bigger celebrities and influence to get attention (Duguay, 2019). People also express their sexual preference on this platform which is a great extent part of their everyday life (Duguay, 2019). However, users face intrusion of privacy from other users who give disturbing comments (portraying hate or sexism) on their content (Duguay, 2019).

Some users make use of the sexual post to gain attention (Duguay, 2019). They also make use of hashtags to attract people with similar identities as them and use other users as their market (Duguay, 2019). Instagram requires the ability to edit pictures and videos, the right pose alongside the right captions and hashtags to express one's identity (Duguay, 2019). Users attempt to establish a relationship with influencers or celebrities who share similar identities for more attention or and gains (Duguay, 2019). In addition to self-identity on Instagram, it is influenced by what the remaining users want and that is why sexual content is more accepted (Duguay, 2019). Sexual content

might not be the desired identity a particular user might want to portray but end up portraying that for more followers or financial gains (Duguay, 2019). Contents on intimacy could is also another way to engage other users on one's Instagram page (Duguay, 2019). Furthermore, the likes on Instagram give its users is a sense of validation and self-worth (Jang, Han, Shih, & Lee, 2015). Also, self-identity on Instagram can be affected by the factor known as 'Fear of Missing Out' (Salim, Rahardjo, Tanaya, & Qurani, 2017).

2.5 Online Self Identity

With the modern development of the internet, users had to go to a place to be online (Elwell, 2014). This was the era of chatrooms, multiuser domains, multi-player online role-playing games, and online bulletin which has brought about the need to theorize self-identity (Elwell, 2014).

The world has now become more and more mediated with the advent of technology. Hence, we engage ourselves with mediated information not excluding online media. This mediated society has become a norm for people (Feher, 2019). Because the world is a global village, we spend most of our time online (Elwell, 2014). This online community provides its users the avenue to display different personalities (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). It has different characteristics such as selfies, pictures, videos, and other content that its users use to express and promote online identity (Feher, 2019). Online identity is the image users generate on the internet (Qin, 2019). There is a thin line that exists between online identity and offline identity (Elwell, 2014). However, users do not display all of their offline identity (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). They only take a part of their personality and display it online (Bullingham &

Vasconcelos, 2013). Also, people display different online identities in a different online community (Qin, 2019).

Bullingham and Vasconcelos (2013), analyzed online identity using Goffman's work of physical interaction. Though his work is seen as old and the need for improvement, both Bullingham and Vasconcelos (2013) were still able to apply it to online identity. In Goffman's work, human behavior differs when they are with people (front stage), which is mostly to impress people, and when they are alone (backstage) (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). The term 'mask' was used to describe deception in physical interaction. That is, hiding all other identities. Both the mask and the hidden identities are part of the individual personality. In applying it to the internet, the online community is seen as the 'real world' and the profile adopted is the mask that displays only a part of the user's personality (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013).

Users of Social Networking Sites (SNS) display their true self rather than their ideal and deceptive self (Michikyan, Subrahmanyam, & Dennis, 2014). Though, users with low self-esteem tend to adopt a false identity on Facebook (Michikyan, Dennis, & Subrahmanyam, 2014). SNS provides its users with the platform to keep in touch and interact with people (Michikyan, Subrahmanyam, & Dennis, 2014). A previous research has stated that people's offline and virtual world, not excluding SNS, are linked psychologically (Michikyan, Subrahmanyam, & Dennis, 2014).

There different dimensions to virtual identities which include- online self-exposure, online communication, and online recreation (Qin, 2019). The online community of online self-exposure and online communication are created by people regardless of the SNS (Qin, 2019). Online recreation on the other hand is the involvement of internet

users in e-products and services (Qin, 2019). The virtual world is used to close the gap or the missing part in the real world (Qin, 2019). For instance, a real-life extrovert can be an introvert and vice versa (Qin, 2019). However, both real-life identity and virtual identity can be influenced by other people whether they are imagined or not (Qin, 2019). This online identity displayed is adjusted unconsciously to be of more advantage to them (Qin, 2019). People more often than not replicate their offline behavior online (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). These two identities are the same but in a different context (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). This is as a result of users wanting to be real and truthful to others (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). In all, online self-identity focuses on a particular trait of an individual and minimizes the result; it also gives room for changing or making improvement of online self (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). People choose to display a particular trait for a reason while embracing mask anonymity (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013).

There have also been accounts of change in the formation of personal identity due to the advancements in information and communication technologies. Interactions via the internet make often make the netizens examine themselves through the digital culture (Turkle, 2011). Stutzman (2006), in his study on online identity behaviour, examined the level of an individual's willingness to share personal information online. The study found out that the majority of the respondents have a willingness to share personal information online and do not care about online privacy protection (Stutzman, 2006), This made the internet a tool for developing an online self-image which also plays a significant role in self-presentation to other online users.

Kietzmann et al. (2011) noted that the structure of the internet combined with the existing web platforms and SNS's may encourage an online identity-sharing

behaviour. This is not only limited to the personal identity information shared consciously but also other identifying information shared unconsciously. The unconscious disclosure of identity information happens via status updates, posts, likes, dislikes, group memberships, and other affirmations. Even though most online users do not consider these disclosures as acts of identity-sharing, they however make up the understanding of their attributes by other online users.

Kietzmann et al. (2011) also noted that while a large number of online users are often willing to share personally identifying information online, other users consider the issue of privacy which they take different measures to protect. Some users also express concerns about their self-identity data being used by corporations and governments. This is due to online marketing techniques that allow individual data to be accumulated and such as directly targeted adverts to them as regards their personal identity information. Other internet users express anxiety that their data may be used by the government for surveillance purposes. This means that regardless of a large number of people willing to share personal identity details online, there is a growing number of people with concerns about online privacy (Kietzmann et al., 2011).

While discussing the influence of technological evolution on the formation of self-identity, Alruwaili (2017) noted that the digital age has opened an avenue for online users to converge within different contexts with the availability of all sorts of connections. Individuals now involve in different online fora and also amend their identities to conform with the online contexts which led to increasing flexibility of self-identity.

The advent of the internet has made identity creation which used to be a private personal affair to be a social scale public affair. The social aspect of identity formation now takes place online especially among the young generation who actively spend more time online due to the ubiquity of the internet which is now part of their identities (Ahlquist, 2015). Online identity development is tagged as digital identity and it refers to how online users present themselves via the internet.

2.6 Online Friendship/ Networking

Communication is important in any society (Spiro, Almquist, & Butts, 2016). However, it is being disrupted by the distance which encourages online friendship (Spiro, Almquist, & Butts, 2016). Loneliness is also seen as one of the factors that facilitate online friendship (Bouwman, Aartsen, Tilburg, & Stevens, 2017). This loneliness is mostly observed in adults (Bouwman, Aartsen, Tilburg, & Stevens, 2017). The internet is an avenue where people form ties with people consciously (Lai & Fung, 2019). Virtual friendship is a result of other activities (Lai & Fung, 2019). Even though the online community has no geographical barrier, people tend to form a closer bond with people they know physically which does not apply to everyone (Spiro, Almquist, & Butts, 2016). Spiro, Almquist, and Butts (2016) have found out that the higher the difference in the educational standard, the lower the bonding between people. Schools promote division in the visual world (Spiro, Almquist, & Butts, 2016). Furthermore, the higher the distance between friends, the lower the bonding between these friends (Spiro, Almquist, & Butts, 2016).

The internet is a platform for people to socialize (Highton- Williamson, Priebe, & Giacco, 2015). It allows its users to respond in their time and allows the users to meet other people outside their social group (Highton- Williamson, Priebe, & Giacco,

2015). This online community provides an avenue for users who have few physical friends to make new friends (Highton- Williamson, Priebe, & Giacco, 2015). Moreover, it assists people with the disorder to socialize (Highton- Williamson, Priebe, & Giacco, 2015).

Video games can be seen as an additional channel to form social ties online (Lai & Fung, 2019). Participants of the video game may later turn to SNS to bond more (Lai & Fung, 2019). They also use their real name more often than not, which shows their intentions to be real with the others online (Lai & Fung, 2019). The purpose of the chat may change to be more personal hence, forming a strong tie (Lai & Fung, 2019). While making the ties stronger, each of them is expected to respect each other's privacy (Lai & Fung, 2019). However, people from the urban area are very cautious about building relationships online (Lai & Fung, 2019). This is because the internet is filled with several risks and intrusion of privacy of its users because of its feature of anonymity (Lai & Fung, 2019). In all, to have friends online, one must conform to the rules protecting users' privacy (Lai & Fung, 2019). Being online friends for a relatively long time could lead to being offline friends (Lai & Fung, 2019). Physical meeting strengthens the tie of online friends (Lai & Fung, 2019). Some people think that they have to physically meet people they have met online before they are considered real friends (Lai & Fung, 2019). Gender and money are considered as a factor that affects the decision to meet online friends physically (Lai & Fung, 2019).

Continuous talking both virtually and physically strengthens the relationship established (Lai & Fung, 2019). The relationship could also survive if they share similar interests and experiences (Lai & Fung, 2019). According to Lai and Fung (2019), online friendship takes four stages. At the first stage, the internet brings

strangers together; the second stage is facilitated when a user finds another user is similar to her or her- stranger turned virtual friend. The third stage takes a physical meeting with this 'virtual friend.' At the fourth stage and final stage, this relationship may still exist or cease to exist which depends on the efforts put in by both parties.

Moreover, online friendship is a good way of reducing loneliness (Bouwman, Aartsen, Tilburg, & Stevens, 2017). It allows for people to make new friends, keep in touch with old friends, and puts into consideration the expectation of people (Bouwman, Aartsen, Tilburg, & Stevens, 2017). Moreover, other methods can be used to reduce loneliness but, the inclusion of the internet makes it more effective (Bouwman, Aartsen, Tilburg, & Stevens, 2017).

2.7 Instagram and Online Friendship

Social networking sites are of advantage to people as it provides a platform to socialize (Mackson, Brochu, & Schneider, 2019). It plays an important role in the lives of teenagers as it helps them make new friends, keep in, and keep in touch with existing friends (Mackson, Brochu, & Schneider, 2019). The higher they spend time on SNS, the higher the stronger their friendship gets and the more they feel they fit into a community (Mackson, Brochu, & Schneider, 2019) which generally applies to all users. Though Instagram is one of the recent social networking sites, it is very much used. Young adults are mostly found on this SNS (Mackson, Brochu, & Schneider, 2019).

On Instagram, users are allowed to like and comment on pictures, share stories, post pictures and or videos, make new friends, do a live video, and chat with people (Salim, Rahardjo, Tanaya, & Qurani, 2017). Users can also make their Instagram page private.

Because Instagram only allows for users to post pictures or videos before content, users make a lot of effort to look good in their post by filtering and have a perfect style of pose (Salim, Rahardjo, Tanaya, & Qurani, 2017). Previous researches have noted that loneliness is one of the reasons people turn to SNS to fill in the void (Mackson, Brochu, & Schneider, 2019; Bouwman, Aartsen, Tilburg, & Stevens, 2017). When users are far from people they consider important in their lives, they then result in making friends feel in the void (Salim, Rahardjo, Tanaya, & Qurani, 2017). SNSs are then used to meet different people from different countries.

Users on Instagram have different behaviors that are displayed depending on who the receiver is. That is their friend or stranger (Salim, Rahardjo, Tanaya, & Qurani, 2017). When with a stranger, they display behaviors that are of more advantage to them which is unlike how they behave with friends (Salim, Rahardjo, Tanaya, & Qurani, 2017). When with friends, on the other hand, they show more of their true self because of the familiarity they share and them trying not to ruin the friendship (Salim, Rahardjo, Tanaya, & Qurani, 2017). Users of Instagram have different levels of forming ties with other people on Instagram (Phua, Jin, & Kim, 2017). Users tend to relate with people they have no ties within the physical setting (Phua, Jin, & Kim, 2017). Instagram is also ranked the third-highest SNS in terms of bonding social capital (Phua, Jin, & Kim, 2017). This is because it allows users to follow people they have no relationship with, hence, forming a weak social bonding. However, users with weak ties increase their bridging social capital by increasing their media use (Phua, Jin, & Kim, 2017). Bridging social capital in this context is using ties with other users to achieve goals (Phua, Jin, & Kim, 2017).

Instagram is a platform where its users satisfy themselves first and update their followers and friends about their activities (Ting, Ming, de Run, & Choo, 2015). It can also be used for socializing but making new friends and keeping in touch with old friends with ease (Ting, Ming, de Run, & Choo, 2015). Users can search for celebrities, bloggers, and even long-lost friends. Because of its photo-sharing characteristic, it is preferred to other social networking in sharing of information and for interaction (Ting, Ming, de Run, & Choo, 2015). Friends, peers, and family are the reason why some people start using Instagram which allows for them to stay connected even when they are distant (Ting, Ming, de Run, & Choo, 2015). Sometimes, they are made to join to increase their followers (Ting, Ming, de Run, & Choo, 2015). People will rather maintain their relationship with people on both Instagram and Twitter than any other SNS (Lee & Lim, 2017). Users may also decide to reach the same person on different SNS (Lee & Lim, 2017).

