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***ABSTRACT***

**The** research was aimed at determining the possible impact of training on compliance with netiquette rules among students. The 500 level students of Department of Library and Information Technology, Federal University of Technology, Minna constituted the population for the study. Repeated measures on compliance were taken from the same population before and after the training programme. Students were subjected to Module 11 of LIT 514: Implication of Information Technology, a three-unit course taught to 500 level students in the Department. Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank statistic was used to test the null hypothesis. The results showed improvement in the level of compliance from 47.62 to 53.38% and rate of compliance from 52.38 to 100% pre- and post-training respectively. The null hypothesis was rejected since the observed value of W+ of 0 is lower than the critical value of 320 of n=42. The result is highly significant at p-value =0.The study concluded that training can indeed improve compliance with netiquette rules and students should be made to undergo training at the social network sites as precondition for membership.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Every given society is faced with ethical dilemmas regarding how information is created, organized, stored, and disseminated for use. Considering the importance attached to possessing information, and the tendency of that information to be used for reasons unknown, people are very cautious with the information they acquire, store, process, before its eventual distribution. The focus of ethics is on providing guidance for appropriate use of information during the communication process. It is believed to have begun at the creation of humanity, presumably with the first man on earth (Adam), when the first human crime was recorded as a breach to laws that determine right or wrong for cordial existence.

The term ethics is derived from *“Etiquette”, a* French word, meaning rules and conventions governing correct or polite behavior in society, in general or in a specified social, or professional group or situation (Encarta Dictionary,2009). It is also regarded as a set of written and unwritten rules indicating the proper and polite way to act. Every culture has its own different set of etiquette, although some are common, especially where there are diverse linguistic groups. The concern for ethics as a philosophy is a result of the imminent nature of humans to do wrong, which has triggered questions to ascertain moral obligation, good intention, and ability to discern good from evil. Consequently, the law comes in place to caution and as well sanction people on their conduct in a society, as a way of reducing moral and social decadence.

The rules and regulations governing behaviour when communicating on the Internet is simply what is regarded as *netiquette*. These rules are binding on every person that use internet whether for sending emails, carrying out online shopping or e-commerce, internet games, or for social networking. The Internet has exciting features that enable communication by simple clicks, from a computer screen where one can participate online by sharing his/her knowledge, ideas, suggestions, opinions, and ask questions on various topics one could imagine, including issues considered personal that individuals might not want to discuss face-to-face are treated and handled confidentially due to the virtual presence of online discussions. Netiquette is intended to guide on what is generally considered right to do, and say on the Internet, and what might be inappropriate. The focal point is to ensure that you treat other people the way you would like them treat you, and as much as possible avoid saying anything online that you would not say in real life.

To achieve this, adequate awareness must be made for people to know exactly what is expected of them. Awareness simply implies having the knowledge or perception of a situation or fact, after observing it or being told about it. Cherry (2015) sees awareness as the ability to know, feel, or to be conscious of occurrences, opinions, feelings, or existence of objects in a pre-defined context. Heinamaa *et. al.* (2007) opined that “consciousness defines the quality of awareness, or the state of being aware of an external object or something within oneself, and or the perception of what goes on in a man’s mind. This submission draws a link to the term “compliance” (adherence to existing procedures), which depicts that within a person there is the capability of discernment by way of inward awareness that informs and influences the choices we make outwardly. To comply simply implies conforming to a rule, such as a specification, policy, standard, or law. It is a state in which someone or something is in accordance with established guidelines, specifications, or legislation.

Willingness or tendency to comply with rules and regulations is an outcome of the degree of awareness people have over stipulated policies. Gutwin and Greenberg (2002) describe awareness in a cooperative setting, to mean knowledge created through the interaction of an agent and its environment, and in literal terms to mean knowing what is going on. When individuals interact with the environment, awareness of such environment is accomplished in the process, therefore the continual changing nature of environment demands that awareness and knowledge to be constantly maintained by getting more and more involved in the high-paced digital trend.

. Some people have the knowledge of using social networking websites but they cannot really understand how it is fashioned, its components, or what propels it into action. Context awareness is regarded as an enabling technology for ubiquitous computing systems, which is now gaining momentum among the netizens, following the advent of hybrid search engines (Paolo *et. al*., 2012).

Toffler (2014) submitted that Information Age is a period of change whereby the currency of information is most significant. For thousands of years, information was transmitted verbally within families, clans, and villages, from person to person, and generation to generation before the invention of printing press by Johann Gutenberg to speed up the amount of information being made available to people. Today, with the proliferation of computers and the resulting hike in use of social network media to share knowledge, a wide-range of ethical issues has taken dominance.

Training can be regarded as teaching or developing skills and knowledge that relate to a specific competence. Competence demonstrates characteristics that enable performance of a job. To enable job performance, skills and knowledge are required. Social and internet skills facilitate interaction and communication with others. Training in social and internet skills has capacity to improve capability and performance of social interaction and communication among students as well as compliance with netiquette rules and regulations which guide their interactions on the Internet.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Online discussion has become the vogue in the digital age as both the youth and elderly have caught the bug. Particularly among the youth, registration and membership of online discussion forums have grown in leaps and bounds and it is probable that no young person exists today that is not affiliated to one or more social discussion forums. Good as membership of discussion forum is, it is doubtful if any student received any formal training on how not to communicate on these platforms. The routine exercise any intending member goes through is the registration formalities whose goal is simply to capture personal data. In many cases, members not only use pseudonyms or completely false names to register and they remain anonymous. The real issues governing use behaviour as embedded in the rules, regulations and privacy templates are hardly read, digested or understood and members are registered as soon as the ACCEPT button of the "Terms and Conditions" is pressed.

