A Research On The Effect of "Using The Internet" On "Social Efficacy"

Dr. Fatma İNCE

Mersin University, Applied Technology and Management School of Silifke, Business Information Management, Mersin, Turkey.

ABSTRACT

The internet can be used for specific purpose, especially socialization, because it reshapes the way of communication recently. This kind of environmental developments refined the social norms and rules. Communication in a society gives people some clues about their abilities. People generate an idea about their capabilities by using the past events, old success, experiences. After comparing the new information and old ones, there is a judgement about ability of problem solving or managing the situation. All these processes come from Bandura's (2011) social cognitive theory and it emphasizes that individual's knowledge acquisition can be related to observing others within the context of social interactions, experiences and other media communications. From this point of view, the effect of using the internet on social efficacy is investigated and there are significant relations between variables in this study.

KEYWORDS : Social Efficacy, Using the Internet, Social Media and Social Skills Inventory

Introduction

In social cognitive theory, the beliefs about efficacy can control behaviors, attitudes and choices of people. Because people can produce desired outcomes and have more incentive to persevere in the face of difficulties, when they think themselves socially and individually efficacy (Bandura, 1997). So the beliefs and perceptions have different spheres of functioning which can form human adaptation and change behaviors (Holden, 1991). All resources, competencies and knowledge are cognitively collected and they are used to solve problems, communicate and improve the quality of life (Fernandez et al., 2002).

The sum of an individual's beliefs about capabilities to organize actions, achieving goals in particular situations and dealing ways with problems create an individual perspective about abilities. After this process, there is a judgement on completing tasks and reaching goals (Wheeler and Ladd, 1982). The term of social efficacy emphasizes this situation in a society. So, social efficacy is a belief about problem solving talents in a social context and is also about the harmony of behaviors and social norms or rules (Ryan and Patrick, 2001). Therefore the social efficacy has social dimensions as well as individual characteristics. In this study, social efficacy has six sub-dimensions which are called as emotional expressivity, emotional sensitivity, emotional control, social expressivity, social sensitivity and social control. Emotional sub-dimensions are about nonverbal abilities in communication, while social sub-dimensions are about verbal abilities.

Emotional expressivity is about the ability of conveying meaning in the form of nonverbal or transmission of signals by using individual energy. As the target of communication, the understanding of emotions, signals and other non-word messages are about emotional sensitivity. In the all process, the abilities about controlling the nonverbal communication emphasize sub-dimension of emotional control. Otherwise, social dub-dimensions are about verbal messages and they include the abilities of sending message, understanding the message and controlling this communication process. According to the Riggio (1986) these social skills are predicted some social group membership, typical social behaviors and depth of social networks.

Statement of the Problem

Is there any effects of Using the Internet on Social Efficacy in students sample and is there any significant differences between the scores using the internet and demographic factors? What is the social efficacy level of participants?

Review of Literature

According to the study of Patrick et al (1997), students' perceptions of their social efficacy were related significantly to their academic efficacy and girls felt more efficacious in their interactions than did boys. Accordingly, Hochwarter et al.(2004) find some relations between social efficacy and job performance, career satisfaction. According to the results, respondents who held low social efficacy beliefs reported higher performance scores and being more satisfied with their career than their high social efficacy counterparts. Finally, Fernández et al (2002) find that socioeconomic status, such as income, occupation, residential status and education have significant relations with individuals and collective social efficacy. This means that social efficacy can affect some of the beliefs or perceptions, while it can be determined some individual, social and environmental factors.

Objectives

To study the effect of using the internet on social efficacy. To identify the social efficacy level. To determine differences between the sample groups (demographic attributes) within the context of social efficacy and using the internet. The research problem involves two variables. First one is social efficacy which has 6 sub-dimensions called emotional expressivity, emotional sensitivity, emotional control, social expressivity, social sensitivity and social control. And the second one is "using the internet" which has no sub-dimensions in this study.

Methodology

All participants are a number of 90 first class students of business in April of 2016. The full sampling technique was adapted for the study. A questionnaire was used to collect information from the respondents. 90 "social skills inventory" items (Riggio, 1986) and 10 "using the internet" items take part in the survey with 5 Likert Scale. Also, Pearson correlation, linear regressions, ANOVA and t-test are used for statistical analyses.

Findings

The cronbach's alpha results of the analysis, which includes sub-dimensions of social efficacy; emotional expressivity 0,903 emotional sensitivity 0,909 emotional control 0,912 social expressivity 0,907 social sensitivity 0,903 and social control 0, 905. All sub-dimensions have 15 items and totally there are 90 social efficacy items.

