Global Media Journal-Indian Edition; Volume 16 Issue 2; December 2024. ISSN:2249-5835

A Study on Social Media Use, Self-Satisfaction and Self-Esteem in Adults

Sayanika Dutta

Assistant Professor and Head (i/c),

Department of Mass Communication,

Journalism and Media Studies,

Cotton University, Guwahati, Assam -781001

Abstract:

The exponential growth in social media use globally has drawn researchers into exploring its influence on various age cohorts. While existing studies primarily target specific demographic segments, such as adolescents or young adults, they often lack diversity across age, gender, socioeconomic status, and cultural backgrounds. To address this gap, the present study examines if social media use impacts self-esteem and self-satisfaction among adults (26 to 44 yrs). Primary data is gathered through an online survey, incorporating *Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, Social Media Addiction Questionnaire* (SMAQ) and the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. Findings indicate that most respondents between 26 to 44 years have moderate addiction to

social media. Gender is significantly related to social media use as females have been found to be more engaged on social media than males. There is a general level of satisfaction among respondents. Economic condition is found to be a factor for self-satisfaction. A scatter positive correlation has been found between self-esteem and self-satisfaction.

Keywords*: society, social media, self-satisfaction, social media and self-esteem*

Introduction

Social media use has exponentially grown over the years, changing how people interact, transact, and negotiate meanings. More than fifty percent of the world's population i.e. 5 billion people use social media as suggested by different studies. Due to the all-encompassing presence of social media in our lives, it has necessitated studies on how social media is likely to impact different aspects of our lives and well-being. The term social media has been subjected to a plurality of meanings. Social media platforms are online channels that enable users to share, create, interact with content, information and other users. Based on their unique characteristics, McCay-Peet and Quan-Haase (2017) classify social media into the following categories: Social Networking Sites (Facebook, LinkedIn), Bookmarking (StumbleUpon), Microblogging (Twitter, Tumblr), Blogs and Forums (Wordpress), Media sharing (YouTube, Pinterest), Social News (Reddit), Collaborative authoring (Wikipedia, Google docs), Web Conferencing (Skype, Zoom), Geo Location based (Tinder) and Scheduling and Meeting (Google Calendar, Microsoft Outlook).

Self-esteem is a widely researched concept in social psychology. It refers to an individual's overall positive evaluation of the self (Rosenberg et. al. 1995). Self-esteem is an indicator of a person's general well-being. Studies have investigated how individual's social media use may

affect their self-esteem. Social media extends connection, content and outlet of expression that contributes to enhanced social capital, positive relationships, understanding of self and coping skills, happiness, and well-being among young users (Vaingankar et al., 2022). In the USA, seven in ten adolescent girls of colour encountered positive content pertaining to race in different social media platforms (Nesi et al., 2023). Routine use of social media has also resulted in positive health outcomes (Bekalu et al., 2019).

Meanwhile, studies have also established concerns over increasing social media use. It has been found to trigger upward and downward social comparisons among users. Most of it is upward comparison by social media users that make them feel inferior, negatively affecting their self-esteem (Jan et al., 2017). Due to upward comparisons, individuals underestimate their self worth and feel envious about others which negatively affects their self-esteem.

Self-satisfaction is the quality of being pleased with oneself. However, frequent exposure to social media platforms and comparisons resulting therefrom may negatively affect self-satisfaction of individuals. Social comparisons and envy increases the negative impact of social media use on life satisfaction. Social media use by individuals is often driven by the need to maintain connectivity, entertainment, and social enhancement. This exposure to social media leads to individuals encountering both social benefit and social overload. Social benefit enhances satisfaction towards life. Social overload does the opposite (Raza et al., 2020). Frequent use of social media is likely to lead to behavioural and social problems (Abdellatif, 2022).

One of the key theories used in this context is the Social Comparision Theory propounded by Leon Festinger in 1954 which asserts that people evaluate their self worth by comparing themselves to others. As found by numerous studies, social media use can trigger upward and

downward social comparisions, thereby impacting the self-esteem and self-satisfaction of individuals.

Literature Review

Research indicates social media to be a predictor of self-esteem. Vogel et al. (2014) through a correlational approach examined to what extent temporary and chronic exposure to social-comparison information found on Facebook impacted the self-esteem of individuals. It was found that individuals with frequent exposure to Facebook had poorer trait self-esteem. Guven (2019) found that social media use and self-esteem are negatively correlated among university students. Facebook and other social media platforms can be associated with lower trait self-esteem (Vogel et al., 2014; Chamsi et al., 2022). Increased social media use led to devaluation of self among individuals. For every hour spent on Facebook daily, there was a 5.574 decrease in the self-esteem score of students at a business institute (Jan et al., 2017). In the Moroccan context, comparisons made on social networking sites led to a decline in self-esteem of young people (Chamsi et al., 2022).

The relationship between social media use and life satisfaction is mediated by self-esteem (Marengi et al., 2021; Hawi & Samaha, 2017). A positive association has been found between positive online feedback and perceived happiness. Positive online feedback and exchanges led to happiness among users which is mediated by self-esteem. Social media seems to significantly influence self-esteem, as individuals with low social media usage had higher self-worth and vice versa (Hasan, 2018).

However, the frequency of social media use and its influence on self-esteem may vary across age groups. While Ardiana and Tumanggor (2020) found a negative impact of Instagram

addiction among high school students, Rahma and Setiasih (2022) found a direct correlation between the intensity of Instagram use and self-esteem among emerging adults.

Studies have found the relationship between social media use and self-esteem among females to be reciprocal. Milheteig & Von Soest (2022) found that while self-esteem may be a motivating factor for frequent use of social media by women, the rise in intensity of social media use resulted in lower levels of self-esteem. Higher levels of loneliness and lower self-esteem have been found among women (Pop, Iorga & Iurcov, 2022). While significant correlations were found between social media usage patterns and indicators of sleep quality and overall mental health (Woods & Scott, 2016), Hawi and Samatha (2017), found no relation between social media addiction and life satisfaction among individuals.

Raza et. al. (2020) found that using social networking sites influenced life satisfaction among university students of Pakistan. The use of social media to maintain interpersonal connection established lower levels of life satisfaction among Egyptian youth (Abdellatif, 2022).

A mixed pattern of relationships is statistically evident from studies. While the intensity of social media use does necessarily affect the self-esteem of most users, small minorities may experience either positive or negative effects. It is person-specific and the correlation between social media use and self-esteem is based on individual exposure and uses. (Cingel et al., 2022).

