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ABSTRACT: This article investigates the influence of social media on the university students’ sociability in Nigeria. Structured questionnaires were used to collect data from 250 students at BIU and 350 students at DELSU through heterogeneous samples in different faculties and departments of respective institution. The data derived were subjected to descriptive statistics with simple percentage, chi-square test and one-way ANOVA. Findings revealed that age, year of study, family income plays decisive role in respondents’ ability to exploit the benefit of social media utilization for sociability. Further, majority of the respondents were observed to use Facebook as major platform for friendship sociability, with mobile media (feature phone with internet connection and smartphone) as a medium of constructive sociability behaviour and respondents’ friendship size of above 200 demonstrate the strength of respondents’ sociability practice. The study also found that the respondents’ frequency of interaction with friendship groups cut across different time frame with communication relations and socio-pleasure as a means of strategic sociability fulfilment. Future research should focus on why university students use social media for romantic sociability since evidences are emerging on the relations of social media sociability and romantic behaviour of young people.
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INTRODUCTION

Sociability in today’s society is undergoing transformation with social media becoming a major facilitator and on which people are now forging friendship relationships or friendship sociability (Tufekci, 2010). The term social media refers to the relationships that exist between networks of people or to participate in social networking (Wang; Chen, Wei; and Liang, Yu, 2011; Griessner, 2012) and Mastrodicasa and Metellus, (2013) regards social media as websites that allows users to connect to one another based on shared interest, activities or characteristics. Tesorero, (2013) sees social media as a phenomenon that has recently taken over the web, allowing more connectivity and interaction between web users and it encourages contributions and feedback from anyone who is a member of any virtual community. These authors’ views emphasise the importance of websites as a connective route to social media usage suggesting further that each social media site serves varied function of sociability for users. For examples, Friendster launched in 2002 and dubbed “circle of friends” and promoted the idea that a rich online community can opens up relationships between people that could be associated with common bonds with different ways to discover those bonds; Myspace came in 2003 with young demographics to build up social connections and share information with people and
organizations they choose to interact online; Blog came-in 1994 and initially known as weblog and in 2002 grown into vast arrays of websites of blogging activities on the internet, primarily for people to share their opinions and information on different social affairs and national orientation and Twitter launched in 2006, a micro blogging site which enable people to communicate in 140 characters and be connected through dialogue or discourse (Kaplan and Heinlein 2010; Chan-Olmstel, Cho and Lee, 2013; Bennett, 2014; Digital Trends Staff, 2016). All of these sites have become online communities for the advancement of sociability in social spheres around the world, noting that distance between online connections and user proximity have become meaningless. Tesorero, (2013) argue that different forms of social media provide platforms for sociability (see earlier discussion on different social media sites) without restrictive geographical and cultural differences. In his words, one get to meet and know a variety of people whose interests are similar to your own and that these sites are a window to different cultures and places.

The popularity of these social media sites has become much of attraction worldwide, relative to the usability patterns, and researches have unfold current trend of accessibility to these sites. Facebook is the most preferable site in the world, with 1.71 billion monthly active users in 2016, followed by YouTube 1 billion. Friendster, Myspace, LinkedIn, Blog and Twitter has comparative users account differences of between 300 billion to 500 billion (Bellini, 2016; Jaydee, 2016). The dynamic of social media sites especially Facebook is said to be

Endnote:
Richards, (2016) explain two ways of social media accessibility patterns and are First; total users refer to the number of people who have signed up for a service and Second, active users are people who actually use the service on a regular basis.

influence by some mediating factors and are; First, the accessibility to internet and mobile media (smartphone or feature phone with internet connection) as the means to access social media communities (Dube, 2012; Bennett, 2013); Second, the demographic picture of social media users is more of younger generation. For this study, it’s more helpful to focus on active users. activities, defined as those between the ages of 18 to 34 years (Bridgestock, 2013; Patteson, 2015), and Third, gender influence on social media usage behaviour (Mazman and Usluel, 2011; Volkovich et al. 2014) and women as the largest group of users (Jaydee, 2016; Richard, 2016; Shandwick, 2016). The study by Pew Research Canter, (2016) on social media platforms in the U.S reported gender (i.e. men and women) and socio-economic factors (i.e. age, education, income, location and technologies exposure in terms of skills to exploit social media for strategic benefit) as critical intervention variables in social media utilization (Karu, Bayer, Pasek and Campbell, 2014; Van Deursen and Van Dijik, 2015; Jung, 2016). Moreover, Akubugwo and Burke, (2013) notes from their study that social media serves different uses to students citing for examples, setting up profiles and get connected with people, building up and preserve popularity, keeping in touch or maintain relationships with classmates, friends and relations and uploading pictures for friends to see.