Students become members of the discussion forums and learn to discuss by following or mimicking their predecessors while gaining discussion experience in the process. The lack of sound knowledge about the rules and regulations governing online discussion has resulted in negative outcomes for many students which has led to sanctions like suspension for a period or outright termination or dismissal of membership in many cases for breaching these rules and regulations for good conduct, which they never really cared to understand or read at the membership registration. It was noticed that even when membership was genuinely suspended, some users re-registered using other names and resumed membership without serving out the suspension period. From the reactions displayed by those sanctioned from time to time, one could even sense a feeling of irritation and perceived unfairness whereas the social discussion media were merely upholding discipline as enshrined in their "Terms and Conditions" for participating in these discussion.

Training programmes or platforms do not exist that can thoroughly ground students in the art of online discussion so they go into the forums oblivious of the type of behaviour that can elicit sanctions. Since many of the students register mainly to enjoy the benefits of free discussion without as much as knowing that freedom comes with some responsibility, it is very easy to see why the breaches and sanctions may continue as the underlying maneouvres to beat the sanctions and punishments are perfected

**AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The aim of the study is to determine the possibility of improving compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion among university students through exposure to a training/course module on the subject. The following are the specific objectives of the study:

1. Identify the social network media used for online discussion by university students
2. Determine the level of compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion on the social network media used before exposure to the training/course module
3. Determine the rate of compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion on the social network media used before exposure to the training/course module
4. Expose university students to the training/course module on netiquette rules for online discussion
5. Determine the level of compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion on the social network media used after exposure to the training/course module
6. Determine the rate of compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion on the social network media used after exposure to the training/course module
7. Determine the impact of the training/course module on university students’ compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. What social network media do university students use for online discussion?
2. What is the state of awareness of the rules governing social communication on the network media used by university students?
3. What is the level of compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion by university students before exposure to the training /course module?
4. What is the rate of compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion by university students before exposure to the training/course module?
5. What is the state of university students’ knowledge on netiquette rules for online discussion after exposure to the training/course module?
6. What is the level of compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion by university students after exposure to the training/course module?
7. What is the rate of compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion by university students after exposure to the training/course module?
8. What is the impact of the training/course module on the level and rate of compliance with netiquette rules for online discussion by university students?

**THE HYPOTHESES**

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

Ho1: There is no significant difference between the pre- and post- training compliance levels with netiquette rules for online discussion by university students.

H1: There is a significant difference between the pre- and post- training compliance levels with netiquette rules for online discussion by university students.

Ho2: There is no significant difference between the pre- and post- training compliance rates with netiquette rules for online discussion by university students

H2: There is a significant difference between the pre- and post- training compliance rates with netiquette rules for online discussion by university students

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Netiquette refers to the ‘golden rules’ that create an internet society (Chiles, 2013). Netiquette can be described as online etiquette over networks such as e-mails, online communication. Netiquette is generally seen as a combination of two words: ‘net’ and ‘etiquette’. Netiquette covers the rules of internet behaviour or the do’s and don’ts of online communication. Netiquette means respecting other users’ views and indicates common courtesies when posting thoughts and any other form of communication into cyberspace (Swingler, 2010). Netiquette is devised to comply with the original five pillars of ethics provided by the Internet Activities Board (IAB) in 1989 regardless of culture and social group. The five pillars which are behaviours which should not be engaged in by users of the Internet include:

1. Seeking to gain unauthorized access to the resources of the Internet
2. Disrupting the intended use of the Internet
3. Wasting the resources of the Internet
4. Destroying the integrity of internet-based information
5. Compromising the privacy of internet users.

Swingler (2010) is of the view that the Internet Ethics of the IAB can be expanded upon to include the following list of don’ts:

1. Do not use abusive or threatening language
2. Do not post racist, homophobic and offensive remarks
3. Do not spam message boards or chat rooms with useless messages
4. Do not use someone else’s name and steal the identity
5. Do not distribute materials that are deemed illegal
6. Do not try to obtain or use someone else’s user name or password
7. Do not try to obtain personal information about someone
8. Do not harass someone who no longer wishes to communicate
9. Do not use bad grammar and spelling on purpose
10. Do not share personal information of someone without their permission
11. Do not refer to people in a derogatory way e.g. nerd, noob or geek
12. Do not post in capital letters, viewed as shouting which can seem aggressive

Users that do not respect netiquette are referred to as ‘trolls’ according to the author. Newcomers to the Internet, according to Shea (2004), are expected to behave according to the local customs of the net. Over the years, internet services have evolved and the introduction of Web 2.0, Web 3.0 and Voice 2.0 technologies has led to a simultaneous expansion of the internet community with concomitant greater social communication. As a result, website applications like Facebook, Twitter, as well as Voice and audio applications like Skype Live have revolutionised online communication therefore increasing the importance of netiquette. As the forums proliferate, new users often had trouble detecting the rules of a particular forum (Lampe and Johnsons, 2005). Netiquette is a body of conventions and manners for using the Internet as a tool for communication or data exchange practised or advocated by a group of people (Tedre *et. al*., 2006). In that sense, netiquette includes laws, regulations as well as good manners and practices; users include both current and future stakeholders of ICT such as individuals, commercial agencies, institutions, companies and organizations while uses include surfing web pages and creating them, searching and advertising, offering web or file transfer protocol services, participating in web fora, reading or writing to newsgroups and mailing lists, chatting, sharing files, trading, etc. Preece (2004) is of the view that there is a diversity of net users in terms of their culture, age, enthusiasm, income. Different technologies require different forms of etiquette, for example, the etiquette of text messaging is different from the etiquette of e-mail but these are converging.