Research indicates that high social media use impacts self-worth of individuals negatively. Positive self-esteem can foster a sense of satisfaction for one's life. However, this appears to be person-specific and is dependent on a host of factors. Age, gender, and socio-economic conditions also need to be considered. Literature reveals that most studies on self esteem and social media use have taken into consideration specific demographic segments like adolescents and young adults. Also, most studies have failed to consider the socio demographic factors that are likely to influence social media use, self-esteem, and self-satisfaction.

Objectives and Research Question

This study examines the impact of socio-demographic variables such as gender, age and economic condition of individuals on their social media use, satisfaction with self and self-esteem. It also attempts to examine the correlation between social media use, self-satisfaction, and self-esteem. Do adults who spend more time on social media report a lower or higher level of self esteem and self satisfaction in comparison to adults who spent less time on social media? And do socio demographic factors have a bearing on social media use, self esteem and self satisfaction of adults? These are two pertinent research questions that this study seeks to answer.

Hypothesis

The hypotheses of the study are described and tested in the analysis section.

Methodology

The study employs a quantitative approach. Individuals between the age of 26 to 44 years who are Indian citizens were considered and an online survey was conducted through Google survey form. Referral sampling technique was employed for gathering responses from eligible individuals for the survey. The viability of applying this technique for recruitment of

participants or respondents for behavioural research has been proven (Frandsen et al., 2013). As the survey form was disseminated online through email, chat applications and through referral method, it is a pan-India study.

Using Morgan's table of sample size as a base for finalisation of the sampling frame, responses garnered from a total of 385 samples have been analysed. ANOVA is applied using SPSS version 25.0 to compare and analyse the differences between means of two or more groups and identify the relationship between them. The *Social Media Addiction Questionnaire* (SMAQ), *Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale* and *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (SWLS) have been used for the questionnaire and survey method has been employed to gather data. The socio-demographic variables taken for the study are age, gender, and economic condition. The economic condition in this context refers to the income status of respondents. Pearson correlation coefficient has been applied for testing of linear correlation between social media engagement, self-esteem, and self-satisfaction.

Social Media Addiction Questionnaire

Items
1. I often think about Facebook when I am not using it (cognitive salience)
2. I often use Facebook for no particular reason (behavioral salience)
3. Arguments have arisen with others because of my Facebook use (interpersonal conflict)
4. I interrupt whatever else I am doing when I feel the need to access Facebook (conflict with other activities)
5. I feel connected to others when I use Facebook (euphoria)
6. I lose track of how much I am using Facebook (loss of control)
7. The thought of not being able to access Facebook makes me feel distressed (withdrawal)
8. I have been unable to reduce my Facebook use (relapse and reinstatement)

Table 1: Elphinston & Noller's FIQ developed in 2011

The Social Media Addiction Questionnaire (SMAQ) has 8 items or statements to gauge addictive behaviour towards social media that are measured against a 7-point scale ranging from *strongly agree to strongly disagree*. Higher scores indicate high addiction to social media and vice versa. SMAQ is derived from Facebook Intrusion Questionnaire (FIQ) that was developed by Elphinston & Noller in 2011.

Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale

Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale (1965) has 10 statements, five of which are reverse scored, to measure an individual's self-worth. It is a widely used tool in clinical studies and measures both positive and negative feelings. A 4-point Likert scale is used to measure the items. Scores between 10-25 indicate low self-esteem. It may be inferred as having feelings of inadequacy, incompetence and discomfort facing life's challenges. Scores between 26-29 indicate moderate self-esteem which is inferred as having mixed feelings and oscillating between feelings of approval and rejection. High self-esteem i.e. scoring between 30-40 is inferred as judging oneself as valuable, confident, and competent.

Items	
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	*Strongly agree (4); Agree (3); Disagree (2), Strongly disagree (1)*
2. At times I think I am no good at all. *(Reversed scored)*	*Strongly agree (1); Agree (2); Disagree (3), Strongly disagree (4)*
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	*Strongly agree (4); Agree (3); Disagree (2), Strongly disagree (1)*
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	*Strongly agree (4); Agree (3); Disagree (2), Strongly disagree (1)*
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. *(Reversed scored)*	*Strongly agree (1); Agree (2); Disagree (3), Strongly disagree (4)*
6. I certainly feel useless at times. *(Reversed scored)*	*Strongly agree (1); Agree (2); Disagree (3), Strongly disagree (4)*
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	*Strongly agree (4); Agree (3); Disagree (2), Strongly disagree (1)*
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. *(Reversed scored)*	*Strongly agree (1); Agree (2); Disagree (3), Strongly disagree (4)*
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. *(Reversed scored)*	*Strongly agree (1); Agree (2); Disagree (3), Strongly disagree (4)*
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	*Strongly agree (4); Agree (3); Disagree (2), Strongly disagree (1)*

Table 2: Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale

Satisfaction with Life Scale

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) assesses overall life satisfaction of respondents. The scale assesses an individual's conscious evaluation and judgement of his or her life (Pavot & Diener, 1993) and consists of five items to measure life satisfaction on a 1-7 scale starting from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Higher scores are indicative of higher life satisfaction and vice versa. While scores between 31 to 35 is inferred as being *extremely satisfied*, 05 to 09 is inferred as being *extremely dissatisfied*.

Items: Strongly agree (7) Agree (6) Slightly agree (5) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Slightly disagree (3) Disagree (2) Strongly disagree (1)
1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

Table 3: Satisfaction with Life Scale by Ed Diener and colleagues

Analysis

Statistical Analysis of Social Media (SM) use

In this section, frequency tables of socioeconomic variables (a) Gender, (b) Age, (c) Economic condition and (d) frequency of social media (SM) use among the respondents is described. To examine whether the score of SM use is significantly different in the socio-demographic variable, one-way ANOVA analysis is applied.

Frequency Tables of Socio-Economic Variables

Table 4 (a): Gender wise frequency and percentage of respondents			
Gender		Frequency	Percentage
	Male	187	48.6
	Female	198	51.4
	Total	385	100.0

A total of 385 responses were received through an online questionnaire from individuals between the ages of 26 to 44 years. Of 385 respondents, 48.6 % were males and 51.4 % were females [Table 4 (a)].

Table 4 (b): Age-wise frequency and percentage of respondents			
Respondent's Age		Frequency	Percent
Age	26-30 yrs	172	44.7
	31-35 yrs	92	23.9
	36-40 yrs	65	16.9
	41+	56	14.5
	Total	385	100.0

The study took into consideration respondents between the age of 26 to 44 years. A total of 44.7% respondents were between 26 to 30 years, 23.9% between 31 to 35 years, 16.9 % between 36 to 40 years and 14.5% were 41 years and above. [Table 4 (b)].