**Nigeria and Social Media**
The coming of social media in Nigeria suggests that the country is moving along the path of social media environment to which Nigerians becoming active users of the new platforms. Ogunlesi, (2013) and Ibibapo, (2016) notes that different social media platforms operate in the country citing Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Blog as some of the sites accessible to Nigerians.
Oyesomi, Okorie et al, (2014) point to social media as a new paradigm of friendship building with diverse sites opening up opportunities for people to advance their social network and sociability.

A study by Ntshingila, (2016) and Kazeem, (2016) on the trends of social media use revealed that Facebook is the most dominant site in terms of active users noting that 16 million people are on the platform, serving as a route to connect and construct relationships with others. As both authors explain 7.2 million people in Nigeria visit Facebook each day—97 per cent of those access the social media site on their mobile devices. Furthermore, the findings from the NOIPolls survey on the use of social media for online dating in Nigeria capture Facebook as the most preferred social media sites to respondents and that those between the ages of 18 – 25 years are more prone to Facebook usage. Gender differences was apparent with female (93 %) more likely than the male (89%) to use Facebook. Further, Okafor and Okoye, (2014) noted from their study on social media use and real-life social relationships that majority of the respondents surveyed at Nnamdi University in Nigeria exploit online communities to improved sociability by enabling old friends and acquaintances interact easily regardless of distance. The authors refer to social interaction to involve two or more people creatively shaping their reality through online social interaction. Oyesomi, Okorie et al, (2014) conducted investigation into how sociable are women on social media and they found evidence to suggest that majority of the respondents were active users, with preference for Facebook compared to other sites (Twitter, Myspace and others) noting entertainment, view/creating profiles, upload pictures and leave comments as well as stay up-to-with-friends were the most usage activities. The significance of demographic characteristics of respondents on social media usage relative to age, educational qualification, marital status and employment was evident.

This discourse provides insight to how social media is engaged in today’s society and the present study aims to go deeper by exploring how social media influence sociability in Nigeria. The concept of social media sociability is put forward to advance the correlation between sociability and social media utilisation. (Ntshingila, 2016; Kazeem, 2016).

**Clarification of Social Media Sociability**

The social media sociability refers to social interaction among people for the purpose of connecting, interacting and communicating, and in which the social media becomes the ultimate goal of usage behaviour (Preece, 2000; 2001). Schroeder, (2016) explains online behaviour of social media users comes in different dimensions citing for instance, people present themselves in their profiles (personal disclosure of information for others to know who they are), frequency of time spent and as a means of expressive interaction and shared mood, and expressions of emotions in friendship relations. The author then submits that social behaviour through social media is helping to advance sociability. Fang and Ha, (2011) notes from their study of sociability gratifications that social media use provides opportunities for students to make more friends, resulting into more time being spend connecting. Further revelations from study of Collins, (2010) indicates that social media creates platform for expressions of friendships and intimacy noting that 60% of the students surveyed use Facebook to show themselves, with posting updates as the most popular activities. This paper explores the connecting relations of social media and sociability with friendships sociability being single out for explorative direction and related research.
Friendship Sociability

Friendship sociability refers to people’s relationships with others in society, with mutual interaction, affection and support to each other. Sociability is all about friendship involving individual, groups, family and acquaintances (Keenan and Sheri, 2009; Schroeder, 2016). Research on friendship sociability point to two discursive directions and are First; offline friendship defined as a physical life or real-life friendship and Second; online friendship in virtual space or communities and of connection to social media (Zoppos, 2011; Koutra, Papalakis, and Sanchez, 2014).