Long before online discussions became a general source of informating where people get to share with one another things that matter to them, and get acquainted to new friends, computer networking was mainly a military-minded scheme designed by the USA Department of Defense Advanced Research Project Agency (DARPA) to furnish the military with surveillance and intelligence information regarding enemies during crisis and war. It wasn’t long before the network expanded from being just a military-centric network of computers, following the success of its emergence.

According to Walker (2011), good avenues for online discussions, commenced fully in 1978 with the Bulletin Board System (BBS) followed by America Online (AOL), Yahoo, and Amazon in 1990, Classmate.com in 1995 and SixDegrees.com in 1997. Aaron (2013) concluded that by 2000, MySpace was introduced while LinkedIn came up in 2003. Google+ and Facebook joined the Internet in 2004, according to Keith (2015).

Social networking is a “Read-Write-Web,” where the online audiences do not just view the content of a website but in addition, contribute to the content (Sweetser and Lariscy, 2008). Similarly, Kietzmann (2012) in consideration of online discussions defines social networking to mean application of mobile and web-based technology to enhance social interactivity among individuals who live in a community and share daily experiences through the Internet. The integration of mobile and web technology has made socialising easy because users are able to generate their own content and further gain access across the internet where people could comment towards to the content, and as a result acquaintance is created.

Various authors share the same view regarding the one thing social network sites have in common, that is the ability for users to create their own content. It is this priviledge to enjoy user-to-user interaction that distinguishes social media from the traditional media which is characterised by top-down news dissemination arrangement, as propounded by Clark and Aufderheide (2009).

**Netiquette rules governing social interaction and polite behaviours**

Netiquette rules and regulations can be discussed under the following headings:

**(i) Netiquette rules for email**

Sending emails is a formal way of communicating and keeping in touch with people over the Internet as opposed to the traditional way of sending mails through postal service. Basically, the email rules and regulations are easy to follow once you understand the elementary of letter writing.

Shea (2004) in her online guide, listed fourteen rules governing e-mail communication which include beginning messages with greeting and concluding by identifying yourself with a name; including a subject for your message at all times; attaching identifying information in form of signature at the end of the message; being concise avoiding sarcasm; showing respect for other people’s privacy; responding to messages promptly by acknowledging the receipt.; copying with limit and caution; avoiding sending junk mail (spam) or unsolicited emails to people without their permission; using simple and appropriate language that can be understood easily. Google mail and Yahoo mail, for example, provide these rules and regulations and terms and conditions for using their services

**(ii) Netiquette rules for blogs and forums**

Participating in online discussions requires full knowledge of netiquette to guide one on the polite way of relating with people via the Internet. Most blogs and forums specify rules and regulations which every member must respect for effective service delivery; some of these rules are commensurate with code of ethics observed by other social network sites. These include avoiding: posting online on topics always and not derailing or tribalising threads; abusing, bullying, deliberately insulting, provoking, or fighting a member; encouraging or advocating violent actions against any member, either by race, tribe or religion; discussions of the act of love-making, especially those involving hidden sexual parts; posting of pornographic or disgusting pictures or videos on an online discussion forums, posting adverts or affiliate links outside the areas where adverts are explicitly allowed saying or doing anything detrimental to the success of social networking; posting fake information that misleads people; using the Site for illegalities. Nairaland Forum(2017), for example publishes these rules and regulations and terms and conditions for use of its services (nairaland.com)

**(iii) Netiquette rules for social networking sites**

Social network sites have reservation for malicious posts and comments, and totally disclaim any liability emanating from a member as a result of his/her posts or uploads on the site. Some of the don’ts are: posting unauthorized commercial communications; collecting users' content or information without their consent; uploading viruses or malicious codes; soliciting login information or access an account belonging to someone else; bullying, intimidating or harassing any user; posting content that is hate speech, threatening, or pornographic, inciting violence, or containing nudity; encouraging or facilitating any violation of social network policies; providing false personal information, or creating an account for anyone other than yourself without his/her permission; creating more than one personal account on the same network; engaging in social networking until the ages 13 and above. . Facebook for example, stipulates terms and conditions of service and principles governing its relationship with users (Facebook Inc.,2017).

(iv) Policy Rules

Policy rules used to protect the identity of users who engage in social network activities. The essence of these policies is to help individuals who want to restrict what other people can see about them. Privacy information is collected when one registers for services on a site, subscribe to an email newsletter, or when registering to receive a test-drive software product, as a condition of use. Access rights is guaranteed for all the content and information posted on a social network medium, and control can be set on how it should be accessed or shared through the privacy and application settings.

Some of the privacy protection policies include non circulation of inflammatory, unlawful, obscene, offensive, hateful, abusive, provocative, threatening, seditious statements invasive of anyone’s privacy; non promotion of discrimination on grounds of race, sex, religion, nationality, disability, religion or belief, sexual orientation, or age; infringement of intellectual property rights including copyright, design right, database right, patents, trade mark, moral right or any other third party right; liability to harass, upset, alarm or cause distress to any other person; containing an instruction, advice, or content that could cause harm or injury to individuals or to computers or systems; encouragement of anyone to commit any unlawful or criminal act or condone any unlawful or criminal act. Yahoo. Facebook, Linkedln, WhatsApp and similar network sites have privacy rules to protect their users.

**Administration of netiquette rules and regulations**

As a way of showing regard for humans and the systems used for social networking, online communities are guided by rules and regulations that direct the conduct of digital citizens, and if it turns out that people do not follow the rules, an arbitrator steps in to enforce sanctions for policy violation. The arbitrator could be a site manager who monitors all cases of infringement of the rules, he/she is expected to delete uncensored posts, or comments, from discussion forums and caution the sender for inappropriate conduct.

