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ABSTRACT

Presently, Facebook is one of the most famous and prosperous social network service (SNS). In view of its pervasiveness, the following questions are apropos: How do participants negotiate and enact their identities on Facebook and what is involved in the construction of identities on Facebook? The present study provided adequate answers to these questions by examining students’ levels of participation on Facebook and how they used it to negotiate the “virtual self” (online identity). Survey research design was employed for the study. The sample size used was 240 posts drawn from the first and third year undergraduate students of the University of Cape Coast, Ghana (UCC). A combination of purposive and simple random sampling techniques was adopted for sampling the respondents. The main research instrument used for the study was questionnaire. The study revealed that by virtue of Facebook design, students have many opportunities to perform their identity on Facebook, several students are highly interested in posting pictures which immensely contributed to identity construction and they were not frequently updating their profiles on this less anonymous website – Facebook.
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INTRODUCTION:
In recent times, construction of identity online has drawn much attention from experts in the social network field. Among these experts, Rheingold (1995) and Turkle (1995) conducted extensive investigation and research on anonymous online environment such as Chat room and their findings revealed that users hide their true identity and totally take on a different identity that may closely resemble their innermost desire and aspirations especially in connection with things they cannot do offline. Users resorted to this type of identity construction due to the anonymous nature of the online environment of which users are less culpable. These findings fanned the interest of several researchers on social network service, including Yurchisin et al. (2005) and Ellison et al. (2006), to investigate how users construct identities in anonymous (i.e opposite of anonymous) online environment, especially on sites that identity is extremely important, such as internet dating sites. Results of their study revealed that people constructed their identity differently on these sites (internet dating), their behavior or actions revealed a sense of awareness of the nonymous online environment, of which their actions or behavior may be consequential. The result of Yurchisin et al. and Ellison et al studies is quite relevant to this study because it vividly revealed that the online environment was not constitutive of a single unit, it has shades of variation suggesting that how individuals constructed identity or presented themselves varied significantly from one online setting to another. In view of this variation, the present study will also carry out an extensive investigation into how users on Facebook, a nonymous and social networking site construct identity or perform self-presentation. The focus of the study is on university students because this social networking site – Facebook has become very popular with university students in Ghana. In order to fully understand the various ways students construct their identity on Facebook, the study has as its objectives the following:

i. to investigate how often students visit Facebook
ii. to ascertain how often students update their profiles on Facebook
iii. to establish how students enact and construct their identities on Facebook.
iv. to find out whether identity enactment is influenced by the Facebook environment and, if so, to investigate the extent to which it affects it.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

i. How often do users visit Facebook?

ii. How often do users update their profiles on Facebook?

iii. How do users enact and perform their identities on Facebook?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

The significance of this study cannot be overemphasized at a time when being a Facebook user is considered a laudable achievement. Moreover, the study would serve as an impetus to understanding how students perform self-presentation in nonymous online environment and will add to literature on identity construction on social networking sites.

FACEBOOK:

