

[٨]

**The effects of Facebook on Arab students' social well-being**

**Dr. Amany Albert**  
**Lecturer of Public relations and Advertising**  
**Mass communication Faculty- Pharos University**  
**Alexandria- Egypt**



## **The effects of Facebook on Arab students' social well-being**

**Dr. Amany Albert \***

---

### **Abstract:**

This paper seeks to understand how Facebook affects youth social well-being. It tries to investigate the relationship between intensity of Facebook use and feeling happy, having Life satisfaction, social trust, Self-Esteem, Loneliness, Shyness, through 6 scales.

The first section discuss well-being meaning and the social factors used in this study. The next section outlines the methodological approach for an empirical test of research questions generated by our review. We then present results. The paper closes with a discussion of the implications of our findings, as well as study limitations and overall conclusions.

We found that almost the entire sample had less than 200 contacts, more than half of facebook users spend from 1-5 hours daily.

The intensity of Facebook use was positively associated with depression-happiness scale, social trust, Self-Esteem, and Loneliness, and negatively associated with life satisfaction and Shyness.

Facebook Members and non members were negatively associated with social trust, Self-Esteem, and Loneliness. The attitude towards Facebook was positively associated with depression-happiness scale, Satisfaction with life, and Self-Esteem.

---

\*Lecturer of Public relations and Advertising, Mass communication Faculty- Pharos University, Alexandria- Egypt

## **Introduction:**

The rapidly expanding Internet has infiltrated Arab youth life. The number of users is growing, and both the mass and the scholarly media are fascinated with this technology.

The use of social network sites (SNS) such as Facebook, MySpace, youtube, and twitter grew faster among Arab youth. In a previous research 2009 the use of Arab youth in the Egyptian Universities was about (65.3%). The intensity of using Facebook, showed some concerns about the impact of the online community on their well being. Especially, more than (50%) from the Arab youth used Facebook when they felt depressed or lonely.

The rising question is, does facebook affect youth well-being? Does online involvement increase, decrease, or supplement the ways in which people engage?

From one side facebook is providing new and better ways of engaging in community and finding information. However, others argue that Facebook decrease in-person communication.

## **What is social well-being?**

Well-being is a good or satisfactory condition of existence; a state characterized by health, happiness, and prosperity. Laughter is taken as a sign of well-being. Also economic/ physical /emotional conditions

The term quality of life is used to evaluate the general well-being of individuals and societies. The term is used in a wide range of contexts, quality of life include not only wealth and employment, but also the

built environment, physical and mental health, education, recreation and leisure time, and social belonging.

Social well-being can be seen as the area of overall well-being involving social relationships, social participation, social networks, and social support. Feelings of having a 'social role' or identity may also play a part in this aspect of well-being.

### **Social Factors:**

There are wide range of personal social factors, which are likely to be affected by using Facebook. Such factors are involved in an individuals' well-being.

Some researchers confirm that social capital is strongly linked to subjective well-being through many independent channels and in several different forms. Ties to friends and neighbors, workplace ties, trustworthiness and trust: all appear independently and robustly related to happiness and life satisfaction.

There are many topics cover well being, such as anger, anxiety and phobias, assertiveness, bereavement, Depression, eating disorders, head injuries, mood swings, self-esteem, social anxiety and shyness, stress, panic or worry, wellbeing, wellness, mood-improvement and relaxation

In this paper we questioned some factors such as happiness, life satisfaction, Social trust, Self-Esteem, Loneliness and Shyness.

Happiness: According to Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary, the definition of happiness is: a state of well-being and contentment, a pleasurable or satisfying experience.

Happiness is a mental or emotional state of well being characterized by positive or pleasant emotions

ranging from contentment to intense joy. Enjoying, showing, or marked by pleasure, satisfaction, or joy.

### **Life satisfaction:**

Life satisfaction is the fulfillment or gratification of a desire, need, or appetite. Pleasure or contentment derived from such gratification.

It is the way a person perceives how his or her life has been and how they feel about where it is going in the future. It is a measure of well being as well as a cognitive, global judgment.

It is having a favorable attitude of one's life as a whole. Well being is commonly understood and measured either in its life satisfaction or in its happiness conceptions.

### **Social trust:**

Trust is the assured reliance on the character, ability, strength, or truth of someone or something.

Social trust-that is, the belief that others around you can be trusted-is itself a strong empirical index of social capital at the aggregate level. High levels of social trust in settings of dense social networks often provide the crucial mechanism through which social capital affects aggregate outcomes. Some researchers include social trust within their definition of social capital.

Social capital, is found to support both physical health and subjective well-being.

Some researches confirmed that trust and well-being are tightly linked, showing that those who feel themselves to be living in a trustworthy environment have much higher levels of subjective well-being.

### **Self-esteem:**

Self-esteem is a term in psychology to reflect a person's overall evaluation or appraisal of his or her own worth.

Self-esteem encompasses beliefs (for example, "I am competent", "I am worthy") and emotions such as triumph, despair, pride and shame. 'The self-concept is what we think about the self; self-esteem, the positive or negative evaluation of the self, is how we feel about it'.

Among the most powerful predictors of subjective wellbeing, are genetic make-up and personality factors, such as optimism and self-esteem.

### **Loneliness:**

Loneliness is an unpleasant feeling in which a person feels a strong sense of emptiness and solitude resulting from inadequate levels of social relationships.

Loneliness is not a subjective experience, since humans are social creatures by nature. Loneliness has also been described as social pain-a psychological mechanism meant to alert an individual of isolation and motivate her/him to seek social connections.

The network of social connections that exist between people, and their shared

values and norms of behavior, which enable and encourage mutually advantageous social cooperation.

Both loneliness and social networks have been linked with mood and wellbeing. Researchers found that Loneliness and social networks both independently affect mood and wellbeing in the elderly, underlying a very significant proportion of depressed mood.

## **Shyness:**

It is a social psychology term used to describe the feeling of apprehension, lack of comfort, or awkwardness experienced when a person is in proximity to, approaching, or being approached by other people, especially in new situations or with unfamiliar people.

Many studies have documented the ways in which shyness can be a barrier to personal well-being and social adjustment throughout childhood and adolescence. Shyness as experienced during emerging adulthood may continue to be a risk factor for successful development.

## **Does Facebook affect relations?**

There is less agreement, however, about how the internet has influenced different aspects of society. It is important to understand what the consequences of the diffusion and high use of the Internet are for people's lives.

Some says the internet leads to a decline in social ties and increase depression and loneliness. Others say it makes better, and new social relationships and decrease loneliness and depression.

Even though, we find ourselves facing a Paradox, which is the inverse proportion between the numbers of friends one has on Facebook and the number of friends one has in real life.

The paradox can be explained by reasoning that somebody who is so active in Facebook must have a lack of real life social interactions to account for the time they can afford to spend on the Internet. On the converse, somebody with a very active social life does not typically worry about spending too much time on

social networking sites, hence the lack of Facebook friends.

For example one person could have 3,000 friends on Facebook, but real relation in life. On the other hand, another one only has 30 friends on facebook, but active in her or his social relations.

### **Does Facebook Increase well-being?**

Some people say that Facebook is stimulating positive change in people's lives by creating new forms of online interaction and enhancing offline relationships. The Internet may foster contact with weak ties of acquaintanceship at the expense of socially-close ties. Weak ties provide new information and access to diverse networks while strong ties provide commitment, friendship, and supportiveness. Internet is increasing social capital, civic engagement, and developing a sense of belonging to online community. They suspect that people not only have more relationships than in pre-Internet times, they are in more frequent contact with their relationships, and the strengthening of the bonds through more frequent contact means that ties can be more readily mobilized for aid.

The experiences of frequent Internet users probably provide the best window into the future, as more people come to use the Internet and as more people use it frequently and routinely.

An analysis of the impact of the Internet needs to consider how the Internet may be contributing to new forms of interaction and community that cannot be measured using standard indicators of social capital. The fact that people are not interacting in visible public

spaces does not mean that they are in isolation. They may be going online to chat with friends on instant messenger, visiting online communities by playing multi-user games or exchanging short text messages through “list serves” or “newsgroups” The Internet makes it necessary to redefine our understanding of what social life is and hence, to introduce new ways to measure it.

Shaoke Zhang et al. discussed how the use of social network websites is meaningful to the users and how these websites influence their social life online and offline in their proximal communities. They put in mind three elements important to individual and collective life: social identity, social engagement, and social tie. They found that Facebook heightened the visibility of social identities. Facebook broadly facilitated offline activities from proposing and planning through to report and commenting. People who use Facebook features differentially as they maintain strong and weak ties. Social identities, social engagements, and social ties are mutually reinforcing and cultivating with the affordances of Facebook.

### **Does Facebook decrease well-being?**

The Internet’s has got some Effects on community, first it decreases community as it draws people away from family and friends. Further, by facilitating global communication and involvement, it reduces interest in the local community and its politics.

**It transforms community:** The Internet provides the means for inexpensive and convenient communication with far-flung communities of shared interest. Through its low costs and asynchronous nature it

increases communication among friends and family, especially contact with those who are far away.

It supplements community it is another means of communication to facilitate existing social relationships and follow patterns of civic engagement and socialization. The Internet blends into people's life. People will use the Internet to maintain existing social contacts by adding electronic contact on to telephone and face-to-face contact. Further, they continue their hobbies and political interests online.

