



# THE EFFECTS OF FACEBOOK USAGE ON ACADEMICS AND VALUES OF THE STUDENTS

**Ronalyn C. Lee<sup>1</sup>, Elizabeth D. Dioso, Ed.D.<sup>2</sup>**

*<sup>1</sup>Master of Arts in Education Major in Educational Administration, Assumption College of Nabunturan  
Teacher I Camanlangan National High School, Division of Davao de Oro*

*<sup>2</sup>Doctor of Education, Professor, Assumption College of Nabunturan, Philippines*

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra14012>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra14012

## ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the effects of Facebook usage on the academic performance and values of students at Camanlangan National High School. The research employed a quantitative research design, utilizing a survey questionnaire as the primary data-gathering tool. The participants were 100 grade 8 students randomly selected. The grades were gathered for the academic performance and the survey questionnaire consisted of questions relating to reasons of Facebook usage, time spent in using Facebook, and level of core values. The data collected were analyzed using statistical methods such as mean, standard deviation, and regression analysis. The results showed that Facebook usage had no significant effect on the academic performance and values of students. The findings revealed that most of the students spent 3-4 hours a day using Facebook, and the main reason they are using the platform is to gather friends hence, moderate usage has a positive effect on values such as communication and socialization. The study recommends that students should use Facebook in moderation and prioritize their academic responsibilities to achieve better academic performance.

**KEYWORDS:** Facebook, Core values, Academic performance, Camanlangan National High School

## Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

### The Problem and Its Background

Facebook is a social networking website where individuals can create an online profile with information about themselves, and its popularity has increased dramatically since its creation in 2004 (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). An estimated 93% of college students have a Facebook account (Sheldon, 2008). Facebook had 200 million unique visitors to its website between January and November of 2008, and it follows Blogger as the second most visited SNS (Schonfeld, 2008). Facebook usage significantly affects students' academic performance and social lives, which is a universal truth. Despite the good effects of the internet for academic performance, some researchers have shown that too much use of internet has negative influences on one's physical health, family life, and academic performance (Asdaque, Khan, & Rizvi, 2010).

A study of Facebook usage among 219 students at a large public Midwestern University-Downers Grove Campus, Downers Grove, Illinois USA found the average self-reported academic achievement of Facebook users to be significantly lower than that of non-Facebook users (Kirschner & Karpinski, 2010). On the other hand, some studies have found social media use to have no impact on academic achievement in college. Two studies found no relationship between self-reported use of Facebook or other social networking sites and self-reported academic achievement in a sample of students from a public Northeast Research University in Manhattan Kansas, USA (Kuh, 2003).

Moreover, there was a study conducted on the impact of Facebook usage to the academic performance of the fourth year education students in Andres Bonifacio College, Dipolog City, Philippines revealed that the academic performance of the student respondents was not affected. Their academic performance remained constant. Time spent



on Facebook was negatively predictive of the performance of the male students but only for few (Alondres et al., 2017).

In Camanlangan National High School where the researcher is currently teaching, she observed that almost all of the students are using the social media specifically Facebook but the performance of her students is not very impressive. She wanted to know whether or not the use of Facebook can help the students improve their academic performance and the development of the right values of the students. With this scenario, the researcher has the inkling to conduct this research.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The major goal of this research was to determine the effect of Facebook usage on the academic performance and values of the students in Camanlangan National High School for school year 2022-2023. It sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of review in using facebook of student's responses in terms of:
  - 1.1 grades range
  - 1.2 reasons in the use of Facebook
  - 1.3 numbers of hours spent
2. What is the academic performance of the students when grouped according to:
  - 2.1 reasons in the use of Facebook
  - 2.2 numbers of hours spent
3. What is the level of values of the students in terms of:
  - 3.1 Maka Diyos,
  - 3.2 Makatao,
  - 3.3 Makakalikasan, and
  - 3.4 Makabansa?
4. Is there a significant relationship between Facebook usage and the level of academic performance of the students?
5. Is there a significant relationship between Facebook usage and the level of values of the students?

### **Null Hypotheses**

With the problems in this study, the following hypotheses below are formulated:

**HO<sub>1</sub>** There is no significant relationship between Facebook usage and the level of academic performance of the students.

**HO<sub>2</sub>** There is no significant relationship between Facebook usage and the level of values of the students.

## **Chapter 2 METHODS**

This section discusses the research design, research locale, research respondents, research instrument, validation of instrument, research procedure, and statistical tools.

### **Research Design**

A quantitative descriptive-correlation research design was used in this study. Information was collected from the students using the adapted questionnaires. According to Bakar (2001), questionnaires for primary data collection were the most appropriate method for obtaining information through observation and questioning. Descriptive research involves a direct investigation, analysis and description of each phenomenon, with the aim of as intuitive a presentation as possible and to the exclusion of as many unexplained assumptions as possible (Streubert & Carpenter 1999).

### **Respondents of the Study**

The respondents were selected through purposive sampling whereby the researcher selected students who were using Facebook in their educational pursuit. The target respondents were coming from grade 8 level. Table 1 below shows the distribution of the respondents per section in grade 8 level.