Before participating online, one has to decide on what name to be identified with. A username name could be a real name or a pseudonym to enable members know who they are relating with. Other websites may require personal detail such as name, contact number, and location before participating online for social networking. Most people prefer to use an ID that is not their full name to guard against intrusion from unknown contacts. In participating in online conversations, names and personal details are withheld to protect the identity of users such that, only the organisation running the conversation can read comment(s) and know who is sending it.

Most online discussion forums monitor and penalise by removing profiles for violations regarding commercial advertisements, uncensored graphic content, and underage profiles, as part of efforts to boost cyber security for non compliance with the terms and conditions of service during social networking. Violation of any specification implies that the defaulter shall stop enjoying all or part of the services he/she is entitled to. Although, this is with a prior notice, stating the nature of offense committed, inability to familiarise oneself with those terms and conditions before participating does not prohibit being sanctioned when found violating any of the rules or associating with those services. Failure to read and comply with any terms, conditions and policies, and where there is a conflict between the rules and regulations, the sanctions listed out for violation of such terms and conditions will prevail and the site shall disclaim any liability thereof.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

The experimental repeated measure research design was adopted for the study. In the study, the same group of participants was subjected to pre-test followed by treatment and a post-test. Forty-two 500 level students in Department of Library and Information Technology, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria was used for the study.

**The Treatment**

LIT 514: Implication of Information Technology is a 2-unit first semester course taught to 500 level students in the Department. The course consists of eleven modules and Module 11 is titled ”Netiquette Rules for Online Discussion’. This module covers such topics as advent of online communication media, benefits of social networking, rules of the Internet, online communication behavior, case study of rules and regulations of major online forums, Facebook, Academic.edu, Linkedln, Twitter, Instagram, WhatsApp, Nairaland Forum. This module was used as the training programme and consequently, the treatment.

**The Instrument**

The questionnaire titled ‘Compliance with Netiquette Rules for Online Discussion’ (COWNROD) was designed for the study. The questionnaire containing 24 rules and regulations on forums and blogs, e-mails, social networking and privacy issues were aggregated from Facebook, Academic.edu, Linkedln, Twitter, Instagram, WhatsApp and Nairaland Forum with each question having a five-point response format of Always, Frequently, Sometimes, Rarely and Never.

**The Experiment**

The experiment was conducted at the commencement of LIT 514 lecture during 2016/2017 academic session. Forty-two registered students taking LIT 514 were served with COWNROD after the first lecture to pre-test their compliance with netiquette rules. All copies of the questionnaire were retrieved, evaluated and found to be usable. Thereafter, LIT 514 lectures continued module by module. Module 11 was introduced and taught to the registered students using two hours for two weeks. The end of course test centred on Module 11 and all the participants were successful with an average grade of B. Five weeks later, at the beginning of the second semester in which the same students registered for LIT 522: Library Automation, taught by the researcher, students were again subjected to post-training test on compliance with netiquette rules using COWNROD. All the 42 copies of the questionnaire were collected and found to be usable. Both sets of questionnaire were analysed and data were presented in frequency tables while the mean was used to answer the research questions. The hypotheses were tested using Wilcoxon matched pairs signed ranks at 0.05 significance level. The hypothesis testing decision rule is as follows:

If observed value of W+ isthe critical value, reject null hypothesis, or

If z-statistic is critical value, reject null hypothesis; otherwise retain the alternate hypothesis

**DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

**Questionnaire response rate**

Table 1 presents questionnaire return rate of respondents

**Table 1: Questionnaire response rate**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Questionnaire Administered** | **Questionnaire Returned** | **Percentage** |
| Pre-training | 42 | 42 | 100 |
| Post-training | 42 | 42 | 100 |

**Demographic data of respondents**

Table 2 presents data on the gender distribution of the respondents

**Table 2: Distribution of respondents by gender**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Pre-training | Post-training | % |
| Male | 32 | 32 | 76.19 |
| Female | 10 | 10 | 23.81 |
| Total | 42 | 42 | 100 |

Table 2 shows that 32 male students representing 76.19% of the population of students responded to the questionnaire while 10 female students representing 28.31% responded.

**Distribution of respondents by age**

Table 3 presents data on the age distribution of respondents

**Table 3: Age distribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age Range | 15 – 20 | 21 – 25 | 26 – 30 | 31 – above | Total |
| Pre-training | 0 | 26 | 11 | 5 | 42 |
| Post-training | 0 | 26 | 11 | 5 | 42 |

The table indicates that most undergraduate students of Library and Information Technology Department of Federal University of Technology, Minna who use online discussion forums are between the age range of 21-25, followed by 15-20, and 26-30. In this study, no undergraduate student(s) between the ages of 31 and above was captured.

**Online discussion forums used by the students**

Table 4 presents data on the social networking sites where online discussions are carried out.

**Table 4: Social networking sites used by students (Pre- and Post-training )**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Site ID** | **Pre-training** | **Post-training** |
| Academia.edu  About.me | 16  2 | 16  2 |
| Bolt.com  Buzznet | 2  2 | 2  2 |
| Classmates.com | 6 | 6 |
| DailyStrength  English, baby  Facebook | 2  2  40 | 2  2  40 |
| Faces.com  FilmAffinity  Flickr  Focus.com  Foursquare | 4  2  8  2  2 | 4  2  8  2  2 |
| GamerDNA | 2 | 2 |
| Google+  Hi5 | 30  6 | 30  6 |
| Instagram | 24 | 24 |
| LibraryThing  LinkedIn | 4  12 | 4  12 |
| MyHeritage  Myspace  Nairaland | 2  8  20 | 2  8  20 |
| Netlog  Open Diary | 4  2 | 4  2 |
| Spaces  Network | 2  7 | 2  7 |
| Twitter | 36 | 36 |
| WhatsApp | 42 | 42 |
| XING  Yahoo | 2  42 | 2  42 |

From Table 4, it can be observed that all 42(100%) respondents use WhatsApp Messenger and Yahoo followed by Facebook with 40(95.24%). Google+ also record a number of 30(71.43%) representing those who use the network, Twitter has 30(71.43%) number of users, Instagram 24(57.14%) users, Nairaland 20(47.62%), Academia.edu 16(38.10%), and LinkedIn 2(28.57%) users. The findings also indicated a minimal number of users in networks like Classmate.com, Flickr, Hi5, MySpaces with 6(14.26%), 8(19.05%), 6(14.26%), and 8(19.05%) respectively.