Some other scholars argue the consequences: (a) The weakening of private community: social contact with kin, friends, workmates, and neighbors. (b) The decline of public community: gatherings in public places, involvement in voluntary organizations, civic concerns, and commitment to community.

Although people who have been on the Internet a long time have no greater general sense of community, they do have a greater sense of online community than those who have only been online for a short time. People who exchange many emails with friends have a greater sense of general community online, and people who exchange many emails with kin have a greater sense of community online with kin.

### **Literature review:**

Emily S. Orr et al. investigated the personality trait of shyness and its relation with certain features of an online communication tool (Facebook). One hundred three undergraduate students at a university in southwestern Ontario enrolled in the present study. The authors hypothesized that shyness would be significantly related to the quantity of time spent on

Facebook, the number of contacts, and attitudes toward Facebook. The findings supported that shyness was significantly positively correlated with the time spent on Facebook and having favorable attitudes toward the social networking site. Furthermore, shyness was significantly negatively correlated with the number of Facebook "Friends." Additionally, they found that shy individuals reported spending more time on Facebook. Finally, they found that attitudes toward Facebook were significantly associated with shyness, such that shy individuals reported having more favorable attitudes toward Facebook than did non-shy individuals.

Charles Steinfield, et al. worked in a longitudinal analysis of panel data from users of a popular online social network site, Facebook, investigated the relationship between intensity of Facebook use, measures of psychological well-being, and bridging social capital. Two surveys conducted a year apart at a large U.S. university, complemented with in-depth interviews with 18 Facebook users, provide the study data. Intensity of Facebook use in year one strongly predicted bridging social capital outcomes in year two, even after controlling for measures of self-esteem and satisfaction with life. These latter psychological variables were also strongly associated with social capital outcomes. Self esteem served to moderate the relationship between Facebook usage intensity and bridging social capital: those with lower self-esteem gained more from their use of Facebook in terms of bridging social capital than higher self-esteem participants. We suggest that Facebook affordances help reduce barriers that lower self-esteem students

might experience in forming the kinds of large, heterogeneous networks that are sources of bridging social capital.

Moira Burke, Cameron Marlow and Thomas Lento tried to measure the relation between Social Network Activity and Social Well-Being, They found that directed communication is associated with greater feelings of bonding social capital and lower loneliness, but has only a modest relationship with bridging social capital, which is primarily related to overall friend network size. Surprisingly, users who consume greater levels of content report reduced bridging and bonding social capital and increased loneliness.

Shaoke Zhang et al. investigated social effects and affordances of communication media such as Facebook on people's social lives with regard to social identity, social engagement, and social ties. Social interactions are pervasive and people's social lives are carried out in complex fabrics of social context. Social relations can be strong or weak, social engagements can be intensive or mild, and social identities can be high or low. All these can be magnified in engineered social networks strongly mediated by information technology.

Through a qualitative study of 90 Facebook scenarios from 18 college students, they were able to look into how new communication media influence the integration of online and offline social interactions. From Facebook activities the participants demonstrated, they saw 1) Facebook users' identities are multifaceted and embodied in social interactions in different context; 2) Facebook provides supports for social engagements that are mutually cultivating with social ties and social identity; 3) while Facebook

provide means to maintain existing ties and facilitate weak ties, Facebook appropriates different affordances for strong ties and weak ties in the context of social engagements.

They found that Facebook made social identities more visible. Facebook does not create a virtual world or completely online communities. As the study shows, activities and identities of Facebook users have their real world origins. Take the field and track team, the Harry Potter group, and music band for example, these groups have their history and traditions, which are rooted in real world interaction. They are not created or enabled purely online by Facebook. When those Facebook users interact online, their feelings may largely be rested on and nurtured by their past experience.

Facebook broadly facilitated offline activities from proposing and planning through to report and commenting. people who use Facebook features differentially as they maintain strong and weak ties. Social identities, social engagements, and social ties are mutually reinforcing and cultivating with the affordances of Facebook.

John T. Cacioppo, James H. Fowler, Nicholas A. Christakis tried to figure the discrepancy between an individual's loneliness and the number of connections in a social network.

Results indicated that loneliness occurs in clusters, extends up to 3 degrees of separation, is disproportionately represented at the periphery of social networks, and spreads through a contagious process. The spread of loneliness was found to be stronger than the spread of perceived social connect-

ions, stronger for friends than family members, and stronger for women than for men.

The results advance understanding of the broad social forces that drive loneliness and suggest that efforts to reduce loneliness in society may benefit by aggressively targeting the people in the periphery to help repair their social networks and to create a protective barrier against loneliness that can keep the whole network from unraveling.

Junghyun Kim, Robert LaRose, and Wei Peng, conducted a research on the Relationship between Internet Use and Psychological Well-Being. The research started from the assumption that one of the major motives driving individuals' Internet use is to relieve psychosocial problems (e.g., loneliness, depression).

This study showed that individuals who were lonely or did not have good social skills could develop strong compulsive Internet use behaviors resulting in negative life outcomes (e.g., harming other significant activities such as work, school, or significant relationships) instead of relieving their original problems. Such augmented negative outcomes were expected to isolate individuals from healthy social activities and lead them into more loneliness.

Kim Junghyun et. al, tried to measure the relationship between internet use and psychological well-being. The study showed that individuals who were lonely or did not have good social skills could develop strong compulsive Internet use behaviors resulting in negative life outcomes (e.g., harming other significant activities such as work, school, or significant relationships) instead of relieving their

original problems. Such augmented negative outcomes were expected to isolate individuals from healthy social activities and lead them into more loneliness. Even though previous research suggests that social use of the Internet (e.g., social networking sites, instant messaging) could be more problematic than entertainment use (e.g., downloading files), the current study showed that the former did not show stronger associations than the latter in the key paths leading to compulsive Internet use.

Kraut et al. (1998) reported small but reliable negative effects of using the Internet on measures of social involvement and psychological well-being among Pittsburgh families in 1995-1996.

They called the effects a “paradox” because participants in the sample used the Internet heavily for communication, which generally has positive effects. In a 3-year follow-up of the original sample, they found that negative effects dissipated over the total period. They also report findings from a longitudinal study in 1998-99 of new computer and television purchasers. This new sample experienced overall positive effects of using the Internet on communication, social involvement, and well-being. Using the Internet generally predicted better outcomes for extraverts or those with more social support but worse outcomes for introverts or those with less support. Although using the Internet had slightly different benefits for teens and adults, controlling for age does not change the main conclusions.

Dennis Mazalin and Susan Moore investigated the relationships between the levels of identity development, Internet use and social anxiety among a sample

of 161 older adolescents/young adults aged between 18 and 25.

Results indicated that, for males only, higher levels of social anxiety and less mature identity statuses were associated with more frequent Internet use, specifically time spent in chat rooms, online browsing for personal use, and games. For females (who were in this sample less socially anxious, more identity-developed, and lower users of the Internet than males), social anxiety and identity status were not significantly associated with time spent online. Discussion centered around the potential roles of Internet use in reinforcing already-existing social anxiety or, alternatively, in supporting and maintaining social contacts in those

**with lower levels of social deficit.**

Leo Sang et al. questioned what kinds of psychological features do people have when they are overly involved in usage of the internet? Internet users in Korea were investigated in terms of internet over-use and related psychological profiles by the level of internet use. They used a modified Young's Internet Addiction Scale, and 13,588 users (7,878 males, 5,710 females), out of 20 million from a major portal site in Korea, participated in this study.

Among the sample, 3.5% had been diagnosed as internet addicts (IA), while 18.4% of them were classified as possible internet addicts (PA). The Internet Addiction Scale showed a strong relationship with dysfunctional social behaviors. More IA tried to escape from reality than PA and Non-addicts (NA). When they got stressed out by work or were just depressed, IA showed a high tendency to access the

internet. The IA group also reported the highest degree of loneliness, depressed mood, and compulsivity compared to the other groups. The IA group seemed to be more vulnerable to interpersonal dangers than others, showing an unusually close feeling for strangers. Further study is needed to investigate the direct relationship between psychological well-being and internet dependency.

Hsieh-Hua Yang et al, designed a questionnaire to measure the university students' friendship network and the time of Internet use. Name generation was used to identify the friendship network. The result showed that the higher the discrepancy between nomination and reciprocal dyads, the longer the time spent using the Internet. Internet is infiltrating into every aspect of life, especially social relations.

Daniel S. Holder attempted to assess the effects of Facebook on interpersonal relationships by comparing existing social networks with Facebook.com networks via the unique "birthday" feature on the site at the University of Chicago.

By asking them how many immediate (family) and distant friends do you have? How many Facebook.com friends do you have? How often do you check your Facebook.com account per day? How do you make new friends on Facebook.com? How many events over the past year have you attended in part because of their placement on Facebook.com via messages from groups you've joined or advertisements?

The study found that this technology augments existing relationships and social obligations. The study also suggests the network becomes part of the user's

“trans-active memory.” The number of friends in existing networks was greater than those in Facebook.com, a fact probably due to the college and high-school only population of the network. Facebook.com seems to reinforce existing relationships more than directly facilitating the creation of new ones.

The purpose of the present study was to examine the influence of personality and competency factors on Facebook use. This research investigated how the Five-Factor Model of personality relates to Facebook use.

Ninety-seven students at a university in Southwestern Ontario participated in the present study. The sample was comprised of 15 men and 82 women, having an average age of 21.69 years ( $SD = 5.40$ ). Students were compensated with partial course credit for their participation.