Table 4 (c): Economic Status wise frequency and percentage of respondents

		Frequency	Percent
	High income	7	1.8
	Middle income	251	65.2
	Low income	70	18.2
	Unemployed	57	14.8
	Total	385	100.0

Table 4 (c) explains the economic status of respondents wherein 65.2 % of them belong to the middle-income bracket, 18.2% in the low-income bracket and 14.8% are unemployed. Only about 2 % of respondents belong to the high-income bracket.

Table 4 (d): Frequency and percentage of respondents - Social media Use			
		Frequency	Percent
	Moderate	374	97.1
	High	11	2.9
	Total	385	100.0

It is observed that most respondents have moderate use of SM (97.1%). Only 2.9 % respondents said to have high use of SM. Low use of SM was not reported by any of the respondents [Table 4 (d)].

Gender wise analysis of Use of Social media

Table 5 (a): Engagement on social media by Gender					
			Female	Male	Total
Social media engagement	Moderate	Number	194	180	374
		%	98.0%	96.3%	97.1%
	High	Number	4	7	11
		%	2.0%	3.7%	2.9%
Total		Number	198	187	385
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

A cross-table analysis of social media engagement by genders was conducted [Table 5 (a)]. The findings reveal that 96.3% male, and 98% female respondents have moderate engagement on social media. In terms of high engagement, while male respondents account for 3.7%, female respondents account for 2%.

Table 5 (b): Descriptive Statistics of social media use based on gender								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Male	187	33.8503	9.24162	.67581	32.5170	35.1835	11.00	56.00
Female	198	35.7778	8.62537	.61298	34.5689	36.9866	16.00	56.00
Total	385	34.8416	8.97034	.45717	33.9427	35.7404	11.00	56.00

Table 5 (b) reveals that the mean score obtained by female respondents is higher than male respondents. While the standard deviation of male respondents is 9.24 with a minimum score of 11.00 and maximum of 56.00, the standard deviation of female respondents is 8.62 with a minimum score of 16.00 and maximum of 56.00.

Further, whether the mean difference of the score is significant or not between Male and Female, ANOVA was carried [Table 5 (c)]. In this analysis we assume the following Hypotheses.

Null Hypothesis (H_0): The mean difference in social media use scores between the genders is not statistically significant.

Alt. Hypothesis (H_1): The mean difference in social media use scores between the genders is statistically significant.

Table 5 (c): ANOVA					
Dependent variable: Score obtained by the respondents					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	357.305	1	357.305	4.481	.035
Within Groups	30542.030	383	79.744		
Total	30899.335	384			

It is observed [Table 5 (c)] that F-statistics with respect to the mean score between male and female respondents is significantly different at .05, sig($p=0.035 < .05$). Hence, the null Hypothesis may be rejected. The mean difference in social media use scores between the genders appears to be statistically significant which means that women are more engaged on social media than men.

Economic status wise analysis of Use of Social Media

Table 6 (a): Engagement on Social Media by Economic status							
			High income	Low income	Middle income	Unemployed	Total
Use of Social Media	Moderate	Number	7	68	244	55	374
		%	100.0%	97.1%	97.2%	96.5%	97.1%
	High	Number	0	2	7	2	11
		%	0.0%	2.9%	2.8%	3.5%	2.9%
Total		Number	7	70	251	57	385
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

A cross-table analysis of social media engagement by respondents based on their socio-economic status was conducted as shown in Table 6 (a). The data shows that irrespective of their economic status, most of the respondents have moderate levels of engagement on social media. High frequency of social media use is very nominal in the low, middle-income, and unemployed categories. No respondent from the high-income group has high use of SM.

Table 6 (b): Descriptive Statistics of social media use based on Economic condition								
Dependent variable: Score								
Economic status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
High income	7	34.5714	5.34968	2.02199	29.6238	39.5191	27.00	42.00
Middle income	251	35.1753	9.00850	.56861	34.0554	36.2952	11.00	56.00
Low income	70	33.7286	8.64924	1.03378	31.6662	35.7909	18.00	56.00
Unemployed	57	34.7719	9.60100	1.27168	32.2244	37.3194	16.00	56.00
Total	385	34.8416	8.97034	.45717	33.9427	35.7404	11.00	56.00

Table 6 (b) shows that the mean score obtained by middle income respondents is higher as compared to respondents with high or low income or unemployed. The standard deviation is highest among the unemployed respondents with a score of 9.601.

Further, whether the mean difference of the score is significant or not among the economic condition of the respondents, ANOVA was carried out as shown in Table 6 (c). In this analysis we assume the following Hypotheses.

Null Hypothesis (H_0): The mean difference in social media use scores with respect to the economic condition of respondents is not statistically significant.

Alt. Hypothesis (H_1): The mean difference in social media use scores with respect to the economic condition of respondents is statistically significant

Table 6 (c): ANOVA					
Dependent variable: score obtained by respondents					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	115.456	3	38.485	.476	.699
Within Groups	30783.879	381	80.798		
Total	30899.335	384			

It is observed that [Table 6 (c)] F- statistics (0.476) is not significant (sig(p=0.699>.05). Hence, as per hypothesis we may accept the null Hypothesis and concludes that economic condition is not a factor of use of social media.

Table 6 (d): Multiple Comparisons of Economic Condition						
Dependent Variable: Score						
Tukey HSD						
(I) Social class	(J) Social class	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High income	Middle income	-.60387	3.44448	.998	-9.4920	8.2843
	Low income	.84286	3.56325	.995	-8.3518	10.0375
	Unemployed	-.20050	3.60000	1.000	-9.4900	9.0890
Middle income	High income	.60387	3.44448	.998	-8.2843	9.4920
	Low income	1.44673	1.21497	.633	-1.6884	4.5818
	Unemployed	.40337	1.31886	.990	-2.9998	3.8066
Low income	High income	-.84286	3.56325	.995	-10.0375	8.3518
	Middle income	-1.44673	1.21497	.633	-4.5818	1.6884
	Unemployed	-1.04336	1.60367	.915	-5.1815	3.0948
Unemployed	High income	.20050	3.60000	1.000	-9.0890	9.4900
	Middle income	-.40337	1.31886	.990	-3.8066	2.9998
	Low income	1.04336	1.60367	.915	-3.0948	5.1815

To examine the multiple comparison of economic condition, Tuckey HSD analysis has been performed where dependent variable is the score of SM use and independent variables are economic condition of the respondents. However, it is observed that none of the economic factor are responsible for engagement of social media, as the significant values of each of the economic condition is greater than 0.05.

