# Social Networking Sites in Education: Information Sharing Behavior of HEI Faculty in Pangasinan

**Noime Siborboro-Ines**
*Urdaneta City University, Philippines*
*Urdaneta City, Philippines*

*Abstract – This study sought to discover the information sharing behavior of the faculty members in the selected higher education institutions in Urdaneta City, Pangasinan. The data were analyzed using frequency and percentage, average weighted mean, chi-square, and thematic analysis. It was found out that majority of the respondents are dominated by millennials aged 18-38 years old, male in sex, working under the College of Education in public Higher Education Institution who open or visit Facebook accounts 1-3 times a day. Majority of the respondents were motivated by information retrieval through liking in the areas of education and instruction, news and current events, entertainment, health, and love and family. The study revealed that the age, type of higher education, course group, and frequency of social media usage affect the information sharing behavior of the respondents. Facebook is the most commonly used SNS as a tool for education and instruction. Also, the chatting feature, information sharing feature, and the page feature are the preferences of the respondents that can contribute to the collaboration of teachers. Nevertheless, ethics were the issues raised in the use of Social Networking Sites.*

*Keywords – Higher Education Institution, Information Sharing Behavior, Social Networking Sites*

## INTRODUCTION

The internet, coined by some as the new media, has taken a viable source of information and realm of social value in the past years. One of the gifts of technological advancement towards communication is the social media over the internet, commonly known as social networking sites that started in 1997 (Boyd and Elison, 2007; Schneider et al., 2006). SNS has become a major medium for communication and a vital part of everyday life (Chen and Lee, 2013; Roblyer et al., 2010). Defined by Boyd and Elison (2007), SNS is a web-based service that allows individuals to construct a public/semi-public profile within a bounded system, articulate a list of some with whom they share a connection, and view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the very same system.

Sociologically speaking along with education, Social Media played a vital role. Researches done by Mao (2014) and Hanson et al. (2011) stated that college students and teachers have become dependent on social media as a means of communication and that the current generation has been exposed to a technology-rich world making their social needs satisfied. The studies, however, did not include college and type of school that could draw a demarcation line in their information sharing behavior. Tess (2013), Roblyer et al. (2010) and Lockyer and Patterson (2008) said that students established positive contact through the integration of SNS in collaborative or team learning, with the goal of working towards particular final results, both in offline and online modes. Yang and Tsai (2010), Stevenson and Liu (2010), and Chen and Li (2008) added that SNS usage is to assist the students in their studies as well as in their language acquisition.

For instance, Gray et al. (2010) and O' Hanlon (2007) found that instructors using online technologies can encourage online discussion among students outside the classes, beyond the traditional class setting. Hence, students were more inclined to participate. Certainly, network has already reached college

classrooms and consumed by students and teachers (Won 2015; Roblyer et al., 2010; Mazer et al., 2007). It can be noted, however, that only the areas of education were tackled. Whether users like, post and/or share information to gain and give information were also not clarified.

Further studies also stated that SNS can create teamwork and that Facebook, one of SNS, could serve as the best supplemental and educational technology (Won, 2015). This was proven by Butler (2009), Kane and Fichman (2009), and Lockyer and Patterson (2008) who found that students at higher level of learning had functioned collaboratively through explorations on the online social atmosphere to resolve certain academic issues or issues with their peers. Facebook users like, share and/or post anything on Facebook. Psychologically speaking, users love Facebook because it taps the brain's pleasure center called nucleus accumbens that process rewarding feelings including social acceptance. The more positive feedback users get, the greater the reward (Seiter, 2016).

Another reason to consider why users continuously like, post and or share on Facebook is that in the real world, they lack self-esteem or that they just want to be someone who they cannot be in the cyberworld which can cause negative outcomes such as missing face-to-face socialization (Seiter, 2016; Caplan, 2005 as cited by Chen and Lee, 2013). This explains why individuals like, share and post on Facebook. It was mentioned that liking on Facebook is a way to a quick and easy nod, to affirm something about ourselves, to express virtual empathy, and because it is believed that liking can give something in return such as attracting attention, dissemination of information, receiving coupons and regular updates from companies they like (Seiter, 2016; Brandtzaeg, 2014). Also, receiving likes or comments from high-status friends results in a high self-esteem and feelings of well-being (Blease, 2015).

Posting makes people feel connected. It was found out by the researchers at the University of Arizona as stated by Gannon's (2013) article that students update their Facebook statuses when they are at a lower level of loneliness. She added that the act of writing a status update itself helps people feel more connected. When it comes to sharing, New York Times, cited by Seiter (2016), showed five major drivers on why people share and these are to support a cause, to nurture a relationship, to define their personality, for self-fulfillment, and merely for entertainment. These have been very useful to support the outcomes of the study specifically problem number two pertaining to the information sharing behavior of the respondents in Social Media in five areas.

In the Philippines, Social Media penetration increased from 40% to 47% from 2015-2016. Most of the Filipino users are from 20-29 years old (Castro, 2016). In 2017, this penetration has increased by 11% (Castro, 2017) and in 2018, it reached 63% highlighting Facebook as the most active social media platforms with users mostly from 18-24 years old (Licera, 2018). But as to how the Filipinos like particularly the faculty members, share, and/or post anything concerning education and instruction, health, family, entertainment, and news and current events have not yet been discovered.

With this scenario, the researcher would like to know the information sharing behavior on social media of the faculty members of higher education institutions in Urdaneta City, Pangasinan in five specific areas which are entertainment, health, love and family, news and current events particularly education and instruction. Since various studies concerning social media have already concluded that Facebook is the usually used website in the world (Licera, 2018; Castro, 2017; Castro, 2016; Chia et al., 2015, Sareah, 2015; Junco, 2012; Urista et al., 2009; Yadav, 2006), this study will focus merely on the respondents' information sharing behavior on Facebook. The researcher would also like to recognize their profile and lastly, the relationship of the respondents' profile to their information sharing behavior.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The objective of this study was to identify the information sharing behavior of the faculty members of higher education institution on social media in the areas of entertainment, health, love  and family, news and current events, and  education and instruction. It's specific objectives are: (1) Identify the respondents' profile particularly their age, sex, between the respondents' profile and their information sharing behavior on social media; and (4) Determine the respondents' perception on SNS to education and instruction.

Meanwhile, the following were the assumptions of the study: (1) The respondents prefer sharing posts rather liking and posting on SNS in areas of education and instruction, entertainment, news and current events, health, and love and family; (2) SNS is an effective tool for education and instruction; and (3) SNS can contribute to the collaboration of faculty and students.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The descriptive-correlational method of research was used in this study. According to Anto (2006), the main goal of this type of research is to describe the data and characteristics of what is being studied. The goal is the acquisition of factual, accurate and systematic data that can be used in averages, frequencies and similar statistical calculations. It is concerned with the description of data and characteristics about a population. Descriptive studies seldom involve experimentation, as they are more concerned with naturally occurring phenomena than with the observation of controlled situations. The sampling technique involved in this study in the selection of the respondents was the Convenience sampling. This sampling technique chose respondents based on their availability.