Despite some expected trends regarding Extraversion and Openness to Experience, results indicated that personality factors were not as influential as literature suggested. The results also indicated that a motivation to communicate was influential in terms of Facebook use. Personality variables were associated with some aspects of Facebook use. For example, individuals high on the trait of Extraversion were found to belong to significantly more Facebook groups.

Surprisingly, levels of Extraversion were not associated with number of “Facebook Friends,” or communicative functions of Facebook. These results suggest that although those high on the trait of Extraversion may utilize Facebook as a social tool, they do not use Facebook as an alternative to social activities.

Mustafa KOÇ and Karen Ann designed a quantitative research with a survey. The data were collected from 758 undergraduate students from the College of Education of a major Anatolian university. They investigated the potential impacts of Internet café use on Turkish college students' social capital.

They found that Internet café usage did not significantly influence on loneliness and prosaically attitudes. Spending more time at Internet cafés and frequent entertainment-based online activities led to a decrease in the quality of social networks with both family and friends. Frequent online communication activities led to an increase in the quality of social networks with friends, and such effects were the same for participants who stay alone, stay with family, and stay with friends. It was concluded that Internet technology was more than a simple and neutral tool that may constitute complex social dimensions involving profound alterations for youth's social life.

#### Hypotheses and Research Questions

This study uses original survey data to test the effects of using Facebook on young adults' well being. Based on this brief review of the relation between social network and well being literature, our empirical analysis on Facebook community is guided by five main hypotheses. Formally, the hypotheses are as follows:

- H1: Intensity of Facebook use is positively associated with social scales.
- H1a: Intensity of Facebook use is positively associated with happiness.
- H1b: Intensity of Facebook use is positively associated with life satisfaction.

- H1c: Intensity of Facebook use is positively associated with social trust.
- H1d: Intensity of Facebook use is positively associated with Self-Esteem.
- H1e: Intensity of Facebook use is positively associated with Loneliness.
- H1f: Intensity of Facebook use is positively associated with Shyness.
- H1g: Intensity of Facebook use positively associated with Loneliness.
- H2: Chatting all the time on Facebook is positively associated with Loneliness.
- H3: Chatting all the time on Facebook is positively associated with shyness.
- H4: There is an association between Facebook users and social scales.
- H4a: Facebook use is positively associated with life satisfaction.
- H4b: Facebook use is positively associated with social trust.
- H4c: Facebook use is positively associated with Self-Esteem.
- H4d: Facebook use is positively associated with Loneliness.
- H4g: Facebook use is positively associated with Shyness.
- H5: Attitude towards Facebook is positively associated with well being scales.
- H5a: Intensity of Facebook use is positively associated with happiness.

- H5b: Facebook use is positively associated with life satisfaction.
- H5c: Facebook use is positively associated with social trust.
- H5d: Facebook use is positively associated with Self-Esteem.
- H5e: Facebook use is positively associated with Loneliness.
- H5f: Facebook use is positively associated with Shyness.

We also investigate the following research questions:

What is the relationship between intensity of Facebook use and Depression-Happiness scale? What is the relationship between intensity of Facebook use and Life satisfaction scale? What is the relationship between intensity of Facebook use and social trust scale? What is the relationship between intensity of Facebook use and Self-Esteem scale? What is the relationship between intensity of Facebook use and Loneliness scale? What is the relationship between intensity of Facebook use and Shyness scale?

Is there a difference between facebook users and non users in Depression-Happiness, Life satisfaction, social trust, Self-Esteem, Loneliness, Shyness scales?

## **Method**

### **Sample and procedure**

The data reported here were collected between March 1 to June 26 2011, Out of approximately 515 invitations sent out for the survey over, only 409

surveys were completed, resulting in a total of 400 usable respondents.

**Table (1)**  
**Demographics of facebook Users**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>51.3</b>	<b>205</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>195</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>University</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1.00</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>50.0</b>
<b>2.00</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>50.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>PRACTICA</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1.00</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>50.0</b>
<b>2.00</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>50.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100.0</b>

To address these questions, a survey with 400 students was conducted from 6 October University and Cairo University 50% (N=200) each. Of those who had an account, 51.3% (N = 205) were male and 48.8% (N = 195) were female.

The sample for the survey consisted of students enrolled in different faculties. Majors varied from %50 (N=200) practical fields including faculties of (medicine, engineering, Dentistry, Pharmacy, physical therapy, Commerce, to 50% (N=200) theoretical faculties including (mass communication, Language, Lawyer, Tourism).

The sample for the survey consisted of students enrolled in 10 faculties, each faculty were given 45 questionnaire paper in both universities.

The margin of error associated with this sample is plus or minus 4.54% with a 95% confidence level. This margin of error is reported as 4.5% for simplicity. With a relatively low margin of error, the results of this survey can be generalized to the broader student population at the 6 October University and Cairo University.

## **Measurement**

The survey asked participants to complete the questionnaire on their Facebook usage and their well being. Participation was voluntary.

Overall, they spent approximately seven to ten minutes on the survey.

Facebook preference was measured with Likert measurement. Response options ranged from 1 to 7, as 1 reflects a level of strong disagreement with the statement, and 7 reflects a level of strong agreement with the statement.

## **Questionnaire**

The questionnaire contained questions about who are having a Facebook account. How long do they spend on Facebook?

The number of contacts they have. Their attitude towards facebook, how long do they chat, how many groups they joined, also they were asked to fill some scales like: Depression-Happiness, Life satisfaction, social trust, Self-Esteem, Loneliness, and Shyness.

## Study scales

### Intensity of Facebook Use

The traditional approach for measuring media use in communication research is to gauge the frequency or duration of exposure to a medium, but this approach fails to account for the richer user experience provided by interactive online sites.

A more complete measure of intensity of Facebook use was developed by Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe (2007), who created a scale to gauge user engagement in Facebook activities based on number of “friends,” amount spent on the network on a typical day, and level of agreement with the following statements:

“Facebook is part of my everyday activity,” “I am proud to tell people I am on Facebook,” “Facebook has become part of my daily routine,” “I feel out of touch when I haven’t logged onto Facebook for a day,” and “I would be sorry if Facebook shut down.” The same scale was used in this study.

The response choices for the number of “friends” ranged from 1 (less than 50) to 5 (400 or more).

The duration question used a 7-point scale (from 1 = no time at all to 7 = more than 3 hours per day), while the response choices for the Likert-scale questions ranged from 1 (disagree) to 3 (agree). They recoded to range from 5 to 15.

These individual items were first recoded to range from 0 to 1 before taking an average to create the scale, due to differing item scale ranges (see Table 2).

**Table (2)**  
**Descriptive Statistics for Scale of Intensity of Facebook Use**

SD	M	%
		<b>Intensity of Facebook Use</b>
		<b>(Cronbach's alpha =.7548)</b>
<b>122.901</b>	<b>128.26</b>	<b>About how many total Facebook friends do you have?</b>
<b>24.7</b>		<b>Less than 50.</b>
<b>32.8</b>		<b>From 50 to less than 100.</b>
<b>27.1</b>		<b>From 100 to less than 200.</b>
<b>8.0</b>		<b>From 200 to less than 300.</b>
<b>7.4</b>		<b>From 300 to more than 400.</b>
<b>82.957</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>On a typical day, about how much time do you spend on Facebook?</b>
<b>2.7%</b>		<b>0 No time at all</b>
<b>9.0</b>		<b>1 Less than 10 min</b>
<b>14.7</b>		<b>2 10 to 30 min</b>
<b>17.7</b>		<b>3 More than 30 min, up to 1 hr</b>
<b>26.4</b>		<b>4 More than 1 hr, up to 2 hrs</b>
<b>10.4</b>		<b>5 More than 2 hrs, up to 3 hrs</b>
<b>19.1</b>		<b>6 More than 3 hrs</b>
<b>.748</b>	<b>1.93</b>	<b>Facebook is part of my everyday activity</b>
<b>.796</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>I am proud to tell people I am on Facebook</b>
<b>.773</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>Facebook has become part of my daily routine</b>
<b>.835</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>I feel out of touch when I haven't logged onto Facebook for a day</b>
<b>.766</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>I feel I am part of the Facebook community at the campus</b>

## Short Depression-Happiness Scale:

Respondents are asked to answer 6 sentences which describe how they felt the past seven days, some statements describe positive feelings and some describe negative feelings.

It consists of six statements: I felt dissatisfied with my life, I felt happy, I felt cheerless, I felt pleased with the way I am, I felt that life was enjoyable, I felt that life was meaningless. Response choices were 1 (never), 2 (rarely), 3 (some of the time), 4 (often).

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)

This scale is a ten item Likert scale with items answered on a four point scale - from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The original sample for which the scale was developed consisted of 5,024 High School Juniors and seniors from 10 randomly selected schools in New York State.

It consists of six statements: On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. At times, I think I am no good at all. I feel that I have a number of good qualities. I am able to do things as well as most other people. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. I certainly feel useless at times. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. I wish I could have more respect for myself. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Response choices were 4 strongly agree, 3 agree, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree, Sum the scores for the 10 items. The higher the score, the higher the self esteem. Scoring: SA=3, A=2, D=1, SD=0. Items with an asterisk are reverse scored, that is, SA=0, A=1, D=2, SD=3.

### **The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS):**

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) is a measure of life satisfaction developed by Ed Diener and colleagues (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985).