Table 1  
Respondents of the Study

Grade Level	Grade 8 Cattleya	Grade 8 Gumamela	Grade 8 Sampaguita	Grade 8 Sunflower	Total
Total number of Respondents	25	25	25	25	100

### Research Instrument

In collecting data, an adapted questionnaire was used by Ayao in her study in 2018. It consisted of two main parts. The first part of the questionnaire asked about the reasons behind in using Facebook and number of hours spend by the students in using Facebook. The second part of the questionnaire asked about the values of students in terms of Maka Diyos, Makatao, Makakalikasan, at Makabansa.

### Validation of Instrument

A panel of external and internal validators were tasked to review the adapted instrument before it was administered to the respondents. After which, the researcher used the test and retest to ensure the reliability of the questionnaire. It was pilot tested to 20 students who were not involved in the study. If found no issues during testing, the administration of the instrument followed.

### Research Procedures

A proper protocol was followed before and during the collection of data.

**Seeking Permission to Conduct the Study.** The researcher wrote a letter of permission to conduct the study to the Schools Division Superintendent, Division of Davao de Oro. A written letter of request was prepared for the principal of Camanlangan National High School for formal consent. Upon receiving the confirmation from the authorities, the researcher immediately administered the questionnaire to the identified respondents. The researcher took into consideration the standard health protocols following the advice of the local health officials so as to ensure the safety of the researcher and the students.

**Administering the Questionnaire.** To start the study, the questionnaire was administered to the identified students. The researcher herself was the one to administer with proper coordination of the teacher in-charge. To facilitate clear understanding of the questionnaire, the researcher explained clearly the items and the respondents were given ample time to answer it.

**Data Gathering.** The researcher gathered and encoded all data in her personal computer. All data was submitted to the statistician for statistical computation after which, the researcher analyzed and interpreted for discussion.

### Statistical Treatment of Data

The data obtained were tallied and tabulated. The statistical tools used to ensure the accuracy in the analyses and interpretations of the findings were the following:

**Percentage.** This was used to determine the average grade of the students.

**Mean.** This was used to measure the academic performance of the students.

**Pearson r.** This was used in computing the significant relationship between of two groups of samples.

## Chapter 3 RESULTS

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data collected. The results of the study were presented and discussed in accordance to the research questions outlined in chapter one.

### Level of Student's Responses

**Grades.** Table 2 shows the grades of the respondents.



**Table 2**  
**Grades of the Respondents**

GRADES RANGE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
75 – 79	19	19%
80 – 89	52	52%
90 – 100	29	29%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 2 shows the distribution of grades of 100 respondents. From this data, 19 or 19% of the respondents received grades between 75-79, 52 or 52% received grades between 80-89, and 29 or 29% have grades between 90-100. Overall, it looks like that the majority of respondents received grades ranging from 80-89

**Reasons in using Facebook.** It is presented in Table 3 the reasons why the students are using Facebook.

**Table 3**  
**Reasons in the use of Facebook**

REASONS FOR USING FB	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
EDUCATIONAL	27	27%
LEISURE	28	28%
FRIENDS	45	45%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

From the data you provided, we can see that the most common reason for using Facebook is for connecting with friends 45%. Around one-fourth of the users (27%) use Facebook for educational purposes, while another 28% use it for leisure. Overall, the data suggests that Facebook is primarily used for social purposes, and also serves as a platform for learning and entertainment.

**Table 4**  
**Numbers of hours spent in Facebook**

Numbers of hours spent in fb	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
1 - 2 hours	26	26%
3- 4 hours	46	46%
5-6 hours	14	14%
7 and up	14	14%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

According to the data, 26% of the respondents use Facebook for 1-2 hours per day, 46% of them use it for 3-4 hours, 14% use it for 5-6 hours, and another 14% use it for more than 7 hours per day. This indicates that the majority of the respondents use Facebook for 3-4 hours per day.

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics on the number of hours spent by the respondents in using Facebook.

**Table 5**  
**Academic Performance of Different Reasons for Using Facebook**

Grade range	Mean	SD
	Academic Performance	
75-79	86.296	5.967
80-89	85.964	5.751
90-100	83.911	5.243

The mean number of hours spent using Facebook for ACA is 86.296, for PER is 85.964, and for 1 is 83.911. This suggests that overall, the respondents in this survey spend a fairly significant amount of time using Facebook. The standard deviations (5.967, 5.751,



and 5.243) indicate that there is some variations in the amount of time spent by different respondents, with some spending considerably more or less time than the mean. In general, the minimum and maximum values (75.000 - 97.000, 75.000 - 96.000, and 75.000 - 96.000).

**Table 6**  
**Number of hours spent in using Facebook**

	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND TIME OF FACEBOOK USER			
	1-2	3-4	5-up	7-up
Valid	26	46	14	14
Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean	86.731	85.000	84.286	83.429
Std. Deviation	5.452	5.827	6.044	4.702
Minimum	75.000	75.000	76.000	78.000
Maximum	96.000	97.000	96.000	91.000

*Note.* Excluded 19 rows from the analysis that correspond to the missing values of the split-by variable time spent

This table displays descriptive statistics for a set of data with four variables, labeled 1 through 4, and a sample size of 100 (with no missing values). The table shows that there are 26 valid responses for variable 1, with a mean response of 86.731 and a standard deviation of 5.452. The minimum response for variable 1 is 75, and the maximum is 96. Similarly, for variables 2, 3, and 4, there are 46, 14, and 14 valid responses respectively, with mean responses of 85.000, 84.286, and 83.429, and standard deviations of 5.827, 6.044, and 4.702. For each variable, the minimum and maximum responses are also displayed.