2.8 Self-Identity

Self-identity does not have a universal definition, hence its difficulty (Batra, Sullivan, Williams, & Geldmacher, 2016). It is the action of individuals to be able to associate and interact with themselves and the people around them. It also does not have any method to identify it in people (Nascimento, 2018). It includes various identities people adopt throughout their lifetime (Batra, Sullivan, Williams, & Geldmacher, 2016). Using Ulric Neisser's framework, self-identity is divided into five types which include personal self, private self, self in the social world, self in the physical world, and self of the past and the future (Batra, Sullivan, Williams, & Geldmacher, 2016). Another research posits that there are six different types of identity which include total self, psychological self, gender self, relational self, aspirational self, and spiritual self (Easton, Leone-Sheehan, & O'Leary, 2016). A major importance of self-identity is the

ability to manage different and clashing identities and their interpretations of these identities (Nascimento, 2018). Efforts are taken to interpret these identities are important to the development of self-identity (Nascimento, 2018). According to Habermas, as cited in Nascimento (2018), the self-identity is responsible for the demand in the structure of communication (Nascimento, 2018).

Scholars have premised that one's identity influences behaviour directly and even indirectly (Wang, Wu, & Lee, 2017). It performs various functions for different people (Easton, Leone-Sheehan, & O'Leary, 2016). Also, events that have happened during one's childhood influence their personality and even one adulthood (Skinner, May, & Rollock, 2016). When these events appear to be negative, it kills one's real self (Easton, Leone-Sheehan, & O'Leary, 2016). Gender, class, locality, age, and ethnicity influence people's identity and individualization (Skinner, May, & Rollock, 2016). Generally, life challenges perform a mediating role in self-identity (Skinner, May, & Rollock, 2016). It does not require people to change their identity but rather expose hidden identities (Skinner, May, & Rollock, 2016). In addition, people tend to present themselves in terms of their private self and social role (Wang, Wu, & Lee, 2017).

Marson and Powell, (2014)'s framework on identity fully explains self- identity. According to his framework, there are two different stages (Marson, & Powell, 2014). They include the front stage and backstage, and individuals are seen as actors. These actors are careful when on stage and more of themselves backstage (Skinner, May, & Rollock, 2016). Human behavior differs when they are with people (front stage), which is mostly to impress people, and when they are alone (backstage) (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). The term 'mask' is used to describe deception in physical interaction. That is, hiding all other identities (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013).

36

Both the mask and the hidden identities are part of the individual personality (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). It does not present these individuals as fake but projects their hidden personalities (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013).

Self-identity differentiates one individual from the other and create uniqueness for one personality among others. Self-identity formation is simply the understanding of the unique attributes of a particular personality. It also refers to how people perceive and profile themselves and present for others as influenced by the different social institutions they are (Belanger, 2010). The self-identity began when people strive to identify themselves and how they want to be profiled.

According to Ogidi (2015), the tradition among the young generation is that during their teenage age, they strive to create their identity in three phases, which are the biological, psychological, and societal, however, this self-identity is not formed until they grow beyond the teenage age. The actual formation of identity usually begins after the identification. He also asserted that the young generation only has a grasp of their identity during the first phase which is birth, however, the other two phases occur after the teenage age (Ogidi, 2015).

Developing self-identity comprises personal identification and emotional investment. The social science discipline sees self-identity formation as being a process of identification while another discipline like psychoanalysis sees it as a process of emotional investment (Erikson, 1968). Pratt (2003) contended that the only point of agreement between the disciplines as regards self-identity formation is that they all explain it to be a process of developing identity.

The process of self-identity is that which is susceptible to influence, however, the young generation does develop their identities with regards to the community or relative influence alone (Froget, Baghestan & Asfaranjan, 2013). This is due to the evolution of SNS which allows young people to develop global identities which conform with other young people's identity globally and their affinity groups (Jacober, 2014). Self-identity formation has to do with how young people perceive themselves and how the perception can be influenced by their perception of God's creation and what is expected from individuals, this is also influenced by social institutions such as schools, social networking sites, family, and so on.

Ogidi (2015) also contended that identity formation of the young generation is usually through affiliations with social institutions like SNS platforms, family, friends, and culture which he termed elemental donors of self-identity. Some identities are personalized and as such only resonate with each young mind, while some are common among the young generation regardless of their heterogeneousness (Froget, Baghestan & Asfaranjan, 2013). Young people's identities both personalized and common are classified into personal, group, primary, religious, social, ego, and cultural identities.

Personal identity is that which is particular to an individual, it is often a label that carries the name of the person as the name of an individual form their personality (Froget, Baghestan & Asfaranjan, 2013). Even though people same have similar names but their life dispositions would be different (Jenkins, 2000). Jenkins (2000) further asserted that personal identity is "identity in the eyes of the beholder" which is also the identity of the "I" (Jenkins, 2000, p.22).

Primary identity refers to the identity which is an inmate in a young person and not influenced by nor shared with other young people ((Froget, Baghestan & Asfaranjan, 2013). Social identity is "the systematic establishment and signification, between individuals, between collectivities, of relationships of similarities and difference" (Jenkins, 2000, p. 25). Cultural identity refers to the cultural context of the young generation, it is a way of making meanings from cultural contexts and other cultural spheres (Castells, 2004). While group identity is used to mean a shared and depersonalized identity formation.

2.9 Theoretical Framework

2.9.1 The Manovich Theory

Manovich's theory centers mainly on the language of the new media and draws relevant inferences from film theory, literary theory, history of arts, and computer science, the theory develops different theoretical assumptions on constructs like the cultural interface, cinematography, and spatial montage (Candrasari, 2016). Manovich (2002), in his theory, draws parallel discourse between the historical background of cinema and that of the new media.

Manovich started by analyzing the nature of the new media through the identification of five principles of the new media which are numerical presentation, modularity, automation, variability, and transcoding (Ryan, 2003). Even though these categories appear to be technological attributes, they are not in any way technical categories. Also, regardless of the principle's technological and technical background, Manovich's theory has made the principles to be more of cultural categories (Looy, 2003).

The theory compared the numerical presentation to Henry Ford's factory logic and semiotics while modality is referred to as the Web and desktop publishing software (Looy, 2003). The automation in the principles simply refers to the power of the computer to automate tasks and this is further classified as low and high-level automation. The low automation has to do with the computation of basic but re-occurring tasks such as the use of a template for report writing or application of filters to pictures (Ryan, 2003). The high-level computation is simply used to refer to artificial life and intelligence (AI) with records of success so far being found in computer games (Looy, 2003).

Among the five principles of the new media, variability is more inconspicuous lending support to the claim that an object of the new media can have an existence in different versions (Ryan, 2003). Transcoding which is the final principle refers to the structure of the media and computer which takes the shape of the computer's internal organization (Ryan, 2003). It is also referred to as the most substantial consequence of the computerization of media (Looy, 2003).

Relating the new media to its roots which are considered as computing and cinema, Manovich provided the pedigree of technology and visual information coding techniques (Looy, 2003). Also, in discussing the language of new media, no particular theoretical framework was referred to, the term was rather used as a concept that covers "various conventions used by designers of new media objects to organize data and structure the user's experience" (Looy, 2003, p. 3). However, the most essential methodological advancement is the reconciliation between technological matters and humanities. Hence, Manovich's theory bridges the gaps that exist between arts and sciences (Manovich, 2017).

Also, the theory perceives new media as that which generally mirrors visual arts and particular cinema (Manovich, 2017). The theory does not see the recent and specialized attributes of the new media as an unknown development but as that which is rooted in the inception of moving images and then the nineteenth-century pro-cinematic practice where images were painted and animated with mere hands (Manovich, 2017). According to the theory, an important aspect of the visual display is the ability of the screen to mirror two realities or different spaces divided by a frame (Looy, 2003). The theory conceptualizes different types of screen such as the classical screen which is said to be flat and having a rectangular surface for frontal viewing, and the dynamic screen which has been in existence for a centenary which marked the inception of moving images display (Looy, 2003).

On the realism of the new media, Manovich drew the inference to adapt the cinema theory where he differentiates between technology and style (Manovich, 2017). According to him, the discourse on technological development is not complete with the historical background of realism (Manovich, 2017). This is because as the visual technologies advance, viewers are being exposed to the fictional nature of the previous visuals and buttresses that the current visual which seems realistic may also be superseded in the future (Looy, 2003).

The concept of a database with its technicalities was also redefined by Manovich through a cultural perspective which he termed the new cultural paradigm (Manovich, 2017). The database here does not refer to that which sequentially orders meaningful events, rather, it gathers a large volume of data in a structured fashion where there exists an equal position of significance. Databases employ a non-sequential listing and

placing of items to represent the global realm. This opposes the concept of narrative which creates a cause-and-effect path eliding the insignificant (Manovich, 2017).

Manovich theory was however criticized for having a very broad scope which covers a wide variety of things that can cause cognitive overhead, while it also lacks the depth for academic (Manovich, 2017). While the theory was subject to criticism due to abundance, it was also criticized due to scarcity as regards the concept of interactivity which is one the most important attributes of the new media (Looy, 2003). Interactivity is considered as an active viewing and two-way communication elements as image instruments. Even though consideration was given, the main focus was the visual qualities and information structure rather than their interactivity (Manovich, 2017).

2.9.2 Social Identity Theory

Social Identity Theory (SIT) was propounded by Tajfel and Turner (1979), it is a social-psychology theoretical framework that explains individual cognition and behavior as a result of the group they belong to or social identity they possess (Tajfel, 1979). The theory studies the human mind and personality, and how it affects the behavior they exhibit to people who are not in their circle or group they belong to.

Social Identity Theory (SIT) gives a backup and explains how different groups behave base on inter-group relation and in-group identification (Yuki, 2003). SIT is a theoretical framework that explained how group behavior influences the mental or logical thinking of an individual and how it, therefore, affects intergroup behavior (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). The behavior exhibit by members of a group finds a way to influence the underlying behavior of the members; at the end of the day, there won't be any significant difference between an individual personality in and outside the group. People tend to see themselves more as a group member than

as a unique personality (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). There is a concentration on the collective self than the personal self.

It is a social psychological theory that focuses on how powerful a group and can be seen through the behavior exhibited by different members of the in-group and out-group, this behavior is pushed by members' ability and readiness to work together (Hornsey, 2008). People will be more concerned about the identity of the group they belong to as they compare it to other relevant groups. Behavior like solidarity and oneness, discrimination and hatred, will be a collective decision by in-group members towards out-group, to boost the identity and self-esteem of their groups.

SIT describe how thought about oneself and thought about how important one is in a group correspond with how the group is identified; such that when an individual starts feeling they are nothing without the group, they start seeing other members as the same (Yuki, 2003). Depersonalization or lack of understanding of unique self, start taking place when members of a group start seeing the group as an integral part of their existence (Kabidzic, 2013).

The theory focuses on how the group reflects in individual life and personality, how people tend to drop and forget their self-concept and now believe the group they belong to determine and define who they are accurate (Tazghini & Siedlecki, 2013). Also, members of the in-group they belong to are perceived to be the same as they are and whatever thinking they have will be as a result of the group they belong to; such that a part of an individual unique personality is seen as a result of the group they belong to Likewise, members of the out-group are perceived to be different from them, they are seen to have different behavior and they believe there is a hierarchy of power and

relevance when it comes to intergroup comparison (Tazghini & Siedlecki, 2013). Here, there is no more concern for the self-identity of an individual, rather the social-identity they hold.

Members of a group are characterized by certain similarities and features which help them perceived their group as unique compare to other groups (Kabidzic, 2013). The members of an in-group are perceived to be more similar to one another with no essential differences and the group is perceived as homogenous (Haslam, Oakes, Turner, & McGarty, 1996). Some parts of every member of an in-group are shared because they have and share similar social identity rather than unique self-identity (Kabidzic, 2013). While members of the out-groups are perceived to always be in a competition and comparison with them (Kabidzic, 2013).

According to Tajfel (1979), SIT is built on 4 underlying principles which are social categorization, social comparison, social Identity, and self-esteem. There have to be differences and categories between members of different groups (Intergroup) and members of the same group and that is known as a social category (Wilcox & Stephen, 2013).