The SWLS is a short, 5-item instrument designed to measure global cognitive judgments of one's lives. Life satisfaction is distinguished from affective appraisal in that it is more cognitively than emotionally driven. Life satisfaction can be assessed specific to a particular domain of life (e.g., work, family) or globally.

The SWLS also has good convergent validity, being related to, but still separate from, constructs such as depression, negative and positive affect, self-esteem, anxiety, and psychological distress (see Pavot and Diener 2008).

It consists of five statements: In most ways my life is close to my ideal, the conditions of my life are excellent, I am satisfied with my life, So far I have gotten the important things I want in life, If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing. Using the 1-7 scale: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Slightly disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, slightly agree, agree, Strongly agree.

Respondents who score from (25 – 35) are highly satisfied, from (24-20) are in average score, (19-15) are slightly below average, (14-10) are dissatisfied, (9-5) are Extremely Dissatisfied.

### **Social Trust Scale:**

A popular measure of social trust is Rosenberg's (1956) Faith in People scale, Social trust was measured with the statements "Generally speaking, would you

say that people can be trusted,” “People try to take advantage of you if they got the chance,” “People try to be fair,” “You can't be too careful in dealing with people,” “People try to be helpful,” and “People are just looking out for themselves”.

Response choices were 1 (never), 2 (hardly ever), 3 (some of the time), 4 (most of the time), and 5 (all of the time).

### **UCLA Loneliness Scale:**

Respondents are asked to answer 6 sentences which are, how often do you feel unhappy doing so many things alone? How often do you feel you have nobody to talk to? How often do you feel you cannot tolerate being so alone? How often do you feel as if nobody really understands you? How often do you find yourself waiting for people to call or write? How often do you feel completely alone? How often do you feel you are unable to reach out and communicate with those around you? How often do you feel starved for company? How often do you feel it is difficult for you to make friends? How often do you feel shut out and excluded by others?

Response choices were 1 (I never feel this way), 2 (I rarely feel this way), 3 (I sometimes feel this way), 4 (I often feel this way), and 5 (all of the time).

### **Cheek and Buss Shyness Scale:**

Respondents are asked to read each item carefully and decide to what extent it is characteristic of their feelings and behavior. The sentences are: I feel tense when I'm with people I don't know well. I am socially somewhat awkward. I find it difficult to ask other

people for information. I am often uncomfortable at parties and other social events. When in a group of people, I have trouble thinking of the right thing to say. It takes me a long time to overcome my shyness in new situations. It is hard for me to act natural when I am meeting new people. I feel nervous when speaking to someone in authority.

I have doubts about my social competence. I have trouble looking someone right in the eye. I feel inhibited in social situations. I find it hard to talk to strangers. I am more shy with members of the opposite sex.

To calculate your score add up the numbers you gave for questions 1 through 13. A score between 13-35 indicates that you are not a shy person. A score between 36-49 indicates that you are somewhat shy. A score between 50-65 indicates that you are a very shy person.

Response choices were 1= very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree 2 uncharacteristic, 3= neutral, 4 = characteristic, 5 = Very Characteristic or true, strongly agree. The average shyness score for college students according to Cheek and Buss is 33. Surveys indicate that about 40% of Americans consider themselves to be shy, and that over 80% of these people do not like being shy.

Only 7% of Americans say they have never experienced feelings of shyness.

## **Results:**

Before proceeding to the formal tests of the hypotheses, it was important to gain an understanding of the differences between those who do (74.8%,

N=299) have a Facebook account and who do not (25.3% (N=101) have a Facebook account.

Of the sample surveyed, 74.8% (N=299) of students had a Facebook account and 25.3% (N=101) did not have. Comparing these results with a previous study done by the author, show a raising percentage for using facebook (10% in a period not more than two years). (Amany Albert, 2009) While multiple non Arab studies showed that somewhere between 80 and 90 % of all college students have a profile on an SNS (Gross et al. 2005; Lampe et al. 2006; Stutzman 2006).

### **Almost the entire sample had less than 200 contacts:**

(32.8%) for those who had 50 to less than 100, (27.1%) for those who had 100 to less than 200 contacts, (24.7%) for those who had Less than 50 contacts, while only (15.4%) of the sample had more contacts from 200 to less than 400.

This somehow shows that youth are careful in choosing and adding who will see their activities and photos on Facebook.

### **More than half of facebook users spend from 1-5 hours daily.**

(55.9%) of the sample spend a long time varied from 1 to 5 hours. While only (9%) spend Less than 15 minutes, which means there is a heavy use of facebook.

### **Users' opinion in facebook:**

Although using Facebook heavily from more than half of the sample, only (24.7%) of them strongly agreed that it is part of their everyday activity. We can

notice that the majority (43.8%) were neutral about this statement. The same neutral opinion about: Facebook has become part of my daily routine (40.5%). While the majority strongly disagreed (46.8%) with the statement I feel out of touch when I haven't logged onto Facebook for a day. which means, using facebook for long times doesn't control their life as they were able to manage their daily life without facebook.

Although facebook is a strong network to connect people, the majority (47.5%) strongly disagreed for being part of the Facebook community at the campus.

The majority had a positive attitude towards facebook, they were proud to tell people they were on Facebook (42.4%).

**Table (3)**  
**Attitude towards Facebook**

strongly disagree		Neutral		strongly agree		Sentence
%	N	%	N	%	N	
31.4	94	43.8	131	24.7	74	Part of my everyday activity
24.1	72	33.4	100	42.4	127	proud to tell people I am on Facebook
29.1	87	40.5	121	30.4	91	has become part of my daily routine
46.8	140	26.4	79	26.7	80	I feel out of touch when I haven't logged
47.5	142	33.4	100	19	57	part of the FB community at the campus

## **Intensity of Facebook Use**

According to the scale developed by Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe (2007), facebook intensity was based on number of “friends,” amount spent on the network on a typical day, and level of agreement with some statements.

Nearly (50%) of respondents were heavy users of Facebook, while (22.1%) were classified as light users.

## **Activities on facebook**

### **Only quarter of the sample chatted all the time they spent on Facebook:**

Only (19.7%) chatted almost all the time, (5.4%) chatted all the time they spend on Facebook, while (39.8%) chatted for sometimes, while (28.8%) chatted in rare times, and (6.4%) never chatted. This shows again how the sample members are controlling their Facebook use.

### **Joining groups:**

(86%) joined different groups, while only (14%) didn't join. Of the half spent 1-5 hours on Facebook, only (5.4%) read and sent messages on different groups. There were higher activities in dealing with groups for those who spend Less than 15 minutes (39.5%). This means there are many other activities than interactivity on groups.

The best sentence described the majority use for groups was I usually read and write (34.5%) then I rarely visit it (28.4%), then I only read the wall/discussion board (21.8%) and finally I start writing new topics to be discussed (15.3%).

**Table (4)**  
**Time spent on Facebook and on groups**

%	N	Time spent on Groups	%	N	Time spent on Facebook
25.7	67	No time at all	2.7	8	No time at all
39.5	103	Less than 15 minutes.	9.0	27	Less than 15 minutes.
21.8	57	From 15 -30 minutes.	14.7	44	From 15 -30 minutes.
7.7	20	From 31-60 minutes.	17.7	53	From 31-60 minutes.
5.0	13	From 1-2 hours.	26.4	79	From 1-2 hours.
--	--	From 2-3 hours.	10.4	31	From 2-3 hours.
.4	1	More than 5 hours	19.1	57	More than 5 hours
100	261	Total	100.0	299	Total

**Table (5)**  
**Short Depression-Happiness Scale**

Std. D	Me an	CV	Never		Rarely		Sometime		Often		Depression-Happiness Scale
			%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
1.011	2.11	47.91	37.1	111	24.1	72	29.8	89	9.0	27	felt dissatisfied with my life
.784	3.17	24.73	3.3	10	13.4	40	45.8	137	37.5	112	I felt happy
.968	2.32	41.72	24.4	73	30.4	91	33.8	101	11.4	34	I felt cheerless
.888	3.00	29.60	8.7	26	13.0	39	47.5	142	30.8	92	I felt pleased the way I am
.918	2.95	31.12	10.4	31	13.7	41	46.8	140	29.1	87	I felt life was enjoyable
1.038	1.98	52.42	43.1	129	27.8	83	17.4	52	11.7	35	my life was meaningless

The three positive sentences in this scale, showed a strong attitude towards being happy, as (82.3%) felt happy often and sometimes. While (78.3%) felt pleased the way they were often and sometimes. And (75.9%) felt life was enjoyable often and sometimes.

The three negative sentences in this scale show that there is a strong attitude against being depressed. Almost two thirds (70.9%) never and rarely felt that their life were meaningless, (61.2%) of the sample were never or rarely felt dissatisfied with their life, while (54.8%) Never or rarely felt cheerless.

Respondents' opinion of feeling happy is more stable and agreeable (CV =24.73), compared to I felt that my life was meaningless. (CV = 52.42).

**Table (6)**  
**Life Satisfaction Scale**

CV	SD	Mean	Strongly agree		Agree		slightly agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Slightly disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Scale
			%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
29.82	1.473	4.94	3.0	12	6.5	26	3.3	13	19.0	76	30.5	122	24.3	97	13.5	54	My life is ideal
25.63	1.407	5.49	2.5	10	2.8	11	4.3	17	8.3	33	22.3	89	36.3	145	23.8	95	My life is excellent.
29.54	1.598	5.41	4.3	17	4.5	18	4.8	19	5.0	20	22.5	90	32.5	130	26.5	106	I am satisfied
33.94	1.721	5.07	4.5	18	8.0	32	6.0	24	10.3	41	23.5	94	24.5	98	23.3	93	I have gotten things I want.
58.55	2.137	3.65	24.0	96	16.5	66	6.0	24	16.0	64	11.8	47	12.8	51	13.0	52	I would change nothing.