**Population and Locale of the Study**

Since the researcher aimed to include selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Urdaneta City to get data, convenience sampling was the best option so as to retrieve the questionnaire swiftly. On the other hand, to determine the sample size, Slovin's formula was

type of higher education institution, course group, and frequency of social media use;  (2) Evaluate the information sharing behavior of the respondentsalong the areas of education and instruction, entertainment, news and current events, health, and love and family; (3) Examine the                                                   relationship

used. The researcher opted to consider six HEIs out of nine for the other three institutions were not able to participate. These were Urdaneta City University (UCU), Pangasinan State University (PSU) Urdaneta Campus, Lyceum Northwestern University (LNU), ABE International College of Business and Accountancy (ABE), Divine Word College of Urdaneta (DWC), and Luzon Colleges of Science and Techonology (LCST).

**Data Gathering Instrument**

The questionnaire as the data gathering instrument was researcher-made. A pilot test was conducted to measure the reliability level of the questionnaire items. Thirty-three faculty members from Urdaneta City University were randomly selected from target population. They were required to answer the questionnaire. By using the Statistical Package for the Social Science Program (SPSS) version 23.0, an analysis of item reliability was determined through the reliability coefficient test particularly Cronbach's Alpha, which is a way to quantify the consistency of a measure. The alpha coefficient for the 79 items is 0.959 which showed acceptable consistency of reliability and it only required one test administration. This shows that the questionnaire items were completely appropriate for research goals.

**Treatment of Data**

Problem number one regarding the profile particularly the age, sex, type of higher education institution, course group and frequency of social media use, utilized frequency and percentage formula as shown. For problem number two pertaining to the information sharing behavior of the respondents in the areas of education and instruction, entertainment, news and current events, health, and love and family, the weighted mean formula was used as shown. To resolve problem number

three regarding the relationship between the respondents' profile variables and their information sharing behavior in the areas of education and instruction, entertainment, news and current events, health, and love and family, chi-square formula was used as shown. Lastly, thematic analysis was used to resolve problem number four.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Profile of the Respondents**

      The table shows that most of the respondents belong to age bracket 18-38 years old with 71%. This is followed by those that are 39-53 years old with 22%. The respondents who are 54-72 years old are those with the least number of respondents having only 12% of the total population. This means that most of the respondents belong to Generation Y (1980-2000) better known as millennials followed by the Generation X (1965-1979), and Baby Boomers (1946-1964), respectively.

      One of the profiles that can be seen from table 1 is the number of female and male respondents. It can be noted that 52% of the respondents are male while the remaining 48% are female. With this, it can be construed that there is almost an equal distribution of respondents during the dissemination of the questionnaire when it comes to sex.

      Another data shown in the table is the type of higher education institution that the respondents belong. It is clearly stated that majority of the respondents belong to public Higher Education Institution (HEI) showing 84% while the remaining 16% are private HEI.

Table 1. Profile the Respondents

| | PROFILE | f | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 18–38 | 115 | 71 |
| | 39–53 | 36 | 22 |
| | 54–72 | 12 | 7 |
| | | | |
| Sex | Male | 84 | 52 |
| | Female | 79 | 48 |
| Type of Institution | Public | 137 | 84 |
| | Private | 26 | 16 |
| Course | | 4 | 2 |

| Group | Humanities | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Social Science | 25 | 15 |
| | Natural Science | 6 | 4 |
| | Formal Science | 34 | 21 |
| | Agriculture | 0 | 0 |
| | Architecture and Design | 3 | 2 |
| | Business | 15 | 9 |
| | Health Science | 11 | 7 |
| | Education | 42 | 26 |
| | Engineering | 19 | 12 |
| | Media and Comm | 4 | 2 |
| | Public Ad | 0 | 0 |
| | Transportation | 0 | 0 |
| | Nutrition | 0 | 0 |
| | | | |
| Frequency of Use | 1–3 times a day | 65 | 40 |
| | 4–6 times a day | 52 | 32 |
| | 7–9 times a day | 16 | 10 |
| | 10 times or more | 30 | 18 |

      When it comes to the course group, Education, Formal Science, and Social Science topped having a percentage of 26%, 21%, and 15% respectively. This is followed by Engineering with 12% of the total number of respondents, Business with 9%, Health Science with 7%, and Natural Science with 4%. Moreover, three course groups got the least number of respondents which are the Media and Communication, Architecture and Design, and Humanities all with 2% taking into consideration the Public Ad, Transportation, Agriculture, and Nutrition which has zero respondents.

      Lastly, the frequency of social media use is presented in table 1 as part of the respondents' profile. It is surprising that 40% of the respondents disclosed that they use social media account particularly Facebook on a daily basis.

**Information Sharing Behavior of Respondents in Five Categories**

      Table 2 presents the result of the respondents' information sharing behavior in all five categories. It is noted that liking, among all information sharing behavior, garnered an overall average weighted mean of 2.55 regarded

as often while sharing and posting got an overall average weighted mean of 2.36 and 2.03 respectively, with the descriptive equivalent of sometimes. This infers that majority of the respondents chose to like the categories in numerous occasions except for the entertainment category which got 2.43 average weighted mean described as sometimes. Further, from the data indicated herein, majority of the respondents are more of liking to simply let the people know that they enjoy the post without leaving a comment. Since the like button was improved on 2015 as per Constine (2016), the respondents can send a more accurate perception of what they feel which is used more often. Moreover, the study suggests that respondents are concerned with building a good impression. Ozanne et al. (2017) called this protective self-presentation. Respondents feel at times that they are not totally involved in the content of the post so instead of posting or sharing, they simply like it. This is one other reason as per Ozanne et al.

(2017) why users hit the like button instead of sharing them.

On the other hand, under sharing, most of the indicators fall under 1.50-2.49 statistical limit with a descriptive equivalent of sometimes. From the data, it can be said that the respondents share information on Facebook once in a while. Moreover, under posting, all categories got a descriptive equivalent of sometimes. To add, its weighted mean is far lower when compared to liking and sharing, indicating that the respondents are posting just once in a while.

Generally, of all categories, education and instruction is mostly the topic being liked and shared by the respondents. Health, love and family, news and current events and entertainment follow in descending order. With all the data gathered, it appears that the hypothesis stating that the respondents prefer sharing posts rather liking and posting on SNS in all areas particularly in the areas of education and instruction, entertainment, news and current events, health and love and family is rejected.