Age wise analysis of Use of Social media

Table 7 (a): Score of Social Media Use by Age of Respondents

			Age				
			26-30 yrs	31-35 yrs	36-40 yrs	41+ yrs	Total
Social Media Engagement	Moderate	Number	167	90	64	53	374
		%	97.1%	97.8%	98.5%	94.6%	97.1%
	High	Number	5	2	1	3	11
		%	2.9%	2.2%	1.5%	5.4%	2.9%
Total		Number	172	92	65	56	385
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 7 (a) shows the social media engagement by respondents based on their age. Among different age groups, 41+ respondents have high use of SM (5.4%). Overall, moderate use of SM is highest in the 36-40 years age group (98.5%).

Table 7 (b): Descriptive Statistics of social media use by Age of respondents								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
26-30 yrs	172	34.2674	9.15995	.69844	32.8888	35.6461	13.00	56.00
31-35 yrs	92	34.1848	8.01500	.83562	32.5249	35.8446	18.00	53.00
36-40 yrs	65	35.1846	8.80322	1.09190	33.0033	37.3659	16.00	55.00
41+	56	37.2857	9.82338	1.31270	34.6550	39.9164	11.00	56.00
Total	385	34.8416	8.97034	.45717	33.9427	35.7404	11.00	56.00

It is observed in Table 7 (b) that the mean score obtained by 36-40 age group respondents is higher than other age groups. The mean value of score is 35.1846 and standard deviation is 8.80322.

Further, whether the mean difference of the score is significant or not among the age of the respondents, ANOVA was carried out as shown in Table 7 (c). The following hypotheses were assumed.

Null Hypothesis (H_0): The mean difference in social media use scores with respect to the age group of respondents is not statistically significant.

Alt. Hypothesis (H_1): The mean difference in social media use scores with respect to the age group of respondents is statistically significant

The dependent variable is the score obtained by the respondents and independent variables is the age of the respondents.

Table 7 (c): ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	438.566	3	146.189	1.829	.141
Within Groups	30460.770	381	79.950		
Total	30899.335	384			

It is observed that [Table 7 (c)] F-statistics (0.141) is not significant (sig(p=0.141>.05).As there are no significant differences in SM use score with respect to the age of the respondents, it can be concluded that age is not related with engagement on social media.

Table 7 (d): Multiple Comparisons						
Tukey HSD						
(I) Age GG	(J) Age GG	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
26-30 yrs	31-35 yrs	.08266	1.15492	1.000	-2.8975	3.0628
	36-40 yrs	-.91717	1.30185	.895	-4.2765	2.4421
	41+	-3.01827	1.37568	.127	-6.5681	.5315
31-35 yrs	26-30 yrs	-.08266	1.15492	1.000	-3.0628	2.8975
	36-40 yrs	-.99983	1.44880	.901	-4.7383	2.7386
	41+	-3.10093	1.51548	.173	-7.0115	.8096
36-40 yrs	26-30 yrs	.91717	1.30185	.895	-2.4421	4.2765
	31-35 yrs	.99983	1.44880	.901	-2.7386	4.7383
	41+	-2.10110	1.63023	.571	-6.3078	2.1056
41+	26-30 yrs	3.01827	1.37568	.127	-.5315	6.5681
	31-35 yrs	3.10093	1.51548	.173	-.8096	7.0115
	36-40 yrs	2.10110	1.63023	.571	-2.1056	6.3078

To examine the multiple comparison of age of the respondents, Tuckey HSD analysis has been performed where dependent variable is score of SM use and independent variable is age of the

respondents. However, it is observed that age is not a responsible factor for engagement on social media, as all the significant values are greater than 0.05.

To conclude, (1) There are significant differences between men and women with regards to social media use; (2) Economic condition is not a factor toward the use of Social Media; and (3) Age is not a factor that affects Social Media use.

Self-Esteem and Socio-demographic Factors

Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale with positively and negatively phrased statements was used to find out how individuals view their self-worth. Data suggests that a large majority (70.9%) have high self-esteem. Only 14.8% of respondents have low self-esteem.

A cross table analysis shows that in terms of gender, 73.7% female respondents and 67.9% male respondents have high self-esteem; 12.1% female and 16.6% male have moderate self-esteem and 14.1% female, and 15.5% male have low self-esteem [Table 8 (a)].

Table 8 (a): Self Esteem By Gender					
			Gender		Total
			Female	Male	
Self-Esteem	Low self esteem	Count	28	29	57
		% within Gender	14.1%	15.5%	14.8%
	Moderate self esteem	Count	24	31	55
		% within Gender	12.1%	16.6%	14.3%
	High self esteem	Count	146	127	273
		% within Gender	73.7%	67.9%	70.9%
Total		Count	198	187	385
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gender wise analysis of Self Esteem

Table 8 (b): Descriptives statistics of score by Gender								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Male	187	34.1765	8.84732	.64698	32.9001	35.4528	11.00	56.00
Female	198	35.4596	9.05964	.64384	34.1899	36.7293	15.00	55.00
Total	385	34.8364	8.96851	.45708	33.9377	35.7351	11.00	56.00

A descriptive statistical analysis of scores by gender reveals that the mean score obtained by female respondents is higher than of males. The standard deviation of female respondents is 9.05 with a minimum score of 15.00 and maximum of 55.00 [Table 8 (b)].

Further, whether the mean difference of the score is significant or not between Male and Female, ANOVA was carried out as shown in Table 8 (c). The following Hypotheses were assumed:

Null Hypothesis (H_0): The mean difference of self esteem scores with respect to gender is not statistically significant.

Alt. Hypothesis (H_1): The mean difference of self esteem scores with respect to gender is statistically significant.

Table 8 (c): ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	158.338	1	158.338	1.974	.161
Within Groups	30728.353	383	80.231		
Total	30886.691	384			

It is observed in Table 8 (c) that F-statistics with respect to the mean difference between male and female respondents is not statistically significant at .05, Sig (p=0.161 > .05). Hence, we may accept the Null hypothesis and conclude that gender is not a factor for low, moderate, or high self-esteem.