**Level of Compliance with netiquette rules**

Table 5(a) presents the result on level of compliance before the training. Going by the decision criterion, only 10 or 47.62% out of the 21 items presented for evaluation were complied with by the respondents while the remaining 11 or 53.38% were not complied with. The overall mean of the responses is 3.17

**Table 5(a): Level of Compliance with netiquette rules (Pre-training)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Statements | Always  (5) | Frequently  (4) | Sometimes  (3) | Rarely  (2) | Never  (1) | fx | N | C:\Users\KAYSAN PC\Desktop\G-VENTURE\3.jpg | Decision |
| 1 | I post online on topics and avoid derailing or trivializing threads. | 18 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 171 | 42 | 4.07 | Complied |
| 2 | I avoid abusing, bullying, deliberately insulting, provoking or fighting a member. | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 30 | 72 | 42 | 1.71 | Failed |
| 3 | I avoid encouraging or advocating violent actions against any member, either by race, tribe or religion. | 6 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 20 | 104 | 42 | 2.48 | Failed |
| 4 | I avoid discussions of the act of lovemaking,  especially those involving hidden sexual parts | 10 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 120 | 42 | 2.86 | Failed |
| 5 | I avoid posting of pornographic or disgusting pictures or videos on online discussion forums. | 2 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 20 | 77 | 42 | 1.83 | Failed |
| 6 | I do not post adverts or affiliate links outside the areas where adverts are explicitly allowed. | 5 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 16 | 103 | 42 | 2.45 | Failed |
| 7 | I avoid posting fake information that misleads people | 10 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 113 | 42 | 2.69 | Failed |
| 8 | I avoid using the Site for illegalities, e.g. defrauding, piracy and spreading malware. | 30 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 42 | 4.71 | Complied |
| 9 | I avoid exposing the identity or posting pictures of any member without their consent. | 20 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 178 | 42 | 4.24 | Complied |
| 10 | I avoid creating distracting posts especially in giant fonts or ALL CAPS | 10 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 131 | 42 | 3.12 | Complied |
| 11 | I am inclined to report posts that violate the rules of social networking. | 5 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 148 | 42 | 3.52 | Complied |
| 12 | I search the forum before creating a new thread. | 18 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 159 | 42 | 1.78 | Failed |
| 13 | I avoid posting censored words by misrepresenting them. | 10 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 136 | 42 | 3.24 | Complied |
| 14 | I avoid advertising in the wrong places of posting the same content all over again. | 10 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 181 | 42 | 4.31 | Complied |
| 15 | I create a new account when banned for infringing a rule. | 5 | 5 | 10 | 16 | 6 | 163 | 42 | 3.88 | Complied |
| 16 | I spell words correctly when posting and ensure to use perfect grammar and punctuation. | 20 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 42 | 4.31 | Complied |
| 17 | I post unauthorized commercial communications. | 5 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 112 | 42 | 2.67 | Failed |
| 18 | I collect users’ contact or information without their consent. | 5 | 4 | 15 | 10 | 8 | 114 | 42 | 2.71 | Failed |
| 19 | I upload viruses or malicious codes. | 2 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 14 | 86 | 42 | 2.05 | Failed |
| 20 | I solicit login information or access an account belonging to someone else. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 16 | 8 | 102 | 42 | 2.43 | Failed |
| 21 | I bully, intimidate or harass when provoked by a fellow user. | 3 | 6 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 102 | 42 | 2.43 | Failed |
|  | Total | 209 | 149 | 184 | 147 | 193 | 882 |  | 3.17 | Complied |

Table 5(b) presents the result on level of compliance with netiquette rules after the training. Respondents complied with fifteen out of the 21 items presented leaving only 6 not complied with. This represents a compliance rate of 71%. The overall mean score of the responses is 3.78.The result shows an increase in compliance level from 10 (47.62%) pre-training result to 15(71%) post-training results, probably attributable to the training programme. The overall mean pre-training result of 3.17 also increased to 3.78 for post-training compliance.