Interested in putting his computer science skill to good use, coupled with his sophomoric sense of humor to created a type of “hot or not” game for Harvard students, Mark Zuckerberg, along with classmates Eduardo Saverin, Dustin Moskovitz, and Chris Hughes invented a social networking website called Facebook. This social networking website was initially made to assist Harvard University students interact socially and get to know one another (Bellis, 2013). Initially, membership to the website was at first restricted to Harvard University students. However, other universities and colleges were later incorporated into this popular social networking site with the help of Zuckerberg’s colleagues. For example, Severin improved the business section of the website, Moskovitz worked as a programmer, and McCollum as a graphic artist. In a short while, Facebook opened up for all audiences and has been growing in leaps and bounds ever since. Facebook differs from other social networking sites because only users or friends who are part of the same network could view each other’s profiles and posts. Unlike Twitter, users do not have access to all the messages on the site. Another unique feature of Facebook is that it allows applications of third parties to have access to certain user information via quiz or game. The website is structured so as to collect useful information when participants use a tool and give permission to the application to use their personal information. Unlike Hyves, Twitter,
Blackplanet and Flickr, Facebook was initially designed to host a specific audience, but due to its evolving nature as indicated by Boyd and Ellison (2007:12), it has embraced other users and has gained worldwide acclaim as a powerful social networking site. However, Facebook also has a marked limitation in that it grants users limited freedom of expression to construct identity or make self-presentation: users cannot choose their own background and colours of their personal page, they have to stick to default settings. Due to its curtailing of users’ ability to feign the ideal personality, Facebook informs an ideal condition for examining identity construction in online environments where the relationships are anchored in offline communities. It is expected that people would engage in identity construction on Facebook and adopt strategies of self-presentation that help them deal with the less anonymous environment. In essence, people are expected to present their hoped-for-possible selves rather than their “true” or hidden selves. Facebook users may emphasize or even exaggerate the part of their possible selves that are socially desirable but not readily discernible in brief offline encounters, such as one’s character, intelligence, and other important inner qualities. At the same time, they may seek to hide or de-emphasize the part of their selves they regard as socially undesirable, such as shyness, overweight, or stuttering. It is certainly true that people engage in such activities in face-to-face situations as well, but the emergence of a less anonymous Facebook environment provides users with new leverage for selective self-presentation. Unlike Internet dating, participants who are primarily looking for romantic relationships among people previously unknown to them, Facebook users are looking for friendships as well as romantic relationships among two types of people: (1) those they know in person, and (2) those they do not know in person. A major function of Facebook is to help the users connect with those they already know and extend that connection to those they do not yet know. However, due to the mixing of these two different types of people in the audience, Facebook allows users to engage in targeted performances by blocking certain viewers from viewing certain parts of their Facebook accounts. As people present themselves differently to different audiences—for example, people won’t tell their neighbors everything they tell their family members—the researcher also expect Facebook users to tailor their online presentations to particular audiences. Hence, Facebook offers a unique opportunity to study how students are performing and constructing identities in their own way.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:

Two aspects are considered under this section, theoretical framework and literature review, so as to provide a fitting context within which the present study is undertaken.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:
SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY BY DECI AND RYAN:

In their book: *Handbook of self-determination research*, Deci & Ryan (2002), see self-determination theory as a macro theory of human motivation and personality, concerning people’s inherent growth tendencies and their innate psychological needs. Essentially, self-determination theory addresses three universal needs: competence, autonomy and psychological relatedness. According to Deci & Ryan (p. 227), needs “specify the necessary conditions for psychological growth, integrity, and well-being.” Relatedness on the other hand is about being connected to others by caring or being cared for (Wang et al., 2008). Competence is described as the effectance-focused ability to produce valued outcomes and experience mastery which in turn implies the desire for information-based learning, while autonomy refers to a person’s volition – the desire to self-organize experience and to engage in activities that are in harmony with one’s sense of the self (Deci & Ryan, 2000). These three aspects of personality are invaluable to understanding what and why certain goals are pursued by actors in a social context. Motivation, according to Deci and Ryan, is very important because it lies at the bottom of the three characteristics mentioned earlier and it serves as the driving force for the three qualities, hence, there might be variation in what individuals need for competence, autonomy and relatedness. As a result, it was seen that individuals are not simply passive and act only when they have to replenish perceived deficiencies of need fulfillment but they are also proactively and self-determinedly engage in activities that interest them and develop or actualize their individual potential as long as they are “in a context that allows need satisfaction” (p. 230). This suggests that most activities people are interested in challenge their curiosity, openness and assimilation culminating in positive resonance not necessarily because a need must be fulfilled but due to the mental exercise involved in such activities and the actualizing of their fantasies and innermost desires. This means correlation requires that activities have a back-channel which allows self-assessment as an option to evaluate and measure need satisfaction.
In essence, Deci & Ryan’s study provides a theoretical framework for this study and sets the background for the research domain: empirical assessment of how numerical data, or their change between two observations, may be perceived as effective reflective cues about personal development in terms of satisfying intrinsic and higher-level needs such as the need for relatedness, competence and autonomy which are often reflective in identity construction or self-representation on social networking sites such as Facebook.