#### Level of Core Values of the Respondents

**Maka Diyos.** Table 7 presents the core value of the respondents in terms of Maka Diyos.

**Table 7**  
**Core Value for Maka Diyos**

Indicators	Mean Rating	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I post gospel phrases in Facebook.	1.75	Not always true
2. I often read gospel phrases from Facebook.	2.05	Not always true
3. I download and read at least 1 bible version and reflect during my free time.	1.73	Not always true
4. I return borrowed things in good condition.	1.58	Not always true
5. I demonstrate intellectual honesty.	2.14	Not always true
6. I aspire to be fair and kind to all.	2.21	Not always true
7. I do not have personal biases.	2.07	Not always true
8. I recognize and respect one's feeling and those of others.	2.39	Not always true
9. I always tell the truth.	2.07	Not always true
10. I respect religious beliefs of others.	2.66	Always true
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>Not always true</b>

Based on the ratings provided, the respondent's behavior towards religious and moral values is less than ideal. The average mean rating of 2.06 suggests that the respondent's behavior falls between "Always true" and "Not always true". Items 1, 3, and 4 are rated the lowest, indicating that there is significant room for development in those areas. However, In secondary schools, students are



taught the importance of respect, equality, and fairness for everyone, regardless of their social status or disabilities. These values are integrated into the lessons and emphasized in the Edukasyong Pagpapakatao subject.

**Makatao.** Table 8 shows the level of core values of the respondents in terms of Makatao.

**Table 8**  
**Core Value for Makatao**

Indicator	Mean Rating	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I show respect for all and wait for one's turn.	2.00	Not always true
2. I view mistakes as learning opportunities.	2.04	Not always true
3. I uphold respect the dignity and equality of all including those with special needs.	2.51	Always true
4. I volunteer to assist others in times of need.	2.29	Not always true
5. I recognize and respect people from different economic, social and cultural background	2.60	Always true
6. I cooperate during school activities.	2.85	Always true
7. I recognize and accept the contribution of others toward a goal.	2.23	Not always true
8. I accept defeat and celebrate other's success.	2.78	Always true
9. I speak out against and prevent bullying.	2.13	Not always true
10. I communicate respectfully.	2.25	Not always true
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>Not always true</b>

Based on the given ratings, the respondent's self-reported behavior suggests that they do not always exhibit positive character traits. The average mean rating of 2.36 indicates that the respondent's behavior falls somewhere between "always true" and "not always true" for the listed characteristics. Additional investigation and conversation could be necessary to assess any obstacles or opportunities for growth in these manners. The average rating of 2.36 indicates that there is possible for improvement in exhibiting these positive character traits regularly. Items 1, 2, and 9 are rated the lowest, indicating that there is significant room for improvement in those areas. However, Item 6 is rated the highest, this indicates that they are all participative and cooperative in any activities sanctioned by the school.

**Makakalikasan.** Shown in Table 9 is the core value of Makakalikasan of the respondents.

**Table 9**  
**Core Value for Makakalikasan**

Indicator	Mean Rating	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I show a caring attitude towards environment.	2.13	Not always true
2. I practice waste management.	2.28	Not always true
3. I conserve energy and resources.	2.24	Not always true
4. I take care of school materials, facilities and equipment.	1.90	Not always true
5. I keep work area in order during and after work.	2.05	Always True
6. I keep one's work neat and orderly.	2.44	Not always true
7. I participate in tree planting activities in school.	1.71	Not always true
8. I join the municipal activity in Pulot Basura.	1.49	Not always true
9. I have concern on my family and my future generation.	2.50	Always true
10. I segregate garbage in a proper trash can.	2.17	Not always true
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>Not always true</b>

Based on the ratings provided, the respondent's behavior towards environmental sustainability is less than ideal. The average mean rating of 2.09 suggests that the respondent's behavior falls between "Always true" and "Not always true". Items 4, 7, and 8 are rated the lowest, indicating that there is significant room for improvement in those areas. However, Item 9 is rated the highest, suggesting that the respondent has concern with their families and the future generation keep the environment clean. The average mean rating of



2.09 suggests that the respondent's behavior falls somewhere between "Always true" and "Not always true". This implies that the respondent can improve their actions in certain areas such as properly managing waste and actively participating in activities like planting trees and cleaning up trash.

**Makabansa.** Presented in Table 10 is the core value for Makabansa of the respondents.

**Table 10**  
**Core Values for Makabansa**

Indicator	Mean Rating	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I identify myself as Filipino.	2.87	Always true
2. I respect the flag and national anthem.	2.29	Not always true
3. I take pride in diverse Filipino cultural expressions, practices and traditions.	2.42	Not always true
4. I promote appreciation and enhancement of Filipino languages.	2.44	Not always true
5. I abide by the rules of the school, community and country.	2.34	Not always true
6. I enable others to develop interest and pride in being a Filipino.	1.99	Not always true
7. I manage time and personal resources efficiently and effectively.	1.94	Not always true
8. I preserve to achieve goals despite difficult circumstances.	2.4	Not always true
9. I conduct myself appropriately in various situations.	2.13	Not always true
10. I establish appropriate behavior in carrying out activities in the school, community and country.	2.11	Not always true
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>Not always true</b>

Based on the ratings provided, the respondent's behavior towards patriotism and cultural identity needs improvement. The average mean rating of 2.29 suggests that the respondent's behavior falls between "Always true" and "Not always true". Items 7, 6, and 4 are rated the lowest, indicating that there is significant room for improvement in those areas. However, Item 1 is rated the highest, suggesting that the respondent identifies oneself as Filipino consistently.