**Table 5(b): Level of Compliance with netiquette rules (Post-training)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Statements | Always  (5) | Frequently  (4) | Sometimes  (3) | Rarely  (2) | Never  (1) | fx | N | C:\Users\KAYSAN PC\Desktop\G-VENTURE\3.jpg | Decision |
| 1 | I post online on topics and avoid derailing or trivializing threads. | 30 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 196 | 42 | 4.67 | Complied |
| 2 | I avoid abusing, bullying, deliberately insulting, provoking or fighting a member. | 30 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 196 | 42 | 4.67 | Complied |
| 3 | I avoid encouraging or advocating violent actions against any member, either by race, tribe or religion. | 25 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 190 | 42 | 4.52 | Complied |
| 4 | I avoid discussions of the act of lovemaking,  especially those involving hidden sexual parts | 29 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 42 | 4.69 | Complied |
| 5 | I avoid posting of pornographic or disgusting pictures or videos on online discussion forums. | 30 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 42 | 4.71 | Complied |
| 6 | I do not post adverts or affiliate links outside the areas where adverts are explicitly allowed. | 36 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 42 | 4.81 | Complied |
| 7 | I avoid posting fake information that misleads people | 30 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 42 | 4.69 | Complied |
| 8 | I avoid using the Site for illegalities, e.g. defrauding, piracy and spreading malware. | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 | 42 | 5.00 | Complied |
| 9 | I avoid exposing the identity or posting pictures of any member without their consent. | 32 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 42 | 3.57 | Complied |
| 10 | I avoid creating distracting posts especially in giant fonts or ALL CAPS | 29 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 42 | 4.69 | Complied |
| 11 | I am inclined to report posts that violate the rules of social networking. | 38 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 42 | 3.62 | Complied |
| 12 | I search the forum before creating a new thread. | 32 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 42 | 4.71 | Complied |
| 13 | I avoid posting censored words by misrepresenting them. | 33 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 42 | 4.79 | Complied |
| 14 | I avoid advertising in the wrong places of posting the same content all over again. | 35 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 | 42 | 4.83 | Complied |
| 15 | I create a new account when banned for infringing a rule. | 39 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | 42 | 5.17 | Complied |
| 16 | I spell words correctly when posting and ensure to use perfect grammar and punctuation. | 36 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 | 42 | 4.86 | Complied |
| 17 | I post unauthorized commercial communications. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 32 | 52 | 42 | 1.24 | Failed |
| 18 | I collect users’ contact or information without their consent. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 74 | 42 | 1.76 | Failed |
| 19 | I upload viruses or malicious codes. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 24 | 60 | 42 | 1.43 | Failed |
|  | I solicit login information or access an account belonging to someone else. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 23 | 61 | 42 | 1.45 | Failed |
| 21 | I bully, intimidate or harass when provoked by a fellow user. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 20 | 60 | 42 | 1.43 | Failed |
|  | Total | 526 | 135 | 10 | 102 | 109 | 822 |  | 3.78 | Complied |

**Test of Ho1 on level of compliance with netiquette rules**

Table 6 presents Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rankdistribution for the frequency scores while Table 7 presents hypothesis testing result using Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank.

Table 6: Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank distribution

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statement | Pre-Trg  fx(a)) | PostTrg  fx(b) | fx(a)- fx (b) | Observed difference | Ordered absolute value of difference | Rank | Signed rank |
| 1 | 171 | 196 | -25 | -25 | -4 | 1 | -1 |
| 2 | 72 | 196 | -124 | -124 | -12 | 2 | -2 |
| 3 | 104 | 190 | -86 | -86 | -22 | 3 | -3 |
| 4 | 120 | 197 | -77 | -77 | -23 | 4 | -4 |
| 5 | 77 | 198 | -121 | -121 | -25 | 5 | -5 |
| 6 | 103 | 202 | -99 | -99 | +26 | 6 | +6 |
| 7 | 113 | 197 | -84 | -84 | +28 | 7 | +7 |
| 8 | 198 | 210 | -12 | -12 | -39 | 8 | -8 |
| 9 | 178 | 150 | +28 | +28 | +40 | 9 | +9 |
| 10 | 131 | 197 | -66 | -66 | +41 | 10 | +10 |
| 11 | 148 | 152 | -4 | -4 | +42 | 11 | +11 |
| 12 | 159 | 198 | -39 | -39 | -54 | 12 | -12 |
| 13 | 136 | 201 | -65 | -65 | +60 | 13 | +13 |
| 14 | 181 | 203 | -22 | -22 | -65 | 14 | -14 |
| 15 | 163 | 217 | -54 | -54 | -66 | 15 | -15 |
| 16 | 181 | 204 | -23 | -23 | -77 | 16 | -16 |
| 17 | 112 | 52 | +60 | +60 | -84 | 17 | -17 |
| 18 | 114 | 74 | +40 | +40 | -86 | 18 | -18 |
| 19 | 86 | 60 | +26 | +26 | -99 | 19 | -19 |
| 20 | 102 | 61 | +41 | +41 | -121 | 20 | -20 |
| 21 | 102 | 60 | +42 | +42 | -124 | 21 | -21 |

**W+=56; W- 171**

**Table 7: Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank hypothesis testing result**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Observed  Value of W+ | Critical value  n=21 | Mean  difference | Sum of W+ ranks | Sum of W- ranks | Calculated  Z-value | Critical z-value two-tailed | Sample size | Signi  ficant  level | Mean  (W) | SD  (W) | P-value |
| 56 | 58 |  | 56 | 175 | -2.0681 | 1.960 | 21 | 0.05 | 28 |  | 0.038632 |

Since the calculated W+ of 56 < W- of 175 (Table 7) there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Since the calculated z-value of -2.0681 is less than the critical z-value (two-tailed) of 1.960 (Table 7), there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The p-value is 0.038632, the result is significant at p 0.05 The null hypothesis is hereby rejected while the alternate hypothesis is retained. Consequently, there is significant difference in the pre- and post-training compliance level with netiquette rules for online discussion by students.

**Rate of Compliance with netiquette rules**

Table 8(a) shows the result of pre-training compliance by individual respondents. Using the mean of 3.0 as the decision criterion, only 22 or 52.38% of the 42 respondents complied with netiquette rules while 20 or 47.62% failed.