Concern for online friendship sociability and social media research has drawn the attention of scholars in recent times (Krishna, Zhao et al, 2014; Schroeder, 2016). Further, Schrorder, (2016) notes that social media are extension of social networking sites in the advancement of sociability. Keenan and Shari, (2009) sees social networking sites as connective route to sociability, and on which social interaction becomes the ultimate goal of usability. A study by Manago and Vaughn, (2014) notes social media as platforms for young people to build meaningful relationships, citing Facebook as a potential arena for constructing friendship behaviour and mobilising resources. Other studies have discussed the significance of Facebook in young people’s social lives. For examples, Al-Khaddam, (2013) reported that 77% of university students in Saudi Arabia use Facebook and that the site has had more of a personal impact than other social media, and Pempak’s (2009) findings also indicates students’ preference for Facebook to facilitate their connection with friends, promote self-presentation, and as a platform to construct social identities. Furthermore, Lakshimi, (2016) explains that sociability on social media has opened the floodgates to interactions, and the list of acquaintances, friends and confidantes have swelled at a great pace citing that two-thirds of teens surveyed made new friends on social media. These review discourse attest to the relationships of how social media advances young peoples’ sociability. The next discusses the relation of friendship size and sociability.

Friendship Size and Sociability

According to Preece, (2001) sociability depends on the number of people or participants who interact in the online communities suggesting that the size of network friendship influences sociability behaviour of social media users. Dunbar, (2016) notes that the size and range of online egocentric social networks indexed as the number of Facebook friends citing younger age classes having larger online networks compared to older age classes. According to him, younger respondents (18-24 years) are more likely to have larger networks size than older respondents. Manago and Vaughn, (2015) notes that friendship size in social media sites promote happiness citing Facebook where network help facilitates connectedness and personal-emotional adjustment (see Manago, Taylor and Greenfield, 2012).

Evidences have been uncovered on the relations of young people’s friendships size as a factor of sociability in social media landscape. For examples, Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe, (2007) notes from their study of 800 Michigan State University undergraduate students on the usage of social media sites and found the respondents’ sociability in Facebook was driven by the size of their network friends, between 150 and 200 friendships circle. Hew and Cheung, (2012) found from a survey of 83 students in Singapore, aged 15-23 years that Facebook provides a platform for broadening social networks and entertainment and on which the students’ network size was between 251 and 300 with 17.72% determinant and that Facebook serves as a supplementary channel of communication relations. Furthermore, Sponcil and Gitimu, (2014) reported from the study of social media use by undergraduates at Midwestern
University in the U.S.A that the average size of the students network was between 301-600 with Facebook, as preferable friendships sociability and connectivity. Akyildiz and Argan, (2015) found in a study on the purpose of Facebook usage among students at the University of Turkey, that just over 50% their participants had a network of 101-300 and that the students used Facebook for social purposes specially to have fun, contact friends and to follow photos, videos and events.

**Frequency of Interaction in Friendship Sociability**

Friendship sociability is all about relationships between individual users of social media with mutual interest, mutual affection and moral obligations to each other. The frequency of interaction defines sociability action among individual friendship circle via time categories of interaction, the intensity of communication relations and socio-pleasure activities (Cheng et al, 2014) wrote social media settings provide users with a platform to interact by way of sending communicative messages to one another and reciprocity becomes the ultimate goal of connecting circle of friendship network. To argue further, the frequency of interaction provides a more ultimate sociability behaviour citing online socio-pleasure (i.e. chatting, conversation, self-expression or presentation via selfies, creating and updating profiles) (see Greets, 2016), The term *selfies* refers to a self-portrait picture taken by oneself (or of oneself and other people using a digital camera or a smartphone for posting on social media sites and has become another form of interactive sociability in virtual society (Qui, Lin, Jiahui et al, 2015; Sorokowska, Oleszkiewicz. et al, 2016). As Reflective Blog, (2016) puts selfies serves as the representative of people identity and as such promotes the identity of sociability, and Iaccino, (2014) notes people take selfies and share them on social media to entertain others citing women takes pictures of themselves and post them on social media to show how they feel.