Economic status wise analysis of Self Esteem

A cross-table analysis of self-esteem based on their socio-economic status reveals that low-income groups and the unemployed category of respondents have low self-esteem. A similar data set has been observed in case of moderate self-esteem. However, high self-esteem has been observed in high income (85.7%) and middle income (74.1%) groups.

Table 9 (a): Self Esteem by Socioeconomic status

			High income	Middle income	Low income	Unemployed	Total
Self Esteem	Low self esteem	Number	0	34	12	11	57
		%	0.0%	13.5%	17.1%	19.3%	14.8%
	Moderate self esteem	Number	1	31	13	10	55
		%	14.3%	12.4%	18.6%	17.5%	14.3%
	High self esteem	Number	6	186	45	36	273
		%	85.7%	74.1%	64.3%	63.2%	70.9%
Total		Number	7	251	70	57	385
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

It has been observed that the mean score of middle-income respondents (35.49) is higher than other categories [Table 9 (b)]. The standard deviation is highest among low-income respondents (9.37139) with a minimum score of 16.00 and a maximum score of 56.00.

ANOVA was carried out to find whether the mean difference of the score is significant or not among the different economic groups [Table 9 (c)]. We assume the following Hypotheses. Null Hypothesis (H_0): The mean difference of scores of self esteem with respect to the economic condition of the respondents is not statistically significant.

Alt. Hypothesis (H_1): The mean difference of scores of self esteem with respect to the economic condition of the respondents is statistically significant.

Table 9 (b): Descriptive statistics of score by Economic status

Economic status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
High income	7	30.8571	6.79285	2.56746	24.5748	37.1395	21.00	40.00
Middle income	251	35.4980	9.13165	.57638	34.3628	36.6332	11.00	56.00
Low income	70	33.2143	9.37139	1.12010	30.9798	35.4488	16.00	56.00
Unemployed	57	34.4035	7.66220	1.01488	32.3705	36.4366	19.00	55.00
Total	385	34.8364	8.96851	.45708	33.9377	35.7351	11.00	56.00

It is observed that [Table 9 (c)] F- statistics (0.476) is not significant (sig(p=0.160>.05). Hence, it may be concluded that economic condition is not a determinant of self-esteem thus validating the null hypothesis.

Table 9 (c): ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	415.580	3	138.527	1.732	.160
Within Groups	30471.111	381	79.977		
Total	30886.691	384			

To examine the multiple comparison of economic condition, Tuckey HSD [Table 9(d)] analysis has been performed where dependent variable is the score of self-esteem and independent variable is the economic condition of the respondents. It is observed that none of the economic factors are responsible for self-esteem, as all the significant values are greater than 0.05.

Table 9 (d): Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Score						
Tukey HSD						
(I) Socioeconomic status	(J) Socioeconomic status	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High income	Middle income	-4.64087	3.42693	.529	-13.4837	4.2020
	Low income	-2.35714	3.54510	.910	-11.5049	6.7907
	Unemployed	-3.54637	3.58167	.755	-12.7885	5.6958
Middle income	High income	4.64087	3.42693	.529	-4.2020	13.4837
	Low income	2.28372	1.20878	.234	-.8354	5.4029
	Unemployed	1.09450	1.31215	.838	-2.2914	4.4804
Low income	High income	2.35714	3.54510	.910	-6.7907	11.5049
	Middle income	-2.28372	1.20878	.234	-5.4029	.8354
	Unemployed	-1.18922	1.59550	.879	-5.3063	2.9278
Unemployed	High income	3.54637	3.58167	.755	-5.6958	12.7885
	Middle income	-1.09450	1.31215	.838	-4.4804	2.2914
	Low income	1.18922	1.59550	.879	-2.9278	5.3063

Age wise analysis of Self-esteem

Table 10 (a) shows the self-esteem of respondents based on their age. The data reveals that 25% of respondents who are 41 years and above have low self-esteem. Respondents between 36 to 40 years (24.6%) have moderate self-esteem. Respondents between 31-35 years (76.1%) have high self-esteem, closely followed by the age group 26 to 30 years (75%).

10 (a): Self-Esteem by Age of the respondents							
			Age				Total
			26-30 yrs	31-35 yrs	36-40 yrs	41+	
Self-esteem	Low self esteem	Number	17	14	12	14	57
		%	9.9%	15.2%	18.5%	25.0%	14.8%
	Moderate self esteem	Number	26	8	16	5	55
		%	15.1%	8.7%	24.6%	8.9%	14.3%
	High self esteem	Number	129	70	37	37	273
		%	75.0%	76.1%	56.9%	66.1%	70.9%
Total		Number	172	92	65	56	385
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The mean value of 26 to 30 years age group is the highest. The mean score of the said group is 36.04565 with a standard deviation of 8.61103. It has a minimum score of 16.00 and a maximum score of 56.00 [Table 10 (b)].

ANOVA was carried out to see if the mean difference of the score is significant or not among the age of the respondents [Table 10 (c)]. The following Hypotheses were assumed.

Null Hypothesis (H_0): The mean difference in the score of self-esteem with respect to the age of the respondents is not statistically significant.

Alt. Hypothesis (H_1): The mean difference in the score of self-esteem with respect to the age of the respondents is statistically significant.

The dependent variable is the score obtained by respondents and independent variables is the age of respondents.

Table 10 (b): Descriptive statistics of score by AGE

Score

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
26–30 yrs	172	36.0465	8.61103	.65659	34.7505	37.3426	16.00	56.00
31-35 yrs	92	34.9239	8.53723	.89007	33.1559	36.6919	17.00	53.00
36-40 yrs	65	32.7846	9.05451	1.12307	30.5410	35.0282	15.00	55.00
41+	56	33.3571	10.16130	1.35786	30.6359	36.0784	11.00	48.00
Total	385	34.8364	8.96851	.45708	33.9377	35.7351	11.00	56.00

Table 10 (c): ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	648.754	3	216.251	2.725	.054
Within Groups	30237.937	381	79.365		
Total	30886.691	384			

It is observed that [Table 10 (c)] F-statistics (2.725) is not significant (sig(p=0.54>.05). Hence, we may accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is there is no significant mean difference in the score of self-esteem with respect to the age of respondents. Hence, age of respondents is not a factor for self-esteem.

However, at 10% probability, the significant mean difference will be found, and the age of respondents would be related to self-esteem.