Table 2. Information sharing behavior of respondents in five categories

| CATEGORIES | LIKING | | SHARING | | POSTING | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | WM | DE | WM | DE | WM | DE |
| Education and Instruction | 2.60 | Often | 2.56 | Often | 2.13 | Sometimes |
| Entertainment | 2.43 | Sometimes | 2.19 | Sometimes | 1.88 | Sometimes |
| News and Current Events | 2.51 | Often | 2.30 | Sometimes | 2.02 | Sometimes |
| Health | 2.65 | Often | 2.41 | Sometimes | 2.07 | Sometimes |
| Love and Family | 2.54 | Often | 2.33 | Sometimes | 2.05 | Sometimes |
| AWM | 2.55 | Often | 2.36 | Sometimes | 2.03 | Sometimes |

**Relationship Between the Respondents' Age and Their Information Sharing Behavior on Social Media**

Table 3 presents the relationship of the profile variable age to the information sharing behavior of the respondents. It is perceived that there are significant relationships between the respondents' information sharing behavior and their age since the computed p – values are

lesser than the 0.05 level of significance according to: posting (p=0.01) on education and instruction; liking (p=0.00), sharing (p = 0.00) and posting (p = 0.00) on entertainment; liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00) and posting (p = 0.00) on news and current events; liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.01), and posting (p = 0.00) on health; and liking (p = 0.01), sharing (p = 0.00), and posting (p = 0.00) on love and family.

These indicate that the respondents' information sharing behavior is significantly correlated to their age in posting topics on education and instruction; liking, sharing, and posting about entertainment; liking, sharing, and posting about news and current events; liking, sharing, and posting about health; and liking, sharing, and posting about love and family. That they tend to like, share, and post in five categories depending on their age. However, there are no significant relationships between the respondents' information sharing behavior and their age particularly under liking (p = 0.07) and sharing (p = 0.52) of education and instruction since the computed p – values are equal to or greater than the 0.05 level of significance. This further implies that the age of the respondents do not significantly affect their behavior in liking and sharing information pertaining to topics on education and instruction alone. That all of them, regardless of their age often like and share information particularly articles on teaching strategies, videos and lecture of key persons and links that can be of help in preparing lessons and assessments tasks of their students. This proves that faculty of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Urdaneta City, regardless of their age, are exerting effort in finding ways to improve their teaching strategies and adapting to the world of their students. Moreover, the hypothesis stating that there is a significant relationship between the age profile and the respondents' information sharing behavior is accepted but in terms of liking and sharing education and instruction information, the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 3. Relationship between age and information sharing behavior

| INDICATORS | $X^2$ | df | p-value | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education and Instruction, Liking | 11.77 | 6 | 0.07 | NS |
| Education and Instruction, Sharing | 5.15 | 6 | 0.52 | NS |
| Education and Instruction, Posting | 17.58 | 6 | 0.01 | S |
| Entertainment, Liking | 21.07 | 6 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Sharing | 36.91 | 6 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Posting | 34.38 | 6 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Liking | 39.93 | 6 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Sharing | 32.96 | 6 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Posting | 32.63 | 6 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Liking | 23.83 | 6 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Sharing | 18.17 | 6 | 0.01 | S |
| Health, Posting | 39.15 | 6 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Liking | 15.90 | 6 | 0.01 | S |
| Love and Family, Sharing | 24.30 | 6 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Posting | 33.72 | 6 | 0.00 | S |

Legend:    $X^2$ – computed Chi-Squared value
df – degrees of freedom
S – has significant relationship
NS – no significant relationship

**Relationship Between the Respondents' Sex and Their Information Sharing Behavior on Social Media**

Table 4 presents the relationship of the profile variable sex to the information sharing behavior of the respondents. Consequently, there are significant relationships between the respondents' liking behavior and their sex in some aspects such as on liking under entertainment (p = 0.02), news and current events (p = 0.00), and health (p = 0.00) since the computed p – values are lesser than the 0.05 level of significance. These indicate that the respondents' liking behavior is significantly correlated to their sex in liking topics pertaining to entertainment, news and current events, and health. However, sex shows no significance when it comes to liking topics on education and instruction (p = 0.45), and liking love and family topics (p = 0.10). These indicate that the respondents, whether male or female, like topics pertaining to education and instruction and love and family.

From the table, it can be seen that the respondents' sex does not affect their information sharing behavior, particularly in sharing, in the dissemination of information in education and instruction (p = 0.11), entertainment (p = 0.89), news and current events (p = 0.32), health (p = 0.05), and love and family (p = 0.19). This implies that sex has nothing to do with the sharing behavior of the respondents. In addition, sex has something to do with the posting of the respondents on their wall in the categories of education and instruction (p = 0.03), news and current events (p = 0.00), health (p = 0.00) and love and family (p = 0.00) except for entertainment (p = 0.45). The data suggests that the posting behavior of the respondents in the categories of education and instruction, health, news and current events, and love and family varies on the respondents' sex. Noticeably, there are categories where sex has nothing to do with the behavior of the respondents in five categories. The result simply implies that sex plays a role in the respondents' behavior on posting topics on education and instruction, in liking entertainment information,

in liking and posting information pertaining to news and current events and in health, and lastly posting about love and family.

**Table 4. Relationship between sex and information sharing behavior**

| INDICATORS | $X^2$ | df | p-value | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education and Instruction, Liking | 2.66 | 3 | 0.45 | NS |
| Education and Instruction, Sharing | 5.97 | 3 | 0.11 | NS |
| Education and Instruction, Posting | 9.26 | 3 | 0.03 | S |
| Entertainment, Liking | 10.06 | 3 | 0.02 | S |
| Entertainment, Sharing | 0.61 | 3 | 0.89 | NS |
| Entertainment, Posting | 2.65 | 3 | 0.45 | NS |
| News and Current Events, Liking | 24.74 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Sharing | 3.54 | 3 | 0.32 | NS |
| News and Current Events, Posting | 14.50 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Liking | 13.20 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Sharing | 7.88 | 3 | 0.05 | NS |
| Health, Posting | 14.21 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Liking | 6.24 | 3 | 0.10 | NS |
| Love and Family, Sharing | 4.77 | 3 | 0.19 | NS |
| Love and Family, Posting | 17.46 | 3 | 0.00 | S |

Legend:      $X^2$ – computed Chi-Squared value

df – degrees of freedom
S – has significant relationship
NS – no significant relationship

With the data revealed in the table, the

hypothesis stating that there is a significant relationship between the profile sex is accepted in terms of the respondents' liking behavior under entertainment, news and current events, health as well as their posting behavior in the categories of education and institution, news and current events, health, and love and family. However, the hypothesis is rejected when it comes to sharing as an information sharing behavior of the respondents in all five categories – education and instruction, entertainment, health, news and current events, and love and family; liking education and instruction and love and family categories and the posting as an information sharing behavior under the entertainment category.