The next stage that takes place after categorization is social comparison, groups start comparing their activities, beliefs, and characteristics with out-groups to gain some hierarchy of power (Wilcox & Stephen, 2013). After comparison, now individuals have seen the difference between in-group and out-group and these differences and the one with the more positive outcome will determine whether they will claim the social identity of the group or not (Wilcox & Stephen, 2013). The positive social identity

will help boost the self-esteem of members of the group they belong to (Wilcox & Stephen, 2013).

SIT was initially a framework for intergroup differences and relations, but there are recent recognition given to intragroup differences and orientation (Yuki, 2003); even if members of an in-group have a high level of similarities, there are some major differences in their behavior which affect the behavior members of a group exhibit within a group.

Social identity theory is rooted in the idea of structural symbolic interactionism with the proposition that people's behavior is affected by their characteristics the interpersonal relationship that exists among them (Wilcox & Stephen, 2013). The Symbolic Interactionism theory is categorized under the cultural perspective theories whose focal point is on how meanings are made by the audience from their environment (Wilcox & Stephen, 2013). However (Lynch, & McConatha, 2006) while discussing on hyper-symbolic interactionism further advances that suggested that the self is subject to continual redefinition and revision as the result of constant interaction with visual/consumer culture, mainstream media, and these new modes of symbolic interaction (Lynch, & McConatha, 2006). One of the basic assumptions of the self-identity theory is that the audience makes meanings from their environment and personal self the knowledge they can accumulate within the environment (Baran & Davis, 2012).

The proposition of self-identity theory has gained the interest of social science scholars and researchers as it examines the variations between people's social behavior, not only as being relevant to many social roles but also as being relevant to the social

45

behaviors of people an individual interacts with (Horowitz, 2012). Also, people are incredibly moved to accomplish positive distinctiveness (Zhang, 2015). They are susceptible to influence from other people they relate with and also work diligently to keep a positive self-perception which is known as self-esteem (Zhang, 2015). Societal social constructionism performs a very important role in the way self-identity is defined and evaluated (Zhang, 2015). Identity as contained in Tajfel's (1981) definition has to do with being aware that one is affiliated to a particular group, the sense of belonging, and knowledge of group status and hierarchy in comparison with others.

Furthermore, Horowitz (2012) came up with classifications of self, which he categorized as schemas, models, and states. Self-schemas have to do with an ignorant and systematic generalization of a personal self (Horowitz, 2012). According to Horowitz (2012) individuals have multiple self-schemas, unconsciously coded in their superego (Horowitz, 2012). The functions of these self-schemas are like a cognitive map that simplifies details into attributes of a particular relationship.

2.9.3 Communication Theory of Identity

Communication theory of identity (CTI) is one of the communication theories that try to explain the interrelationship between communication and identity (Zhang, 2015). The theory gives a descriptive outlook on how identity is perceived as a form and process of communication (Zhang, 2015). The theory assumes that understanding the relationship and roles played by individuals in the society will be by their identity they portray through communication (Jung & Hecht, 2004). This means that individual identity is an offshoot of the roles they play in society and that can be well understood through communication.

Identity can be communicated in four different approaches; identity communicated through intrapersonal means, this is like a self-identity understand by an individual; identity communicated through other people's message; identity communicated through the relationship shared with people and lastly identity communicated through a larger group that an individual belongs to (Orbe, 2004). The identity of an individual is best understood through communication transactions which can be intrapersonal, interpersonal, or group communication which will also be as a result of their social role (Orbe, 2004). Mehdizadeh (2010) is also of the view that CTI focus on negotiating identities, and as much as "communication shapes identity, identity also shapes communication" (Mehdizadeh, 2010, p. 357).

The identity or social role an individual portrays can be well understood by the communication transaction they engaged in, also the way, manner, or kind of communication an individual is involved in can be influence by the identity they carry (Mehdizadeh, 2010). For example, the chain of command and authority a professor has in his field will be understood from the way he speaks, writes, or his level of interaction.

The identity is exclusive and can be communicated at a different time and different level, but it can also overlap or counter another identity an individual will wear on a different level (Hutchinson & Pang, 2018). The way an individual has portrayed himself on a personal level will be different from the way he will portray himself on a relational and communal level; therefore, the identity will contradict if there are no similarities between them (Hutchinson & Pang, 2018).

People are very cautious of the kind of identity they communicate to people; they can be very selective on what they want people to see about them. People are fond of presenting themselves on SNS and by so doing, they portray an identity that is overrated (Hutchinson & Pang, 2018). So, CTI is all about the personal and social relationship of an individual to communicate identity.

There is a sort of joint identity among members of a similar community, together with their identity (Faulkner & Hecht, 2011). People in a communal environment tend to have some identity they share which kind of bound them together. At some point, this communal identity which is like the third level of identity and relational identity which is the second level of identity that shows what identity other people ascribed to an individual will affect the personal identity which is the first identity that explains how an individual view himself (Faulkner & Hecht, 2011).

The development of the communication theory of identity was rooted in empirical data which proposes that communication is not a product of identity but rather an element (Hecht & Choi, 2012). There are several emerging theories where identity is seen as more processual and layered, however, the communication theory of identity view identity as the integration of all social layers and self-concepts with personal identity.

According to Hetch and Choi (2012), the communication theory of identity has 10 basic propositions, which are:
1.   Identities have two levels of interpretation: content and relationship
2.   Identities involve both subjective and ascribe meaning.
3.   Identities are clues presented in conversations and define membership in the society.

4. Identities have individual, social, and communal attributes.

5. Identities are both persistent and dynamic.

6. Identities are affective, cognitive, behavioral, and spiritual.

7. Identities have semantic attributes that are presented with symbols, meanings, and labels.

8. Identities prescribe modes of appropriate and effective communication.

9. Identities are a source of expectations and motivations.

10. Identities are emergent.

These propositions present personal identity formation and development as a continuous communication process with personal self and others rather than being a resultant effect of communication (Hecht, 1993).

The theory also proposes that people incorporate interaction with others, relationships, and the self-concept into identities via communication, hence, identity is presented via a process of communication (Growiec & Growiec, 2014). Put differently, communication and identity have a reciprocal form of communication and with this view, communication is bedrock and sustainer of an individual's identity (Buckingham, 2008).

Additionally, identity according to the communication theory of identity is presented as a collective attribute that is socially constructed with shared meaning for identity. This means that people share the same perception for selfhood or identity just as the member of a particular group share the same language, values, customs, and cultures. It simply goes beyond individuals as members of a group and it also affects their cultural products and beliefs (Growiec & Growiec, 2014). To that effect, the theory

also proposes four layers of identities which are personal layers, relational layers, enacted layers, and communal where interaction and influence are reciprocated (Hecht & Choi, 2012). This means that none of the layers exist independently or in isolation. They have an interconnection which is labelled interpenetration (Hecht & Choi, 2012). However, they are often explained independently for analysis (Sponcil & Gitimu, 2013).

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology for the study. It discusses the research design, research method, population of the study, sample size, sampling procedure, instruments for data collection, validity and reliability, data collection, and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

According to Bhat (2019), research design refers to the structure of methods and techniques a researcher deploys to logically bring different components of the study together to ensure the efficiency of results. For this study, the survey design was adopted. The design entails a one-off collection of data at a time (Babbie, 2020). In this design, the study respondents are selected based on the scope of the study and other criteria set, then proceeding to examine the study objectives through the respondents (Setia, 2016).

3.3 Research Method

This study employs the survey approach under the quantitative research method. This is because people's opinions, attitudes, and orientations are best sought through surveys from which conclusions are finally drawn (Babbie, 2010). The quantitative method is based on the measurement of numeric data regarding a particular variable to provide accurate, reliable, and valid results (Babbie, 2010). This method is aimed at having access to large respondents to the phenomenon under study. This study

therefore adopted the use of questionnaire to survey the opinions of the respondents as regards the topic of study. Being a quantitative study, numeric data were gathered and analysed during the course of the study.

3.4 Population

Population refers is an aggregate or totality of all the objects, subjects, or members that conform to a set of specifications. The population is said to be an aggregation of elements from which the sample is selected (Barbie, 2010). According to Wimmer and Dominick (2011), one of the main goals of scientific inquiries is to understand and give a description of the nature of population.

The study sought to explore Instagram usage frequency and it's relation on self-identity and friendship quality among Nigerians in North Cyprus. Therefore, the population for this study comprises of young males and females active Instagram users amongst Nigerians living in North Cyprus.

3.5 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

The sample size is a smaller unit within the population where the research will be conducted to lend credence to the generalizations that would be made from the study findings.

According to Sawahel (2019), there are about 20,000 Nigerians in North Cyprus, hence, the study employs the recommendations of Krejcie and Morgan (1970) where the sample size for any population up to 20,000 is 375. However, to prepare for unanswered and poorly filled instruments, a total of 400 data collection instruments would be administered.

The sampling procedure adopted for this study is the simple random sampling procedure. This would be used to select the most productive sample to answer the research questions through variables developed to guide their selection. Together with the aforementioned technique, the Snowball sampling procedure, where a respondent would refer the researcher to another individual (s) who possess the required criteria, would also be used. Questionnaire link was sent to individuals randomly through personal WhatsApp contacts, e-mails, and Facebook messenger. This is due to the fact that these platforms allow for instant messaging and chats compare to others. In addition, personal friends also helped send to their personal contacts who were Nigerians living in TRNC. This helped in recruiting individuals to participate in the research, thereby achieving the desired number.

3.6 Instrument of Data Collection

In collecting data for the study, the online Google form which is a primary source of data collection was employed. The Google Form were used to elicit responses from the respondents. To arrive at this, the form is divided into five sections, namely: Section A: Respondents' Demographic Profile (7 Items), Section B: Frequency of Instagram Use (4 Items), Section C: increased friendship quality online (6 Items), Section D: self-identity online (4 Items), and Section E: online self-identity (14 Items). This questionnaire was distributed to the respondents based on the recommendations and those that are known. The google form was distributed online within the 1st December 2020 and 23rd January 2021. The research was initially ought to be a face to face data collection process, however due to the current Coronavirus pandemic and the government policy which frowns at the physical gathering of people.

3.7 Validity and Reliability

According to Babbie, (2010), validity is the degree to which an empirical measurement adequately represents the real meaning of the phenomenon under study. Babbie, (2010), also asserted that reliability refers to the ability of a particular technique, when applied repeatedly to the same object, to yields the same results. Hence, reliability is concerned with the accuracy of the measuring instrument and validity is concerned with the instrument's success at measuring what the researcher set out to measure.

To achieve this, face validity was established after consultation with the study supervisor to ascertain that the instrument is valid and effective enough to capture the objective of the study. Besides, most of the key constructs were adapted from existing literature that had validated the measurements. Reliability of the instrument would eventually be ascertained from the result of the pilot test by calculating the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient which is used to determine the internal consistency of a set of item. The result of the reliability analysis revealed that there is an acceptable range of reliability result as the overall Cronbach Alpha recorded is .701 which is in consonance with the internal consistency requirements of the reliability test as posited by Babbie, (2010).

3.8 Method of Data Analysis

For the analysis of this study, data collected from responses to the questionnaire would be analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24. Descriptive and Inferential statistical analysis were be employed. The descriptive statistics would be frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation. To answer the research questions the mean and standard deviations of each item would be presented. For hypothesis testing, the Pearson Product Moment Correlations (PPMC) will be used

analyse relationships and Chi-Square would be used to examine association between variables tested.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This chapter discusses the analysis of the data and findings of this study. The chapter is divided into two major parts. The first one is the descriptive statistics which centers on the demographic profiles of the respondents and summaries about the sample and the measures of all items presented on the research questions. The second part is the inferential statistics to test the hypotheses developed and answer other research questions.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are summary statistics that summarise or describe a given data set quantitatively (Thompson, 2009). The section reveals all descriptive analysis in the study.

4.1.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic characteristics of respondents analyzed include respondents' gender, age group, marital status, level of education, SNS presence, and SNS use.

Table 1: Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	153	39.8	39.8	39.8
Female	231	60.2	60.2	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 1 shows the gender distribution of respondents. Results reveal that majority of the respondents are females (60.2%), while the male respondents recorded only 39.8%.

Table 2: Age

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
18-22	147	38.3	38.3	38.3
23-27	117	30.5	30.5	68.8
28-32	100	26.0	26.0	94.8
33 or above	20	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 presents the age group of respondents. Results reveal that majority of the respondents are between the age group 18-22 (38.3%), closely followed by age group 23-27 (30.5%). Those between the age group 28-32 are 26.0% while only 5.2% of the respondents are above 33 and above.

Table 3: Marital Status

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Single	208	54.2	54.2	54.2
Married	81	21.1	21.1	75.3
In a relationship	95	24.7	24.7	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 presents that the majority of the respondents are single (54.2%), 24.7% of the respondents are in a relationship while only 21.1% of the respondents are married.