#### **Significant Relationship between Facebook Usage [REASON] and the Level of Academic Performance of the Students**

**Table 11**  
**Reason and the Academic Performance**

Contingency Tables

reason	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE			
	1	2	3	Total
1	4	11	12	27
2	4	16	8	28
3	11	25	9	45
Total	19	52	29	100

#### **Chi-Squared Tests**

	Value	df	p
X <sup>2</sup>	5.668	4	0.225





#### Chi-Squared Tests

	Value	df	p
N	100		

The table shows the number of responses for each combination of two variables, with the total number of responses at the margins. In this table, the two variables being analyzed are reason and academic performance each with three categories (1, 2, and 3). The cells in the table represent the frequency of each combination of the two variables. For example, there are 4 responses with reason = 1 and ACA\_PER = 1, 11 responses with reason = 1 and ACA\_PER = 2, and 12 responses with reason = 1 and ACA\_PER = 3. The total number of responses for reason = 1 is 27. Similarly, for reason = 2, there are 4 responses with ACA\_PER = 1, 16 responses with ACA\_PER = 2, and 8 responses with ACA\_PER = 3. The total number of responses for reason = 2 is 28. For reason = 3, there are 11 responses with ACA\_PER = 1, 25 responses with ACA\_PER = 2, and 9 responses with ACA\_PER = 3. The total number of responses for reason = 3 is 45. The total number of responses across all categories is 100.

In the given data, the Chi-Squared value is 5.668 with 4 degrees of freedom. The resulting p-value is 0.225, which indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the observed frequencies and the expected frequencies in the contingency table at a significance level of 0.05. This means that the evidence found in the data is not sufficient to reject the null hypothesis, which states that there is no relationship between the reasons of the respondents

#### Significant Relationship between Facebook Usage [Time Spent] and the Level of Academic Performance of the Students

**Table 12**  
**Time Spent and Academic Performance**

Contingency Tables

Time spent	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE			Total
	1	2	3	
1	3	14	9	26
2	8	24	14	46
3	4	7	3	14
4	4	7	3	14
Total	19	52	29	100

#### Chi-Squared Tests

	Value	df	p
X <sup>2</sup>	3.082	6	0.798
N	100		

The given contingency table shows the distribution of responses based on the time spent in using Facebook. The table has four categories representing the time spent (1-4), with a total of 100 respondents. Category 2 had the most responses, with 46 participants, followed by Category 1 with 26 participants. Categories 3 and 4 had the fewest participants with 14 responses each. The contingency table provides a breakdown of responses based on the amount of time spent.

The result of the Chi-Squared test shows that the calculated Chi-Squared value is 3.082 with 6 degrees of freedom, and a p-value of 0.798. This suggests that there is no a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies. The sample size is 10

#### Significant Relationship between Facebook Usage [Reason] and the Level of Core values of the Students





**Table 13**  
**Reason and Core Value**

Contingency Table

reason	Value			Total
	1	2	3	
1	1	10	16	27
2	0	8	20	28
3	1	21	23	45
Total	2	39	59	100

**Chi-Squared Tests**

	Value	df	p
X <sup>2</sup>	3.657	4	0.454
N	100		

This is a contingency table that displays the frequency counts of two categorical variables, "reason" and "value". The table shows the number of times the combinations of categories occurred in the dataset. For instance, the table indicates that the combination of "reason" category 1 and "value" category 1 occurred only once in the dataset, whereas the combination of "reason" category 2 and "value" category 2 occurred eight times. The table also shows the totals for each row and column, as well as the overall total. Chi-Squared test result that shows a Chi-Squared value of 3.657 and 4 degrees of freedom, with a p-value of 0.454. Based on this result, there is not enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies. The sample size for this test is 100

**Significant Relationship between Facebook Usage [Time Spent] and the Level of Core values of the Students**

**Table 14**  
**Time Spent and Core Value**

Contingency Table

Time spent	Value			Total
	1	2	3	
1	1	8	17	26
2	0	21	46	46
3	0	6	8	14
4	1	4	9	14
Total	2	32	59	100

**Chi-Squared Tests**

	Value	df	p
X <sup>2</sup>	5.335	6	0.502
N	100		

The table shows the frequency count for two categorical variables, "time spent" and "value", in a dataset of 100 observations.  
- There are four categories for "time spent": category 1 represents 26 instances where a certain activity was conducted for a short amount of time, category 2 represents 46 instances where the activity was conducted for a moderate amount of time, category 3 represents 14



instances where the activity was conducted for a slightly longer time period, and category 4 represents 14 instances where the activity was conducted for the longest duration. - There are three categories for "value": category 1 represents 2 instances where a certain attribute or dimension measured had the lowest value, category 2 represents 39 instances where the attribute measure was of moderate value, and category 3 represents 59 instances where it was of high value. - The table indicates that, for instance, the combination of "time spent" being 1 and "value" being 1 occurred just one time, while the combination of "time spent" being 2 and "value" being 2 occurred 21 times. - The totals show the overall frequency count for each category of "time spent", "value", and the total number of observations. A calculated Chi-Squared ( $X^2$ ) value of 5.335 with six degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.502. The p-value indicates the likelihood of a particular result being obtained purely by chance. In this case, the p-value is higher than 0.05, which suggests that there is not enough statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the two variables being tested. The result probably indicates that the Chi-Squared test did not detect any significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies in the data. The sample size for this test is 100.