**Relationship Between the Respondents' Type of Higher Education Institution and Their Information Sharing Behavior on Social Media**

Table 5 presents the relationship of the profile variable type of institution to the information sharing behavior of the respondents. It can be gleaned from the table that there are relationships between the respondents' information sharing behavior and their type of institution since the computed p – values are lesser than the 0.05 level of significance according to: liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00) and posting (p = 0.00) on education and instruction; liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00) and posting (p = 0.00) on entertainment; liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00), and posting (p = 0.00) on news and current events; liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00), and posting (p = 0.00) on health; and liking (p = 0.01), sharing (p = 0.00), and posting (p = 0.01) on love and family. These indicate that the respondents' information sharing behavior is significantly correlated to their type of institution in liking, sharing and posting education and instruction, entertainment, news and current events, health, and love and family. In the case of private institutions such that in ABE College of Urdaneta Divine Word College (DWC), Luzon Colleges of Science and Technology (LCST), and Lyceum Northwestern University (LNU) in Urdaneta City, there is lesser number of users which consequently lessens the use of SNS thereby decreases the information sharing behavior of the respondents. Therefore, the hypothesis stating that there is a significant relationship between the type of institution and information sharing behavior of the respondents is accepted.

Table 5. Relationship between HEI type and information sharing behavior

| INDICATORS | $X^2$ | df | p-value | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education and Instruction, Liking | 22.03 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Education and Instruction, Sharing | 19.49 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Education and Instruction, Posting | 14.76 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Liking | 22.90 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Sharing | 36.11 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Posting | 23.89 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Liking | 19.25 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Sharing | 42.89 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Posting | 22.44 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Liking | 8.25 | 3 | 0.04 | S |
| Health, Sharing | 37.82 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Posting | 24.74 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Liking | 25.04 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Sharing | 21.45 | 3 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Posting | 12.59 | 3 | 0.01 | S |

Legend:      $X^2$ – computed Chi-Squared value
         df – degrees of freedom

S – has significant relationship
NS – no significant relationship

**Relationship Between the Respondents' Course Group and Their Information Sharing Behavior on Social Media**

Table 6 presents the relationship of the profile variable course group to the information sharing behavior of the respondents. It is notable from the table that there are significant relationships between the respondents' information sharing behavior and their course group since the computed p – values are lesser than the 0.05 level of significance according to: liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00), and posting (p = 0.00) on education and instruction; liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00), and posting (p = 0.00) on entertainment; liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00), and posting (p = 0.00) on news and current events; liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00), and posting (p = 0.00) on health; and liking (p = 0.00), sharing (p = 0.00), and posting (p = 0.00) on love and family. Specifically, under the education and instruction and news and current events categories, it can be inferred that those courses involving teamwork, communication, and language acquisition prefer to be exposed more on Social Networking Sites affecting their information sharing behavior. Such course groups would be Education, and Media and Communication where language and communication are their specialization. Other course groups particularly those with research subjects as part of their curriculum can also be included such as Formal, Health, Social, Natural

Sciences, Business, Engineering, Humanities and Architecture and Design.

In the entertainment category, health, and love and family, the table shows that there is a significant relationship between the course group and the information sharing behavior of the respondents after showing a p-value of (0.00) in liking, (p = 0.00) sharing, and (p = 0.00) posting. Development communication specifies that there are five kinds of audience which were classified according to how well they know a certain topic. These are lay audience, operator, technician, manager and expert. Since different course groups mean different fields of interest and specialization, it can be said that their knowledge on different topics on entertainment, health and love and family also varies. A particular course Group to be considered a lay audience who has no idea on a particular topic has different interest from those who are called expert audience, one who knows more than lay audience. With this, different behavior will be executed such as liking, sharing, and/ or posting.

It can, therefore, be construed that course group of the respondents where they belong affect their information sharing behavior-liking, sharing, and posting, in all five categories namely education and instruction, entertainment, news and current events, health, and love and family thereby accepting the hypothesis stating that there is a significant relationship in the respondents' profile and their information sharing behavior.

Table 6. Relationship between course group and information sharing behavior

| INDICATORS | $X^2$ | df | p-value | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education and Instruction, Liking | 143.97 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Education and Instruction, Sharing | 128.27 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Education and Instruction, Posting | 132.40 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Liking | 74.03 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Sharing | 85.86 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Posting | 84.25 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Liking | 117.35 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Sharing | 73.95 | 27 | 0.00 | S |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| News and Current Events, Posting | 118.34 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Liking | 153.67 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Sharing | 151.76 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Posting | 123.61 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Liking | 149.71 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Sharing | 110.38 | 27 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Posting | 126.52 | 27 | 0.00 | S |

Legend:   $X^2$ – computed Chi-Squared value
df – degrees of freedom
S – has significant relationship
NS – no significant relationship

**Relationship Between the Respondents' Frequency of Social Media Use and Their Information Sharing Behavior on Social Media**

Table 7 presents the relationship of the profile variable frequency of social media use to the information sharing behavior of the respondents. From the table, it can be stated that there are relationships between the respondents' information sharing behavior and their frequency of use since the computed $p$ – values are lesser than the 0.05 level of significance according to: liking ($p = 0.00$), and posting ($p = 0.00$) on education and instruction; liking ($p = 0.00$), sharing ($p = 0.00$), and posting ($p = 0.00$) on entertainment; liking ($p = 0.00$), sharing ($p = 0.00$), and posting ($p = 0.00$) on news and current events; liking ($p = 0.00$), and sharing ($p = 0.00$) on health; and liking ($p = 0.01$), sharing ($p = 0.00$), and posting ($p = 0.01$) on love and family. Most of the results indicate that the respondents' information sharing behavior is significantly correlated to their frequency of use in liking and posting education and instruction; liking, sharing and posting entertainment; liking, sharing and posting news and current events;

liking and sharing health; and liking, sharing and posting love and family. From the results, the respondents' frequency of visit can be related to various reasons. As explained by Uses and Gratification Theory, individuals, groups, and society use media differently to satisfy individual needs. These different motives of the users urge them to open their account to gratify their needs. Under the category love and family, liking ($p = 0.01$), sharing ($p = 0.00$), and posting ($p = 0.01$) show a significant relationship with the respondents' frequency of social media use. Some of the respondents frequent the Social Networking Sites to keep in touch with friends, meeting new friends, or locating old friends. On the other hand, other users hold deeper reason of visiting the SNS more often such as nurturing relationship with the immediate family members. With these different views on the usage of Social Networking Sites by the respondents, it can be concluded that there is also a variation in their Social Networking Sites' frequency of use. When it comes to liking behavior of the respondents in all categories, the table showed a p-value of (0.00) which signifies that there is a relationship between the frequency of social media use and the liking behavior of the respondents.

