

Original Article

https://hnpublisher.com

Role of Social Media Applications in Creating Intolerance among Pakistani Youth

Majid Ul Ghafar¹, Muhammad Adil Khan², Azhar Rashid³

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Communication & Media Studies, Hazara University, Mansehra, KPK

²BS, Department of Communication & Media Studies, Hazara University, Mansehra, KPK

³Lecturer, Department of Communication & Media Studies, Hazara University, Mansehra, KPK

Correspondence: drmajidghafar@hu.edu.pk¹

ABSTRACT

Aim of the Study: Social media has become an integral part of everyone's life. People, especially the youth around the globe use social media and different social media applications for different purposes like information, education, and entertainment. Social media has provided the opportunity to its users to chat and share ideas and thoughts inform of writing, audio, and video messages.

Methodology: Present research study is based on survey technique to explore and investigate role of social media in creating intolerance among young people of Pakistan. Uses and Gratification theory was used in this research work as theory relevancy. A standardized questionnaire was used for the purpose of data collection from the students selected as sampled from Hazara University, Mansehra. The data was collected according to the objectives of the study. The quantitative data was analyzed by using parametric statistics.

Findings: The empirical analysis of the data reveals that overall majority of the youth of Hazara University frequently use social media and social media applications for different purpose among these purposes information is the most important purpose for using social media applications. Data tabulation and its subsequent analysis reveals that overall, most of the respondents agree that social media affects their beliefs.

Conclusion: The exclusive analysis of the data reveals that TikTok social media application spread intolerance among youth followed by overall majority of the students of Hazara University has the view that social media organizations should implement policies and restrictions to counter the intolerant material used in social media.

Keywords: Social Media, Applications, Intolerance, Beliefs, Uses, Youth.

Introduction

Media is used as plural form. Media refers to a wide range of communication techniques, channels, and means of communication used to disseminate different contents and material such as information and other types of messages to audiences, readers, listeners, and viewers. Media includes different mediums like, print, Radio, TV, and newly emerged concept such as social media and social media applications

Article History

Received: January 26, 2024

Revised: March 13, 2024

Accepted: March 15, 2024

Published: March 17, 2024



(Nordqvist, 2024). Online platforms for the creation, sharing, and consumption of user-generated content are considered as social media. These platforms shifted the traditional way of interaction of people around the globe towards online interaction in form of chat, calling etc. (Tomasis, 2024). However, Facebook, Twitter/X, Instagram, YouTube, WhatsApp and TikTok are the social media platforms which are the most common and famous platforms used around the globe (Hall, 2024).

A study was conducted in Jordan aimed to explore the role of social media in spreading the culture of extremism among high school students from the teachers' point of view. The results of the study showed that the role of social media in spreading the culture of extremism among high school students was found to be generally moderate from the teachers' perspective. The study also found that male respondents had a more favorable view of social media's role in spreading extremism than female respondents (Al Homran et al., 2021). This research study further identified three main types of extremist discussions on social media applications and its effects on its users, the most common effects was the extremism, followed by religious and political extremism. This means that the content causing concern regarding intolerance was mostly related to social issues, then religious matters, and finally, political discussions (Al-Khataibeh, 2017).

Research in United States conducted by Costello et al. (2020) examines the factors that are associated with the frequency of exposure to online hate material among young people aged from 15 to 24 years in the United States. The study shows that spending more time online, using particular social media sites, interacting with close friends online, and having political views online all correlate with increased exposure to online hate. Having political grievances was also associated with seeing hate material online frequently. This means that frequent exposure to online hate material caused political grievances (Costello et al., 2020).

Statement of the Problem

The increasing use of social media among youth has raised concerns about its potential to contribute to the spread of intolerance and extremism. Therefore, it is a relevant and interesting case to examine how social media influence the tolerance levels of youth. Therefore, this research seeks to investigate "Role of Social Media Applications in Creating Intolerance Among Pakistani Youth" is the Statement Problem of this research work.

Objectives of the Study

Following are the most important and major objectives of the present research study.

- To explore use of social media platform, use by youth of Hazara University.
- To investigate youth exposure to Intolerant behavior by the youth.
- To explore the role of social media applications in spreading intolerance among youth.
- To investigate the effects of social media on culture and society.
- To investigate the influence of social media on the opinion and belief of its users.