Although they are satisfied with their lives they want to make some changes on it. The sample showed high satisfaction with their lives, as they agreed with the following sentences (68.3%) in most ways my life is close to my ideal, (82.4%) the conditions of my life are excellent, (81.5%) I am satisfied with my life. (71.3%) So far I have gotten the important things I want in life. And showed high disagree (46.5%) with the sentence if I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing. Respondents' opinion of the statement "the conditions of my life are excellent", is more stable and agreeable (CV =25.63), compared to I would change almost nothing (CV = 58.55).

**Table (7)**  
**Social Trust Scale**

CV	SD	Mean	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always		Social Trust Scale
			%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
36.68	1.038	2.83	9.3	37	30.0	120	36.0	144	18.5	74	6.3	25	can be trusted
31.22	1.027	3.29	4.5	18	15.5	62	39.3	157	27.5	110	13.3	53	Take advantage
41.42	1.251	3.02	16.0	64	15.0	60	33.8	135	21.3	85	14.0	56	You can't be too careful
33.13	1.037	3.13	3.8	15	24.5	98	39.0	156	20.5	82	12.3	49	try to be helpful
29.32	1.085	3.70	3.8	15	10.0	40	25.5	102	33.8	135	27.0	108	looking out for themselves

The scale showed a low social trust with others, as they agreed with the following: Generally speaking, would you say that people can be trusted (60.8%). And People try to be helpful (39%) for sometimes, and (24.5%) for rarely. For the revised sentences, high agreement for the following sentences: People are just looking out for themselves (86.3%), People try to take advantage of you if they got the chance (80.1%), You can't be too careful in dealing with people (69.1%).

Respondents' opinion of the statement "People are looking out for themselves ", is more stable and agreeable (CV =29.32), compared to the statement people can be trusted (CV = 36.68).

**Table (8)**  
**Self-Esteem Scale**

CV	SD	Mean	disagree		Strongly disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Self-Esteem Scale
			%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
24.53	.758	3.09	3.5	14	14.3	57	52.5	210	29.8	119	satisfied with myself.
34.72	.854	2.46	13.3	53	38.5	154	37.5	150	10.8	43	I am no good at all.
16.40	.556	3.39	.5	2	2.0	8	55.3	221	42.3	169	good qualities.
20.60	.688	3.34	1.8	7	7.3	29	46.8	187	44.3	177	able to do things.
38.75	.899	2.32	19.0	76	41.0	164	29.5	118	10.5	42	don't have much to proud of.
33.87	.840	2.48	13.3	53	35.3	141	42.0	168	9.6	38	feel useless at times.
21.81	.711	3.26	2.8	11	7.3	29	51.0	204	39.1	156	I'm a person of worth
30.13	.961	3.19	10.0	40	8.3	33	34.3	137	47.6	190	I wish I have more respect for myself.
42.81	.899	2.10	27.0	108	44.5	178	19.8	79	8.8	35	I am a failure.
22.57	.729	3.23	2.8	11	9.5	38	50.0	200	37.8	151	positive attitude toward myself.

The scale showed high Self-Esteem, as Respondents agreed with the following statements:

I feel that I have a number of good qualities. (97.6%).

I am able to do things as well as most other people. (91.1%).

I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. (90.1%), I take a positive attitude toward myself. (87.8%), On the whole, I am satisfied with myself (82.3%).

The revised sentences, showed high disagreement in the following:

All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure (71.5%). I feel I do not have much to be proud of (60%).

At times, I think I am no good at all (51.8%). Except a high agreement with I wish I could have more respect for myself (81.9%).

and a moderate agreement with I certainly feel useless at times (51.6%)

Respondents' opinion of the statement "I feel that I have a number of good qualities", is more stable and agreeable (CV =16.40), compared to the statement All in all.

I am inclined to feel that I am a failure (CV = 42.81).

**Table (9)**  
**UCLA Loneliness Scale**

CV	SD	Mean	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		How often do you feel
			%	N	%	n	%	N	%	N	
27.00	.883	3.27	5.8	23	11.8	47	32.3	129	50.3	201	unhappy doing things alone?
46.68	1.069	2.29	31.0	124	25.0	100	28.3	113	15.8	63	you have nobody to talk to?
39.62	1.042	2.63	18.3	73	24.5	98	33.0	132	24.3	97	you cannot tolerate being alone
41.14	1.086	2.64	21.5	86	19.3	77	33.5	134	25.8	103	as if nobody understands you?
42.23	1.081	2.56	23.0	92	21.3	85	32.8	131	23.0	92	waiting for people to call?
52.81	1.072	2.03	42.3	169	25.8	103	18.5	74	13.5	54	feel completely alone?
49.54	1.075	2.17	37.3	149	21.5	86	28.0	112	13.3	53	unable to communicate ?
34.08	1.036	3.04	12.3	49	15.0	60	29.5	118	43.3	173	starved for company?
54.80	1.074	1.96	47.3	189	21.5	86	19.0	76	12.3	49	difficult for you to make friends
51.93	1.101	2.12	40.3	161	21.8	87	23.3	93	14.8	59	shut out and excluded by other

Respondents agreed feeling unhappy doing things alone (82.6%), feeling starved for company (72.8%), cannot tolerate being so alone (57.3%), feel as if nobody understands you? (59.3%), find yourself waiting for people to call or write (55.8%).

The revised sentences, showed high disagreement in the following: I feel you have nobody to talk to (56%), I feel completely alone (68.1%), I feel you are unable to reach out and communicate with those around you (58.8%), I feel it is difficult for you to

make friends (68.8%), I feel shut out and excluded by others (62.1%).

Respondents' opinion of the statement "I feel unhappy doing things alone", is more stable and agreeable (CV =27.00), compared to the statement I feel it is difficult for me to make friends (CV = 54.80).

**Table (10)**  
**Cheek and Buss Shyness Scale**

CV	SD	Mean	Strongly - Slightly agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly - Slightly disagree		Shyness Scale
			%	N	%	N	%	N	
1.195	3.40	35.15	53.3	213	23.3	93	23.5	94	tense when I'm with people I don't know well.
1.165	2.49	46.79	79.3	317	14.5	58	6.3	25	I am socially awkward.
1.197	2.61	45.86	75.9	303	15.3	61	9.0	36	difficult to ask other people for information.
1.388	2.76	50.29	67	268	18.0	72	15.0	60	uncomfortable at social events.
1.262	2.58	48.91	73.3	293	17.5	70	9.3	37	in a group, I 've trouble of things to say.
1.310	2.85	45.96	67.6	270	18.3	73	14.3	57	long time to overcome my shyness in new situations
1.287	2.85	45.16	66.6	266	21.3	85	12.3	49	hard to act neutral when I am meeting new people
1.237	2.75	44.98	70.8	283	19.0	76	10.3	41	nervous when speaking to someone in authority.
1.142	2.36	48.39	81.6	326	13.8	55	4.8	19	doubts about my social competence.
1.417	3.13	45.27	55.5	222	22.0	88	22.6	90	trouble looking someone in the eye.
1.260	3.46	36.42	45.5	182	30.8	123	23.9	95	I feel inhibited in social situations.
1.258	2.82	44.61	70.3	281	17.5	70	12.3	49	I find it hard to talk to strangers.
1.380	3.21	42.99	53.6	214	23.5	94	23.1	92	I am more shy with opposite sex.

Respondents agreed whether slightly or strongly on the following: I have doubts about my social competence (81.6%), I am socially somewhat awkward (79.3%), I find it difficult to ask other people for information (75.9%), When in a group of people, I have trouble thinking of the right thing to say (73.3%), I feel nervous when speaking to someone in authority (70.8%), I find it hard to talk to strangers (70.3%), It takes me a long time to overcome my shyness in new situations (67.6%), I am often uncomfortable at parties and other social events (67%), It is hard for me to act neutral when I am meeting new people (66.6%).

I have trouble looking someone right in the eye (55.5%), I feel tense when I'm with people I don't know well (53.4%), I am more shy with members of the opposite sex (53.6%), I feel inhibited in social situations. (45.5%) with high percentage (30.8%) of undecided opinions (neither agree nor disagree).

Respondents' opinion of the statement "I feel one", is more stable and agreeable ( $CV = 27.00$ ), compared to the statement I feel it is difficult for me to make friends ( $CV = 54.80$ ).

**Table (10)**  
**Stability among scales**

Std. Deviation	Mean	cv	N	scales
.51506	1.9291	26.70	299	Attitude to facebook
.51907	2.5881	20.06	299	Depression-Happiness scale
1.14768	4.9110	23.37	400	Satisfaction with life
.47617	3.1950	14.90	400	Social trust
.30020	2.8848	10.41	400	Self Esteem
.59277	2.4712	23.99	400	Loneliness
.79429	2.8675	27.70	400	Shyness

Comparing the degree of stability and agreement among different scales, we calculated the mean of each scale, the CV, and the Std. of Deviation. Respondents' opinion of the scale "Self Esteem", was more stable and agreeable (CV =10.41), compared to the scale of shyness (CV =27.70).