Table 10 (d): Multiple Comparisons						
Tukey HSD						
(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
26--30 yrs	31-35 yrs	1.12260	1.15069	.763	-1.8466	4.0918
	36-40 yrs	3.26190	1.29708	.059	-.0851	6.6089
	41+	2.68937	1.37064	.204	-.8474	6.2262
31--35 yrs	26-30 yrs	-1.12260	1.15069	.763	-4.0918	1.8466
	36-40 yrs	2.13930	1.44349	.449	-1.5855	5.8641
	41+	1.56677	1.50993	.727	-2.3295	5.4630
36---40 yrs	26-30 yrs	-3.26190	1.29708	.059	-6.6089	.0851
	31-35 yrs	-2.13930	1.44349	.449	-5.8641	1.5855
	41+	-.57253	1.62426	.985	-4.7638	3.6187
41+	26-30 yrs	-2.68937	1.37064	.204	-6.2262	.8474
	31-35 yrs	-1.56677	1.50993	.727	-5.4630	2.3295
	36-40 yrs	.57253	1.62426	.985	-3.6187	4.7638

To examine the multiple comparison of age of the respondents, Tuckey HSD analysis [Table 10(d)] has been performed where the dependent variable is the score of self-esteem and the independent variable is the age of respondents. However, it is observed that age is not a responsible factor for self-esteem, as all the significant values are greater than 0.05.

To conclude, (1) There are no significant differences between men and women with respect to self-esteem; (2) Economic condition is not a factor for self-esteem; and (3) Age is not a factor toward self-esteem.

Self-satisfaction and socio-demographic factors

Out of 385 respondents, the majority of respondents are *satisfied* with themselves (35.3%). 30.6% of respondents are *slightly satisfied.* Only 1% of respondents said to be extremely dissatisfied. The data shows a general level of satisfaction among respondents.

Table 11 (a): Self Satisfaction By Gender of the Respondents					
			Gender		Total
			Female	Male	
Self-satisfaction categories	Extremely dissatisfied	Number	4	0	4
		%	2.0%	0.0%	1.0%
	Dissatisfied	Number	16	9	25
		%	8.1%	4.8%	6.5%
	Slightly dissatisfied	Number	23	22	45
		%	11.6%	11.8%	11.7%
	Neutral	Number	15	6	21
		%	7.6%	3.2%	5.5%
	Slightly satisfied	Number	52	66	118
		%	26.3%	35.3%	30.6%
	Satisfied	Number	71	65	136
		%	35.9%	34.8%	35.3%
	Extremely satisfied	Number	17	19	36
		%	8.6%	10.2%	9.4%
Total		Number	198	187	385
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Gender wise analysis of self-satisfaction

In terms of gender, while the majority of female respondents (35.9%) expressed to be *satisfied*, the majority of male respondents (35.3%) expressed to be *slightly satisfied.* While not a single male respondent said to be *extremely dissatisfied*, even among female respondents this percentage is negligible (2%) as seen in Table 11 (a).

Table 11 (b): Descriptives Statistics of mean score on Self-satisfaction

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Male	187	24.4599	5.25196	.38406	23.7022	25.2176	10.00	35.00
Female	198	23.6010	6.23299	.44296	22.7275	24.4746	6.00	35.00
Total	385	24.0182	5.78586	.29487	23.4384	24.5980	6.00	35.00

The mean value of male respondents is the highest [Table 11 (b)]. The mean score of the said group is 24.4599 with a standard deviation of 5.25196.

Further, whether the mean difference of the score is significant or not among gender of the respondents, ANOVA was carried out as shown in Table 11 (c). In this analysis we assume the following Hypotheses.

Null Hypothesis (H_0): The mean difference in the scores of self-satisfaction with respect to gender is not statistically significant.

Alt. Hypothesis (H_1): The mean difference in the scores of self-satisfaction with respect to gender is statistically significant.

The dependent variable is the score obtained by respondents and independent variables is the gender of respondents.

Table 11 (c): ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	70.944	1	70.944	2.125	.146
Within Groups	12783.929	383	33.378		
Total	12854.873	384			

It is observed in Table 11 (c) that F-statistics (2.125) is not significant (sig($p=0.146>.05$). Hence, we may accept the null hypothesis and conclude that the mean difference in the score of self-satisfaction with respect to genders is not statistically significant. Hence, gender is not a factor for self-satisfaction.

Age wise analysis of self-satisfaction

Table 12 (a): Self-satisfaction by Age of the respondents							
			Age				Total
			26-30 yrs	31-35 yrs	36-40 yrs	41+ yrs	
Self-satisfaction categories	Extremely dissatisfied	Number	2	2	0	0	4
		%	1.2%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
	Dissatisfied	Number	12	8	4	1	25
		%	7.0%	8.7%	6.2%	1.8%	6.5%
	Slightly dissatisfied	Number	20	12	5	8	45
		%	11.6%	13.0%	7.7%	14.3%	11.7%
	Neutral	Number	10	4	4	3	21
		%	5.8%	4.3%	6.2%	5.4%	5.5%
	Slightly satisfied	Number	59	24	15	20	118
		%	34.3%	26.1%	23.1%	35.7%	30.6%
	Satisfied	Number	52	33	33	18	136
		%	30.2%	35.9%	50.8%	32.1%	35.3%
	Extremely satisfied	Number	17	9	4	6	36
		%	9.9%	9.8%	6.2%	10.7%	9.4%
Total		Number	172	92	65	56	385
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

As evident in Table 12 (a), a majority of respondents between 26 to 30 years (34.3%) are mostly *slightly satisfied.* In the 31 to 35 (35.9%) and 36 to 50 (50.8%) year categories, most respondents said to be *satisfied*. While a negligible percentage of respondents between 26 to 30 and 31 to 35 years said that they are *extremely dissatisfied*, none in the age groups above 36 years expressed being e*xtremely dissatisfied.*

Table 12 (b): Descriptive Statistics of score by AGE

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
26-30 yrs	172	23.7558	5.99110	.45682	22.8541	24.6575	7.00	35.00
31-35 yrs	92	23.7609	6.29210	.65600	22.4578	25.0639	6.00	35.00
36-40 yrs	65	24.7692	5.07989	.63008	23.5105	26.0280	10.00	34.00
41+	56	24.3750	5.04728	.67447	23.0233	25.7267	12.00	35.00
Total	385	24.0182	5.78586	.29487	23.4384	24.5980	6.00	35.00

The mean score is the highest in the age group 36 to 40 yrs. The score is 24.7692 with a standard deviation of 5.07989.

Further, whether the mean difference of the score is significant or not among different age groups of respondents, ANOVA was carried out as shown in Table 12 (c). The following Hypotheses were assumed.