LITERATURE REVIEW:
The advent of the internet has revolutionized the traditional conditions of identity production. With the inability of users to experience physical contact during online encounter, it becomes possible for student A in Accra to interact with student B in Cape Coast on the Facebook thinking he is communicating with a lady whereas offline (the real world) a young man is posing as a lady. In view of such tendencies, starting from the 1990’s researchers have been conducting investigations into various possibilities and implications the internet would hold for the social conception of identity. Turkle (1995:14) for example investigated the potential for fragmented, multiple postmodern selves and arrived at the following submission: “computer-mediated communication can serve as a place for the construction of identity.” In his study, Harraway (2004) probed feminist concepts such as affinity politics and oppositional consciousness through the idea of the Cyborg (a being with both organic and cybernetic parts) and sought to reject boundaries such as those between man and machine. Also, some researchers discovered that the combination of disembodiment and anonymity creates a technologically mediated environment in which a new mode of identity production emerges (Bargh, McKenna, & Fitzsimons, 2002; McKenna, Green, & Gleason, 2002). An important characteristic of this emergent mode of identity production is the tendency for people to play-act at being someone else or to put on different online personae that differ from their “real life” identities (Stone, 1996; Turkle, 1995). The inability of users to experience physical contact enables people to hide their undesired physical features, and anonymity allows individuals to re-create their biography and personality. In other words, the disembodied and anonymous online environment makes it possible for people to reinvent themselves through the production of new identities. For example, in the online world, a man can pretend to be a woman, a nerd to be a star athlete, and an introvert to be an extrovert. Online “role-playing,” as the phenomenon has come to be known, can be an empowering process. Research has shown that the removal of physical “gating features” (stigmatized appearance, stuttering, shyness, etc.) enables certain disadvantaged people to bypass the usual obstacles that prevent them from constructing desired identities in face-to-face settings (McKenna et al., 2002). The emergent online anonymous environment also provides an outlet for the expression of one’s “hidden self” (Suler, 2002) and the exploration of various non-conventional identities (Rosenmann and Safir, 2006). As such, the Internet plays an important role in identity empowerment.

However, Zhao (2006) indicated that the online world is not entirely anonymous. Family members, neighbors, colleagues, and other offline acquaintances also communicate with each other on the Internet. He referred to this type of offline-based online relationships as “anchored relationships” An online relationship can be anchored offline in a number of ways. For example, an online relationship can be anchored through institutions, residence, or mutual friends. The level of anchorage varies depending on the degrees to which online partners are identifiable and locatable offline. The most important identifying information includes a person’s legal name, residential location, and institutional affiliations (Marx, 1999). If an online environment can verify such personal information and also make it public, then interpersonal relationships are fully anchored in that environment.

In their study, DiMaggio & Hargittai (2001) demonstrated that the internet is far from a system with the highest ideal or with very skilled users as initially conceived during its introduction, because till now several individuals lack access to the internet and some that do have do not possess the skill to operate it. Still others do not have experiential access; percieved barriers to access (or usefulness or ease of use) play just as much of a role in preventing people from getting online as actual barriers (Porter and Donthu 2006). As a result, Ginger (2008) posits that “group identities belonging to marginalized or disadvantaged populations could be setback or hindered in the world of the digital.” Even once people are established online, studies have demonstrated that gendered, sexual, classed, raced, and age-based identities and corresponding conflicts continue to be salient factors in determining the character of online relationships (Kendall 1998). People who’ve grown up using the web employ skepticism when considering the norms of digital identity and possess learned skills to determine authenticity, much like they would in Goffman’s vision of the everyday world. This is a form of digital literacy (Hawisher et al., 2004) and quite possibly an example of critical access (Banks, 2006), which is increasingly becoming forefront in the humanities and social sciences (“Our Cultural Commonwealth,” 2006). They learn...
what kind of behaviors to expect; they know better than to assume that the spam email about millions of dollars in Africa is real or to view a profile on MySpace as equally informing or valid as meeting that person face to face. It is not that offline identity is in any way non-imperative to constructing digital identity, it is that the performance of and way identity is ascertained online is subject to variant forms of expression, reception, and consequential construction. Essentially, the present study shall unveil and discuss new dimensions in the performance and construction of identity by university students on a less anonymous online website – Facebook.