Table 8(a): Rate of compliance with netiquette rules (Pre-training)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | Always  (5) | Frequently  (4) | Sometimes  (3) | Rarely  (2) | Never  (1) | fx | N |  | Decision |
| 1 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 84 | 21 | 4.00 | Complied |
| 2 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 69 | 21 | 3.29 | Complied |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 61 | 21 | 2.90 | Failed |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 56 | 21 | 2.67 | Failed |
| 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 69 | 21 | 3.29 | Complied |
| 6 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 64 | 21 | 3.05 | Complied |
| 7 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 68 | 21 | 3.24 | Complied |
| 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 60 | 21 | 2.86 | Failed |
| 9 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 58 | 21 | 2.76 | Failed |
| 10 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 68 | 21 | 3.24 | Complied |
| 11 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 57 | 21 | 2.71 | Failed |
| 12 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 74 | 21 | 3.52 | Complied |
| 13 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 61 | 21 | 2.04 | Failed |
| 14 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 59 | 21 | 2.81 | Failed |
| 15 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 68 | 21 | 3.24 | Complied |
| 16 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 56 | 21 | 2.67 | Failed |
| 17 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 63 | 21 | 3.00 | Complied |
| 18 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 63 | 21 | 3.00 | Complied |
| 19 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 58 | 21 | 2.76 | Failed |
| 20 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 62 | 21 | 2.95 | Failed |
| 21 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 61 | 21 | 2.09 | Failed |
| 22 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 68 | 21 | 2.04 | Failed |
| 23 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 70 | 21 | 3.33 | Complied |
| 24 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 68 | 21 | 3.24 | Complied |
| 25 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 64 | 21 | 3.05 | Complied |
| 26 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 67 | 21 | 3.19 | Complied |
| 27 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 65 | 21 | 3.10 | Complied |
| 28 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 65 | 21 | 3.10 | Complied |
| 29 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 59 | 21 | 2.81 | Failed |
| 30 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 57 | 21 | 2.71 | Failed |
| 31 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 61 | 21 | 2.04 | Failed |
| 32 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 60 | 21 | 2.86 | Failed |
| 33 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 63 | 21 | 3.00 | Complied |
| 34 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 73 | 21 | 3.48 | Complied |
| 35 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 64 | 21 | 3.05 | Complied |
| 36 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 58 | 21 | 2.76 | Failed |
| 37 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 62 | 21 | 2.95 | Failed |
| 38 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 69 | 21 | 3.29 | Complied |
| 39 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 64 | 21 | 3.05 | Complied |
| 40 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 60 | 21 | 2.86 | Failed |
| 41 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 65 | 21 | 3.10 | Complied |
| 42 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 59 | 21 | 2.81 | Failed |
| Total | 209 | 149 | 184 | 147 | 193 | 882 |  | 2.90 | Failed |

Table 8(b) presents the results of respondents’ compliance with netiquette rules after the training programme. From the table, all 42 respondents complied with a mean score of 3.0. The overall mean score of 4.06 also indicates a high rate of post-training compliance.

Table 8(b): Rate of compliance with netiquette rules (Post-training)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondents | Always  (5) | Frequently  (4) | Sometimes  (3) | Rarely  (2) | Never  (1) | Fx | N |  | Decision |
| 1 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 91 | 21 | 4.33 | Complied |
| 2 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 81 | 21 | 3.86 | Complied |
| 3 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 84 | 21 | 4.00 | Complied |
| 4 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 87 | 21 | 4.14 | Complied |
| 5 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 84 | 21 | 4.00 | Complied |
| 6 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 82 | 21 | 3.90 | Complied |
| 7 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 75 | 21 | 3.57 | Complied |
| 8 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 83 | 21 | 3.95 | Complied |
| 9 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 89 | 21 | 4.24 | Complied |
| 10 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 85 | 21 | 4.05 | Complied |
| 11 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 80 | 21 | 3.81 | Complied |
| 12 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 81 | 21 | 3.86 | Complied |
| 13 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 77 | 21 | 3.67 | Complied |
| 14 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 81 | 21 | 3.86 | Complied |
| 15 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 79 | 21 | 3.70 | Complied |
| 16 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 81 | 21 | 3.86 | Complied |
| 17 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 84 | 21 | 4.00 | Complied |
| 18 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 82 | 21 | 3.90 | Complied |
| 19 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 76 | 21 | 3.62 | Complied |
| 20 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 87 | 21 | 4.14 | Complied |
| 21 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 87 | 21 | 4.14 | Complied |
| 22 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 88 | 21 | 4.19 | Complied |
| 23 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 93 | 21 | 4.43 | Complied |
| 24 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 76 | 21 | 3.62 | Complied |
| 25 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 87 | 21 | 4.14 | Complied |
| 26 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 90 | 21 | 4.29 | Complied |
| 27 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 85 | 21 | 4.05 | Complied |
| 28 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 85 | 21 | 4.05 | Complied |
| 29 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 89 | 21 | 4.24 | Complied |
| 30 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 80 | 21 | 3.81 | Complied |
| 31 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 83 | 21 | 3.95 | Complied |
| 32 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 83 | 21 | 3.95 | Complied |
| 33 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 87 | 21 | 4.14 | Complied |
| 34 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 84 | 21 | 4.00 | Complied |
| 35 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 84 | 21 | 4.00 | Complied |
| 36 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 81 | 21 | 3.86 | Complied |
| 37 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 80 | 21 | 3.81 | Complied |
| 38 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 85 | 21 | 4.05 | Complied |  |  | 114 |
| 39 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 81 | 21 | 3.86 | Complied |  |  | 83 |
| 40 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 87 | 21 | 4.14 | Complied |  |  | 92 |
| 41 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 79 | 21 | 3.76 | Complied |  |  | 96 |
| 42 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 77 | 21 | 3.67 | Complied |  |  | 99 |
| Total | 526 | 135 | 10 | 102 | 109 | 822 |  | 4.00 | Complied |  |  | 80 |

The results presented on Table 8(a) and 8(b) show an increase in compliance rate from 22(52.38%) pre-training to 42(100%) post-training. In the same vein, the overall mean score increased from 2.90 pre-training to 4.00 post-training. These improvements may be attributed the training programme.