Null Hypothesis (H_0): The mean difference in the scores of self-satisfaction with respect to the age of respondents is not statistically significant.

Alt. Hypothesis (H_1): The mean difference in the scores of self-satisfaction with respect to the age of respondents is statistically significant.

The dependent variable is the score obtained by the respondents and independent variables is the age group of respondents.

Table 12 (c): ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	61.726	3	20.575	.613	.607
Within Groups	12793.147	381	33.578		
Total	12854.873	384			

It is observed in Table 12 (c) that F-statistics (.607) is not significant (sig(p=0.613>.05). Hence, we may accept the null hypothesis and conclude that mean difference in the scores of self-satisfaction with respect to the age of respondents is not statistically significant. Hence, age of the respondent is not a factor for self-satisfaction.

Table 12 (d): Multiple Comparisons						
Tukey HSD						
(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
26-30 yrs	31-35 yrs	-.00506	.74846	1.000	-1.9364	1.9263
	36-40 yrs	-1.01342	.84368	.626	-3.1905	1.1636
	41+	-.61919	.89153	.899	-2.9197	1.6813
31-35 yrs	26-30 yrs	.00506	.74846	1.000	-1.9263	1.9364
	36-40 yrs	-1.00836	.93891	.706	-3.4311	1.4144
	41+	-.61413	.98213	.924	-3.1484	1.9202
36-40 yrs	26-30 yrs	1.01342	.84368	.626	-1.1636	3.1905
	31-35 yrs	1.00836	.93891	.706	-1.4144	3.4311
	41+	.39423	1.05650	.982	-2.3320	3.1204
41+	26-30 yrs	.61919	.89153	.899	-1.6813	2.9197
	31-35 yrs	.61413	.98213	.924	-1.9202	3.1484
	36-40 yrs	-.39423	1.05650	.982	-3.1204	2.3320

To examine the multiple comparison of age of the respondents, Tuckey HSD analysis [Table 12 (d)] has been performed where dependent variable is score of self-satisfaction and independent variable is age of the respondents. It is observed that age is not a responsible factor for self-satisfaction, as all significant values are greater than 0.05.

Economic status wise analysis of Self Satisfaction

Majority of respondents across all economic categories expressed to be *satisfied* with life. Among the unemployed respondents, majority (29.8%) expressed to be *slightly satisfied.* None in the high-income category expressed to be *extremely dissatisfied* or *dissatisfied* [Table 13 (a)].

Table 13 (a): Self-satisfaction By Economic Condition							
			High income	Low income	Middle income	Unemployed	Total
Categories	Extremely dissatisfied	Number	0	1	2	1	4
		%	0.0%	1.4%	0.8%	1.8%	1.0%
	Dissatisfied	Number	0	1	13	11	25
		%	0.0%	1.4%	5.2%	19.3%	6.5%
	Slightly dissatisfied	Number	2	8	29	6	45
		%	28.6%	11.4%	11.6%	10.5%	11.7%
	Neutral	Number	0	3	11	7	21
		%	0.0%	4.3%	4.4%	12.3%	5.5%
	Slightly satisfied	Number	1	20	80	17	118
		%	14.3%	28.6%	31.9%	29.8%	30.6%
	Satisfied	Number	3	29	92	12	136
		%	42.9%	41.4%	36.7%	21.1%	35.3%
	Extremely satisfied	Number	1	8	24	3	36
		%	14.3%	11.4%	9.6%	5.3%	9.4%
Total		Number	7	70	251	57	385
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 13 (b): Descriptive statistics of score by Economic status								
					Mean Confidence Interval at 95%			
Economic status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
High income	7	23.7143	6.34335	2.39756	17.8477	29.5809	15.00	31.00
Middle income	251	24.4900	5.57592	.35195	23.7969	25.1832	6.00	35.00
Low income	70	24.9286	5.34958	.63940	23.6530	26.2041	8.00	35.00
Unemployed	57	20.8596	6.24339	.82696	19.2031	22.5162	7.00	35.00
Total	385	24.0182	5.78586	.29487	23.4384	24.5980	6.00	35.00

Low-income group has the highest mean score of 24.9286 with a standard deviation of 5.34958 as observed in Table 13 (b).

ANOVA was carried out to examine if the mean difference of the score is significant or not among different economic categories of respondents. In this analysis we assume the following Hypotheses.

Null Hypothesis (H_0): The mean difference in the score of self-satisfaction with respect to the economic condition of respondents is not statistically significant.

Alt. Hypothesis (H_1): The mean difference in the score of self-satisfaction with respect to the economic condition of respondents is statistically significant.

The dependent variable is the score obtained by respondents and independent variables is the economic condition of respondents.

Table 13 (c): ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	683.199	3	227.733	7.129	.000
Within Groups	12171.674	381	31.947		
Total	12854.873	384			

In Table 13 (c), analysis of variables show that F-statistics (.000) is highly significant (sig(p=0.000>.05). Hence, we may accept the alternative hypothesis and conclude that the mean difference in the score of self-satisfaction with respect to the economic condition of respondents is statistically significant.

Table 13 (d): Multiple Comparisons						
Tukey HSD						
(I) Socioeconomic status	(J) Socioeconomic status	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High income	Middle income	-.77575	2.16589	.984	-6.3646	4.8131
	Low income	-1.21429	2.24058	.949	-6.9959	4.5673
	Unemployed	2.85464	2.26369	.588	-2.9866	8.6959
Middle income	High income	.77575	2.16589	.984	-4.8131	6.3646
	Low income	-.43853	.76398	.940	-2.4099	1.5328
	Unemployed	3.63039*	.82930	.000	1.4905	5.7703
Low income	High income	1.21429	2.24058	.949	-4.5673	6.9959
	Middle income	.43853	.76398	.940	-1.5328	2.4099
	Unemployed	4.06892*	1.00839	.000	1.4669	6.6710
Unemployed	High income	-2.85464	2.26369	.588	-8.6959	2.9866
	Middle income	-3.63039*	.82930	.000	-5.7703	-1.4905
	Low income	-4.06892*	1.00839	.000	-6.6710	-1.4669
*. The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.						

Tuckey HSD analysis [Table 13 (d)] has been conducted where the dependent variable is the score of self-satisfaction and the independent variable is the socio-economic condition of respondents. It has been found that socioeconomic condition is a factor for self-satisfaction as the mean difference has been found to be significant at the 0.05 level.

To conclude, (1) There is no significant difference between men and women with respect to self-satisfaction; (2) Age is not a factor toward self-satisfaction; and (3) Economic condition is a factor that impacts self-satisfaction.