METHODOLOGY:
This section discusses the research design, population and sampling procedure and research site, instrumentation and data collection procedure.

RESEARCH DESIGN:
The study is rooted within survey research paradigm. The choice of this research design was informed by its appropriateness and suitability. Mizner (2008) indicated that a survey research provides a high level of general capability in representing a large population. Due to the usual huge number of people who are surveyed, the data being gathered possess a better description of the relative characteristics of the general population involved in the study. As compared to other methods of data gathering, surveys are able to extract data that are near to the exact attributes of the larger population. Moreover, Zhao et al (2008) and Ginger (2008) employed it in a recent research similar to the present research with appreciable results.

POPULATION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE:
The population for the study was made up of all the first and third year undergraduate students of the Department of English, University of Cape Coast, Ghana. The first year students were selected by the researcher because they have less academic workload. It was therefore thought that these will be more active on Facebook. The third year students are also not under much pressure academically like the second and final year students, as such the same assumption about the first year students was thought to hold for the third year students. The stated academic context of the first and third year students allows them ample time to visit Facebook frequently. Upon this basis, a combination of purposive and simple random sampling method was used to sample 240 undergraduate students for the study. The purposive sampling was used to select the first and third year undergraduate students, since they possess the characteristics needed for the study whereas the simple random sampling was used to randomly select 240 undergraduate students.

RESEARCH SITE:
The University of Cape Coast (UCC), one of the six public universities in Ghana, is the research site for the study. Established in October 1962 as a College of Education affiliated to the University of Ghana, the institution attained full status as an independent university with the authority to confer its own degrees in 1971 (Afful, 2007). The choice of this research site hinges on its proximity to the researcher. The issue of proximity is very important taking into consideration the time and financial burden of moving from the University of Cape Coast (where the researcher resides) to other universities. Also, being an alumnus and presently a lecturer in UCC, the researcher is quite familiar with the students and media ecology, hence the choice of UCC as the research site.

INSTRUMENTATION:
The major research instrument used was the questionnaire. Open-ended and closed-ended questions were used. Section C of the questionnaire contained structured questions based on a four Likert Scale where Always was 4, Sometimes 3, Rarely 2, and Never 1. The questionnaire was made up of three major sections. Section (a) consisted of items dealing with the frequency of users to Facebook, section (b) contained items designed to measure respondents’ effort in updating their profiles on Facebook while section (c) looked into how people construct and enact identities on Facebook.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE:
The researcher administered the questionnaire, the main instrument for data collection, personally to respondents. This was to promote participation and a high return rate of the questionnaire from respondents.
DATA ANALYSIS:

Analysis was done in relation to the stated research questions. First, in order to answer researcher questions 1 and 2, simple frequencies were run for section A and B of the questionnaire using frequencies and percentages. Secondly, an adequate answer was provided regarding question 3 by calculating the average-mean of responses in relation to section C of the questionnaire. The aggregate conjecture of the data assisted the researcher to arrive at a conceptualization of construction of identity on Facebook.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:

Identification of students’ activity on Facebook is primarily important to deciphering how they enact their identity on Facebook. This matter is treated in research question one (1).

RESEARCH QUESTION ONE (1):

How often do users visit Facebook? This question is meant to reveal how frequently Facebook users visit their profiles, and make necessary contacts, conversation, and announcements. Table 1 provides an answer to the first research question.

Table 1 below shows that of the students observed, majority (48.3%) visit their profiles between one and two times a day. This means that many students are digitally oriented and desire to make and retain friends on Facebook. Many though, (21.7%) visit the site three to four times daily, while only 6.7% visit the site three times a week and 3.3% less than once a week. These statistics suggest that participants log on frequently, which logically parallels the frequency at which they could (and do) perform their identity.

ACTIVITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6+ times daily</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times daily</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times daily</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times a week</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a week</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work, 2013
n=240

RESEARCH QUESTION TWO (2):

How often do users update their profiles on Facebook? This question is intended to elicit information on the regularity or readiness of users to update their profiles on Facebook. Table 2 dwelled on this aspect of the study and results are presented below.

Table 2 below revealed that an overwhelming 124 (51.7%) of the respondents update their profiles once every few weeks. This means majority of the respondents are not very eager to update their profile, perhaps they feel until something very important happens before they will update their profile. 32 (13.3%) update their profile every few days whiles 24 (10%) update their profile once a week. It is also noteworthy that 12 (5%) update their profile once a day. This means they are very frequent in updating their information, but they are few as compared to the total number of students’ sampled. Additionally, 48 (20%) are updating their profiles less than once a month. These ones are really lagging behind, perhaps they are not digitally inclined or motivated or have fewer friends, hence they visit it once-in-a-while.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a day</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every few days (or more)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Table Showing Activities Students Often Perform on Facebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Investigate/view profiles or pictures</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Investigate/view groups or event</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Investigate/view notes or posted item</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>Unpopular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>View news feeds (personal or general)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Search for people (profiles) or pictures</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Search for groups or events</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpopular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Check, reply to, or send messages</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Read wall posts</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Make or respond to wall posts</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Poke others (initiate)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>Unpopular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Return pokes (reciprocate)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Create groups</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>Unpopular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Create events</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Unpopular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Post pictures</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Check out advertisements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpopular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work, 2013
n=240

RESEARCH QUESTION THREE (3):

How do users construct and enact their identity on Facebook? The study revealed that users are logging in often, and updating their profiles semi-frequently, but what are they really doing when they log in? i.e. How do they go about negotiating their identity on Facebook. Section C of the questionnaire contained questions to gauge students usage tendencies. These behaviours give one measure of how information might be exchanged in ways that construct or enact identity. By assigning value of 4, 3, 2, and 1 to the four point likert scale, the scale allows for easy identification of popular or unpopular used items. Using 2.50 as the cut off point to determine popular and unpopular items, then, frequently used or popular item is represented by items with mean value higher than 2.50 while items with mean value of responses lower than the 2.50 is indicative of an unpopular item. 2.50 therefore represent neutral item. Responses of the students are given in Table 3 above.

A closer look at Table 3 revealed that most activities have stayed at approximately the same level of popularity for respondents. The only significant exception might be posting of pictures, followed by wall actions and reciprocating pokes, which seem to have become more popular, 3.60 (posting pictures), 3.52 (read wall post). Pictures and Wall postings are an interesting method of expression on the Facebook network. When users post on another’s wall, they are not just simply messaging or communicating with one another, but doing so in a semi-public fashion, making it a distinctly different kind of performance-based activity. The act of posting to another’s wall is the only one that is (potentially) picked up by the newsfeed and easily visible to the general public (people who visit your profile).

Apart from wall actions, the remaining common usages on Table 3 were covert ones: investigate/view profiles and pictures, reading wall posts and messages, and following the newsfeed. Posting pictures and returning pokes are the only two occasional activities that are clearly shown. The remaining actions users sometimes take when logged on are hidden: Sending messages, searching for friends, and investigating or viewing groups and events. Table 3 also revealed that the most popular behaviors are those related to both direct and indirect.
communication and information exchange. Intentional construction of identity (on-stage) comes in the form of ‘public’ actions such as profile updates, posting of pictures, and wall messages as well as hidden reciprocative actions (back-stage) like messaging and poking communications. Implicit influences on identity construction are carried out by the searching and investigating of profiles and pictures, distanced observations of walls, groups, events, and newsfeeds, and potentially read but unanswered messages (off-stage). Participants know others are looking at their profiles and watching the newsfeed and thus situate them in a context suited to their audience, allowing for a blend of influence strategies (impression management). Pictures are often one of the driving features behind the whole economy of profile exchange.