Table 7. Relationship between frequency of social media use and information sharing behavior

| INDICATORS | $X^2$ | df | p-value | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education and Instruction, Liking | 34.10 | 9 | 0.00 | S |
| Education and Instruction, Sharing | 16.83 | 9 | 0.05 | NS |
| Education and Instruction, Posting | 27.98 | 9 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Liking | 32.63 | 9 | 0.00 | S |
| Entertainment, Sharing | 23.56 | 9 | 0.00 | S |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entertainment, Posting | 28.39 | 9 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Liking | 41.71 | 9 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Sharing | 30.80 | 9 | 0.00 | S |
| News and Current Events, Posting | 23.61 | 9 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Liking | 45.37 | 9 | 0.00 | S |
| Health, Sharing | 17.50 | 9 | 0.04 | S |
| Health, Posting | 9.42 | 9 | 0.40 | NS |
| Love and Family, Liking | 26.02 | 9 | 0.00 | S |
| Love and Family, Sharing | 19.79 | 9 | 0.02 | S |
| Love and Family, Posting | 40.56 | 9 | 0.00 | S |

Legend:      $X^2$ – computed Chi-Squared value
                 df – degrees of freedom
                 S – has significant relationship
                 NS – no significant relationship

Further, there are no significant relationships between the respondents' information sharing behavior and their frequency of use according to: sharing (p = 0. 05) on education and instruction and posting (p = 0.40) on health since the computed p – values are equal to or greater than the 0.05 level of significance. This means that whether they visit their accounts once or many times in a day, the respondents' probability of sharing information on education and instruction and posting about health-related information is highly executed. Particularly, in liking, sharing, and posting information sharing behavior of the respondents, the two categories are in the first or second place. The study posited that the respondents' frequency of use of social media affects their information sharing behavior except for the sharing of information about education and instruction and posting health information thereby accepting the hypothesis stating that there is a significant relationship between the profile frequency of use and the respondents' information sharing behavior but rejected in sharing education and instruction content and posting health related information.

Table 8. Factors considered why SNS is an effective tool in education and instruction

| FACTORS | % |
|---|---|

**Respondents' Perception on SNS to Education and Instruction**

**Effectivity of SNS as a Tool for Education and Instruction**

When asked if SNS is considered an effective tool for communication, the respondents gave different answers. Moreover, their answers were backed up with their beliefs showing high confidence in what they believed in. Table 8 presents the respondents' reason why they considered SNS as an effective tool in education and instruction. It can be perceived that the information the social media offers is being appreciated by many after having 35% of the total number of respondents. According to them, the respondents are able to share and know updates particularly about the subjects to be taught. Facebook feeds sources where users could visit and get additional information. Also, by this information, the respondents even acknowledge the fact that it can improve their teaching strategy. This is followed by the speedy information dissemination (24%). Respondents pointed out that they like Facebook because it disseminates information fast and the process is easy.

| | |
|---|---|
| Source of information | 35 |
| Speedy information dissemination | 24 |
| Accessibility | 22 |

| Preference | 15 |
|---|---|
| Invites a participatory attitude | 4 |

| RESPONSE | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 84 |
| No | 6 |
| Sometimes | 10 |

Accessibility having 22% was also recognized making them suggest that Facebook could be a good tool for education and instruction. They described SNS as being user-friendly and that they can access their account any day, anywhere, and anytime when the need arises. Preference of learners (15%) was also considered by the respondents. They believe that using a tool that interests the learners where they are more inclined could attract attention, thereby inviting a good learning environment. This then leads to the invitation of a participatory attitude from the learners. This shows 4% of the total response of the respondents. Meanwhile, there are still some who do not totally accept Facebook to be used in teaching.

The respondents questioned the authenticity of the information and that at times, students ignore instruction given to them. They even pointed out that Facebook is just for disseminating information. It is therefore safe to conclude that Facebook is accepted as an effective tool for education and instruction with reservations by the respondents. It can be drawn from the data that Facebook's edges the traditional way of teaching because it acts as a good source of information, offers speedy information dissemination, easy access, students' preference and invites a participatory attitude.

**Contribution of SNS to Teachers and Students' Collaboration**

This study looked into the collaboration of the respondents to their students in the education and instruction area. When asked if SNS particularly Facebook contributes to their collaboration with the learners, majority of them agreed. The respondents then were further asked to state their reason.

Table 9. Distribution of respondents' responses on collaboration

It is reflected in Table 9 that 84% of the total respondents agree that Facebook can contribute to the collaboration between the teachers and students. In addition, a total of 10% answered sometimes while the remaining 6% answered no. The data reveals that Facebook is a better medium for communication between the teachers and students as compared to the traditional classroom setting. Its' accessibility made it even more preferred by the users. With its features, it was found out that students are given the privilege to send feedback even outside the classroom. It breaks the limitation, particularly the time and distance, making it a fast way to communicate. With this, the respondents stated that it helped them build a relationship with the students. They also appreciated the presence of Facebook for they use it mainly as a medium for the distribution of information, instruction, and designation of tasks to the students. On the other hand, 6% of the respondents believe the other way around. They said that Facebook is used merely for informing the students and that teacher needs to have more interaction with the students. They added that unless students are willing to participate, are active users and will not be disturbed by trash information, it could be of help to collaboration.

**SNS Features Used in Teaching**

Having been aware that Facebook was considered by the respondents as an aid in their teaching profession, the researcher decided to dig deeper. Knowing the features of Facebook that are considered as a tool in teaching would be of great value in this study to understand better the respondents. Table 10 shows the Facebook features that are of great importance both for the teachers and the students.

From the table, it is reflected that almost half of the respondents value the chatting feature with 49%. The information sharing feature follows closely with 44% and 7% for the page feature. Information sharing feature allows users to send, upload and receive files. Links sharing, posting on walls and newsfeeds are also under this category. On the other hand, respondents find the chatting feature very useful in their teaching profession. Under this category is the Messenger application where they could send instruction and announcement to their students. According to their answers, the group chat of Messenger application in Facebook is their widely used form of sending information. Group chat helps the respondents to limit the audience who may receive their instructions. The group members, usually, are those students who belong in one class and schedule. Video chat was also mentioned in their answer under chatting feature. This feature is also considered to be useful for them. A teacher who is currently unavailable to meet the class due to some tasks given by the heads could use the video chat to check the students' progress without their presence. Lastly, the respondents consider Messenger application as a good storage of their files. Files sent are not deleted, thereby making it an instant file saving medium which can be utilized when needed. The page feature of Facebook has the capacity to create pages. This is to promote distance learning. A page could be established by the teacher and the students where they could raise a topic and encourage opinion sharing. The respondents find this helpful when there is a need to catch up with the lessons.