Social Media Use, Self-Esteem, and Self-Satisfaction: The Correlation

To find out the relation in the social media use among the socioeconomic variables, Self-esteem and Self-satisfaction, a correlation matrix is applied with significant levels. The result of correlation matrix is given below:

- A scatter negative correlation is found between social media use and self-esteem (-.002). But it is not significant. sig(P=.974>.05)
- A scatter negative correlation is found between social media use and self-satisfaction (-.044). But it is not significant. sig(p=.385>.05)
- A scatter positive correlation is found between self-esteem and self-satisfaction (.071). But it is not significant. sig(p=.163)

Correlations Matrix				
		Social Media use	Self-esteem	Self-satisfaction
Social media score	Pearson Correlation	1	-.002	-.044
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.974	.385
	N	385	385	385
Self-esteem score	Pearson Correlation	-.002	1	.071
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.974		.163
	N	385	385	385
Self-satisfaction score	Pearson Correlation	-.044	.071	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.385	.163	
	N	385	385	385

Conclusion

From the above statistical analysis, we may conclude that most respondents between 26 to 44 years have moderate addiction to social media. This means that adult respondents fluctuate between feelings of approval and rejection. Gender is significantly related to social media use as females have been found to be more engaged on social media than males. Age and socio-economic conditions are not factors for social media use. Most respondents have high levels of self-esteem which means that they judge themselves as valuable, confident, and competent. Socio-demographic variables such as age, gender and economic condition have no influence on self-esteem. There is a general level of satisfaction among respondents. The level of dissatisfaction has been found to be negligible. While age and gender have no bearing on self-satisfaction, economic condition is found to be a factor for self-satisfaction. There is a negative correlation between social media use and self-esteem among adult users. Social media use and self-satisfaction are also negatively correlated. However, a scatter positive correlation has been found between self-esteem and self-satisfaction. This relates with the findings of previous studies that an overall sense of satisfaction with one's own life can lead to higher self-esteem.

References

- Abdellatif, M. (2022). The impact of social media on life satisfaction: The mediating role of social comparison, envy and self- Esteem. *Information Sciences Letters*, *5*(11), 1805-1813. https://doi.org/10.18576/isl/110536
- Ardiana, R. T., & Tumanggor, R. O. (2020). Social media Instagram addiction and self-esteem in high school students. *Proceedings of the 2nd Tarumanagara International Conference on the Applications of Social Sciences and Humanities (TICASH 2020)*. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201209.042
- Bekalu, M. A., McCloud, R. F., & Viswanath, K. (2019). Association of social media use with social well-being, positive mental health, and self-rated health: Disentangling routine use from emotional connection to use. *Health Education & Behavior*, *46*(2_suppl), 69S-80S. https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198119863768
- Chamsi, F., Katir, I., Korchi, A., Belbachir, S., & Ouanass, A. (2022). The impact of social media on self-esteem. European Psychiatry, 65(S1), S551-S551. https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2022.1410
- Cingel, D. P., Carter, M. C., & Krause, H. V. (2022). Social media and self esteem. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *45*.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 49(1), 71–75.
- Elphinston, R. A., & Noller, P. (2011). Time to face it! Facebook intrusion and the implications for romantic jealousy and relationship satisfaction. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *14*(11), 631-635. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2010.0318
- Frandsen, M., Walters, J., & Ferguson, S. G. (2013). Exploring the viability of using online social media advertising as a recruitment method for smoking cessation clinical

trials. Nicotine and Tobacco Research, 16(2), 247–251. https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntt157

- Guven, A. (2019). *Relationship between social media use, self-esteem and satisfaction with life* [Master's thesis]. https://ir-api.ua.edu/api/core/bitstreams/4ab2ffce-8f5a-4635-b972-fe99ad4df838/content
- Hasan, S. (2018). A study between social media usage and self-esteem among youths. Electronic Research Journal of Behavioural Sciences , 1.
- Hawi, N. S., & Samaha, M. (2016). The relations among social media addiction, self-esteem, and life satisfaction in University students. Social Science Computer Review, 35(5), 576-586. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439316660340
- Marengo, D., Montag, C., Sindermann, C., Elhai, J. D., & Settanni, M. (2021). Examining the links between active Facebook use, received likes, self-esteem and happiness: A study using objective social media data. Telematics and Informatics, 58, 101523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2020.101523
- Miljeteig, K., & von Soest, T. (2022). An experience sampling study on the association between social media use and self-esteem. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications, 34*(6), 373–382. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000333
- Nesi, J., Mann, S. and Robb, M. B. (2023). Teens and mental health: How girls really feel about social media. San Francisco, CA: Common Sense. Retrieved from https://www.commonsensemedia.org/sites/default/files/research/report/how-girls-really-feel-about-social-media-researchreport_final_1.pdf
- Pop, L. M., Iorga, M., & Iurcov, R. (2022). Body-esteem, self-esteem and loneliness among social media young users. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(9), 5064. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19095064

- Rahma, L. M., & Setiasih, S. (2021). The impact of social media usage intensity on self-esteem: Survey on emerging adulthood of Instagram user. KONSELI : Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling (E-Journal), 8(1), 39-46. https://doi.org/10.24042/kons.v8i1.8313
- Rosenberg, M., Schooler, C., Schoenbach, C., & Rosenberg, F. (1995). Global self-esteem and specific self-esteem: Different concepts, different outcomes. *American Sociological Review*, *60*(1), 141. https://doi.org/10.2307/2096350
- Sloan, L., & Quan-Haase, A. (2017). What is Social Media and What Questions Can Social Media Research Help us Answer? In *The SAGE handbook of social media research methods*. SAGE.
- Vaingankar, J. A., Van Dam, R. M., Samari, E., Chang, S., Seow, E., Chua, Y. C., Luo, N., Verma, S., & Subramaniam, M. (2022). Social media–driven routes to positive mental health among youth: Qualitative enquiry and concept mapping study. *JMIR Pediatrics and Parenting*, *5*(1), e32758. https://doi.org/10.2196/32758
- Vogel, E. A., Rose, J. P., Roberts, L. R., & Eckles, K. (2014). undefined. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. https://doi.org/10.1037/e512142015-699
- Woods, H. C., & Scott, H. (2016). #Sleepyteens: Social media use in adolescence is associated with poor sleep quality, anxiety, depression and low self-esteem. Journal of Adolescence, 51(1), 41-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.05.008