Table 1: Correlation Analysis of the Relations between "Using the internet" and "Social Efficacy"

	Mean	St.Dv.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.Emotional expressivity	3,0800	,4955	1							
2.Emotional sensitivity	3,0289	,4718	,695**	1						
3.Emotional control	2,7963	,4943	,573**	,402**	1					
4.Social expressivity	2,8326	,4219	,475**	,497**	,564**	1				
5.Social sensitivity	2,7711	,5040	,571**	,523**	,549**	,650**	1			
6.Social control	2,8163	,5010	,576**	,574**	,516**	,558**	,613**	1		

| 7.Social Efficacy | 2,8875 | ,3823 | ,821** | ,774** | ,759** | ,775** | ,822** | ,809** | 1 | |
| 8.Using the Internet | 2,7300 | 1,428 | ,250* | ,214* | ,161 | ,285** | ,175 | ,136 | ,215* | 1 |

*Correlation p<0,05 (two tailed); **Correlation p<0,01 (two tailed)

According to the table, all sub-dimensions have correlation with each other (p: 0,000). "Using the internet" has correlations with emotional expressivity, emotional sensitivity, social efficacy (p: 0,05) and social expressivity (p: 0,01). Also, the arithmetic mean of social efficacy level in this sample is 259 which is from 90 to 450 points.

Table 2: Independent Group T- Test between Spending Time on the Internet and Social Efficacy

Time	N	x̄	SD	df	t	p	Sig.
0-1 hour	46	2,79	0,35	88	-2,41	0,018	p<0,05
1 hour+	44	2,98	0,39				Significant

Table 3: Effect of "Using the Internet" on "Social Efficacy"

Variables	Beta	t	Sig.	R	R2	F	Sig.
Constant	2,605	21,123	0,000	0,250	0,062	5,850	0,018
Using Int.	0,190	2,419	0,018				Significant
Regression Model: Y (Social Efficacy): 2,605 + 0,190 (Using the Internet)							

According to the regression results, using the internet has a meaningful effect on social efficacy, so the model of the research is acceptable statistically. Using the internet is a predictor of social efficacy with R2: 0,062. The weak influence of using the internet shows that there are a lot of dimensions which can affect the social efficacy directly.

Conclusion and Suggestions

Personal, behavioral and environmental factors determine the beliefs, perceptions and personalities. So a lot of factors affect people's beliefs about social and general capabilities and make them more active or passive in the society. Social efficacy is one of the items which is affected from social norms, rules and personal characteristics. The term is a judge being socially efficacious and a belief about managing social difficulties. University life gives some opportunities about personal and social growth, success. So an investigation about students' social perceptions bring light the term of social efficacy clearly. Also, recent developments about technology can affect the level of sociality as one of the environmental factors. From this point of view, the effect of using the internet on social efficacy is analyzed in this study.

In addition to these, ANOVA shows that the level of fathers' education has a significant difference with other levels. High school level has different scores than levels of primary school, university and postgraduate. The arithmetic mean of individualistic social efficacy is 259 from 450. Boys have higher levels of social efficacy than girls in this sample. The other demographic factor have not any significant differences. Consequently, it is shown that there are positive relations between using the internet and social efficacy in this study. It can be said that other environmental factors can be analyzed in a large sample for future researches. Social efficacy levels of employees, entrepreneurs and leaders can also investigated for professionals.

T-test results show that spending time on the internet more than 1 hour has higher mean than other. The frequency of internet using (F: 1,757; p: 0,188), per week (F: 0,460; p: 0,05), the aim of using (F: 1,049; p: 0,308) and the preference of device (F: 0,973; p: 0,382) are also analyzed with t-test and ANOVA. But there is no significant difference in the scores. Also, there are no any differences between groups with demographic factors. Only sex and education levels of father have some differences. According to the t-test results, boys have a higher social efficacy level (mean: 3,01) than girls (mean: 2,80; p: 0,01). Also, according to the ANOVA results, high school level of fathers has some differences with primary school (mean difference in LSD analysis: -0, 239; p: 0,014), university (-0,406; p: 0,014) and postgraduate (-0,662; p: 0,017).

8.   Wheeler, V. A., & Ladd, G. W. (1982). Assessment of children's self-efficacy for social interactions with peers. Developmental Psychology, 18(6), 795.

References

1.   Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change, Psychological Review, 84 (2), 191-215.

2.   Bandura, A. (2011). Social cognitive theory. Handbook of social psychological theories, 349-373.

3.   Fernández-Ballesteros, R., Díez-Nicolás, J., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Bandura, A. (2002). Determinants and structural relation of personal efficacy to collective efficacy. Applied Psychology, 51(1), 107-125.

4.   Hochwarter, W. A., Kiewitz, C., Gundlach, M. J., & Stoner, J. (2004). The impact of vocational and social efficacy on job performance and career satisfaction. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10(3), 27-40.

5.   Patrick, H., Hicks, L., & Ryan, A. M. (1997). Relations of perceived social efficacy and social goal pursuit to self-efficacy for academic work. The Journal of Early Adolescence, 17(2), 109-128.

6.   Riggio, R. E. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. Journal of Personality and social Psychology, 51(3), 649.

7.   Ryan, A. M., & Patrick, H. (2001). The classroom social environment and changes in adolescents' motivation and engagement during middle school. American Educational Research Journal, 38(2), 437-460.