**Table (11)**  
**Facebook Intensity with scales**

Total	Life Satisfaction Scale						Depression-Happiness Scale						Facebook Intensity
	agree		Neutral		Disagree		Agree		Neutral		disagree		
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
49.8%	19.1%	57	15.7%	47	15.1%	45	15.7%	47	24.1%	72	10.0%	30	High
28.1%	7.4%	22	9.7%	29	11.0%	33	10.4%	31	9.4%	28	8.4%	25	Medium
22.1%	8.0%	24	6.0%	18	8.0%	24	1.7%	5	6.7%	20	13.7%	41	Low
100.0%	34.4%	103	31.4%	94	34.1%	102	27.8%	83	40.1%	120	32.1%	96	

More than one third of the sample (34.4%) agreed on life satisfaction scale, (19.1%) of them had high intensity of Facebook use. Almost one third (32.1%) disagreed on Depression-Happiness Scale, (13.7%) of them had low intensity of Facebook use.

### Short Depression-Happiness Scale

A significant difference (.000) was found between heavy, medium and low users of Facebook with the depression happiness scale, as Pearson Chi-Square value (43.346) at a degree of freedom (4) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.356) showing a high relation going towards those who agree on the scale.\*

\* max 0.7 from 0.2 to 0.4 good . \* high significant (\*\*\*) 0.00 \* medium significant (\*\*\*) 0.05 \* low significant (\*) 0.1

## Life Satisfaction Scale

No significant difference (.354) was found between heavy, medium and low users of Facebook with the Life Satisfaction scale, as Pearson Chi-Square value (4.404) at a degree of freedom (4) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.120).

**Table (12)**  
(N =299)

Total	Self-Esteem Scale						Social Trust Scale						Facebook Intensity
	agree		Neutral		disagree		agree		Neutral		disagree		
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
49.8%	16.7%	50	19.4%	58	13.7%	41	21.7%	65	18.4%	55	9.7%	29	High
28.1%	6.7%	20	11.0%	33	10.4%	31	9.0%	27	8.0%	24	11.0%	33	Medium
22.1%	4.3%	13	5.4%	16	12.4%	37	7.7%	23	8.7%	26	5.7%	17	Low
100.0%	27.8%	83	35.8%	107	36.5%	109	38.5%		35.1%		26.4%		

## Social Trust Scale

A significant difference (.020) was found between heavy, medium and low users of Facebook with the Social Trust Scale, as Pearson Chi-Square value (11.637) at a degree of freedom (4) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.194) showing a good relation going towards those who agree on the scale.\*

## Self-Esteem Scale

A significant difference (.002) was found between heavy, medium and low users of Facebook with the

Self-Esteem Scale, as Pearson Chi-Square value (17.207) at a degree of freedom (4) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.233) showing a good relation going towards those who agree on the scale.\*

**Table (13)**  
**(N =299)**

Total	Shyness Scale						UCLA Loneliness Scale						Facebook Intensity
	agree		Neutral		disagree		agree		Neutral		disagree		
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
49.8%	15.7%	47	14.7%	44	19.4%	58	17.4%	52	18.1%	54	14.4%	43	High
28.1%	6.7%	20	10.4%	31	11%	33	9.4%	28	10.4%	31	8.4%	25	Medium
22.1%	6.0%	18	6.4%	19	9.7%	29	7.4%	22	4.7%	14	10%	30	Low
100.0%	28.4%	85	31.4%	94	40.1%	120	34.1%	102	33.1%	99	32.8%	98	

A significant difference (.097) was found between heavy, medium and low users of Facebook with the UCLA Loneliness Scale, as Pearson Chi-Square value (7.849) at a degree of freedom (4) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.160) showing a good relation going towards those who agree on the scale.\*

No significant difference (.628) was found between heavy, medium and low users of Facebook with the Cheek and Buss Shyness Scale, as Pearson Chi-Square value (2.596) at a degree of freedom (4) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.093) showing a good relation going towards those who agree on the scale.\*

The scale measuring intensity of Facebook use was positively associated with depression-happiness scale, social trust, Self-Esteem, and Loneliness, which

means that depressed, less social trust, less self-esteem, and Lonely persons spend more time on Facebook, providing support for the first hypotheses (H1a, H1c, H1d and H1e). The scale measuring intensity of Facebook use was negatively associated with life satisfaction and Shyness, showing no support for the first hypotheses (H1b and H1f).

### **The relation between chatting on facebook and feeling lonely or shy.**

No significant difference was found between Chatting all the time on Facebook and Loneliness, as Pearson Chi-Square value (.425) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.046) showing No relation.

No significant difference was found between Chatting all the time on Facebook and shyness, as Pearson Chi-Square value (.415) with a Contingency Coefficient value (-.047) showing No relation.

Chatting all the time on Facebook was negatively associated with Loneliness and Shyness, showing no support for the second and third hypotheses.

### **The relation between "Members and non members of facebook" and "social scales".**

**Table (14)**

Social Trust				Life Satisfaction Scale					
Total	Agree	Neutral	disagree	Total	Agree	Neutral	disagree		
299	115	105	79	299	103	94	102	N	Members
74.8%	28.8%	26.3%	19.8%	74.8%	25.8%	23.5%	25.5%	%	
101	43	30	28	101	32	45	24	N	Non
25.3%	10.8%	7.5%	7.0%	25.3%	8.0%	11.3%	6.0%	%	
400	158	135	107	400	135	139	126	N	Total
100.0%	39.5%	33.8%	26.8%	100.0%	33.8%	34.8%	31.5%	%	

A significant difference (.039) was found between users and nonusers of Facebook towards Satisfaction with Life , as Pearson Chi-Square value (6.477) at a degree of freedom (2) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.126) showing a good relation going towards those who agree on the scale.\*

No significant difference (.598) was found between users and nonusers of Facebook towards Social Trust , as Pearson Chi-Square value (1.027) at a degree of freedom (2) with a Contingency Coefficient value (051) showing NO relation.

**Table (15)**

Loneliness				Self esteem				
Total	agree	Neutral	disagree	agree	Neutral	disagree		
299	102	99	98	83	107	109	N	Members
74.8%	25.5%	24.8%	24.5%	20.8%	26.8%	27.3%	%	
101	31	47	23	31	41	29	N	Non-
25.3%	7.8%	11.8%	5.8%	7.8%	10.3%	7.3%	%	
400	133	146	121	114	148	138	N	Total
100.0 %	33.3%	36.5%	30.3%	28.5%	37.0%	34.5%	%	

No significant difference (.366) was found between users and nonusers of Facebook towards Social Trust , as Pearson Chi-Square value (2.011) at a degree of freedom (2) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.071) showing NO relation.

No significant difference (.039) was found between users and nonusers of Facebook towards Social Trust , as Pearson Chi-Square value (6.491) at a degree of freedom (2) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.126) showing NO relation.

**Table (16)**  
**Shyness**

shyness					
Total	agree	Neutral	disagree	N	Members
299	85	94	120	N	Members
74.8%	21.3%	23.5%	30.0%	%	
101	49	34	18	N	Non-
25.3%	12.3%	8.5%	4.5%	%	
400	134	128	138	N	Total
100.0%	33.5%	32.0%	34.5%	%	

A significant difference (.000) was found between users and nonusers of Facebook towards Satisfaction with Life, as Pearson Chi-Square value (20.104).

At a degree of freedom (2) with a Contingency Coefficient value (.219).

Showing a good relation going towards those who agree on the scale.\*

Being a member on Facebook or not was positively associated with life satisfaction and Shyness, which means that those who are not satisfied with their life, and shy persons spend more time on Facebook, providing support for the fourth hypotheses (H4a and H4g).

Facebook Members and non members were negatively associated with social trust, Self-Esteem, and Loneliness, showing no support for the first hypotheses (H4b, H4c, and H4d).

## Relation among "Attitude towards Facebook" and " well being scales".

The Spearman rank correlation analysis was conducted for individual attitudes towards Facebook as well as the aggregate relationship among the well being scales.

Parameter estimates, standard errors and associated p-values for the complete-case analysis are given in Table 2##, in the form of a series of linear regression models.

**Table (17)**

Shynes s	Lonelines s	Self esteem	Social trust	Satisfactio n	Happines s	Attitud e		
.094	.118	.176	.085	.119	.292	--	SPEARMA N Correlation Coefficient	Attitude towards Facebook
.106	.041	.002	.142	.040	.000	--	P-VALUE	
--	--	Good	--	Good	* high	--	Indication	
.178	.211	.359	.254	-.029	--	.292	SPEARMA N Correlation Coefficient	Happiness
.002	.000	.000	.000	.618	--	.000	Sig. (2- tailed)	
Good	high	high	high	--	--	High	Indication	
-.144	-.253	.000	.031	--	-.029	.119	Correlation Coefficient	Satisfactio n with life
.004	.000	.997	.535	--	.618	.040	Sig. (2- tailed)	
Good	High	--	--	--	--	good	Indication	
.065	.140	.230	--	.031	.254	.085	Correlation Coefficient	Social trust
.197	.005	.000	--	.535	.000	.142	P-VALUE	

--	Medium	High	--	--	High	--	Indication	
.194	.243	--	.230	.000	.359	.176	Correlation Coefficient	Self esteem
.000	.000	--	.000	.997	.000	.002	P-VALUE	
High	High	--	High	--	High	Good	Indication	
.473	--	.243	.140	-.253	.211	.118	Correlation Coefficient	Loneliness
.000	--	.000	.005	.000	.000	.041	P-VALUE	
High	--	High	mediu m	High	High	Good	Indication	
--	.473	.194	.065	-.144	.178	.094	Correlation Coefficient	Shyness
--	.000	.000	.197	.004	.002	.106	P-VALUE	
--	High	High	--	Good	Good	--	Indication	

The study showed a significant correlation of high strength between the attitude towards Facebook and the depression- Happiness scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=0.000$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient =  $.292$ ;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had good attitude towards Facebook tend to be happier in their lives.