Table 4: Educational Level

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
High school	15	3.9	3.9	3.9
Undergraduate	207	53.9	53.9	57.8
Graduate	162	42.2	42.2	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

The Table 4 presents the respondents' level of education. In the table, the study consist of major undergraduates (53.9%), followed by respondents who are graduates (42.2%). Only 3.9% of the respondents are high school certificate holders.

Table 5: Social Networking Sites Presence

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	384	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5 presents the SNS presence of the respondents. The table revealed that all the respondents make use of SNS (100%), this means each respondent has at least one SNS profile.

Table 6: Number of Social Networking Sites Profiles

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	9	2.3	2.3	2.3
2	60	15.6	15.6	18.0
3	45	11.7	11.7	29.7
More than 3	270	70.3	70.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 reveals the number of SNS profiles owned by each respondent. In the table, majority of the respondents own more than 3 SNS accounts, 15.6% of the respondents have 2 SNS accounts, 11.7% of the respondents have 3 SNS accounts. Only 2.3% of the total respondents have just 1 SNS account.

Table 7: Frequency of Social Networking Sites Use

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very often	206	53.6	53.6	53.6
Often	142	37.0	37.0	90.6
Sometimes	36	9.4	9.4	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 reveals the frequency of SNS use by the respondents. Majority of the respondents use SNS very often (53.6%), while 37.0% of the total respondents use SNS often and only 9.4% of the respondents visit SNS sometimes.

Table 8: Number of Instagram Accounts

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	247	64.3	64.3	64.3
2	122	31.8	31.8	96.1
3	15	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 8 shows 64.3% of the respondents have just one Instagram account, while 31.8%

of the respondents have 2 Instagram accounts and only 3.9% of the respondents have

up to 3 Instagram accounts.

Table 9: Use of Real Name on Instagram Accounts

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	256	66.7	66.7	66.7
No	128	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

The Table 9 reveals that majority of the respondents use their real name on their

Instagram accounts (66.7%) while only 33.3% of the total respondents do not use their

real name.

Table 10: Number of Instagram Friends

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
10 or less	31	8.1	8.1	8.1
11-50	77	20.1	20.1	28.1
51-100	40	10.4	10.4	38.5
301-400	46	12.0	12.0	50.5
more than 400	190	49.5	49.5	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

According to the Table 10, 49.5% of the respondents have more than 400 friends on Instagram, 20.1% have 11-50 friends on Instagram, 12.0% have 301-400 friends on Instagram, 10.4% of the respondents have 51-100 friends on Instagram while only 8.1% have less than 10 friends on Instagram.

Table 11: Time Spent on Instagram Recently

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
less than 10	48	12.5	12.5	12.5
10-30	82	21.4	21.4	33.9
31-60	57	14.8	14.8	48.7
1-2 hours	40	10.4	10.4	59.1
2-3 hours	77	20.1	20.1	79.2
More than 3 hours	80	20.8	20.8	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 11 presents the time spent on Instagram by the respondents within the last few weeks. In the table, 21.4% of the respondents spent 10-30 minutes which is the highest, closely followed by more than 3 hours by 20.8% of the respondents and 2-3 hours by 20.1% of the respondents. 14.8% of the respondents spent 31-60%, 12.5% spent less than 10 minutes while 10.4% of the total respondents spent 1-2 hours on Instagram averagely within the last few weeks.

Table 12: Number of Instagram Following

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
less than 500	144	37.5	37.5	37.5
501-1000	168	43.8	43.8	81.3
1001-1500	41	10.7	10.7	91.9
1501-2000	15	3.9	3.9	95.8
more than 4500	16	4.2	4.2	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 12 above reveals that 43.8% of the respondents have 501-1000 following on Instagram, 37.5% have less than 500 following, 10.7% of the respondents have 1001-1500 following, 4.2% of the respondents have more than 4500 following while only 3.9% of the respondents have 15001-2000 following on Instagram.

Table 13: Number of Instagram Followers

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
less than 500	169	44.0	44.0	44.0
501-1000	120	31.3	31.3	75.3
1001-1500	9	2.3	2.3	77.6
1501-2000	9	2.3	2.3	79.9
2001-2500	16	4.2	4.2	84.1
2501-3000	29	7.6	7.6	91.7
More than 4500	32	8.3	8.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 13 presents the number of followers each respondent has on Instagram. About 44.0% of the respondents have less than 500 followers, 31.3% of the respondents have 501-1000 followers, 8.3% of the respondents have more than 4500 followers, 7.6% of the respondents have 2501-3000 followers, 4.2% of the respondents have 2001-2500 respondents while 2.3% of the respondents have 1001-1500 and 1501-2000 followers on Instagram.

Table 14: I add only people I know on Instagram

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	90	23.4	23.4	23.4
Disagree	105	27.3	27.3	50.8
Undecided	91	23.7	23.7	74.5
Agree	83	21.6	21.6	96.1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	15	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 14 shows that 27.3% of the respondents disagreed to adding only people they know on Instagram, 23.75 of the respondents are undecided, 23.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed, 21.6% of the respondents agreed while only 3.9% of the respondents strongly agreed that they only add people they know on Instagram.

Table 15: I add only my intimate friends on Instagram

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	145	37.8	37.8	37.8
Disagree	132	34.4	34.4	72.1
Undecided	55	14.3	14.3	86.5
Agree	52	13.5	13.5	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

According to the Table 15, 37.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed to adding only their intimate friends on Instagram, 34.4% disagreed, 14.35 of the respondents are undecided while only 13.5% of the respondents agreed to adding only their intimate friends on Instagram.

Table 16: I add only friends that we belong to the same circle on Instagram

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	120	31.3	31.3	31.3
Disagree	126	32.8	32.8	64.1
Undecided	102	26.6	26.6	90.6
Agree	36	9.4	9.4	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 16 above revealed that 32.8% of the respondents disagreed to adding only friends whom they belong to same circle on Instagram, 31.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed, 26.6% of the respondents are undecided while only 9.4% of the total respondents agreed to only adding friends with whom they belong to same circle on Instagram.

Table 17: I am guided successfully by what other Instagram users say

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	44	11.5	11.5	11.5
Disagree	156	40.6	40.6	52.1
Undecided	153	39.8	39.8	91.9
Agree	31	8.1	8.1	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 17 presents that 40.6% of the respondents disagreed to being guided successfully by what other Instagram users say, 39.8% of the respondents are undecided while 11.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed. Only 8.1% of the total respondents agreed to being guided successfully by what other Instagram users say.

Table 18: I think it is best to follow what other Instagram users say

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	179	46.6	46.6	46.6
Disagree	114	29.7	29.7	76.3
Undecided	71	18.5	18.5	94.8
Agree	20	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 18 revealed that 46.6% of the respondents strongly disagreed that it is best to follow what other Instagram users say, 29.7% of the respondents disagreed, 18.5% were undecided while only 5.25 of the total respondents agreed that it is best to follow what other Instagram users say.

Table 19: I receive more help from other Instagram users compared with providing help

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	92	24.0	24.0	24.0
Disagree	139	36.2	36.2	60.2
Undecided	86	22.4	22.4	82.6
Agree	47	12.2	12.2	94.8

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	20	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

In Table 19, 36.2% of the respondents disagreed to receiving more help from other Instagram users than providing help, 24.0% of the respondents strongly disagreed, 22.4% of the respondents were undecided, while 12.2% of the respondents agreed and only 5.2% of the total respondents strongly agreed that they receive more help from other Instagram users than providing help.

Table 20: While surfing Instagram I lack decision

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	101	26.3	26.3	26.3
Disagree	171	44.5	44.5	70.8
Undecided	103	26.8	26.8	97.7
Agree	9	2.3	2.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 20 presents that 44.5% of the respondents disagreed to lacking decision while surfing Instagram, 26.8% of the respondents were undecided, 26.3% strongly disagreed while only 2.3% of the respondents agreed to lacking decision when surfing Instagram.

Table 21: I wait for other Instagram users' help rather than using my own judgment

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	165	43.0	43.0	43.0
Disagree	170	44.3	44.3	87.2
Undecided	40	10.4	10.4	97.7
Agree	9	2.3	2.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

In the Table 21, 44.3% of the respondents disagreed to waiting for other Instagram user's help rather than using their judgement, closely followed by 43.0% of the respondents who strongly disagreed. About 10% of the respondents were undecided, while only 2.3% of the respondents agreed to waiting for other Instagram users' help rather than using their own judgement.

Table 22: I am easily influenced by other Instagram users behavior

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	122	31.8	31.8	31.8
Disagree	158	41.1	41.1	72.9
Undecided	30	7.8	7.8	80.7
Agree	74	19.3	19.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 22 presents that 41.1% of the respondents disagreed to being easily influenced by other Instagram users' behavior. 31.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed, 7.8%

were undecided while only 19.3% of the respondents agreed to being easily influenced

by other Instagram users' behaviour.

Table 23: Do you post your 'real' pictures on your Instagram platform

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	338	88.0	88.0	88.0
No	46	12.0	12.0	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 23 revealed that 88.0% of the respondents post their 'real' pictures on Instagram

while only 12.0% of the respondents do not post their real pictures on Instagram.

Table 24: Do you post pictures of your friends on your Instagram platform

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	228	59.4	59.4	59.4
No	156	40.6	40.6	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

In Table 24, 59.4% of the respondents post the pictures of their friends on Instagram

while 40.6% of the respondents do not post their friends pictures on Instagram.

Table 25: Do you post pictures of your family members on your Instagram

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	194	50.5	50.5	50.5
No	190	49.5	49.5	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 25 presents that only 50.5% of the respondents post the pictures of their -family members on Instagram, closely followed by 49.5% of the respondents who do not post the pictures of their family members on Instagram.

Table 26: With my friends we praise each other for doing things well on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	272	70.8	74.7	74.7
Disagree	31	8.1	8.5	83.2
Undecided	26	6.8	7.1	90.4
Agree	35	9.1	9.6	100.0
Total	364	94.8	100.0	
Missing System	20	5.2		
Total	384	100.0		

In Table 26, 70.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed to sharing praise with friends when they do things well. 8.1% of the respondents disagreed while 6.8% of the respondents were not sure and only 9.1% of the respondents agreed to sharing praise with friends when they do things well.

Table 27: After I make mistakes my friends encourage me on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	244	63.5	63.5	63.5
Disagree	59	15.4	15.4	78.9
Undecided	61	15.9	15.9	94.8
Strongly Agree	20	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

The Table 27 shows that 63.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed that their friends encourage them whenever they make mistake on SNS. While 15.4% of the respondents disagreed and 15.9% are undecided, only 5.2% of the respondents agreed that their friends encourage them after making mistakes.

Table 28: We can talk about anything with my friends on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	217	56.5	56.5	56.5
Disagree	42	10.9	10.9	67.4
Undecided	81	21.1	21.1	88.5
Strongly Agree	44	11.5	11.5	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

In Table 28, 56.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they talk about anything with their friends, 10.9% of the respondents disagreed, 21.1% of the respondents were undecided and only 11.5% of the respondents agreed that they can talk about anything with their friends.

Table 29: My friend looks out for me on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	272	70.8	70.8	70.8
Disagree	30	7.8	7.8	78.6
Undecided	31	8.1	8.1	86.7
Strongly Agree	51	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

The Table 29 shows that 70.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed that their friends look out for them when they don't post on SNS for a while, 13.3% of the respondents agreed, 8.1% of the respondents were undecided and only 7,8% of the respondents disagreed.

Table 30: With my friends we tell each other secrets on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	243	63.3	66.8	66.8
Disagree	67	17.4	18.4	85.2
Undecided	39	10.2	10.7	95.9
Agree	15	3.9	4.1	100.0
Strongly Agree	20	5.2		
Total	384	100.0		

In Table 30, 63.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they discuss their secrets while with friends, 17.4% of the respondents also disagreed, 10.2% of the respondents

were undecided, 5.2% strongly agreed while only 3.85% of the respondents agreed that they discuss their secrets while with friends.

Table 31: With my friends we have common interests on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	238	62.0	62.0	62.0
Disagree	106	27.6	27.6	89.6
Undecided	16	4.2	4.2	93.8
Strongly Agree	24	6.3	6.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

According to the Table 31, 62.05 of the respondents strongly disagreed to having common interest with their friends, 27.6% disagreed, 4.2% were undecided and only 6.3% of the respondents agreed to having common interest with their friends.

Table 32: With my friends we do similar things on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	241	62.8	62.8	62.8
Disagree	118	30.7	30.7	93.5
Undecided	16	4.2	4.2	97.7
Strongly Agree	9	2.3	2.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 32 presents that 62.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they do similar things with their friends, 30.7% of the respondents disagreed, 4.2% were undecided while only 2.3% strongly agreed that they do similar things with their friends.