Researches on the frequency of interaction with friendships network on social media sites are emerging. For examples, Brandtzag, Heim and Kaare (2010) who found that users reported the frequency of interaction with family members was once a month or more and contact with friends occurred more frequent. Moreover, Cheng Ean Lee et al, (2011) observe that their participants reported making contact with friends in their network for 1 to 2 hours a day. Both studies appear to show the correlation between the amounts of time spent interacting and emotional attachment between individuals in network sociability. Further, Hill and Dunbar, (2002) explained that the frequency of interaction in friendship sociability over time could be driven by the distance between individuals in a students’ network and their emotional closeness to their circle of family members and friends. Rahman’s (2014) study on international students in New Zealand found that the respondents’ sociability was intense because they were away from home and on which social media sites becomes the medium of communication with family and friends in their home country. Gender differences were detected, female respondents were more likely to use SMSs more than their male counterparts in order to extend their sociability with their friends and family through communication. Furthermore, Sorokowska, Oleszkiewicz et al, (2016) found from their study that posting selfies helped function as a sociability enhancement (display of willingness to keep friends up-to-date about oneself) noting that women engage in selfie-posting behaviour more often than do men in social media platforms. Both findings advance the argument that women are powerful in social media landscape (Milbrath, 2013). These discursive reviews provide ground to explore whether the engagement of social media influences the sociability of university students in Nigeria and the following research questions were advanced to underpin the students’ usage patterns of social media sites for sociability behaviour.
RQ1: Does the university students’ socio-economic background influences their social media use for sociability?

RQ2: How do university students use social media for friendship sociability?

RQ3: Does the university students’ frequency of contact drives university students’ friendship sociability in social media platforms?

The choice of university students in Nigeria informed the need for better understanding on how young people use social media for sociability. The university students are young generation of active new media users or digital natives or digital generation or interactive generation (see Sanchez-Navarro and Aranda, 2012), and has the ability to use new media technologies (feature phones and smartphones) to exploit the potentialities of social media for sociability through constructive profiles and interactive relations (Myers and Sundaram, 2012). Koutra, Papalakis and Sanchez, (2014) refers to this as second life of sociability and social interaction in online virtual world.

**Research Method**

A self-completion questionnaire consisting of demographic information of students with age, year of study, family income and family status and specific research questions on whether the university students’ usage of social media influences their friendship sociability behaviour was distributed to the students on face to face contact with a ratio of 50 to 50 men and women at Benson Idahosa University, Edo State and Delta State University, Delta State. For examples, 150 men and 150 women at BIU while 175 men and 175 women at DELSU. This was done by means of heterogeneous sample. The rationale for this sample strategy was due to the size of respective university with large students’ population, faculties and departments. (see Gillspie and Milet, 1981; Tufekci, 2010).

The response rate for the distributed questionnaire and the final number of actual respondents who completed the questionnaire was observed to be slightly low: 324 students returned completed questionnaire out of 350 distributed in Delta State University and 230 out of 250 distributed at Benson Idahosa University. The shortfall was due to the failure of some students to complete their questionnaire.

The participants selected were all users of smartphone and social media users, with ability to complete the questionnaire within the time frame. The completed questionnaire was collected, sorted into gender categories, men and women respondents in respective study location and subjected to descriptive statistics (i.e. Pearson chi-square test, One-way ANOVA test, and simple percentages). Results were analysed and subjected to interpretations for a better understanding of how university students in Nigeria use social media for sociability.

**RESULTS**

The results section reported the data derived from the self-completed questionnaire, starting from socio-economic background of the respondents, followed by specific research questions on the interplay between friendship sociability and social media utilization.
RQ1: Does the university students' socio-economic background influence their social media use for sociability?

This question arose from the intervening variables identified in the literature and on which age, year of study, family status (upper, middle and lower), family income per month) and skills and competencies were set up as independent variables. This was subjected to descriptive to determine the nature of statistical differences via simple percentage variation. (see Table 1-4 for data presentation and analysis)

### Table 1: Reported Data on Social Media Use for Sociability by Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Benson Idahosa University</th>
<th>Delta State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 20 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.2%)</td>
<td>(11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.8%)</td>
<td>(26.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
<td>(1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>(40.4%)</td>
<td>(40.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 provides data on four categories of age differences among the respondents at BIU and DELSU. The findings from the statistical analysis shows that the significant proportion of the respondents are between the ages of 21 to 25 at BIU and DELSU with gender variations in reported social media use for sociability and at BIU women (73 (26.8%) are more likely than men (62 (22.8%) to take-on social media for sociability. Further, at DELSU, the women (39.0%) are more likely than men (30/1%) to share similar pattern of social media for sociability. This finding is consistent with previous studies that found women as the largest group of users of social media engagement for sociability (see Jaydee, 2016; Richards, 2016; Shandwick, 2016).