## Chapter 4

### DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the discussions, conclusion, and recommendations of the study.

#### Discussions

After the data were analyzed and interpreted, the following discussions of the findings are gathered:

1. About 19% of the respondents received grades between 75-79; 52% received grades between 80-89; and 29% have grades between 90-100. Overall, the majority of respondents received grades ranging from 80-89. According to Kirschner and Karpinski (2010) many Facebook users reported no significant impact on their overall academic performance as long as they did not frequently use the social media platform. Additionally, some students noted that they prioritized their schoolwork, and therefore, their use of Facebook did not have a noticeable effect on their grades in school.

2. The most common reason for using Facebook is for connecting with friends 45%. Around one-fourth of the users (27%) use Facebook for educational purposes, while another 28% use it for leisure. Overall, the data suggests that Facebook is primarily used for social purposes, and also serves as a platform for learning and entertainment. Junco (2012) found that when students use Facebook for educational purposes such as checking to see what friends are up to and sharing information (sharing links), it results in a positive academic outcome better than when they used it merely for socializing such as status update and chatting.

3. The respondents use Facebook for durations ranging from 1 to 2 hours (26%) and 3 to 4 hours (46%) per day. It is notable that the total of 72% of the respondents use Facebook for at least 3 hours a day. A small number of respondents, around 14% each, use Facebook for 5 to 6 hours and 7 or more hours per day. These results suggest that Facebook is a popular platform among users who spend a considerable amount of time browsing, engaging, and interacting with content on the platform. The frequency of usage may vary for different users, and it is important to ensure a healthy balance between social media use and other aspects of daily life. A study made by Boogart and Robert (2006), found out that too much usage of Facebook is associated with lower academic achievement, implying a negative impact on the scholastic performance of students.

4. The respondents spend a fairly significant amount of time using Facebook. The standard deviations (5.967, 5.751, and 5.243) indicate that there are some variations in the amount of time spent by different respondents, with some spending considerably more or less time than the mean. In general, the minimum and maximum values (75.000 - 97.000, 75.000 - 96.000, and 75.000 - 96.000. According to Junco's (2011) research, spending more time on Facebook was linked to lower scores on a scale measuring student engagement. Additionally, Junco found that some activities on Facebook were associated with increased student engagement, while others were associated with decreased engagement. As student engagement is connected to significant academic results, it is possible that certain activities on Facebook may also be linked to these outcomes (Kuh, 2009; Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005).

5. Based on the given ratings, the respondent's self-reported behavior suggests that they do not always exhibit positive character traits. In addition, Facebook also can provide useful stimulus for reflecting on the potential of technological tools for "legitimizing" students' points of view as expert members of the school communities and for improving the quality of education and participatory cultures (Manca -Grion, 2017).

6. There is no association between Facebook usage according to reason and academic performance of the respondents. Further, it was also revealed that the time spent in using Facebook is also not associated with the academic performance of the respondents.

7. There is no significant relationship between Facebook usage and the level of academic performance of the students.

5. There is no significant relationship between Facebook usage and the level of values of the students.

#### Conclusions

Based on the summary provided, it seems that utilizing Facebook does not significantly impact the academic performance and the core values of the student respondents. Instead, Facebook is primarily used for online communication with friends, and the students reported



spending anywhere from 3 to 8 hours on it daily. The students also scored vastly on core values such as maka Diyos, makatao, makakalikasan, and makabansa, with descriptive ratings indicating that these values were not always true.

### Recommendations from the study

1. Students should have proper guidance on the appropriate use of platforms like Facebook that can help reduce the amount of time they spend engaging in unproductive activities such as chatting and irrelevant engagements that do not significantly contribute to their academic or personal development.

2. School administrators, teachers, and parents should work together to establish guidelines and educate students on proper social media behavior, as well as use monitoring tools to identify and address any issues that may arise. Additionally, by monitoring social media activity, educators and parents can intervene if they notice any signs of cyberbullying or other negative behaviors, and provide support to affected students. Ultimately, the goal of monitoring social media activities is to create a safe and positive online environment for students, and to protect their overall well-being.

3. Stakeholders should also consider organizing social events that bring students together to interact and socialize in person. These events can provide a safe and structured environment for youth to build positive relationships and connect with peers who share similar interests and values. By promoting face-to-face interactions and fostering positive social connections, stakeholders can help reduce social isolation and promote social-emotional wellness among young people.