Table 33: With my friends we have the same values on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	171	44.5	44.5	44.5
Disagree	98	25.5	25.5	70.1
Undecided	115	29.9	29.9	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 33 shows that 44.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they have same values with their friends, 25.5% of the respondents' disagreed and 29.9% of the respondents were undecided.

Table 34: With my friends we think the same way on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	139	36.2	37.8	37.8
Disagree	126	32.8	34.2	72.0
Undecided	103	26.8	28.0	100.0
Agreed	16	4.2		
Total	384	100.0		

Table 34 revealed that 36.2% of the total respondents strongly disagreed that they think the same way with their friends, 32.8% disagreed, 26.8% were undecided and only 4.2% of the respondents agreed that they think the same way with their friends.

Table 35: With my friends we do fun things on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	262	68.2	68.2	68.2
Undecided	52	13.5	13.5	81.8
Strongly Agree	70	18.2	18.2	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 35 present 68.2% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they do fun things with their friends, 13.5% were undecided and only 18.2% of the respondents agreed that they do fun things with their friends.

Table 36: With my friends we play well together

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Strongly Disagree	325	84.6	84.9	84.9
	Undecided	35	9.1	9.1	94.0
	Strongly Agree	23	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	383	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		384	100.0		

Table 36 revealed that 84.6% of the respondents strongly disagreed to playing well together with their friends, 9.1% of the respondents were undecided and only 6.0% of the respondents strongly agreed to playing well together with their friends.

Table 37: With my friends, we spend time together on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	310	80.7	80.7	80.7
Disagree	45	11.7	11.7	92.4
Strongly Agree	29	7.6	7.6	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 37 presents that 80.7% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they spend time together with their friends, 11.7% disagreed and only 7.6% of the respondents agreed that they spend time together with their friends.

Table 38: With my friends we make up easily when we have a fight on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	282	73.4	73.4	73.4
Disagree	36	9.4	9.4	82.8
Undecided	66	17.2	17.2	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 38 revealed that 73.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they make up easily with their friends whenever they have a fight, 9.4% of the respondents disagreed and 17.2% of the respondents were undecided.

Table 39: With my friends we try to work things out when we disagree

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	313	81.5	81.5	81.5
Disagree	20	5.2	5.2	86.7
Strongly Agree	51	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 39 presents that 81.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed that the work things out with their friends whenever they disagree, 13.2% of the respondents strongly agree and only 5.2% of the respondents disagreed.

Table 40: With my friends after an argument talk about a solution on SNS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	291	75.8	75.8	75.8
Disagree	16	4.2	4.2	79.9
Undecided	77	20.1	20.1	100.0
Total	384	100.0	100.0	

Table 40 presents that 75.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they talk about a solution after an argument with their friends, 20.1% were undecided and 4.2% of the respondents disagreed.

4.2 Inferential Statistics

In this study, inferential statistics such as regression and chi-square will be used to make judgments from the data gathered with regard to the study objectives.

Table 41: Model Summary of how the frequency of Instagram usage influence online friendship quality

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.384[a]	.147	.143	.41291

a. Predictors: (Constant), Instagram Use

Table 42: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.226	2	5.613	32.922	.000[b]
	Residual	64.960	381	.170		
	Total	76.186	383			

a. Dependent Variable: Friendship Quality
b. Predictors: (Constant), Instagram Use

Table 43: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.547	.057		27.233	.000
	Instagram Use	-.038	.007	-.282	-5.748	.000
	Instagram Use	.088	.013	.345	7.037	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Friendship Quality

Table 41 presented the result of the simple regression analysis on the frequency of Instagram usage's influence on online friendship quality with Instagram usage being the independent variable and online friendship quality as the dependent variable. The tables showed that the frequency of Instagram usage predicts a 14.7% variation to the

online friendship quality of respondents. The study, therefore, revealed that the frequency of Instagram usage has a significant influence on the friendship quality of the respondents (P=.000).

Table 44: Model Summary of how the frequency of Instagram use predict the self-identity of its users

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.283[a]	.080	.075	.48385

a. Predictors: (Constant), Instagram Use

Table 45: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.746	2	3.873	16.544	.000[b]
	Residual	89.197	381	.234		
	Total	96.943	383			

a. Dependent Variable: Self-Identity
b. Predictors: (Constant), Instagram Use

Table 46: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.757	.067		26.404	.000
	Instagram Use	-.038	.008	-.254	-4.988	.000
	Instagram Use	.060	.015	.208	4.076	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Self-Identity

Table 44 presented the result of the regression analysis on the extent to which frequency of Instagram use predicts the self-identity of the respondents, with Instagram, use being the independent variable and self-identity as the dependent variable. The tables showed that frequency of Instagram use predicts an 8.0% variation on self-identity of the respondents who are Instagram users. The study, therefore, revealed that frequency of Instagram use has a significant prediction on the self-identity of the respondents (P=.000).

Table 47: Model Summary of how the frequency of Instagram use's influence increased online friendship

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.237[a]	.056	.051	.70632

a. Predictors: (Constant), Instagram Use

Table 48: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.264	2	5.632	11.289	.000[b]
	Residual	190.077	381	.499		
	Total	201.341	383			

a. Dependent Variable: Online Friendship
b. Predictors: (Constant), Instagram Use

Table 49: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.799	.097		18.523	.000

Instagram Use	.045	.021		.108	2.096	.037
Instagram Use	.040	.011		.184	3.563	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Online Friendship

Table 47 presented the result of the simple linear regression analysis on frequency of Instagram use influence on online friendship, with Instagram use being the independent variable and online friendship as the dependent variable. The tables revealed that the frequency of Instagram usage predicts a 5.6% variation of influence on the online friendship of respondents. The study, therefore, revealed that frequency of Instagram use has significant influence on the online friendship of the respondents (P=.000).

Table 50: Correlations on self-identity and friendship quality

		Self-Identity	Friendship Quality
Self-Identity	Pearson Correlation	1	.181[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	384	384
Friendship Quality	Pearson Correlation	.181[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	384	384

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 50 presents the correlation analysis of the relationship between self-identity and friendship quality. The result of the analysis revealed that the two variables (self-

identity and friendship quality) are positively correlated and significant (r= .181, p= .000). This implies that increased self-identity leads to an increase in friendship quality.

Table 51: Correlations between Friendship quality and online friendship

		Friendship Quality	Online Friendship
Friendship Quality	Pearson Correlation	1	.422**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	384	384
Online Friendship	Pearson Correlation	.422**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	384	384

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 51 presents the correlation analysis of the relationship between friendship quality and online friendship. The result of the analysis revealed that the two variables (friendship quality and online friendship) are positively correlated and significant (r= .422, p= .000). This implies that the increase in friendship quality leads to an increase in friendship quality.

Table 52: Chi-Square Tests on the association between Instagram use and increased friendship quality

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1062.755[a]	70	.000
Likelihood Ratio	955.299	70	.000

Linear-by-Linear Association	28.113	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	384		

a. 60 cells (66.7%) have an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is .94.

In Table 52, the Chi-square test was used to analyze the association between Instagram use and increased friendship quality. The results of the analysis showed that there is a significant association between Instagram use and increased friendship quality ($X^2 =$ 1062.755, P = .000). This result implies that Instagram use is not independent of friendship quality, therefore, Instagram use is significantly associated with increased friendship quality.

Table 53: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.092[a]	.008	.006	4.21915

a. Predictors: (Constant), Friendship Quality

Table 54: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	57.954	1	57.954	3.256	.072[b]
	Residual	6800.085	382	17.801		
	Total	6858.039	383			

a. Dependent Variable: Instagram Use
b. Predictors: (Constant), Friendship Quality

Table 55: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14.194	.909		15.623	.000
	Friendship Quality	-.056	.031	-.092	-1.804	.072

a. Dependent Variable: Instagram Use

The linear regression conducted on Instagram use and friendship quality revealed that

0.8% coefficient of variation i.e. influence exists between the two variables and the

result is statistically significant with a sig. of .000.

Table 56: Chi-Square Tests on the frequency of Instagram use is significantly associated with self-identity

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	766.960[a]	50	.000
Likelihood Ratio	778.029	50	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.592	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	384		

a. 32 cells (48.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .94.

In Table 53, the Chi-square test was used to analyse the association between frequency

of Instagram use and self-identity. The results of analysis showed that there is a

significant association between the two variables of Instagram use and self-identity

($X^2 = 766.960$, P = .000). Therefore, Instagram use is significantly associated with self-

identity.

Table 57: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.115[a]	.013	.011	4.20890

a. Predictors: (Constant), Self Identity

Table 58: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	90.964	1	90.964	5.135	.024[b]
	Residual	6767.075	382	17.715		
	Total	6858.039	383			

a. Dependent Variable: Instagram Use
b. Predictors: (Constant), Self Identity

Table 59: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14.242	.755		18.864	.000
	Self Identity	-.130	.058	-.115	-2.266	.024

a. Dependent Variable: Instagram Use

The linear regression conducted on Instagram use and self-identity revealed that 1.3%
coefficient of variation i.e. influence exists between the two variables and the result is
statistically significant.

Table 60: Chi-Square Tests on Frequency of Instagram use is significantly associated with increased online friendship.

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	925.933[a]	60	.000
Likelihood Ratio	772.677	60	.000

Linear-by-Linear Association	9.380	1		.002
N of Valid Cases	384			

a. 50 cells (64.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .94.

Table 54 presents the chi-square analysis on the association between frequency of Instagram use and increased online friendship. The results of analysis showed that there is a significant association between the two variables of Instagram use and online friendship ($X^2 = 925.933$, P = .000). Therefore, this implies that Instagram use is significantly associated with increased online friendship.

Table 61: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.250[a]	.062	.060	4.10267

a. Predictors: (Constant), Online friendship

Table 62: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	428.248	1	428.248	25.443	.000[b]
	Residual	6429.791	382	16.832		
	Total	6858.039	383			

a. Dependent Variable: Instagram Use
b. Predictors: (Constant), Online friendship

Table 63: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	9.375	.673		13.930	.000
	Online friendship	.243	.048	.250	5.044	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Instagram Use

The linear regression conducted on Instagram use and online friendship revealed that 6.2% coefficient of variation i.e. influence exists between the two variables and the result is statistically significant.

Table 64: Chi-Square Tests on association between self-identity and increased friendship quality

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2476.199[a]	140	.000
Likelihood Ratio	1334.292	140	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.563	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	384		

a. 149 cells (90.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .21.

In table 55, the Chi-square test was used to analyse the association between self-identity and increased friendship quality. The results of analysis showed that there is a significant association between the two variables of self-identity and friendship quality (X^2 = 2476.199, P = .000). Therefore, the result implies that self-identity is significantly associated with increased friendship quality.

Table 65: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.147[a]	.022	.019	3.70018

a. Predictors: (Constant), Friendship Quality

Table 66: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	115.871	1	115.871	8.463	.004[b]
	Residual	5230.088	382	13.691		
	Total	5345.958	383			

a. Dependent Variable: Self Identity
b. Predictors: (Constant), Friendship Quality

Table 67: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14.825	.797		18.606	.000
	Friendship Quality	-.079	.027	-.147	-2.909	.004

a. Dependent Variable: Self Identity

The linear regression conducted on Friendship quality and self-identity revealed that 2.2% coefficient of variation i.e. influence exists between the two variables and the result is statistically significant with a sig. of .000.

Table 68: Inter Correlation analysis of variables

		Friendship Quality	Online Friendship	Instagram Use	Self-Identity
Friendship Quality	Pearson Correlation	1	.422[**]	-.109[*]	.181[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000

	N	384	384	384	384
Online Friendship	Pearson Correlation	.422**	1	.231**	.477**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	384	384	384	384
Instagram Use	Pearson Correlation	.109*	.231**	1	.148**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	384	384	384	384
Self-Identity	Pearson Correlation	.181**	.477**	.148**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	384	384	384	384

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 56 presents the correlation analysis between all variables of the study which are friendship quality, online friendship, Instagram use and self-identity. The analysis revealed that all variables are positively correlated and significant which implies that increase in one variable leads to increase in the other.

4.3 Findings

This part of the research provides the findings derived from the research. This will help in understanding the interpretations of the research.

Research Question One: How is the frequency of Instagram usage's influence on online friendship quality?

When users were asked about the influence of Instagram on online friendship quality, the points discussed below are pertinent to friendship quality online, the study revealed that the majority of the respondents use their real name on their Instagram accounts, a

89

significant number of the respondents revealed that they have over 500 friends on Instagram. The majority of the respondents claimed that they spend 10 to 30 minutes per day on Instagram, a sizeable portion of the respondents claimed that they spend over 3 hours per day online. The study, therefore, revealed that the frequency of Instagram usage has a significant influence on the friendship quality of the respondents.