The ties between the physical and online worlds facilitate a stronger representation of identity and help to combat feelings of disembodiment. Sharing through pictures may be less assertive, however, as viewing a picture does not actually notify the owner of the picture that someone is looking at it. Users seem to browse (investigate) more than they actively and intentionally search for specific people, groups, and events in the system. The newsfeed, however, offers an interesting mixture of potential passive observation and indication of assertive behavior. Some items, like the breakup of a romantic relationship, group and application involvement, and status changes are also tagged by the newsfeed but were not included in the collection of widespread routines. Significantly, Table 3 indicates that the newsfeed (3.36 (popular)) has become a viable, or at least accepted way of sharing one’s activities, constructing identity information, and otherwise communicating indirectly (and potentially unintentionally) with the mass. While some users may not purposely act to perform for the newsfeed they at least know that they are being observed. The fact that far fewer people initiate pokes (2.04 (unpopular)) than return them probably indicates fewer poke starters than people willing to engage in poke-exchanges. The most assertive activities, such as creating events, groups, and poking others as well as the ones least directly connected to people, such as viewing groups, events, the pulse, and posted items, were the ones of lowest occurrence. Advertisements (2.04 (unpopular)) were one of the least often engaged items on Table 3, which is perhaps not surprising, but nonetheless unfortunate news for marketing agents who feel Facebook is the best place to get their product to take off.

Ginger (2008) and Compete.com (cited by Freiert, 2007) also conducted similar studies to determine what Facebook visitors were doing most on the website. Their findings are consistent with those explained here though they sourced data via a different method. For example, Compete.com tracked only behavior, wall posting was not examined. Their study was not based on user-reported data but instead collected data by analysis of system statistics. Unlike this study, Compete.com’s findings ranked browsing of profiles as the most frequent activity, followed by browsing pictures and interacting with applications. Ginger on the other hand studied the differences between users on a basis of the number of friends on other networks and also analyzed the demographics of participants.

SUMMARY:

The major findings emanating from the research include the following:

i. It was discovered that Facebook subscribers have many opportunities to perform their identity on Facebook, hence several students investigated are frequently (Table 1, item 3 (48.3%) visiting the site once or two times a day for networking, making and retaining friends and the likes.

ii. The investigative study also revealed on Table 2, item 4 that majority (124 (51.7%)) of the respondents update their profiles once every few weeks, this means they are semi-frequent in updating their profiles. This may also suggest that they are very actively involved or passive about such matters but are rather interested in checking postings or events on the site.

iii. The study also revealed that majority of the respondents are highly interested in posting pictures (3.60) followed by wall posting (3.52) as depicted in Table 3, item 8 and 14. These are veritable means of constructing and performing individual identities on the Facebook.

CONCLUSIONS:

In view of the findings emanating from this study, the following conclusions are drawn:

a. In line with the analysis presented above, majority of the students showcased themselves indirectly through photo (Table 3, item 8, 3.60) and wall posting on Facebook (Table 3, Item 14, 3.52). In this way, the visual possibilities of Facebook mean that users offer a mediated interaction to their audience, one that requires the audience to pay equal attention to the social milieu of the individual. Most users appealed to the interest of ideal figures that captivate their fantasies.
b. The study also revealed that any activity in the virtual (online) world is consequential, appropriate penalty or fine can be imposed for deviant behavior, hence it is expected of subscribers to behave according to established norms; conformity to norms will be rewarded and deviations from them will be punished.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Based on the findings and the conclusions enumerated above regarding the construction and enactment of identity on Facebook, the researcher made the following recommendations:
1. All users of Facebook network should be wary in their approach to matters on the website because Facebook allows subscribers to present a totally different picture of their person or personality thereby staging different identity shows for different audiences. Users should not be deceived into believing what may later hurt him physically and otherwise.
2. Also, in view of the great deal of power and leverage Facebook has over users due to its access to subscribers’ private information through other sources, it is recommended that Facebook should continue to uphold the tenet of individual privacy and right of information and refrain from using user’s private information for marketing purposes which may create an avenue for miscreants to gain access to privileged information.
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