Hypotheses of the Study

- H¹. it is more likely youth of Hazara University spent more than 5 hours a day on using social media.
- H². it is more likely students of Hazara University frequently use TikTok social media as compared to other social media applications.
- **H**³. it is more likely Facebook social media application frequently spread intolerance among youth as compared to any other social media application.
- **H**⁴. it is more likely youth of Hazara University agree with the statement that social media platforms should implement strict policies to counter intolerance.
- H⁵. it is more likely social media applications effects on their opinion and beliefs.

Review of Literature

Amit et al., (2020) A study conducted in Bangladesh suggests that social media has a big role in spreading extreme ideas among young people. Many students find hard to tell the difference between real Islamic teachings and extreme interpretations. There is a lot of online content that talks about Muslims being mistreated since the start of Islam. Young people often see current conflicts as part of a story about Western control. The main problem, where people cannot tell the difference between real Islamic teachings and extreme views, comes from cultural influences, and gets worse with social media. The government and other groups in Bangladesh are taking various actions to stop violent extremism, and they are using social media for activities against violence too.

Ismail et al., (2022) Another study conducted in Malaysia attempted to examine Malaysian youth's social media practices and their attitude towards violent extremism. The research discovered that young people's views on violent extremism fall within the moderate range. The study identified several factors that can impact these attitudes, such as the quality of information or arguments, how useful the information is perceived to be, and how easy it is perceived to use. In essence, the study highlights that the way information is presented and its perceived value and usability can play a significant role in shaping youth attitudes towards violent extremism.

Alsalm, (2022) Social media plays a significant role in promoting extremism and radicalization. The study was conducted among university students in Kuwait, and the results showed that most of the participants agreed that terrorist groups spread false beliefs related to religion and that they represent a perversion of religion. The study also found that social media platforms promote moral decay and help in spreading sectarianism.

Abro et al., (2017) A research study from Pakistan found that social media has a big impact on how young people in urban Sindh and Pakistan become more intolerant. The participants in the study talked about how the youth follow characters from movies, TV shows, cartoons, and video games that involve fighting and wars. Social media, like Facebook and WhatsApp, also plays a role in this. They mentioned that information on these platforms can make young people react quickly and become more aggressive. The study also found that various groups, like religious and political ones, use social media to share many posts. These posts try to influence young people and make them more aggressive and intolerant, even on issues that might not be important. The study pointed out that the clashes in places like Baluchistan, Karachi, and KPK are examples of how social media can contribute to increased conflict.

Hawdon et al., (2015) Research which was conducted in four countries: Finland, United States, Germany, United Kingdom, reveals that there is significant number of young people across different countries come across mean or hurtful content online, primarily on popular platforms like Facebook and YouTube. However, the actual number of individuals personally targeted by this content is relatively low. The content of online hate material often focuses on themes related to sexual orientation, ethnicity, and political views, with variations observed among different countries. The findings suggest that while online hate material is prevalent, not many young people are direct targets, and the specific themes targeted vary across regions.

Waldman & Verga, (2016) A research work was conducted in Canada in 2016. The study aimed to explore the role of social media in countering violent extremism. The study found that social media can be used to counter violent extremism through positive and negative measures. Positive measures produce countercontent that seeks to challenge extremist narratives and propaganda, while negative measures are designed to block, filter, take-down or censor extremist content. The study also found that online and social media are useful in the dissemination of counter-narratives in multiple languages, and to reach a broad, geographically diverse audience.

Newton et al., (2021) Another research which was conducted in four countries: Indonesia, Philippines, Myanmar, and India, shows how social media affects conflicts in four countries. It says that controlling

violent or extreme content on social media is hard, especially when it's linked to governments. It further mentions that what people say online often reflects and makes worse real-world divisions based on things like ethnicity and religion. During elections, people might use strong language online to get support, and trying to control it might not work well and could even cause more problems. The study suggests that instead of seeing online issues as just a problem, we should think of them as a part of how people experience life, as social media is now a big part of our everyday lives.