Research Question Two: How will the frequency of Instagram use predict the self-identity of its users?

The examination observationally researched the recommendation that Instagram is to be sure used for the introduction of idealized online selves, the idea of which seems, by all accounts, to be a focal determinant in by and large informal organization usage. Instagram clients are reliably presented to the introduction of idealized selves. As explained, Instagram users don't self-present in an aggregate manner; all things considered, their self-presentations shift across attributes and people. In this manner, singular contrasts give off an impression of being of principal significance in self-identity on the web, the investigation uncovered that recurrence of Instagram use has a huge influence on the self-personality of the respondents.

Research Question Three: How is the frequency of Instagram use's influence increased online friendship?

Given the exhaustive joining of online media into the lives of most teenagers, it is nothing unexpected that these destinations assume a significant part in the foundation of companionships and the regularly to and fro of friend connections. Instagram has become a basic stage for making and keeping in contact with companions. Given this, and the recurrence with which numerous teenagers utilize web-based media, it isn't

amazing that teen users of Instagram report that the platform causes them to feel better associated with their companions' emotions and to data about what is happening in their companions' lives. Instagram-utilizing adolescents state and thereby makes them more associated with data about what's going on in their companions' lives, the investigation along the lines of Manovich Theory / Social Identity Theory /Communication Theory of Identity uncovered that the recurrence of Instagram use has a huge effect on the online companionship of the respondents.

Research Question Four: How online self-identity enhance increased friendship quality?

Instagram can have a positive effect on forlornness, closeness, and relationship support during youth. In any case, youths additionally experience social issues. Social Networking Sites, especially Instagram, may have both a positive and a negative effect on the state of mind indications and other mental issues. Instagram may assume a part in personality arrangement by permitting more youthful clients to try different things with various practices and interactional styles. The aftereffect of the examination suggests that self-character is essentially connected with expanded companionship quality.

Research Question Five: How increased online friendship intensity increased friendship quality?

Instagram is regularly utilized both to stay in contact with existing companions and to grow new kinships. Long-range informal communication destinations, thusly, separate themselves from other relational Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) applications, for example, email, or Instant Messaging. The two of which are transcendently used to either speak with obscure individuals or to keep up associations

with one's current companions. Accordingly, Instagram gives a decent occasion to research and analyze both the recurrence and nature of various sorts of kinships. One of the critical highlights of friendships is its quality. The nature of fellowships alludes to the accomplished closeness, trust, and comprehension between companions. A few examinations have explored and analyzed the nature of online versus disconnected kinships. These examinations have reliably exhibited that online companionships are seen to be lower in quality than disconnected fellowships. Moreover, even though the nature of both on the web and disconnected companionships expanded over the long haul, the nature of online fellowships improved altogether more than disconnected connections. In particular, they found when online kinships went on for over a year, their quality got equivalent to disconnected fellowships. This is in support of the Manovich Theory, social Identity Theory and Communication Theory of Identity.

Research Question Six: Increased online friendship mediates the relationship between frequency of Instagram and increased friendship quality.

The study discovered that online companionship is a mediator between the recurrence of Instagram and expanded friendship quality. Constant talking both for all intents and purposes and truly reinforces the relationship set up. The relationship could likewise endure if the offer comparable interest and experience. It takes into account individuals to make new companions stay in contact with old companions and places into thought the desire for individuals.

Hypotheses:

1. Frequency of Instagram use is significantly associated with increased friendship quality.

This hypothesis was supported by the results which indicates that there is a significant relationship between the variables of Instagram use and online friendship. The linear regression conducted on Instagram use and friendship quality revealed that 6.2% coefficient of variation i.e. influence exists between the two variables and the result is statistically significant.

2. Frequency of Instagram use is significantly associated with self-identity.

Like the first hypothesis, this hypothesis was also supported by the results. The linear regression conducted for both Instagram use and self-identity revealed that 2.2% coefficient of variation i.e. influence exists between the two variables and the result is statistically significant with a sig. of .000. Therefore, there is significant relationship between Instagram use and self-identity.

3. Frequency of Instagram use is significantly associated with increased online friendship.

As predicted, frequency of Instagram use is associated with increased online friendship. The analysis revealed that the frequency of Instagram usage predicts a 5.6% variation of influence on the online friendship of respondents. Thus, frequency of Instagram use has significant influence on the online friendship of the respondents (P=.000).

4. Self-identity is significantly associated with increased friendship quality.

The linear regression conducted on friendship quality and self-identity revealed that 2.2% coefficient of variation i.e. influence exists between the two variables and the result is statistically significant with a sig. of .000. Thus, the hypothesis is supported.

5. Increased online friendship is significantly associated with increased friendship quality?

As the results show, the hypothesis that increased online friendship is significantly associated with increased friendship quality was supported. The result of the analysis revealed that the two variables (friendship quality and online friendship) are positively correlated and significant (r= .422, p= .000). This indicates that the increase in friendship quality leads to an increase in friendship quality.

5. (a) self-identity online and (b) increased online friendship is a mediator between frequency of Instagram and increased friendship quality.

In the last hypotheses, it was expected that increased online friendship would be significantly associated with increased friendship quality. After testing, the result of the analysis revealed that that the two variables (friendship quality and online friendship) are positively correlated and significant.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

This section discusses three major conclusive points. First, it summarizes the whole study. Secondly, it concludes 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 attempts to explore the influence of Instagram use on self-identity and making of friends through a survey conducted among young males and females active Instagram users in Nigeria. The study aimed to find out: 'Instagram usage's influence on online friendship quality; the influence of Instagram use on self-identity; the relationship between frequency of Instagram and increased friendship quality between Nigerians who are living in North Cyprus between 1st December 2020 until 23rd January 2021.

5.2 Conclusions Drawn from the Study

The research sets out to investigate the following research questions.

Following the two speculations embraced in the investigation, Social Identity Theory and Manovich Theory, we found that there are exact confirmations gotten from this examination that supports the central articulations of this hypothesis. One of the central suppositions\ of Social Identity Theory is that when individuals make personality through the acknowledgment, they stress and discussion about what they have made

and this is significant because in this investigation. Taking into account that the Social personality hypothesis sets that making character empowers people to pick up self-acknowledgment, we infer that this modest number of respondents make this personality to pick up self-acknowledgment.

5.2.1 Conclusion of Inter-Variable Correlation

The investigation found that the three factors of friendship quality, online friendship, Instagram use, and self-identity are connected. Instagram permits clients to make individual profiles, and offer occasions to get an introduction to data about others' lives. As a photograph and video-sharing social networking site, Instagram offers a plentiful open door for self-introduction that may build watchers' social examination. Additionally, it isn't unexpected to keep public profiles on Instagram, which empowers users to follow, view, as, and remark on individuals they don't know specifically, including influencers and famous people.

5.3 Highlight of the Study

The study discovered that majority of the respondents use SNS very often (53.6%), while 37.0% of the total respondents use Instagram often and only 9.4% of the respondents visit SNS sometimes. The majority of the respondents use their real name on their Instagram accounts (66.7%) while only 33.3% of the total respondents do not use their real name.

Table 42 presented the result of the simple regression analysis on the frequency of Instagram usage's influence on online friendship quality with Instagram usage being the independent variable and online friendship quality as the dependent variable. The tables showed that the frequency of Instagram usage predicts a 14.7% variation in the online friendship quality of respondents. The study, therefore, revealed that the

frequency of Instagram usage has a significant influence on the friendship quality of the respondents (P=.000).

The tables showed that the frequency of Instagram use predicts an 8.0% variation on self-identity of the respondents who are Instagram users. The study, therefore, revealed that the frequency of Instagram use has a significant prediction on the self-identity of the respondents (P=.000). The tables revealed that the frequency of Instagram usage predicts a 5.6% variation of influence on the online friendship of respondents. The study, therefore, revealed that the frequency of Instagram use has a significant influence on the online friendship of the respondents (P=.000).

The study used a correlation analysis on the relationship between self-identity and friendship quality. The result of the analysis revealed that the two variables (self-identity and friendship quality) are positively correlated and significant (r= .181, p= .000). This implies that increased self-identity leads to an increase in friendship quality. Also finding support the postulations of the Manovich Theory, Social Identity Theory, Communication Theory of Identity.

The results of the analysis showed that there is a significant association between Instagram use and increased friendship quality (X2 = 1062.755, P = .000). This result implies that Instagram use is not independent of friendship quality, therefore, Instagram use is significantly associated with increased friendship quality.

5.4 Recommendations for Further Research

Findings in this research indicate that, inside and out meeting appears to be appropriate to an extremely enormous degree notwithstanding that reaction negates the notion of this examination, the greater part of youthful grown-ups participate in making a

counterfeit character, consequently, future investigations should direct the same examination with a little example and along these lines lead top to bottom meeting with respondents. What's more, the utilization of hashtags can additionally drive reach, given that all photographs with the hashtag are accessible, making them more available to a bigger measure of individuals. This area is also recommended for further exploration.

REFERENCES

Ahlquist, D. A. (2015). Multi-target stool DNA test: a new high bar for non-invasive screening. *Digestive diseases and sciences*, *60*(3), 623-633.

Ahlquist, S. (2015). The Storyline approach: promoting learning through cooperation in the second language classroom. *Education 3-13*, *43*(1), 40-54.

Akdeniz, Ü. (2018). *Creating Fake Identity and Pseudo Accounts on Social Media Among University Students in North Cyprus* (Master's thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University).

Alruwaili, T. O. (2017). Self-identity and community through social media: The experience of Saudi female international college students in the United States.

Alter, A. (2017). *Irresistible: The Rise of Addictive Technology and the Business of Keeping Us Hooked.* Taiwan: Penguin Books: Taipei.

Alves, H., Fernandes, C., & Raposo, M. (2016). Social Media Social Networking Sites Marketing: A Literature Review and Implications. Psychology & Marketing, 33(12), 1029–1038.

Babbie, E. (2010). The practice of social research (12th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Babbie, E. R. (2020). *The practice of social research*. Cengage learning.

Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2012). Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferment, and Future (Sixth ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cenage Learning. (Horowitz, 2012).

Barbie, D. A. (2010). Functional genomics and cancer drug target discovery. *Current opinion in molecular therapeutics*, *12*(3), 284-293.

Bates, R. H., Greif, A., Levi, M., Rosenthal, J. L., & Weingast, B. R. (2020). *Analytic narratives*. Princeton University Press.

Batra, S., Sullivan, J., Williams, B. R., & Geldmacher, D. S. (2016). Qualitative assessment of self-identity in people with advanced dementia. Dementia, 15(5), 60-78.

Belanger, H. G. (2010). Neuropsychological performance following a history of multiple self-reported concussions: a meta-analysis. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society: JINS*, *16*(2), 262.

Bhat, A. (2019). Research Design: Definition, Characteristics, and Types. Retrieved from: http://www.questionpro.com/blog/research-design/amp/ on December 26th, 2020

Bouwman, T. E., Aartsen, M. J., van Tilburg, T. G., & Stevens, N. L. (2017). Does stimulating various coping strategies alleviate loneliness? Results from an

online friendship enrichment program. *Journal of social and personal relationships*, *34*(6), 793-811.

Broberg, B. (2017). Users' behavior on Facebook: A study of narcissistic and voyeuristic tendencies. Unpublished research work. Halmstad University, Sweden

Buckingham, D. (2008). *Introducing identity*. MacArthur Foundation Digital Media and Learning Initiative.

Bullingham, L., & Vasconcelos, A. C. (2013). 'The presentation of self in the online world': Goffman and the study of online identities. *Journal of Information Science*, 39(1), 101-112.

Candrasari, Y. (2016). Social Media and Social Change: self identity construction and self presentation in cybersociety. In *Proceeding Internasional Seminar Research Month: Innovation, Development, and Utiltion of Research and Communicaty Service. LPPM UPN Veteran Jatim* (pp. 673-682).

Carter, M., & Grover, V. (2015). Me, myself, and I(T): Conceptualizing information technology. MIS Quarterly, 39(4), 931–957.

Casalo, L. & Sanchez, S. (2020). Influencers on Instagram: Antecedents and Consequences of opinion leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 117, 510-519

Castells, M. (2004). *The network society A cross-cultural perspective*. Edward Elgar.

Catania, J., Coates, T., & Kegeles, S. (1989). Predictors of condom use and multiple

    partnered   sex among sexually active adolescent women: Implications for

    AIDS-related health   interventions. Journal of Sex Research, 26, 514-524.

Chen, Z. T. (2018). Poetic prosumption of animation, comic, game and novel in a post-

    socialist China: A case of a popular video-sharing social media Bilibili as

    heterotopia. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 1469540518787574.