4. Parents should help teachers and offer more assistance and teach students about responsible Facebook use.

### REFERENCES

1. Affum, Mark Quaye (2022), "The Effect of Internet on Students' studies: review". *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 6932.
2. Akhter, N. (2013). *Relationship between Internet Addiction and Academic Performance among University Undergraduates*. *Journal of Science and Technology Education Research*, 8, 1793-1796.
3. Asdaque, M. M., Khan, M. N., & Rizvi, D. S. (2010). *Effect of Internet on the Academic Performance and Social Life of University Students in Pakistan*. *Journal of Education and Sociology*, 12, 21-27.
4. Bargh, John A., and Katelyn YA McKenna (2004) "The Internet and social life." *Annual review of psychology* 55.1: 573-590. Castells, M. (2014). *Comunicación y poder*. Madrid, España: Alianza Editorial.
5. Bliuc, A. M., Ellis, R., Goodyear, P., & Piggott, L. (2010). *Learning through face-to-face and online discussions: Associations between students' conceptions, approaches and academic performance in political science*. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(3), 512-524.
6. Brandtzæg, P. B. (2010). *Towards a unified Media-User Typology (MUT): A meta-analysis and review of the research literature on media-user typologies*. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 940-956.
7. Boogart, V., & Robert, M. (2006). *Uncovering the social impacts of Facebook on a college campus (Doctoral dissertation)*. Kansas State University.
8. Boyd, D.M., & Ellison, N.B. (2007). *Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship*. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1). Retrieved September 20, 2008, from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol13/issue1/boyd.ellison.html>
9. Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2020). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. Wiley.
10. Castells, M. (2014). *The impact of the internet on society: a global perspective*. *Change*, 19, 127-148.
11. Caprara, G. V., Schwartz, S. H., Vecchione, M., & Barbaranelli, C. (2020). *The impact of values on political ideology: A longitudinal study*. *Political Psychology*, 41(4), 695-713.
12. Cassidy, J. (2006). *Me media' The New Yorker*, 82, 13, pp. 50-59.
13. Choi, (2004) "Motives of Internet uses: crosscultural perspective – the US, the Netherlands, and S. Korea". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, New Orleans Sheraton, New Orleans, LA. [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p\\_mla\\_apo\\_research\\_citation/1/1/2/8/3/p112833\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apo_research_citation/1/1/2/8/3/p112833_index.html). Accessed 21.02.11.
14. Chou, C., & Hsiao, M. C. (2000). *Internet addiction, usage, gratification, and pleasure experience: the Taiwan college students' case*. *Computers & Education*, 35(1), 65-80.
15. Clayton, S., Devine-Wright, P., Stern, P. C., Whitmarsh, L., & Carrico, A. R. (2020). *Climate change, psychological adaptation, and behavioral responses: A report on the psychological science of climate change*. American Psychological Association.
16. Crede, M., & Phillips, L. A. (2011). *A meta-analytic review of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire*. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21(4), 337-346.
17. Cribb, A., & Bignold, S. (2021). *Health professional values education in the 21st century*. Springer.
18. Coates, H. (2007). *A model of online and general campus-based student engagement*. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(2), 121-141.
19. Coates, H. (2006). *Student engagement in campus-based and online education: university connections*. Routledge, New York.
20. Cotten, S. R. (2008). *Students' technology use and the impacts on well-being*. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2008(124), 55-70.
21. Dahlstrom, E., de Boor, T., Grunwald, P., & Vockley, M. (2011). *The ECAR National Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology 2011 (Research Report)*. Boulder.
22. Davies, I., & Lovat, T. (2021). *Values education and student wellbeing*. Routledge.