Table 10. Distribution of respondents' preferred Facebook feature

| FEATURES | % |
| --- | --- |
| Information Sharing Feature | 44 |
| Chatting Feature | 49 |
| Page Feature | 7 |

**SNS Issues**

This discusses the issue raised about the use of Social Networking Sites particularly Facebook in the field of education and instruction. Table 11 presents the specific reasons behind the use SNS. Based on the table, the major issues that the respondents perceived are the ethics showing 44%, followed by content reliability with 21%, distraction with 19% and the privacy and security with 15%.

Table 11. Distribution of respondents' issues in using SNS in education and instruction

| ISSUES | % |
| --- | --- |
| Ethics | 44 |
| Content reliability | 21 |
| Distraction | 19 |
| Privacy and security | 15 |

Ethical issues provided by the respondents include. Part of this, as per the answer of the respondents, were the indiscriminate sharing of educational materials, loss of self-control that might result to addiction, vulgar words posted by many, plagiarism and cybercrime such as bullying, harassment and trolling. Content reliability includes getting fake news, irrelevant topics, and the spread of false information. Distraction was considered by the respondents as an issue in SNS since it divides the students' attention and loses focus most especially inside the classroom setting. Further, the slow information retrieval and distribution were pointed out under the distraction issues. Based on the respondents' response, some of them do not have gadget to use and some have no access to internet. With this scenario, meeting deadline, submission of needed requirements, or having a group video chat all for education purposes will be delayed. Security and privacy were also an issue to the respondents. According to them, Social Networking Sites are very showy and has no filter of information. Further, the respondents said that the cyber security and privacy issues, ethical issues, distraction, and content reliability concern the faculty upon incorporating social media on their teaching strategies.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The following conclusions are drawn. These are based on the findings as presented under the Results and Discussion. Majority of the respondents are dominated by millennials aged 18-38 years old, male in sex, teaching courses in education in public Higher Education Institution who open or visit Facebook accounts 1-3 times a day. Majority of the respondents are motivated by information retrieval through liking in the areas of education and instruction, news and current events, entertainment, health, and love and family. That the respondents are more on liking articles on teaching strategies, photos of beautiful places, breaking news and events concerning the government, proper exercise methods, healthy lifestyle and inspiring quotations, phrases, and excerpts regarding the role of a man in a relationship. The age, type of higher education, course group, and frequency of social media usage affect the information sharing behavior of the respondents. However, the sex of the respondents does not affect their information sharing behavior specifically in sharing, liking education and instruction and love and family topics, and posting entertainment articles. Facebook is the most commonly used SNS as a tool for education and instruction as a good source of information, offers speedy information dissemination, accessible, invites a participatory attitude and preferred medium by most of the students. Also, the chatting feature, information sharing feature, and the page feature are the preferences of the respondents that can contribute to the collaboration of teachers.

### Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn, the following are the recommendations. If these would be considered by HEIs, the use of SNS will be improved. Much scholarly researches such as determining the reasons why Facebook is not maximize in the field of research as well as the effect of internet bandwidth and teaching load to SNS use should be conducted. Importantly, an experimental or other research designs to test other social media aside from Facebook for teaching and learning and its efficacy must be facilitated. Further, inclusion of other profile variables like level of exposure in terms of hours spent and intensity of respondents' Facebook usage in terms of commenting should be considered in future studies. The higher education institutions should come up with ways on how to maximize the use of Social Networking Sites such as coming up with strategies to integrate these technologies to facilitate collaborations with clear instructional goals in education and instruction as well as for information dissemination purposes in the categories of health, love and family, news and current events and entertainment. School administrators should equip existing teachers to be more adept with the use of Information Communication Technology (ICT) and social media through capacity building trainings. The millennial faculty-respondents should also share their time and knowledge to the other faculty members to maximize the SNS feature in strategizing teaching-learning process. School administrators, stakeholders, and the faculty personnel should formulate and implement policy guidelines governing the use of SNS in the educational environment in the light of ethical, content reliability, distraction, privacy and security issues. Students should also be educated on proper use of social media to avoid issues raised in this study.

### REFERENCES

[1] AL-RAHMI, W. M. and M. S. OTHMAN. 2013. The Impact of Social Media Use on Academic Performance Among University Students: A Pilot Study. Retrieved 17 September 2018 from http://seminar.utmspace. edu.my/jisri

[2] ANDERSON, T., and J. DRON. 2011. Three Generations of Distance Education Pedagogy. The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning. Vol. 12. No. 3. Pp. 80-97.

[3] ANTO, J. 2006. What is Descriptive Research? Retrieved 11 October 2017 from

http://wiki.answers.com/Q/What_is_descriptive_research

[4] BAEK, Y. M., E. KIM and Y. BAE. 2014. My Privacy is Okay, But Theirs is Endangered: Why Comparative Optimism Matters in Online Privacy Concerns. Computers in Human Behavior. Vol. 31. Pp. 48-56.

[5] BLEASE, C. R. 2015. Too Many 'Friends,' Too Few 'Likes'? Evolutionary Psychology and 'Facebook Depression'. Review of General Psychology. Vol. 19, No. 1. Pp. 1-13.

[6] BRANDTZAEG, P. B. 2014. Facebook Likes: A Study of Liking Practices for Humanitarian Causes. Retrieved 04 August 2018 from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0179/c69751e600dd57149edc045659f155ad1a57.pdf

[7] BOLTON, R. N., A. PARASURAMAN, A. HOEFNAGELS, N. MIGCHELS, S. KABADAYI, T. GRUBER, Y. KOMAVORA and D. SOLNET. 2013. Understanding Generation Y and Their Use of Social Media: A Review and Research Agenda. Journal of Service Management, Vol. 24. No. 3. Pp. 245-267.

[8] BOYD, D. M. and N. B. ELLISON. 2007. Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. Retrieved 04 August 2018 from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007. 00393.x/full

[9] BRUIN, J. 2006. Newtest: Command to Compute New Test. UCLA: Statistical Consulting Group. Retrieved 09 November 2018 from https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/stata/ado/analysis/

[10] BUHAS, R. and S. BALTATESCU. 2013. Types of Internet Usage Among Higher Education Students in the Romanian-Hungarian Cross-border Area. University of Oradea, Romania.

[11] BUTLER, M. E. 2009. English for Specific Purposes (ESP), Innovation, and Technology. English Education and ESP, 1-15

[12] CASTRO, F. 2016. Social Media and Digital Stats in the Philippines 2016 (We are Social Data). Retrieved 08 June 2018 from http://fleirecastro.com/guides/social-media-and-digital-stats-in-the-philippines-2016-wearesocial-data/

[13] CASTRO, F. 2017. The State Social Media and Digital in the Philippines. Retrieved 08 June 2018 from https://www.slideshare.net/likke13/the-state-of-social-media-and-digit al-in-the-philippines-for-2017

[14] CHAKRABORTY, R., C. VISHIK and H.R. RAO. 2013. Privacy Preserving Actions of Older Adults on Social Media: Exploring the Behavior of Opting Out of Information Sharing. Decision Support Systems. Vol. 55. No. 4. Pp. 948–956.