### Table 2: Reported Social Media Use for Sociability by Year of Study and Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>BIU</th>
<th>DELSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of study</td>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>30 (13.6%)</td>
<td>46 (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>46 (20.9%)</td>
<td>54 (16.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>44 (20.0%)</td>
<td>64 (19.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>54 (24.6%)</td>
<td>74 (22.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>42 (19.1%)</td>
<td>60 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD/MA/MSc, PhD</td>
<td>4 (1.8%)</td>
<td>26 (8.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count Total Parenage</td>
<td>220 (100)</td>
<td>324 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage variation in Table 2 shows that the students at BIU and DELSU embrace social media for sociability. The possible explanation for this development could be the students grow...
up in the era of social media landscape and their level of literacy has consistently developed to exploit online communities for socialization and projection of new lifestyle. This observation finds support with the argument that younger generations performed better in medium related skills in terms of ability to traverse social media sites for self-presentation and discursive interaction and strategic decision-making on which sites to use for sociability (see Van Deursen and Van Dijik, (2015).

Table 3: Reported Data on Social Media Use for Sociability by Family Income Per Month and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Benson Idahosa University</th>
<th>Delta State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income per month</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under N18,000</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21,000- N44,000</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N45,000- N66,000</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
<td>5 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N66,001- N85,000</td>
<td>18 (6.6%)</td>
<td>17 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N85,001- N90,000</td>
<td>18 (6.6%)</td>
<td>11 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N90,001- N100,000</td>
<td>17 (6.3%)</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above N100,000</td>
<td>50 (18.4%)</td>
<td>70 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count Percentage</td>
<td>110 (40.4%)</td>
<td>110 (40.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, one can deduce variations in family income per month among students at BIU and DELSU on which significant proportion of respondents are from family income of above N100,000 per month. This suggests that the respondents in respective institutions are from the same parental level of family income group and their frequency of access to social media could be associated to users’ income disposition. The Pew Research Center (2013; 2016) provides income as measurable factor of social media research in the US and finding on respondents’ social media utilisation has consistently revealed statistical variations of users.

Further, gender differences in family income per month were observed at BIU for which women (25.7%) are more likely than men (18.4%) to come from higher income parental group while at DELSU women (29.0%) are more likely than men (22.5%) to come from similar background. This finding appears to reinvent the connection of family income and students’ disposable income and on which the findings of the current study indicate that Nigerian students’ family income per month is linked to the potentials of disposable income for social media sociability.

**RQ2: How do university student use social media for friendship sociability?**

The question was drawn from the literature on social media sociability and on which the university students’ usage patterns of social media use for sociability in Nigeria is subjective
of further inquiry. Central to the research question were three hypotheses to test whether there is a relationship between social media sites and sociability of university students at BIU and DELSU. These are;

**Hypothesis I:** Sociability by gender/institution is independent of social media sites.

**Hypothesis II:** Social media sites is independent of the social connection by gender/institution

**Hypothesis III:** There is no significant variation between the social media sites and devices used by gender/institution

### Table 1a: Reported Usage of Social Media Sites For University Students’ Sociability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media Sites Used to Sustain Sociability</th>
<th>BIU</th>
<th>DELSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>40 (36%)</td>
<td>54 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MySpace</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>17 (16%)</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>18 (16%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendster</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
<td>12 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>110 (100%)</td>
<td>110 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = 13.61, \text{ df} = 6, \alpha = 0.05
\]