22. DeBell, M., & Chapman, C. (2006). *Computer and Internet Use by Students in 2003. Statistical Analysis Report. NCES 2006-065. National Center for education statistics.*
23. De La Cruz, (2017). *Investigating the relationships among college students' satisfaction, addiction, needs, communication apprehension, motives, and uses & gratifications with Snapchat. Computers in Human Behavior, 75, 870-875.*
24. Diamanduros, T., Downs, E., & Jenkins, S. J. (2008). *The Role of School Psychologists in the Assessment, Prevention, and Intervention of Cyberbullying. Psychology In The Schools, 45(8), 693-704.*
25. Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). *Schools, academic motivation, and stage-environment fit. Handbook of Adolescent Psychology, 2, 404-434.*
26. Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2011). *Connection strategies: Social capital implications of Facebook-enabled communication practices. New media & society, 13(6), 873-892.*
27. Ellison, N., Steinfield, C. and Lampe, C. (2007) 'The benefits of facebook 'friends': social capital and college students' use of online social network sites' *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication 12, 4, pp.1143-1168*
28. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). *School engagement: potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59-109.*
29. Fogg and Iizawa, (2008), *online behaviors also reflect personality traits, values, and Cultures*
30. Gross, E. F. (2004). *Adolescent Internet use: What we expect, what teens report. Journal of applied developmental psychology, 25(6), 633-649.*
31. Grossman, L. (2010). *Mark Zuckerberg. Time Magazine, December, 15.*
32. Godwin-Jones, R. (2008). *Mobile computing technologies: Lighter, faster, smarter. Language Learning & Technology, 12(3), 3-9.*
33. Häfner, M. (2003). *Contrast from social stereotypes in automatic behavior. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39(6), 577-584.*
34. Hamburger, Y. A., & Ben-Artzi, E. (2000). *The relationship between extraversion and neuroticism and the different uses of the Internet. Computers in human behavior, 16(4), 441-449.*
35. Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.*
36. Heiberger, G., & Harper, R. (2008). *Have you Facebooked Astin lately? Using technology to increase student involvement. New directions for student services, 2008(124), 19-35.*
37. Heim, Jan, Petter Bae Brandtzæg, Birgit Hertzberg Kaare, Tor Endestad, and Leila Torgersen (2007) "Children's usage of media technologies and psychosocial factors". *New Media & Society 9, 425-454.*
38. Horrigan, John, B. (2007) "A typology of information and communication technology users". *PewInternet & American Life Project Report. [http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2007/PIP\\_ICT\\_Typology.pdf.pdf](http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2007/PIP_ICT_Typology.pdf.pdf). Accessed 03.05.11.*
39. Hulleman, C. S., Durik, A. M., Schweigert, S. A., & Harackiewicz, J. A. (2008). *Task values, achievement goals, and interest: An integrative analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 100(2), 398-416.*
40. Hurt, N. E., Moss, G. S., Bradley, C. L., Larson, L. R., Lovelace, M. D., & Prevost, L. B. (2012). *The "Facebook" effect: College students' perceptions of online discussions in the age of social networking. International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 6(2), 1-24*
41. Iwighrehweta, O., & Igere, M. A. (2014). *Impact of the Internet on Academic Performance of Students in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria. Journal of Information and Knowledge Management, 5, 47-56.*
42. Jackson, L. A., Von Eye, A., Biocca, F. A., Barbatis, G., Fitzgerald, H. E., & Zhao, Y. (2003). *Personality, cognitive style, demographic characteristics and Internet use-Findings from the HomeNetToo project. Swiss Journal of Psychology/Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Revue Suisse de Psychologie, 62(2), 79.*
43. Johnson, G. M., & Kulpa, A. (2007). *Dimensions of online behavior: Toward a usertypology. CyberPsychology & Behavior, 10(6), 773-780.*
44. Junco, R. (2012). *Too much face and not enough books: The relationship between multiple indices of Facebook use and academic performance. Computers in Human Behavior, 28(1), 187-198.*
45. Karl, K., Peluchette, J., & Schlaegel, C. (2010). *Who's posting Facebook faux pas? A cross-cultural examination of personality differences. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 18(2), 174-186.*
46. Katz JE, Rice RE. *Social consequences of Internet use: Access, involvement, and interaction. MIT press; 2002 Aug 30.*
47. Kiesler, S., Kraut, R., Cummings, J., Boneva, B., Helgeson, V., & Crawford, A. (2002). *Internet evolution and social impact. It & Society, 1(1), 120-134.*
48. Kim, J. J. (2017). *Uses and gratifications of social networking sites for bridging and bonding social capital: A comparison of Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat. Computers in human behavior, 72, 115-122.*
49. Kirschner and Karpinski (2010, p. 26) *Facebook usage in the study on Facebook and academic performance.*
50. Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J., Helgeson, V., & Crawford, A. (2002). *Internet paradox revisited. Journal of Social Issues, 58, 49-74.*
51. Kubey et al., 2001: (2001). *Internet Use and Collegiate Academic Performance Decrements: early findings.*
52. Landers, R. N., & Lounsbury, J. W. (2006). *An investigation of Big Five and narrow personality traits in relation to Internet usage. Computers in human behavior, 22(2), 283-293.*
53. Laroche, M., Habibi, M. R., Richard, M. O., & Sankaranarayanan, R. (2020). *The effects of culture on consumer behavior: Cross-cultural research in advertising and marketing. Routledge.*
54. Lee et al. (2014). *Personality traits and self-presentation at Facebook Personality and Individual Differences*
55. Leveritt, M., Irwin, I., Ball, L., & Desbrow, B. (2012). *Students' perceptions of using Facebook as an interactive learning resource at university. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 28(7), 1221-1232. <http://doi:10.4018/ijebpl.2011010104>*