The study showed a significant correlation of good strength between the attitude towards Facebook and the Satisfaction with life scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=0.040$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient =  $.119$ ;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had good attitude towards Facebook tend to satisfied with their lives.

The study showed a significant correlation of good strength between the attitude towards Facebook and the self esteem scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=0.002$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient

=.176;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had good attitude towards Facebook tend to highly esteem themselves.

There were no significant correlations ( $P > 0.05$ ) between Facebook Attitudes and Social trust, Loneliness, Shyness scales.

The scale measuring attitude towards Facebook was positively associated with depression-happiness scale, Satisfaction with life, and Self-Esteem, which means that depressed, less satisfied with life, and less self-esteem persons spend more time on Facebook, providing support for the fifth hypotheses (H5a, H5b, and H5d).

The scale measuring intensity of Facebook use was negatively associated with Social trust, Loneliness, Shyness scales. (H5c, H5e, and H5f).

Relation among Depression-Happiness Scale and well being scales.

The study showed a significant correlation of high strength between Depression-Happiness Scale and the Social trust scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.000$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient = .254;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had good attitude towards Facebook tend to have social trust in others.

The study showed a significant correlation of high strength between the Depression-Happiness Scale and the Self esteem scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.000$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient

=.359;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had good attitude towards Facebook tend to esteem themselves.

The study showed a significant correlation of high strength between the Depression-Happiness Scale and the Loneliness scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.000$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient = .211;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had good attitude towards Facebook tend to feel lonely with their lives.

The study showed a significant correlation of good strength between the Depression-Happiness Scale and the Shyness scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.002$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient =.178;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had good attitude towards Facebook tend to feel Shy.

There were no significant correlations ( $P > 0.05$ ) between happiness and Satisfaction scales.

Relation among Satisfaction with life and well being scales.

The study showed a significant correlation of high strength between Satisfaction with life and the self esteem scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.000$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient =-.253;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had Satisfaction with life tend to be less Lonely.

The study showed a significant correlation of good strength between Satisfaction with life and Shyness scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.004$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient =-.144;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had Satisfaction with life tend to be less shy.

There were no significant correlations ( $P > 0.05$ ) between Satisfaction with life and Social trust, Self esteem scales.

Relation among Social trust scale and well being scales.

The study showed a significant correlation of high strength between Social trust scale and the self esteem scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.000$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient  $=-.230$ ;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who had good Social trust tend to esteem themselves.

The study showed a significant correlation of medium strength between Social trust scale and Loneliness scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.005$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient  $=.140$ ;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who felt Loneliness tend to esteem themselves.

There were no significant correlations ( $P > 0.05$ ) between Social trust scale and Shyness scales.

Relation among Self esteem scale and well being scales.

The study showed a significant correlation of high strength between esteem themselves and Loneliness scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.000$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient  $=.243$ ;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who tend to esteem themselves felt Loneliness

The study showed a significant correlation of high strength between esteem themselves and Shyness scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.000$ ), (Spearman's

correlation coefficient =.194;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who esteem themselves tend to be shy.

Relation among Loneliness scale and well being scales.

The study showed a significant correlation of high strength between loneliness and Shyness scale as Pearson Chi-Square value ( $\rho=.000$ ), (Spearman's correlation coefficient =.473;  $P < 0.05$ ). This means, those who are lonely tend to be shy.

## References:

- **Amany Albert (2009). Connecting and Communicating on face book, a field study on the uses of Arab youth in Egyptian Universities". 14th Annual conference of the Arab-US. Association for communication Educators, November 7-10.**
- **Well-being. (n.d.). (2009). Dictionary.com Unabridged. Retrieved June 10, 2012, from Dictionary.com website: <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/well-being> Macmillan dictionary. <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/well-being>.**
- **Gregory, Derek; Johnston, Ron; Pratt, Geraldine et al., eds. (June2009). "Quality of Life". Dictionary of Human Geography(5th ed.). Oxford: Wiley- Blackwell- ISBN - 978-1-4051-3287-9. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:BookSources/978-1-4051-3287-9>**
- **Lisa Callaghan, Social Well-Being in Extra Care Housing: An Overview of the Literature, PSSRU Discussion March 2008, <http://www.pssru.ac.uk/pdf/dp2528.pdf>**
- **John F. Helliwell and Robert D. Putnam , The social context of well-being, Published online 31 August 2004, The Royal Society. [http://www.subjectpool.com/ed\\_teach/y4person/3\\_happiness/Social\\_causes\\_of\\_happiness.pdf](http://www.subjectpool.com/ed_teach/y4person/3_happiness/Social_causes_of_happiness.pdf)**
- **The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, <http://www.rbkc.gov.uk/leisureandlibraries/libraries/adultservices/bibliotherapy/wellbeing.aspx>**

- Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/happiness>
- Wolfram Alpha LLC, 2012-A Wolfram Research Company Researchy [http://www.wolframalpha.com/input/?i=happiness&a=\\*C.happiness-\\*Word-](http://www.wolframalpha.com/input/?i=happiness&a=*C.happiness-*Word-)
- The free dictionary, 2012, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/happiness>
- The free dictionary, 2012, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/satisfaction>
- The free encyclopedia, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life\\_satisfaction](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life_satisfaction)
- Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. (2002) Subjective Questions to Measure Welfare and WellBeing: A Survey, Tinbergen Institute Discussion Papers, [http:// ideas. repec. org/p/dgr/uvatin/20020020.html](http://ideas.repec.org/p/dgr/uvatin/20020020.html)
- Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/trust>
- John F. Helliwell and Robert D. Putnam , The social context of well-being, Published online 31 August 2004, The Royal Society, [http://www.subjectpool.com/ed\\_teach/y4person/3\\_happiness/Social\\_causes\\_of\\_happiness.pdf](http://www.subjectpool.com/ed_teach/y4person/3_happiness/Social_causes_of_happiness.pdf)
- John F. Helliwell, Shun Wang, Trust and Well-Being, Nber Working Paper Series, Working Paper 15911, National Bureau of Economic Research, April 2010 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15911.pdf>, [http:// en.wikipedia. org/wiki /Self-esteem](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-esteem)
- John F. Helliwell and Robert D. Putnam , The social context of well-being, Published online 31 August 2004, The Royal Society [http://www.subjectpool.com/ed\\_teach/](http://www.subjectpool.com/ed_teach/)

y4person/3\_happiness/Social\_causes\_of\_happiness.pdf.

- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Loneliness>
- <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/social+capital>
- Jeannette Golden, Ronán M. Conroy, Irene Bruce, Aisling Denihan, Elaine Greene, Michael Kirby and Brian A. Lawlor, Loneliness, social support networks, mood and wellbeing in community-dwelling elderly, International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2009; 24: 694–700. Published online 9 March 2009 in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com) DOI: 10.1002/gps.218 [http://www.cs.berkeley.edu/~jfc/papers/MH432143/elders\\_social\\_nets.pdf](http://www.cs.berkeley.edu/~jfc/papers/MH432143/elders_social_nets.pdf).
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shyness>
- Larry J. Nelson, Laura M. Padilla-Walker, Sarah Badger, Carolyn McNamara Barry, Jason S. Carroll and Stephanie D. Madsen, Associations Between Shyness and Internalizing Behaviors, Externalizing Behaviors, and Relationships during Emerging Adulthood, <http://www.springerlink.com/content/n6700qvx76144k23/>
- Barry Wellman, Anabel Quan-Haase, Jeffrey Boase, and Wenhong Chen, Examining the Internet in Everyday Life, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, presented to Euricom Conference on e-Democracy, Nijmegen, Netherlands, October 2002 <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/wellman/publications/euricom/ExaminingEuricom.PDF>.