### Table 1b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Size and Circle of Sociability</th>
<th>BIU</th>
<th>DELSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 49</td>
<td>15 (14%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 99</td>
<td>19 (17%)</td>
<td>18 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 – 149</td>
<td>22 (20%)</td>
<td>11 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 – 200</td>
<td>23 (21%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 200</td>
<td>31 (28%)</td>
<td>66 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>110(100%)</td>
<td>110(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = 26.3, \text{ df} = 4, \alpha = 0.05
\]
Table 1c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device Used for Sociability Engagement in Social Media Sites</th>
<th>BIU Men</th>
<th>BIU Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DELSU Men</th>
<th>DELSU Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet enabled mobile device</td>
<td>62 (56%)</td>
<td>76 (69%)</td>
<td>138 (62%)</td>
<td>122 (75%)</td>
<td>96 (59.3%)</td>
<td>218 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal computer via internet</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>12 (11%)</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
<td>13 (8%)</td>
<td>23 (14.2%)</td>
<td>36 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop with internet</td>
<td>16 (14%)</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
<td>22 (10%)</td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
<td>15 (9.3%)</td>
<td>27 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybercafé</td>
<td>15 (14%)</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>21 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (6%)</td>
<td>23 (14.2%)</td>
<td>33 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network with sub. Via modern</td>
<td>11 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>21 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110 (100)</td>
<td>110 (100)</td>
<td>220 (100)</td>
<td>162 (100)</td>
<td>162 (100)</td>
<td>324 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 26.3, \text{ df } = 4, \alpha = 0.05 \]

\[ X^2 = 11.33, \text{ df } = 4, \alpha = 0.05 \]

Table’s 1a-1c indicates the data on the students’ usage of social media sites for sociability. Using the Pearson chi-square test, at 5% level of significance and specified degrees of freedom, the calculated values of \( X^2 \) seems to be greater than the table value of \( X^2 \) in Tables 1a-1c. This leads to the rejection of the above hypotheses by gender. Thus, it follows the conclusion that sociability/connection by gender rest on the social media sites used by them and on which there is a significant difference between the social media site and devices used by gender at BIU and DELSU.

Furthermore, the calculated values of \( X^2 \) seems to be lesser than the table value of \( X^2 \) in Table Ib and Ic and greater in Table Ib. Thus, the results obtained in Tables Ia and Ib leads to the acceptance of the hypotheses while Table Ib leads to the rejection of the hypothesis by institution. This follows that sociability/connection by institution has no association with social media sites used by institutions suggesting that a student social connection on social media sites lies upon individual student choice of route to build network of friendship sociability. There is also significant difference between the social media sites and devices by used at BIU and DELSU.

**Gender as Intervening Variable on Respondents’ Social Media Sociability**

Table 7.1a, Table 7.1b and Table 7.1c shows that all the items (independent variables) revealed percentage differences relative to men and women response data. According to Table 1a, the finding for Facebook appear to possess significant percentage value in each gender categories implying that at BIU, the women (49%) are more likely than the men (36%) to use Facebook for friendship sociability in social media sites and in DELSU, the women (69%) are more likely than the men (25%) to use Facebook as a platform for friendship sociability. These findings suggest that the women are actively turning to Facebook as a major sociability site in terms of opening up opportunities for online connectivity, socialising online and as a source of daily entertainment (see also Milbrath, 2013).

As for Table Ib, gender differences were obvious at BIU and DELSU relative to respective percentage distribution. This implies that at BIU, the women (60%) are more likely than the men (28%) to have friendship size of over 200 of friendship circle and at DELSU, the women...
(49%) are more likely than the men (23%) to have friendship size of above 200 friendship circle. These results show that the women have more friendship size to strategically enhance their sociability behaviour.

Furthermore, gender differences were equally apparent in Table 1c on the devices used to engage friendship in social media sites noting percentage differential between men and women on the devices used for sociability engagement in social media sites. Nevertheless, the internet enabled mobile device is mostly used by the respondents, with gender differences being observed in BIU and DELSU. For examples, at BIU, the women (69%) are more likely than the men (62%) to use the internet enabled mobile device to build friendship sociability in social media sites and at DELSU, the men (75%) are more likely than the women (59.3%) to embrace the internet enabled mobile device to forge and sustain friendship sociability in social media sites. These results indicate the influence of internet enabled mobile device among the men and women students in both institutions. This appears to reinforce the value of gender- social media relationships in social media research.