Chua, T. H., & Chang, L. (2016). Follow me and like my beautiful selfies: Singapore

    teenage   girls' engagement in self-presentation and peer comparison on

    social media.

Cohen, R., Newton-John, T., & Slater, A. (2017). The relationship between Facebook

    and Instagram appearance-focused activities and body image concerns in

    young women. *Body image*, *23*, 183-187.

Colliander, J., & Dahlen, M. (2011). Following the fashionable friend: The power of

    social   media. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 51(1), 313-320.

Correa, T., Hinsleyl, A. W., & Zúñiga, H. G. (2010). Who interacts on the Web?: The

    intersection of users' personality and social mediaSocial Networking Sites use.

    Computers in Human Behavior,   26, 247–253.

Cortese, S., Adamo, N., Del Giovane, C., Mohr-Jensen, C., Hayes, A. J., Carucci, S., & Cipriani, A. (2018). Comparative efficacy and tolerability of medications for attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder in children, adolescents, and adults: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, *5*(9), 727-738.

Courbet, D., & Fourquet-Courbet, M., (2014) When a celebrity dies …Social identity, uses of social media, and the mourning process among fans: the case of Michael Jackson, Celebrity Studies,5:3, 275-290,

Dahlgren, P., & Olsson, T. (2007). From public sphere to civic culture: Young citizens' internet use. In *Media and public spheres* (pp. 198-209). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Davis, C., Deil-Amen, R., Aguilar, C., & Canche, M., (2014). Social MediaSocial Networking Sites, Higher Education, and Community Colleges: A Research Synthesis and Implications for the Study of Two-Year Institutions. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*. 39. 409-422.

Davis, C., Deil-Amen, R., Aguilar, C., & Canche, M., (2014). Social Networking Sites, Higher Education, and Community Colleges: A Research Synthesis and Implications for the Study of Two-Year Institutions. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*. 39. 409-422.

Davis, C., Deil-Amen, R., Aguilar, C., & Canche, M., (2014). Social Networking Sites, Higher Education, and Community Colleges: A Research

Synthesis and Implications for the Study of Two-Year Institutions. *Community College Journal of   Research and Practice*. 39. 409-422.

Delvoye, M., & Tasker, F. (2016). Narrating self-identity in bisexual motherhood. Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 12, 5-23.

Dencker, A., Taft, C., Bergqvist, L., Lilja, H., & Berg, M. (2010). Childbirth experience   questionnaire (CEQ): development and evaluation of a multidimensional instrument. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 10(81), 1-8. Doi:10.1186/1471-2393-10-81.

Duguay, S. (2019). "There's no one new around you": Queer Women's Experiences of Scarcity in Geospatial Partner-Seeking on Tinder. In *The Geographies of Digital Sexuality* (pp. 93-114). Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore.

Easton, S. D., Leone-Sheehan, D. M., & O'Leary, P. J. (2016). 'I Will Never Know the Person   Who I Could Have Become': Perceived Changes in Self-Identity Among Adult Survivors of Clergy-Perpetrated Sexual Abuse. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1-24.

El Ouirdi, A., El Ouirdi, M., Segers, J., & Henderickx, E. (2015). Employees' use of social media technologies: a methodological and thematic review. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, *34*(5), 454-464.

Elwell, J. S. (2014). The transmediated self: Life between the digital and the analog. *Convergence*, *20*(2), 233-249.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis* (No. 7). WW Norton & company.

Erin, V., & Jason, R., Lindsay, R., & Katheryn, E., (2014). Social comparison, social media, Social Networking Sites, and self-esteem. Psychology of Popular Media Culture. 3. 206-222. 10.1037/ppm0000047.

Faulkner, S. L., & Hecht, M. L. (2011). The negotiation of closetable identities: A narrative analysis of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered queer Jewish identity1. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship*s, 28(6), 829–847.

Fehér, A. (2019). Callus, dedifferentiation, totipotency, somatic embryogenesis: what these terms mean in the era of molecular plant biology?. *Frontiers in plant science*, *10*, 536.

Froget, J. R. L., Baghestan, A. G., & Asfaranjan, Y. S. (2013). A uses and gratification perspective on social media usage and online marketing. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, *15*(1), 134-145.

Marson, S. M., & Powell, R. M. (2014). Goffman and the infantilization of elderly persons: A theory in development. *J. Soc. & Soc. Welfare*, *41*, 143.

Gonzales, A. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2011). Mirror, Mirror on My Facebook Wall: Effects of Exposure to Facebook on Self-Esteem. *Cyberpsychology Behavior and Social Networking,* 14(1-2), 79-83.

Granger, J. P., Alexander, B. T., Llinas, M. T., Bennett, W. A., & Khalil, R. A. (2001). Pathophysiology of hypertension during preeclampsia linking placental ischemia with endothelial dysfunction. *Hypertension*, *38*(3), 718-722.

Growiec, K., & Growiec, J. (2014). Trusting only whom you know, knowing only whom you trust: The joint impact of social capital and trust on happiness in CEE countries. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *15*(5), 1015-1040.

Hall, S. (1991). The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity. In A. D. King (Ed.), *Culture, Globalization and the World-System* (pp. 19–39). London: Macmillan.

Hanckel, B., Vivienne, S., Byron, P., Robards, B., & Churchill, B. (2019). 'That's not necessarily for them': LGBTIQ+ young people, social media platform affordances and identity curation. *Media, Culture & Society*, *41*(8), 1261-1278.

Haslam, A. S., Oakes, P. J., Turner, J. C., & McGarty, C. (1996). Social Identity, Self-Categorization, and the Perceived Homogeneity of Ingroups and Outgroups: The Interaction Between Social Motivation and Cognition. Handbook of Motivation and Cognition, 3, 182-222.

Hauben, M., & Hauben, R. (1998). Netizens: On the history and impact of Usenet and the Internet. *First Monday*.

Hecht, M. L. (1993). 2002—A research odyssey: Toward the development of a communication theory of identity. *Communications Monographs*, *60*(1), 76-82.

Hecht, M. L., & Choi, H. (2012). The communication theory of identity as a framework for health message design. In H. Cho (Ed.), *Health communication message design: Theory and practice*, (pp. 137-152). Los Angeles: SAGE

Highton-Williamson, E., Priebe, S., & Giacco, D. (2015). Online social networking in people with psychosis: a systematic review. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, *61*(1), 92-101.

Hoffman , N., & Schwartz, R. (2012, May 20). Visualizing Instagram: Tracing cultural visual   rhythms. Retrieved March 28, 2020, from http://razschwartz.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Instagram_ICWSM12.pdf

Hoffner, C., & Rehkoff, R. A. (2011). Young voters' responses to the 2004 U.S. Presidential election: Social identity, perceived media influence, and behavioral outcomes. Journal of Communication, 61(4), 732–757.

Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social Identity Theory and Self-categorization Theory: A Historical Review. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2(1), 204–222.

Horowitz, M. (2012). *States of mind: Analysis of change in psychotherapy*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Hu, C., Zhao, L., & Huang, J. (2015). Achieving self-congruency? Examining why individuals reconstruct their virtual identity in communities of interest established within social network platforms. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *50*, 465-475.

Huang, Y. T., & Su, S. F. (2018). Motives for Instagram use and topics of interest among young adults. *Future Internet*, *10*(8), 77.

Hutchinson, C., & Pang, K. (2018). An Application of the Communication Theory of Identity: Third Culture Kids. Pepperdine Journal of Communication Research, 6(5).

Instagram (2018). *Instagram*. Retrieved from Instagram: ttps://about.instagram.com/

Ismail, M. I. B., & Arshah, R. B. A. (2016). The impacts of social networking sites in higher learning. *International Journal of Software Engineering and Computer Systems*, *2*(1), 114-119.

Jackson, N. (2011, 7 11). Infographic: Using social media Social Networking Sites to build brand loyalty. Retrieved 3 2020, from   The   Atlantic: http://www.google.com/amp/s/amp.theatlantic.com/amp/article/241701/

Jacober, A. (2014). Church and the Unmaking of Violence in the Experience of Those with Disabilities. *Religious education Association*.

Jang, J. Y., Han, K., Shih, P. C., & Lee, D. (2015, April). Generation like: Comparative characteristics in instagram. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 4039-4042).

Jenkins, R. (2000). Categorization: Identity, social process and epistemology. *Current sociology*, *48*(3), 7-25.

Jiang, L. C., Bazarova, N. N., & Hancock, J. T. (2011). The disclosure–intimacy link in computer-mediated communication: An attributional extension of the hyperpersonal model. *Human communication research*, *37*(1), 58-77.

Jung, E., & Hecht, M. L. (2004). Elaborating the communication theory of identity: Identity gaps and communication outcomes. *Communication quarterly*, *52*(3), 265-283.

Kabidzic, S. (2013). Narcissism as a predictor of motivations behind Facebook profile picture selection. *Cyber psychology Behaviour Social Network.* 16 1 14-9.

Kaplan , A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media Social Networking Sites . *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59-68.

Kietzmann, J. H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I. P., & Silvestre, B. S. (2011). Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media. *Business horizons*, *54*(3), 241-251.

Kircaburun, K., Alhabash, S., Tosuntaş, Ş. B., & Griffiths, M. D. (2020). Uses and gratifications of problematic social media use among university students: A simultaneous examination of the Big Five of personality traits, social media platforms, and social media use motives. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, *18*(3), 525-547.

Komito, L. (2011). Social mediaSocial Networking Sites and migration: virtual community 2.0. *Journal of the American   Society of Information Science and Technology*, 62(6), 1075-1086.

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30(3), 607-610.

Lai & Fung, A. L. C. (2019). Adolescent reactive and proactive aggression, and bullying in Hong Kong: prevalence, psychosocial correlates, and prevention. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *64*(6), S65-S72.

Lalancette, M., & Raynauld, V. (2019). The power of political image: Justin Trudeau, Instagram, and celebrity politics. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *63*(7), 888-924.

Lantz, G., & Loeb, S. (1996). Country of origin and ethnocentrism: an analysis of Canadian and American preferences using social identity theory. *ACR North American Advances*.

Lee, M. Y., & Lim, W. (2019). Investigating patterns of pre-service teachers' written

feedback on procedure-based mathematics assessment items. *International

Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, *15*(1), em0561.

Leonardi, P. M., Huysman, M., & Steinfield, C. (2013). Enterprise Social Media Social

Networking Sites: Definition, History, and Prospects for the Study of Social

Technologies   in Organizations. *Journal of Computer-Mediated

Communication,* 19, 1-19.

Leung, D., Law , R., Hoof , H., & Buh, D. (2013). Social MediaSocial Networking

Sites In Tourism And Hospitality: A Literature Review. *Journal of Travel &

Tourism Marketing*, 30, 3-22.

Looy, J. (2003). Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown. *Game Studies*, *3*(2).

Lui, X. & LaRose, R. (2008). Does using the internet make people more satisfied with

their lives? The effects of the internet on college students' school life

satisfaction. CyberPsychology & Behavior, Vol 11(3), pp. 310–320.

Lunden, I. (2014, 1 21). Instagram is the fastest-growing social site globally, mobile

devices rule   over   PCs   for   access.   Retrieved   from   Techrunch:

http://techcrunch.com/2014/01/21/instagramis-the-fastest-growing-social-site-

globally-mobile-devices-rule-over-pcs

Lynch, M. and McConatha, D. (2006). Hyper-Symbolic Interactionism: Prelude to a

  Refurbished Theory of Symbolic Interaction or Just Old Wine? *Sociological*

  Viewpoints, 22, 87–96

Mackson, S. B., Brochu, P. M., & Schneider, B. (2019). Instagram: Friend or Foe? The

  App's Impact on Psychological Well-Being.

Mangold, W. G., & Faulds, D. J. (2009). Socialmedia:The new hybrid element of the

  promotion mix . *Business Horizons*, 52, 357–365.

Manovich, L. (2017). Instagram and contemporary image. *Nova Iorque: CUNY*.

Manovich, L. (2002). The language of new media. Massachusetts: MIT press.

McPartland, M. D. (2013). An analysis of Facebook "likes" and other nonverbal

  internet communication under the federal rules of evidence. *Iowa Law Review*,

  99(1), 445-470.

Mehdizadeh, S. (2010). Self-Presentation 2.0: Narcissism and Self-Esteem on

  Facebook. *Cyber psychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 13*, 357-

  364.

Meier , E. P., & Gray, J. (2014). Facebook photo activity associated with body image

  disturbance in adolescent girls. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social

  Networking, 17(4), 199-206.

Michikyan, M., Subrahmanyam, K., & Dennis, J. (2014). Can you tell who I am? Neuroticism, extraversion, and online self-presentation among young adults. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *33*, 179-183.