- Mustafa KOÇ (mkoc@tef.sdu.edu.tr), Karen Ann Ferneding (fernedin@uiuc.edu), THE Consequences of Internet café Use on Turkish Collegestudents' Social Capital, The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET July 2007 ISSN: 1303-6521 volume 6 Issue 3 Article 9 <http://www.tojet.net/articles/639.pdf>
- Urban dictionary (6,596,278 Definitions Since 1999) <http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=active%20social-life>
- Anabel Quan Haase, Barry Wellman, James Witte, Keith Hampton , Capitalizing on the Internet Social Contact, Civic Engagement, and Sense of Community, In Barry Wellman and Caroline Haythornthwaite (Eds.) (2002). The Internet and
- Everyday Life. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. Forthcoming
- <http://www.mysocialnetwork.net/downloads/ng-8b1.pdf>
- Barry Wellman, Anabel Quan-Haase, Jeffrey Boase, and Wenhong Chen, Examining the Internet in Everyday Life, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, presented to Euricom Conference on e-Democracy, Nijmegen, Netherlands, October 2002 <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~wellman/publications/euricom/Examining-Euricom.PDF>
- Shaoke Zhang, Hao Jiang, John M. Carroll, Integrating Online and Offline Community through Facebook, 2011 <http://www.personal.psu.edu/suz114/paper/CTS2011.pdf>
- Nie, N. H. (2001). "Sociability, Interpersonal Relations, and the Internet: Reconciling

- **Conflicting Findings.” American Behavioral Scientist, 45(3), 426-437.**
- **Nie, N. H., D.S. Hillygus, and L. Erbring. (2002). Internet Use, Interpersonal Relations and Sociability: A Time Diary Study. In Wellman, B. & C. Haythornthwaite (eds.), Internet and Everyday Life (pp. 215-243). London: Blackwell.**
- **Chen, W., J. Boase and B. Wellman (2002). "The Global Villagers:**
- **Comparing Internet Users and Uses Around the World." In Wellman, B. and C.**
- **Haythornthwaite. (eds.), The Internet in Everyday Life (pp.74-113). Oxford: Blackwell.**
- **Barry Wellman, Anabel Quan-Haase, Jeffrey Boase, and Wenhong Chen, Examining the Internet in Everyday Life, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, presented to Euricom Conference on e-Democracy, Nijmegen, Netherlands, October 2002 <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~wellman/publications/euricom/Examining-Euricom.PDF>**
- **Anabel Quan Haase, Barry Wellman, James Witte, Keith Hampton , Capitalizing on the Internet Social Contact, Civic Engagement, and Sense of Community, Barry Wellman and Caroline Haythornthwaite (Eds.) (2002). The Internet and Everyday Life. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. Forthcoming**
- **<http://www.mysocialnetwork.net/downloads/ng-8b1.pdf>.**
- **Anabel Quan Haase, Barry Wellman, James Witte, Keith Hampton , Capitalizing on the Internet Social Contact, Civic Engagement, and Sense of Community, Barry Wellman**

and Caroline Haythornthwaite (Eds.)  
(2002). The Internet and

- **Everyday Life.** Oxford, UK: Blackwell. Forthcoming
- <http://www.mysocialnetwork.net/downloads/ng-8b1.pdf>
- **Emily S. Orr, Mia Sisic, Craig Ross, Mary G. Simmering, Jaime M. Arseneault, and R. Robert Orr.** *CyberPsychology & Behavior.* Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.
- **June 2009, 12(3): 337-340. Volume: 12 Issue 3: June 5, 2009, The Influence of Shyness on the Use of Facebook in an Undergraduate Sample,**
- <http://peterhbrown.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/shyness-facebook.pdf>
- **Charles Steinfield, Nicole B. Ellison, Cliff Lampe, Social capital, self-esteem, and use of online social network sites: A longitudinal analysis, Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 29 (2008) 434-445.** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0193397308000701>
- **Moira Burke, Cameron Marlow and Thomas Lento, Social Network Activity and Social Well-Being. CHI 2010, April 10-15, 2010, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.**
- [http://www.thoughtcrumbs.com/publications/burke\\_chi2010\\_sns\\_and\\_wellbeing.pdf](http://www.thoughtcrumbs.com/publications/burke_chi2010_sns_and_wellbeing.pdf)
- **Shaoke Zhang, Hao Jiang, John M. Carroll, Integrating Online and Offline Community through Facebook, 2011** <http://www.personal.psu.edu/suz114/paper/CTS2011.pdf>
- **John T. Cacioppo, James H. Fowler, Nicholas A. Christakis, Alone in the Crowd: The Structure and Spread of Loneliness in a Large Social Network, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,**

2009, Vol. 97, No. 6, 977-991 © 2009  
American Psychological Association

- **Junghyun Kim, Robert LaRose, and Wei Peng, Loneliness as the Cause and the Effect of Problematic Internet Use: The Relationship between Internet Use and Psychological Well-Being, Cyberpsychology & Behavior, Volume 12, Number 4, 2009, Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.**
- **<https://www.msu.edu/~pengwei/KimLaRosePengcyberpsychologylonelinessascauseandeffectofPIU.pdf>**
- **Kim, Junghyun., Larose, Robert. andPeng, Wei. "Loneliness as the Cause and the Effect of Problematic Internet Use: The Relationship Between Internet Use and Psychological Well-Being" CYBERPSYCHOLOGY & BEHAVIOR, Volume 12, Number 4, 2009, Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.**
- **<https://www.msu.edu/~pengwei/KimLaRosePengcyberpsychologylonelinessascauseandeffectofPIU.pdf>**
- **Nie, N. H. &Erbring, L. (2000). Internet and society: SIQSS Internet study. (Feb. 18, 2000). Report available at [http://www.stanford.edu/group/siqss/Press\\_Release/internetStudy.html](http://www.stanford.edu/group/siqss/Press_Release/internetStudy.html) Downloaded Sept. 25, 2000.**
- **Dennis Mazalin and Susan Moore, Internet Use, Identity Development and Social Anxiety Among Young Adults, Behaviour Change |Volume 21 | Number 2 | 2004 | pp. 90-102 90.**

- [http://opax.swin.edu.au/~3050858/download/internet/BC2\\_1.2\\_3Mazalin.pdf](http://opax.swin.edu.au/~3050858/download/internet/BC2_1.2_3Mazalin.pdf)
- Leo Sang-Min Whang, Sujin Lee, and Geunyoung Chang, Internet Over-Users' Psychological Profiles: A Behavior Sampling Analysis on Internet Addiction Cyberpsychology & Behavior, Volume 6, Number 2, 2003 © Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.
- [http://www.uam.es/personal\\_pdi/psicologia/pei/download/whang2003.pdf](http://www.uam.es/personal_pdi/psicologia/pei/download/whang2003.pdf).
- Hsieh-Hua Yang, Hung-Jen Yang, Friendship Discrepancy and Time Spent on the Internet, Proceedings of the 10th Wseas International Conference on Applied Mathematics, Dallas, Texas, USA, November 1-3, 2006 197- 200
- <http://academic.research.microsoft.com/Paper/5073123>.
- 1Daniel S. Holder, Ethnographic Study of the Effects of Facebook.com on Interpersonal Relationships, 16 April 2006
- Craig Ross, Emily S. Orr, Mia Sisic, Jaime M. Arseneault, Mary G. Simmering, R. Robert Orr, Personality and motivations associated with Facebook use, Computers in Human Behavior, 25 (2009) 578–586 Elsevier Ltd.[http://www.uni-graz.at/dips/neubauer/lehre/fm\\_III/ROSS%20ET%20AL%20\(2009\).pdf](http://www.uni-graz.at/dips/neubauer/lehre/fm_III/ROSS%20ET%20AL%20(2009).pdf)
- Mustafa KOÇ(mkoc@tef.sdu.edu.tr), Karen Ann ferneding (fernedin@uiuc.edu), The Consequences of Internet Café Use on Turkish Collegestudents' Social Capital, The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET July 2007 ISSN: 1303-6521 volume 6

Issue 3 Article 9 <http://www.tojet.net/articles/639.pdf>

- Sebastián Valenzuela<sup>2</sup>, Namsu Park<sup>3</sup>, and Kerk F. Kee, Lessons from Facebook: The Effect of Social Network Sites on College Students' Social Capital, Submitted to the 9th International Symposium on Online Journalism Austin, Texas, April 4-5, 2008 <http://onlinejournalism.utexas.edu/2008/papers/Valenzuela.pdf>.
- Dr. Stephen Joseph, Short Depression-Happiness Scale, 2004. Available at [http://www.healthscotland.com/uploads/documents/7573-MHI\\_Appendix\\_E\\_S-T.pdf](http://www.healthscotland.com/uploads/documents/7573-MHI_Appendix_E_S-T.pdf).
- Crandal, R. (1973). The measurement of self-esteem and related constructs, Pp. 80-82 in J.P.
- Robinson & P.R. Shaver (Eds), Measures of social psychological attitudes. Revised edition. Ann Arbor: ISR. Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Wylie, R. C. (1974). The self-concept. Revised edition. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, <http://www.yorku.ca/rokada/psycstest/rosenbrg.pdf>
- Corrigan, J. (2000). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. The Center for Outcome Measurement in Brain Injury. <http://www.tbims.org/combi/swls> (accessed July 25, 2009 ).
- Psychological Assessment Vol.5 No.2 164-172 1993, <http://www.psych.uiuc.edu/~ediener/hotopic/hotopic.html>
- Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS), 1985. Obtained from Prof. Ed Diener. Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J.

- Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75. Reproduced with permission.
- Corrigan, J. (2000). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. The Center for Outcome Measurement in Brain Injury. <http://www.tbims.org/combi/swls> ( accessed July 25, 2009 ).
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2008). The Satisfaction With Life Scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3, 137-152.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *J Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75. <http://www.tbims.org/combi/swls/swlssyl.html>
- Ed Diener, February 13, 2006, <http://s.psych.uiuc.edu/~ediener/Documents/Understanding%20SWLS%20Scores.pdf>
- Sebastián Valenzuela2, Namsu Park3, and Kerk F. Kee, Lessons from Facebook: The Effect of Social Network Sites on College Students' Social Capital, Submitted to the 9th International Symposium on Online Journalism Austin, Texas, April 4-5, 2008 <http://online.journalism.utexas.edu/2008/papers/Valenzuela.pdf>.
- Russell, D. (1996). The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 66, 20-40.
- <http://www3.shastacollege.edu/lvalvatne/psych15/Interpreting%2028-B%20shyness.htm>