**Test of HO2  on rate of compliance with netiquette rules**

Table 9 presents the Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank distribution using the frequency scores while Table 10 presents the result of hypothesis testing.

Table 9: Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank distribution

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | PreTrg  fx(a) | PostTrg  fx(b) | Fx(a)-fx(b) | Observed difference | Ordered absolute value of difference | Rank | Signed rank |
| 1 | 84 | 91 | -7 | -7 | -7 | 2 | -2 |
| 2 | 69 | 81 | -12 | -12 | -7 | 2 | -2 |
| 3 | 61 | 84 | -23 | -23 | -7 | 2 | -2 |
| 4 | 56 | 87 | -32 | -32 | -8 | 4 | -4 |
| 5 | 60 | 84 | -15 | -15 | -11 | 5.5 | -5.5 |
| 6 | 64 | 82 | -18 | -18 | -11 | 5.5 | -5.5 |
| 7 | 68 | 75 | -7 | -7 | -12 | 7 | -7 |
| 8 | 60 | 83 | -23 | -23 | 14 | 8 | -8 |
| 9 | 58 | 89 | -31 | -31 | -15 | 9 | -9 |
| 10 | 68 | 85 | -17 | -17 | -16 | 10.5 | -10.5 |
| 11 | 57 | 80 | -23 | -23 | -16 | 10.5 | -10.5 |
| 12 | 74 | 81 | -7 | -7 | -17 | 12.5 | -12.5 |
| 13 | 61 | 77 | -16 | -16 | -17 | 12.5 | -12.5 |
| 14 | 59 | 81 | -22 | -22 | -18 | 13 | -13 |
| 15 | 68 | 79 | -11 | -11 | -18 | 13 | -13 |
| 16 | 56 | 81 | -25 | -25 | -18 | 13 | -13 |
| 17 | 63 | 84 | -21 | -21 | -18 | 13 | -13 |
| 18 | 63 | 82 | -19 | -19 | -19 | 18 | -18 |
| 19 | 58 | 76 | -18 | -18 | -20 | 20.5 | -20.5 |
| 20 | 62 | 87 | -25 | -25 | -20 | 20.5 | -20.5 |
| 21 | 61 | 87 | -26 | -26 | -20 | 20.5 | -20.5 |
| 22 | 68 | 88 | -20 | -20 | -20 | 20.5 | -20.5 |
| 23 | 70 | 93 | -23 | -23 | -21 | 23 | -23 |
| 24 | 68 | 76 | -8 | -8 | -22 | 24.5 | -24.5 |
| 25 | 64 | 87 | -23 | -23 | -22 | 24.5 | -24.5 |
| 26 | 67 | 90 | -23 | -23 | -23 | 30 | -30 |
| 27 | 65 | 85 | -20 | -20 | -23 | 30 | -30 |
| 28 | 65 | 85 | -20 | -20 | -23 | 30 | -30 |
| 29 | 59 | 89 | -30 | -30 | -23 | 30 | -30 |
| 30 | 57 | 80 | -23 | -23 | -23 | 30 | -30 |
| 31 | 61 | 83 | -22 | -22 | -23 | 30 | -30 |
| 32 | 60 | 83 | -23 | -23 | -23 | 30 | -30 |
| 33 | 63 | 87 | -24 | -24 | -23 | 30 | -30 |
| 34 | 73 | 84 | -11 | -11 | -23 | 30 | -30 |
| 35 | 64 | 84 | -20 | -20 | -24 | 35 | -35 |
| 36 | 58 | 81 | -23 | -23 | -25 | 36.5 | -36.5 |
| 37 | 62 | 80 | -18 | -18 | -25 | 36.5 | -36.5 |
| 38 | 69 | 85 | -16 | -16 | -26 | 38 | -38 |
| 39 | 64 | 81 | -17 | -17 | -27 | 39 | -39 |
| 40 | 60 | 87 | -27 | -27 | -30 | 40 | -40 |
| 41 | 65 | 79 | -14 | -14 | -31 | 41 | -41 |
| 42 | 59 | 77 | -18 | -18 | -32 | 42 | -42 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -903 |

**Table 10: Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank hypothesis testing result**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Observed  Value of W+ | Critical value  n=42 | Mean  difference | Sum of W+ ranks | Sum of W- ranks | Calculated  Z-value | Critical z-value two-tailed | Sample size | Signi  ficant  level | Mean  (W) | SD  (W) | P-  value |
| 0 | 320 | -17.19 | 0 | 903 | -5.6454 | 1.960 | 42 | 0.05 | 451.5 | 79.78 | 0 |

Since the W-value is 0, the distribution is approximately normal, the Z-value was used. Since the calculated Z-value of -5.6454 is lower than the Z-two tailed critical value of 1.960 at 0.05 significance level, there is evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The p-value is 0, the result is significant at p 0.05. On the other hand, since the observed value of W+ is lower than the critical value of 320, there is further evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis is hereby rejected while the alternate hypothesis is retained. Consequently, there is significant difference in the pre- and post-training compliance rate with netiquette rules for online discussion by students.

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Students used a variety of social media forums for online communication. Online discussion forums used mostly are WhatsApp, Yahoo, Facebook, Twitter, Google+ etc. The activities of the students during online discussions include keeping in touch, academic support, sharing information, making friends, getting news updates, and killing boredom The study showed that post-test compliance rate and level improved as against pre-test indicating that awareness alone which is the baseline for this study did not guarantee improved compliance. Rather than rely on the current methods, social network sites should incorporate a training schedule in their membership recruitment to enhance use and compliance with their rules and regulations for online communication.
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