Nascimento, A. M. (2018). Counter-hegemonic linguistic ideologies and practices in Brazilian Indigenous rap. In *The Sociolinguistics of Hip-hop as Critical Conscience* (pp. 213-235). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Nesi, J., Choukas-Bradley, S., & Prinstein, M. J. (2018). Transformation of adolescent peer relations in the social media context: Part 1—A theoretical framework and application to dyadic peer relationships. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *21*(3), 267-294.

Ogidi, O. C.(2015). In vitro evaluation of antimicrobial efficacy of extracts obtained from raw and fermented wild macrofungus, Lenzites quercina. *International journal of microbiology*, *2015*.

Orbe, M. P. (2004). Negotiating Multiple Identities Within Multiple Frames: An Analysis of First- Generation College Students. *Communication Education*, 53(2), 131–149.

Orbe, M. P. (2004). Negotiating multiple identities within multiple frames: an analysis of first-generation college students. *Communication education*, *53*(2), 131-149.

Orsatti, J., & Riemer, K. (2015). Identity-making: A Multimodal Approach for Researching   Identity in Social Media Social Networking Sites. ECIS 2015 Completed Research Papers   (p. 140). Sydney: Association for Information Systems AIS Electronic Library (AISeL).

Perrin, A. (2015). Social MediaSocial Networking Sites Usage: 2005-2015 65% of adults now use social networking sites –a   nearly   tenfold   jump   in   the   past decade. Pew Research   Centre.

Phua, J., Jin, S. V., & Kim, J. J. (2017). Gratifications of using Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, or Snapchat to follow brands: The moderating effect of social comparison, trust, tie strength, and network homophily on brand identification, brand engagement, brand commitment, and membership intention. *Telematics and Informatics*, *34*(1), 412-424.

Pratt, M. G. (2003). Disentangling collective identities. In *Identity issues in groups*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Qin, L., (2019). Prediction of number of cases of 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) using social media search index. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(7), 2365.

Raacke, J., & Bonds-Raacke, J. (2008). MySpace and Facebook: Applying the uses and gratifications theory to exploring friend-networking sites. Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 11(2), 169–174.

Ray, S., Kim , S. S., & Morris, J. G. (2014). The central role of engagement in online communities. Information Systems Research, 25(3), 528–546.

Ryan, M. (2003). Narrative as Virtual Reality: Immersion and Interactivity in Literature and Electronic Media. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Salim, F., Rahardjo, W., Tanaya, T., & Qurani, R. (2017). Are self-presentation of instagram users influenced by friendship-contingent self-esteem and fear of missing out. *Makara Hubs Asia*, *21*, 70-82..

Salomon, D. (2013). Moving on from Facebook: Using Instagram to connect with undergraduates and engage in teaching and learning. *College & Research Libraries News*, *74*(8), 408-412.

Sanderson, J. & Cheong, P.H. (2010). Tweeting Prayers and Communicating Grief over Micheal Jackson Online. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 30(5), 328-340.

Sawahel, W. (2019). Nigerian student deaths in North Cyprus –What is going on?. Retrieved from www.universityworldnews.com/post-mobile.php?story=201908 141125418283 on February 3rd, 2021.

Setia, M. S. (2016). Methodology series module 5: Sampling strategies. *Indian journal of dermatology*, *61*(5), 505.Huang, Y.-T., & Su, S.-F. (2018). Motives for

115

Instagram Use and Topics of Interest among Young Adults. Future Internet, 10(77).

Setia, M. S. (2016). Methodology series module 5: Sampling strategies. *Indian journal of dermatology*, *61*(5), 505.

Shapiro, L. A. S., & Margolin, G. (2014). Growing up wired: Social networking sites and adolescent psychosocial development. *Clinical child and family psychology review*, *17*(1), 1-18.

Skinner, D., May, V., & Rollock, N. (2016). Self-identity and its discontents: Sociology in the 1990s. *Sociology*, *50*(6), 13-23.

Smith, A., & Anderson, M. (2018, March 1). Social MediaSocial Networking Sites Use in 2018. Retrieved March 31, 2020, from Pew Research Centre: www.pewresearch.org/internet/2018/03/01/social-media-use-in-2018

Solomon, Z. (2013). *Combat stress reaction: The enduring toll of war*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Spiro, E. S., Almquist, Z. W., & Butts, C. T. (2016). The persistence of division: Geography, institutions, and online friendship ties. *Socius*, *2*, 2378023116634340.

Sponcil, M., & Gitimu, P. (2013). Use of social media by college students: Relationship to communication and self-concept. *Journal of Technology Research*, *4*(1), 37-49.

Sponcil, M., & Gitimu, P. (2013). Use of social media by college students: Relationship to communication and self-concept. *Journal of Technology Research*, *4*(1), 37-49.

Stieglitz, S., & Linh, D.-X. (2013). Emotions and Information Diffusion in Social Media Social Networking Sites-Sentiment of Microblogs and Sharing Behavior. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 29(4), 217-247.

Storsul, T. (2014). Deliberation or Self-presentation? Young People, Politics and Social MediaSocial Networking Sites. *Nordicom Review* , 35(2), 17-28.

Štulhofer, A., Buško, V., & Brouillard, P. (2010). Development and bicultural validation of the new sexual satisfaction scale. Journal of sex research, 47(4), 257-268.

Stutzman, F. (2006). An evaluation of identity-sharing behavior in social network communities. *Journal of the International Digital Media and Arts Association*, *3*(1), 10-18.

Tajfel, H. (1979). Individuals and Groups in Social Psychology. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology,* 18, 183-1901.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tajfel, H. (1981). Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tang, Q., Gu, B., & Whinston, A. B. (2012). Content contribution for revenue sharing and reputation in social media Social Networking Sites: A dynamic structural model. *Journal of Management Information System,* 29(2), 41-76.

Tankovska, H. (2021). Number of monthly active Instagram users retrieved on 3rd February from   www.statista.com/statistics/253577/number-of-monthly-active-instagram-users/

Tazghini, S. & Siedlecki, K. (2013). A mixed approach to examining Facebook use and its   relationship to self-esteem. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*, 827-832.

Teenage Girls, Social Media Social Networking Sites, and Beauty. https://www.inte chopen.com/online-first/social-media-and-its-effects-on-beauty.

Thompson, J. (2009). *Performance affects: Applied theatre and the end of effect.* Springer.

Ting, H., Ming, W. W. P., de Run, E. C., & Choo, S. L. Y. (2015). Beliefs about the use of Instagram: An exploratory study. *International Journal of business and innovation*, *2*(2), 15-31.

Turkle, S. (2011). The tethered self: Technology reinvents intimacy and solitude. *Continuing higher education review*, *75*, 28-31.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tyer, S. (2016). Instagram: What Makes You Post? Pepperdine *Journal of Communication Research,* 4(14).

Veletsianos, G., & Stewart, B. (2016). Discreet openness: Scholars' selective and intentional self-disclosures online. *Social Media+ Society*, *2*(3), 2056305116664222.

Villaespesa, E., & Wowkowych, S. (2020). Ephemeral storytelling with social media: Snapchat and Instagram stories at the Brooklyn museum. *Social Media+ Society*, *6*(1), 2056305119898776.

Wang, S., Wu, L., & Lee, S. (2017). Role of dispositional aspects of self-identity in the process of planned behaviour of outbound travel. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 1-13.

Waterloo, S. F., Baumgartner, S. E., Peter, J., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2018). Norms of online expressions of emotion: Comparing Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and WhatsApp. *new media & society*, *20*(5), 1813-1831.

Whiting, A., & Williams, D. (2013). Why people use social media: a uses and gratifications approach. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*.

Wiederhold, B. K. (2020). Social media use during social distancing.

Wilcox, K. and Stephen, A.T. (2013). Are close friends the enemy? online social networks, self-   esteem and self-control. *Journal of Consumer Research, 40*, 1 90-103.

Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. K. (2011). Mass Media Research: An Introduction (International Edition). United Kingdom: Wadsworth Cengage Learning

Yılmaz, A., & Kocabalkanlı, E. (2021). The production of space through transmediated identity practices: Spatial self in Instagram at Mavibahçe shopping Centre in Izmir. *Convergence*, *27*(1), 189-211.

Yuki, M. (2003). Intergroup Comparison Versus Intragroup Relationships: A Cross-Cultural Examination of Social Identity Theory in North American and East Asian Cultural Contexts. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 66*(2), 166-183.

Zafarani, R., Abbasi, M. A., & Liu, H. (2014). Social Media Social Networking Sites Mining: An Introduction. Cambridge University Press.

Zhang, H., (2015). Gender, Personality, and Self Esteem as Predictors of Social Media Presentation.

Zhang, W. (2015). Discourse of resistance: Articulations of national cultural identity in media discourse on the 2008 Wenchuan earthquake in China. *Discourse & Communication*, *9*(3), 355-370.

Zhao , P., Yaobin , L., Bin , W., & Chau, P. Y. (2017). Who Do You Think You Are? Common and Differential Effects of Social Self-Identity on Social Media Social Networking Sites Usage. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 34(1), 71-101.

APPENDIX

Social Media Use, Identity and Friendship Questionnaire

Dear Respondent,

Thank you for accepting to participate in this very important research. This survey is titled "Social Media Identity: Exploring the effects of Instagram use on Self-Identity and Friendship Quality" we thank you sincerely for your help.

Section A

1.   Gender: (1) Male (2) Female
2. How old are you? (1) 18-22 (2) 23-27 (3) 28-32 (4) 33 or above
3. What is your marital status? (1) Single (2) Married (3) In a relationship
4. What is your level of education? (1) Middle school (2) High school (3) Undergraduate (4) Graduate
5. Do you have a social media account? (1) Yes (2) No
6. How many social media accounts do you have? (1) 1 (2) 2 (3) 3 (4) More than 3
7. How often do you check your social media accounts? (1) Very often (2) Often (3) Sometimes (4) Rarely (5) Not at all

Section B Instagram Usage
Frequency of Instagram Usage

8. How many Instagram accounts do you have? (1) 1 (2) 2 (3) 3 (4) More than 3
9. Do you use your real name on your Instagram account profile? (1) Yes (2) No
10. About how many total Instagram friends do you have
(1) 10 or less, (2) 11–50, (3) 51–100, (4) 101–150, (5) 151–200, (6) 201–250, (7) 251–300, (8) 301–400, (9) more than 400
11. In the past week, on average, approximately how many minutes per day have you spent on Instagram? (1) less than 10, (2) 10–30, (3) 31–60, (4) 1–2 hours, (5) 2–3 hours, (6) more than 3 hours.

Section C Online Friendship (Instagram)

12. On an average, how many people do you follow on Instagram?
(1) less than 500, (2) 501–1000, (3) 1001–1500, (4) 1501–2000, (5) 2001–2500, (6) 2501–3000, (7) 3001–3500, (8) 4000–4500, (9) more than 4500
13. On an average, how many people follow you on Instagram?
(1) less than 500, (2) 501–1000, (3) 1001–1500, (4) 1501–2000, (5) 2001–2500, (6) 2501–3000, (7) 3001–3500, (8) 4000–4500, (9) more than 4500

	Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
14	I add only people I know on Instagram					
15	I add only my intimate friends on Instagram					
16	I add only friends that we belong to the same circle on					

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	Instagram					
17	I add only my class mates on Instagram					

Section D Self Identity

Kindly CIRCLE (O) the answer that corresponds with your agreement to the following statements, where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, & 5 = Strongly Agree

	Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
18	I am guided successfully by what other Instagram users' say					
19	I think it is best to follow what other Instagram users' say					
20	I receive more help from other Instagram users compared with providing help					
21	While surfing Instagram, I lack decision					
22	I wait for other Instagram users' help rather than using my own judgment					
23	I am easily influenced by other Instagram users' behavior					

Section E Friendship Quality

24. Do you post your real pictures on your Instagram platform? (1) Yes (2) No

25. Do you post pictures of your friends on your Instagram platform? (1) Yes (2) No

26. Do you post pictures of your family members on your Instagram platform? (1) Yes (2) No

Kindly CIRCLE (O) the answer that corresponds with your agreement to the following statements, where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, & 5 = Strongly Agree

	With my friend/s we;	Not at all true	Not True	Undecided	True	Really True
27	Praise each other for doing things well.					
28	After I make mistakes, my friends encourage me					
29	Can talk about anything.					
30	Looks out for me					
31	Tell each other secrets.					
32	Have common interests					
33	Do similar things					

34	Have the same values.					
35	Think the same way.					
36	Do fun things					
37	Play well together.					
38	Spend time together.					
39	Make up easily when we have a fight					
40	Try to work things out when we disagree					
41	After an argument, talk about a solution					

Thank you