Erbschloe, (2018) Different scholars reveal points of views on social media and its effects on behavior of youths reveals that extremists use social media for their purposes. It mentions concerns about propaganda and misinformation being spread online, which can influence people, lead to violence, and even affect political elections. The book looks at how major social media platforms respond to these issues. It also discusses the concept of online groups where people with similar views support and reinforce each other. The author argues that such communities can contribute to the rise of extremism, misinformation, and intolerance, affecting issues like racism, religious bias, violence, and discrimination against different groups.

Theoretical Framework

Usage and Gratification Theory (UGT) is a communication theory that explains how individuals use media and technology to fulfill their needs and desires. The theory suggests that people use media to satisfy their needs, and the gratification they experience is a result of the fulfillment of these needs (Katz et al., 1973). Assumptions of Usage and Gratification Theory are 1) Users actively choose media to fulfill certain needs. 2) Individuals make informed decisions about media based on their understanding of the content. 3) Users select media to satisfy various needs, such as entertainment, information, personal identity, and integration into society. 4) Media consumption is a dynamic process that evolves as individuals' needs change (Katz et al., 1973).

People around the globe use social media and social media applications for the purpose of information, entertainment, and education. Therefore, the Uses and Gratification theory of mass communication is the most relevant theory of media.

Research Methodology

A research methodology is the procedure a researcher carried for the purpose of data collection and analysis. Without having the research methodology no research work will be completed. for this present research study, a survey technique is used for the purpose data collection.

Universe of the Study

For present research study universe of the study is the Hazara University. The researcher chooses Hazara University as universe of the study because it is convenient and easy for researchers to collect the data from the relevant sample.

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis of the present research study is the students who are studying in different departments of the Hazara University.

Sample

Sample is the sub-set of the population. Researchers choose both male and female students as sample for this specific research work.

Sample Size

Sample size is the number a researcher chooses for the purpose of collection of data. For this research study 200 students are the sample size.

Data Collection

Data collection is the technique a researcher uses to collect data. For this specific research study, the researcher used the standardized questionnaire having close ended questions to collect the responses form the relevant sample.

Data Analysis

The collected data was analysed by using SPSS statistical software to reach the conclusion according to the objective of the study.

Data Tabulation and Analysis

This research study is based on survey technique to investigate and explore the role of social media and social media applications in spreading the intolerance among the youth. The data was gathered according to the objectives of the study and from the students of Hazara University, both male and female. The reason behind the selection of female and male students is to generalize the results. The collected data was analysed by using SPSS statistical software to reach the conclusion.

Results

Table 1: Demographic Variable

| Category | Values | Responses | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Gender | | | | | |
| | Male | 100 | 49.5 | 49.5 | 49.5 |
| | Female | 102 | 50.5 | 50.5 | 100 |
| Age | | | | | |
| | 18-19 | 35 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 17.3 |
| | 20-21 | 90 | 44.6 | 44.6 | 61.9 |
| | 22-23 | 61 | 30.2 | 30.2 | 92.1 |
| | More than | 15 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 100 |
| Semester | | | | | |
| | 1 st | 38 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| | $2^{\rm nd}$ | 18 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 27.7 |
| | $3^{\rm rd}$ | 49 | 24.3 | 24.3 | 52 |
| | 4^{th} | 6 | 3 | 3 | 55 |
| | 5 th | 43 | 21.3 | 21.3 | 76.2 |
| | 6^{th} | 2 | 1 | 1 | 77.2 |
| | 7^{th} | 26 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 90.1 |
| | 8 th | 18 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 99 |
| | $10^{\rm th}$ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| Discipline | | | | | |
| | Arts | 26 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| | Social | 47 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 36.1 |
| | Sciences | 120 | 59.4 | 59.4 | 95.5 |
| | Law & | | | | |
| | Administra | 9 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 100 |
| | tion | | | | |
| Educational Lev | | | | | |
| | BS | 182 | 90.1 | 90.1 | 90.1 |
| | MS | 4 | 2 | 2 | 92.1 |
| | M.Phil. | 14 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 99 |
| | PhD | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100 |

N=200

This table indicates the demographic variables of the respondents and reveals that overall male and female respondents are based on equal percentile, while as for as age of the respondents is concerned 17.3% respondents were of age between 18-19, followed by 44.2% respondents with age group between 20-21, 30.2% respondents belonged to age group of 22-23, while there were only 7.4% respondents who had age group of more than 24.