**RQ3: Does the university students’ frequency of interaction drives their friendship sociability in social media environment?**

The research question three was informed by the literature on frequency of contact and friendship sociability and this helped explore respondents’ interactive sociability relations with their circle of network friends in social media sites. Table 2 shows range of contact frequencies via hours and times per day/week and as independent variables, statistically tested. (see reported data relative to statistical evaluation of findings).

| Table 2: Reported Data on Students’ Frequency of Interaction with Social Groups on Social Media Sites at Benson Idahosa University |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **BENSON IDAHOUSA UNIVERSITY** | **CATEGORIZATION OF TIME-FRAME** | **FRIENDSHIP GROUPS** | **Men** | **Women** | **FRIENDSHIP GROUPS** | **Total** |
| Frequency of Interaction in SMS | Acquaintances | Colleagues | Cousins | Family Member | Acquaintances | Colleagues | Cousins | Family Member | Total |
| 1-3 Times per day | 6 | 11 | 25 | 33 | 24 | 8 | 14 | 18 | 34 | 26 | 220 |
| 4-6 Times per day | 6 | 5 | 27 | 22 | 40 | 5 | 9 | 32 | 21 | 33 | 220 |
| 2-5 hours per week | 5 | 25 | 23 | 34 | 13 | 3 | 28 | 22 | 22 | 25 | 220 |
| 6 to 10 hours per week | 17 | 21 | 25 | 25 | 12 | 14 | 17 | 25 | 21 | 23 | 220 |
| 11-20 hours per week | 33 | 22 | 15 | 16 | 14 | 32 | 9 | 19 | 24 | 16 | 220 |
Table 2A (Men)

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2238.800</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>111.940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2238.960</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference at 5% level of significance between the students’ frequency of interaction with social groups on social media sites by men students at BIU

Table 2 B (Women)

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1840.000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1840.000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference at 5% level of significance between the students’ frequency of interaction with social groups on social media sites by women students at BIU

Table 2 A: Reported Data on Students’ Frequency of Interaction with Friendship Social Groups on Social Media Sites at DELSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>Course Mates</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Family Members</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>Course Mates</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Times per day</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 Times per day</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 hours per week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 hours</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 hours</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no significant difference at 5% level of significance between the students’ frequency of interaction with social groups on social media sites by men students at DELSU.

Table 2D (Women)

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3106.800</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>155.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3106.960</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant difference at 5% level of significance between the students’ frequency of interaction with social groups on social media sites by women students at DELSU.

Students’ Frequency of Interaction with Friendship Social Groups on Social Media Sites at DELSU

Table 2 shows the various frequency of interaction from 1-3 times per day to 11-20 hours per week between men and women students at BIU and DELSU. One-way ANOVA was utilized to test the means scores of the frequency of interaction between social groups and within social groups in both institutions data. The results revealed there was no significant difference between students’ frequency of interaction with social groups at BIU (see Table .2A and 2B) and DELSU (2C and 2D). These results indicate that the students in each university have similar time frame to relate with their social groups of friendship network and in which mutual affection and love becomes the motivation of friendship interaction, communication relations and socio-pleasure.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The question whether the use of social media influences university students’ sociability in Nigeria found evidences to affirm the uniqueness of online communities in the advancement of sociability behaviour of respondents at BIU and DELSU. Findings from the research question one showed that demographic variables in terms of age, year of study and family income as well as gender plays significant motivation on social media usage for sociability, citing those between 21-25 years are more active in online social behaviour and gender.
variations were observable. (see Table 1). Further, the percentage distribution for students’ year of study varied among respondents’ data and year four of students’ level was found to be higher compared to other students’ level of year. (see Table 2). This suggests that the respondents at the level of graduating year engage in active consolidation of friendship sociability for post university support and benefits from network of friendships circle. Moreover, the family income status of the respondents portrays their potentialities to engage the social media environment in forging and maintaining friendship sociability (see Table 3 for family income variations respondents at BIU and DELSU relative to gender categories). This results support those of other researchers who reported the relations of family income and social media usage behaviour (Pew Research Center, 2013; 2016)