[15] CHANG, C. K., G. D. CHEN, and L. Y. LI. 2008. Constructing a Community of Practice to Improve Coursework Activity. Computers & Education. Vol. 50. No. 1. Pp. 235-247.

[16] CHE (Council on Higher Education). n.d. What is the Difference Between a Public and Private Higher Education Provider. Retrieved 08 June 2018 from http://www.che.ac.za/content/what-difference-between-public-and-private-higher-education-provider

[17] CHEN, B. and T. BRYER. 2012. Investigating instructional for using social media in formal and informal learning: The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning. Research Articles. Vol. 13. No. 1. Pp. 88-104.

[18] CHEN, W. and K. LEE. 2013. Sharing, Liking, Commenting, and Distressed? The Pathway Between Facebook Interaction and Psychological Distress. Retrieved 03 August 2018 from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237094568

[19] CHIA, W. K., J. C. GEOW and C. S. KHOO. 2015. Characteristics of Information Shared on Facebook: An Exploratory Study. Retrieved 04 August 2018 from http://www.ntu.edu.sg/home/assgkhoo/papers/Chia,%20Geow%20&%20Khoo.A-LIEP2015.pdf

[20] CONSTINE, J. 2016. Facebook Enhances Everyone's Like With Love, Haha, Wow, Sad, Angry Buttons. Retrieved 04 August 2018 from https://techcrunch.com/2016/02/24/facebook-reactions/

[21] COURSES.COM.PH. n.d. College Courses in the Philippines. Retrieved 09 September 2017 from http://www.courses.com.ph/college-courses-in-the-philippines/

[22] CURRY, l. 2016. What Marketing Content Do Different Age Groups like to Consume? Retrieved 17 September 2018 from https://www.digitaldoughnut.com/articles/2016/september/what-marketing-content-different-age-groups-like

[23] DELIANG, W. 2013. A Theory of Instinctive Information Sharing Behavior. Unpublished Dissertation, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

[24] DERUSHIA, K. D. 2010. Internet Usage Among College Students and its Impact on Depression, Social Anxiety, and Social Engagement. Indiana University of Pennyslvania.

[25] GANNON, M. 2013. Why Some Facebook Users Constantly Update Status. Retrieved 04 August 2018 from https://www.livescience.com/25972-facebook-status-updates-loneliness.html

[26] GRAY, K., S. CHANG, and G. KENNEDY. 2010. Use of Social Web Technologies by International and Domestic Undergraduate Students: Implications for Internationalising Learning and Teaching in Australian Universities. Retrieved 25 July 2016 from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14759390903579208#.U7G35ZSSxrU

[27] HACKWORTH, B. A., and M. B. KUNZ. 2010, Health Care and Social

[28] Media: Building Relationships via Social Networks. Academy of Health Care Management Journal. Vol. 6. No. 1. Pp. 55-68.

[29] HALL, S. J. 2014. How Higher Education Institutions Utilize Social Media. Published Undergraduate Thesis, Georgia Southern University, Georgia. Retrieved 08 June 2018 from https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/andhttpsredir=1andarticle=1076andcontext=honors-theses

[30] HANSON, T. L., K. DRUMHELLER, J. MALLARD, C. MCKEE and P. SCHLEGEL. 2011. Cellphones, Text messaging, and Facebook: Competing time demands of today's College students. College Teaching. Retrieved 22 July 2016 from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/87567555.2010. 489078#. U7EBbpSSxrU

[31] HERMIDA, A., F. FLETHCER, D. KORELL and D. LOGAN. 2012. Share, Like, Recommend. Journalism Studies. Vol. 13 No. 5-6. Pp. 815-824.

[32] JAYARANTHNA, L.C. and W. M. Fernando. 2014. Relationship Between Facebook Usage and the Student Engagement of Sri Lankan Management Undergraduates. International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering Vol.8. No.8. Pp.2689-2693.

[33] JUNCO, R. 2012. The Relationship between Frequency of Facebook Use, Participation in Facebook activities and student engagement.

[34] KANE, G. C., and R. G. FICHMAN. 2009. The Shoemaker's Children: Using

Wikis For Information Systems Teaching, Research and Publication. Retrieved 25 July 2016 from https://www2.bc.edu/~fichman/KaneFichman2008.pdf

[35] KANE, S. 2018. The Common Characteristics of Generation X Professionals. Retrieved 17 September 2018 from https://www.thebalancecareers.com/common-characteristics-of-generation-x-professionals-2164682

[36] KRAMER, C. R., I. E. GAMEZ and A. G. SANTILLAN. 2015. Educational Use of Facebook in Higher-Education Environments: Current Practices and Guidelines. Retrieved 17 September 2018 from http://www.uv.mx/personal/iesquivel/files/2015/02/Manuscript.pdf

[37] LENHART, A., K. PURCELL, A. SMITH and K. ZICKUHR. 2010. Social Media and Mobile Internet Use Among Teens and Young Adults. Retrieved 17 September 2018 from http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2010/Social-Media-and-Young-Adults. aspx

[38] LICERA JR., R. 2018. State of Digital and Social Philippines 2018. Retrieved 08 June 2018 from https://www.slideshare.net/rubenlicera/state-of-digital-and-social-media-in-the-philippines-2018

[39] LOCKYER, L. and J. PATTERSON. 2008. Integrating Social Networking Technologies in Education: A Case Study of a Formal Learning Environment. Retrieved 12 September 2016 from http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1074 and context=edupapers

[40] LUFKENS, M. 2016. Twiplomacy Study 2016. Retrieved 01 September 2017 from http://twiplomacy.com/blog/twiplomacy-study-2016/?utm_content=bufferfc491andutm_medium=socialandutm_s
ource=twitter.comandutm_campaign=buffer.

[41] MADGE, C., J. MEEK, J. WELLENS and T. HOOLEY. 2009. Facebook, Social Integration and Informal Learning at University: It is More for Socialising and Talking to Friends about Work than for Actually Doing Work. Learning, Media and Technology. Vol. 34 No 2. Pp. 141-155.

[42] MAO, J. 2014. Social media for learning: A mixed methods study on high school students' technology affordances and perspectives. Retrieved 04 August 2018 from https://www.scribd.com/document/279910563/Mao-Social-for-Learning-A-Mixed-Methods-Study-on-High-School-Students-Technology-Affordances-and-Perspective

[43] MAZER, J. P., R. E. MURPHY, and C. S. SIMONDS. 2007. I'll see you on "Facebook" : The effects of computer-mediated teacher self-disclosure on student motivation, affective learning, and classroom climate. Communication Education. Vol. 56, No. 1. Pp. 1−17.