56. Lim, J., & Richardson, J. C. (2016). Exploring the effects of students' social networking experience on social presence and perceptions of using SNSs for educational purposes. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 29, 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.12.001>
57. Lundby, K. (2020). *The handbook of media and communication research: Qualitative and quantitative methodologies*. Routledge.
58. Madge, C., Meek, J., Wellens, J., & Hooley, T. (2009). Facebook, social integration and informal learning at university: 'it's more for socialising and talking to friends about work than for actually doing work'. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34(2), 141-155.
59. Manca, S. (2017). Snapping, pinning, liking or texting: Investigating social media in higher education beyond Facebook. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 44, 100707.
60. Mason, R. (2006). Learning technologies for adult continuing education' *Studies in Continuing Education*, 28, 2, pp.121-133
61. Mazman, S.G. & Usluel, Y.K. (2010). Modeling educational usage of Facebook. *Computers & Education*, 55 althy, K. V. (2010). The perils of sexting. *Businesswest*, 27(6), 47.
62. Mazman, S. G., & Usluel, Y. K. (2009). Adoption process of social network and their usage in educational context. Unpublished Master Thesis, 106
63. McKenna, K. Y., & Bargh, J. A. (2000). Plan 9 from cyberspace: The implications of the Internet for personality and social psychology. *Personality and social psychology review*, 4(1), 57-75
64. M.D. Roblyer, M. McDaniel, M. Webb, J. Herman, and V. Witty, (2010). Facebook in Higher Education: A Comparison of College Faculty and Student Uses and Perceptions of Social Networking Sites, *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13, pp. 134-140, 2010.
65. Mensah, S. O., & Nizam, I. (2016). The impact of social media on students' academic performance-A case of Malaysia Tertiary Institution. *International Journal of Education, Learning and Training*, 1(1), 14-21.
66. Nalwa, K. and Anand, A. (2003) Internet addiction in students A cause of concern. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*. doi10.1089/109493103322725441.
67. Nucci, L. P. (2019). *Handbook of moral and character education*. Routledge.
68. Oche, M., & Aminu, A. (2010). Nigeria: Social Networking and the Future of Students 3RD October 2010. *Leadership Newspaper (ABUJA)* [Http://allafrica.com/stories/201010040385.html](http://allafrica.com/stories/201010040385.html) R Etrieved, 21(5),
69. Ogedebe, P. M., Emmanuel, J. A., & Musa, Y. (2012). A survey on Facebook and academic performance in Nigeria Universities. *International Journal of engineering research and applications*, 2(4), 788-797.
70. Papacharissi, Z., & Rubin, A. M. (2000). Predictors of Internet use. *Journal of broadcasting & electronic media*, 44(2), 175-196.
71. Pintrich, P. R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 667-686.
72. Pircher Verdorfer, A. (2020). *Values-based leadership: A journey towards personal and professional transformation*. Palgrave Macmillan.
73. Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6. Retrieved from <http://goo.gl/93tth3j>
74. R.J. Fouser, (2011). From CMS to SNS: Exploring the Use of Facebook in the Social Constructivist Paradigm, 10th Annual International Symposium on Applications and the Internet, pp. 221-224
75. Roblyer, M. D., McDaniel, M., Webb, M., Herman, J., & Witty, J. V. (2010). Findings on Facebook in higher education: A comparison of college faculty and student uses and perceptions of social networking sites. *The Internet and higher education*, 13(3), 134-140.
76. Roeser, R. W., & Peck, S. C. (2009). An education in awareness: Self, motivation, and self-regulated learning in contemplative perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 44(2), 119-136.
77. Rosen, P., & Sherman, P. (2006). Hedonic information systems: acceptance of social networking websites.
78. Ryan, T, & Xenos, S. (2011). Who uses Facebook? An investigation into the relationship between the Big Five, shyness, narcissism, loneliness and Facebook usage. *Computers in Human Behavior*, in press doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.02.004.
79. Saha, S. R., & Guha, A. K. (2019). Impact of Social Media Use of University Students. *International Journal of Statistics and Applications*, 9, 36-43.
80. Sari, (2018). The development of internet-based economic learning media using moodle approach. *International journal of active learning*, 3(2), 100-109.
81. Schonfeld, E. (2008). Top social media sites of 2008 (Facebook still rising). Retrieved February 25, 2009, from <http://www.techcrunch.com/2008/12/31/top-social-media-sites-of-2008-facebook-still-rising>
82. Schwartz, S. H. (2020). *Basic human values: Theory, methods, and applications*. Springer.
83. Sengupta, M.; Das, J. & Maji, P. K. (2010). Environmental awareness and environment related behaviour of twelfth grade students in Kolkata: Effects of stream and gender. *Anwesa*, Vol.-5, 1-8. Retrieved from <http://rkmbcerahara.org/pdf/1270471914anwesa.pdf>
84. Singh, (2013). Threshold-limited spreading in social networks with multiple initiators. *Scientific reports*, 3(1), 1-7.
85. Sheldon, P. (2008). The relationship between unwillingness to communicate and students' Facebook use. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications* 20(2). Retrieved October 15, 2008, from PsycNet database.
86. Stutzman, F. (2006). Adopting the Facebook: a comparative analysis' [[http://www.ibiblio.org/fred/pubs/stutzman\\_wp5.pdf](http://www.ibiblio.org/fred/pubs/stutzman_wp5.pdf)]
87. Swickert, R. J., Hittner, J. B., Harris, J. L., & Herring, J. A. (2002). Relationships among Internet use, personality, and social support. *Computers in human behavior*, 18(4), 437-451
88. Talooki, N. N., Ataee, M., Gorji, M. A. H., & Aghaei, N. (2017). The Role of Regular Internet Usage on Social Behavior of Students. *Indian Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 33, 53-56.
89. Tower, M., Latimer, S., & Hewitt, J. (2014). Social networking as a learning tool: Nursing students' perception of efficacy. *Nurse Education Today*, 34(6), 1012–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.11.006>.
90. Wang, M. T., & Eccles, J. S. (2012). Adolescent behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement trajectories in school and their differential relations to educational success. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 22(1), 31-39.



91. Wellman, B. (2001). *Little boxes, glocalization, and networked individualism* in Ishida, T. (ed.) 'Digital Cities 2' Berlin, Springer
92. Wolters, C. A. (2004). *Advancing achievement goal theory: Using goal structures and goal orientations to predict students' motivation, cognition, and achievement*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(2), 236-250.
93. Vanden Boogart, M. R. (2006). *Uncovering the social impacts of Facebook on a college campus* (Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University).
94. Zakharova, V. A. (2020, October 29). *Social health and environmental behavior of students in the digital age* / *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*. <https://www.un-pub.eu/ojs/index.php/cjes/article/view/5167>