Respondents were again asked on how they use social media sites for friendship sociability (see RQ2). The study found that the respondents pursue different direction of sociability in fulfilling their social lives, citing Facebook as the most preferred social media sites for respondents’ sociability goal at BIU and DELSU. This finding confirmed previous results that saw Facebook as the most attractive site for younger generation in constructing friendships relations and self-presentation (Al-Khaddam, (2013; Manago and Vaughn, 2014; Pempak, 2009; Ntshingila, 2016; Kazeem, 2016)

Further, respondents were required to indicate their size of friendship circles in social media communities. The response from BIU and DELUS revealed over 200 friendship accumulations and this indicates the benefit of social media sociability to the respondents. This finding compare favourably with those of other studies where size of friends had strong linked to social media sociability (Hew and Cheung, 2012; Sponcil and Gitimu, 2014; Akyildiz and Argan, 2015).

Moreover, the finding on the devices used in accessing social media sites for friendship sociability yielded inspiring responses noting that the majority of respondents utilize internet enabled mobile device in sustenance of sociability practice. This finding confirmed those of other researchers who found mobile media as a driver of social media utilization among young generation (Dube, 2012; Bennett, 2013; Al-Harrasi and Al-Badi, 2014; Kuru, Bayer, Pasek and Campbell, 2014; Kumari and Verma, 2015; Shemenski, 2016). The term mobile media in this study refers to smartphone or feature phone with internet connection)

The research question three asked respondents whether their frequency of interaction with network of friends influence their relationships. Findings revealed predictable patterns of frequency interaction between respondents’ circles of network friends in relation to similar time frame at BIU and DELSU (see Table 2 and 2A). The result appears to support those of other scholars on the importance of respondents’ interaction with network of friends and in which socio-pleasure strategies (i.e. selfies) becomes useful indicator of self-fulfilment (Iaccino, 2014; Greets, 2016; Reflective Blog, 2016; Sorokowska, Oleszkiewicz et al, 2016) and communication with friendship network (Brandtzag, Heim and Kaare, 2010; Ean Lee et al, 2011; Rahman’s 2014). All of these activities provide remarkable determinant on how university students in Nigeria achieve the ideals of friendship sociability.

CONCLUSION

This study advance knowledge about the influence of social media on university students’ sociability and on which the social media sites (Friendster, Myspace, LinkedIn, Facebook, Blog
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and Twitter) becomes the mode of sociability behaviour. Evidences from the study indicate that the university students are exploiting the social media platforms to forge and sustain friendship sociability with Facebook as the core of sociability engagement. The formation of friendship size and the frequency of contact to which socio-pleasure and self-promoting strategies, and communication with friendship circles suggest that university students are evolving intimate sociability as part of a wider post-university education social lives. Moreover, their ability to use the new media technologies (feature phone with internet connection and smartphone) to engage social media for sociability demonstrate the university students belong to millennial generation or digital generation or interactive generation with skills to operate the system technologies citing their education background, year of study and income disposition as critical factors of influence in pursuance of social media sociability. To conclude, the entire study rests on deductive reasoning to which structured questionnaire for data collection and statistical applications ensure objective results in validating the relations of university students and social media sociability in Nigeria context.

LIMITATION

This research focused on two study locations in Nigeria: BIU, privately funded institution and students are from affluent parental background and accessible disposable income and DELSU, publicly funded institution with majority of the students from lower and middle class background with comparatively low disposable income. The data generated from the survey questionnaire through heterogeneous sample was limited to the two universities. Findings therefore were limited to the students’ usage experience of social media for friendship sociability in both institutions and as such the findings of the study cannot be generalised for the entire university students’ population in Nigeria. It can however help in predicting future usage patterns of social media in sociability behaviour.

FUTURE RESEARCH

The relations of romantic relationship and social media sociability is drawing the attention of researchers and commentators (Utz and Beukeboom, 2011; Ayodele, 2011; Sener, 2016). Further research therefore should focus on how university students in Nigeria uses social media for romantic sociability. University students in Nigeria are integral component of global digital natives or digital generation who are active users of social media and as new paradigm of self-presentation and self-seeking pleasure in the advancement of social lives. Furthermore, mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative research strategic) is suggested as an investigative thought for a reliable and predictable conclusion to be drawn on why social media use for romantic sociability relative to self-posting selfies as complementary emotion.
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