[44] MBODILA, M., C. NDEBELE, and K. MUHANNDJI. 2014. The Effect of Social Media on Students' Engagement and Collaboration in Higher Education: A Case Study of the Use of Facebook at a South African University. Thohoyandou, South Africa.

[45] MCLEOD, S. 2016. Simple Psychology: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. Retrieved 01 September 2017 from https://www.simply psychology.org/maslow.html

[46] MORAN, M., J. SEAMAN and H. T. KANE. 2011. Teaching, Learning, and Sharing: How Today's Higher Education Faculty Use Social Media. Pearson Learning Solutions and Babson Survey Research Group: Boston.

[47] MORRISON, C. M. and H. GORE. 2010. The relationship between excessive Internet use and depression: A questionnaire-based study of 1,319 young people and adults. Psychopathology. Vol. 43, 1. Pp. 121–126.

[48] MUSA, A. S., M. L. AZMI and N. S. ISMAIL. 2016. Exploring the Uses and Gratifications Theory in the Use of Social Media among the Students of Mass Communication in Nigeria. Malaysian Journal of Distance Education. Vol. 17 No. 2. Pp. 83-95.

[49] O'HANLON, C. 2007. If you can't beat 'em, join 'em. The Journal. Vol. 34 No. 8. Pp. 39-44.

[50] OZANNE, M., A. C. NAVAS and A. S. MATTILA. 2017. An Investigation into Facebook "Liking" Behavior an Explanatory Study. Retrieved 04 August 2018 from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305117706785

[51] PADAYACHEE, K. 2018. The Myths and Realities of Generational Cohort Theory on ICT Integration in Education: A South African Perspective Research Paper. Vol. 10. No. 1. Pp. 4-282.

[52] PEGLER, K., J. KOLLEWYN and S. CRICHTON. 2010. Generational Attitudes and Teacher ICT Use. Journal of Technology and Teacher Education. Vol. 18. No. 3. Pp. 443-458.

[53] PINKER, S. 2014. The village effect: Why face to face contact matters. London, UK: Atlantic Books.

[54] PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION INTERNATIONAL. 2012. Theories of Communication. Retrieved 08 September 2017 from http://www.peoi.org/Courses/Coursesas/mass/ mass2.html.

[55] PROVINCE OF PANGASINAN. n.d.Urdaneta City. Retrieved 06 August 2018 from http://pangasinan. gov.ph/ =the-province/cities-and-municipalities/urdaneta-city/

[56] ROBLYER, M. D., M. McDaniel, M. Webb, J. Herman and J. Witty. 2010. Findings on Facebook in higher education: A comparison of college faculty and student uses and perceptions of social networking sites. Retrieved on August 8, 2018 from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org /0ff9/827e8a1edbab2fe1150c21390e0cbbb 82327.pdf?_ga=2.67208849.1021825444. 1533262012-1070444698.1533262012

[57] ROCKET MARKETING INC. n.d. Definition of Facebook Share. Retrieved 06 August 2018 from https://www. rocketmarketinginc.com/faq/definition/fac ebook-share

[58] SAREAH, F. 2015. Interesting Statistics for the Top 10 Social Media Sites Retrieved 07 September 2016 from http://smallbiztrends.com/2015/07/social-media-sites-statistics.html

[59] SAVOLAINEN, R. 2017. Information sharing and knowledge sharing as communicative activities. Retrieved 04 August 2018 from http://www.informationr.net/ir/22-3/paper767.html

[60] SCHNEIDER, G. P., J. EVANS and K. T. PINARD. 2006. The Internet Fourth Edition Illustrated Introductory. Boston, Massachusetts: Cengage Learning.

[61] SEITER, C. 2016. The Secret Psychology of Facebook: Why we like, share, comment, and keep coming back. Retrieved 03 August 2018 from https://blog.bufferapp. com/psychology-of-facebook

[62] SIN, S. J. and K. S. KIM. 2013. International students' everyday life information seeking: The informational value of social networking sites. Library & Information Science Research. Vol. 35 No. 2. Pp.107-116.

[63] SKIERA, B., H. OLIVER and S. MARTIN. 2015. Social Media and Academic Performance: Does the Intensity of Facebook Activity Relate to Good Grades? Retrieved 17 September 2018 from http://www.ecm.bwl.uni-muenchen.de/publikationen/pdf

[64] STEVENSON, M. P. and M. LIU. 2010. Learning a Language with Web 2.0: Exploring the Use of Social Networking Features of Foreign Language Learning Websites. CALICO Journal. Vol. 27. No. 1. Pp. 233-259.

[65] TALJA, S. 2006. Information sharing. In A. Spink and C. Cole (eds), New Directions in Human Information Behavior, Springer: Netherlands, p. 113-134.

[66] TAVAKOL, M and R. DENNICK. 2011.Making Sense of Cronbach's Alpha. International Journal of Medical Education. Vol.2. No.1. Pp. 53-55.

[67] TAURASI, L. 2014. Social media for development. Making the most of Facebook. Retrieved 01 September 2017 from https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2014/jun/02/social-media-facebook-case-studies

[68] TESS, P. A. 2013. The role of social media in higher education classes (real and virtual) – A literature review. Computers in Human Behavior. Vol. 29 No. 1. Pp. A60-A68.

[69] UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE. 2017. Uses and Gratification Approach. , Retrieved 05 August 2018 from https://www. utwente.nl/en/bms/communication-theories/sorted-by-cluster/Mass%20Media/Uses_and_Gratifications_Approach/

[70] URISTA, M. A., D. QINGWEN and K. D. DAY. 2009. Explaining Why Young Adults Use MySpace and Facebook Through Uses and Gratifications Theory. Human Communication. Vol. 12 No. 2. Pp. 98

[71] VOORN, R. J. and P. A. KOMMERS. 2013. Social Media and Higher Education: Introversion and Collaborative Learning from the Student's Perspective. J. Social Media and Interactive Learning Environments. Vo. 1. No. 1. Pp. 59–73

[72] WILSON, T. D. 2010. Information sharing: an exploration of the literature and some propositions. Information Research. Vol. 15 No. 4. Pp. 44

[73] WON, S. G. 2015. Social Media as Connected Learning Technology: A Mixed Methods Investigation of Facebook for Undergraduate Education. Retrieved 04 August 2018 from https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/bitstream/handle/10919/51995/Won_SG_D_2015.pdf;sequence=1

[74] YADAV, S. 2006. Facebook – The Complete Biography. Retrieved 07 September 2016 from http://mashable.com/