This table also shows that there were 18.2% respondents who were from 1st semester, while there were 8.9% respondents from 2nd semester, followed by 24.3% respondents who were from 3rd semester, 3% respondents from 4th semester, while 21.3% respondents were from 5th semester, followed by 1% students from 6th semester, 12.9% respondents were from 7th semester, meanwhile 8.9% respondents were from 8th semester.

As for as discipline is concerned, this table reveals that 12.9% respondents were studying in discipline of Arts, followed by 23.3% respondents from Social Sciences, 59.4% respondents were from science discipline, meanwhile 4.5% respondents were from discipline of Law and Administration.

This table also indicates the educational level of respondents and reveals that there were 90.1% respondents from BS, followed by 2% respondents from MS, 6.9% respondents belonged to M.Phil., meanwhile there were only 1% respondents who were from PhD.

Table 2: Social Media Usage

| Category | Values | Responses | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Social Media Use | Yes | 202 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Social Media Use | No | Nill | Nill | Nill | Nill |
| | 1 hour | 12 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
| | 2-3 hours | 33 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 22.3 |
| Frequency of Social Media | 3-4 hours | 45 | 22.3 | 22.3 | 44.6 |
| Usage | 4-5 hours | 36 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 62.4 |
| | More than 5 hours | 76 | 37.6 | 37.6 | 100 |

N=200

This table shows the social media usage of respondents. This table indicates that 100% of respondents were social media users. Table no.2 also indicates the frequency of daily social media usage. This table also reveals that 5.9% respondents used social media for 1 hour, followed by 16.3% respondents who used social media for 2-3 hours, 22.3% respondents had social media usage duration between 3-4 hours, 17.8% respondents used social media for 4-5 hours, meanwhile 37.6% respondents had social media usage of more than 5 hours.

Table 3: Usage of Social Media Platforms

| Category | Values | Responses | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Facebook | | | | | |
| | Not at all | 63 | 31.2 | 31.2 | 31.2 |
| | Rarely | 40 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 51 |
| | To some extent | 32 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 66.8 |
| | Frequently | 44 | 21.8 | 21.8 | 88.6 |
| | Very frequently | 23 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 100 |
| X/ Twitter | | | | | |
| | Not at all | 121 | 59.9 | 59.9 | 59.9 |
| | Rarely | 41 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 80.2 |
| | To some extent | 23 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 91.6 |
| | Frequently | 12 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 97.5 |

| | Very frequently | 5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 100 |
|-----------|-----------------|-----|------|------|------|
| YouTube | | | | | |
| | Not at all | 15 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.4 |
| | Rarely | 35 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 24.8 |
| | To some extent | 68 | 33.7 | 33.7 | 58.4 |
| | Frequently | 46 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 81.2 |
| | Very frequently | 38 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 100 |
| Instagram | | | | | |
| | Not at all | 33 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 16.3 |
| | Rarely | 34 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 33.2 |
| | To some extent | 42 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 54 |
| | Frequently | 63 | 31.2 | 31.2 | 85.1 |
| | Very frequently | 30 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 100 |
| TikTok | | | | | |
| | Not at all | 52 | 25.7 | 25.7 | 25.7 |
| | Rarely | 24 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 37.6 |
| | To some extent | 35 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 55 |
| | Frequently | 48 | 23.8 | 23.8 | 78.7 |
| | Very Frequently | 43 | 21.3 | 21.3 | 100 |
| WhatsApp | | | | | |
| | Not at all | 5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| | Rarely | 14 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 9.4 |
| | To some extent | 16 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 17.3 |
| | Frequently | 52 | 25.7 | 25.7 | 43.1 |
| | Very Frequently | 115 | 56.9 | 56.9 | 100 |

N=200

This table shows the social media usage of respondents regarding different platforms of social media. This table indicates that 31.2% of respondents reported not using Facebook at all, followed by 19.8% who used it rarely, 15.8% used Facebook to some extent, 21.8% used it frequently, and 11.4% used it very frequently.

This table shows the usage level of X/ Twitter, with 59.9% of respondents who did not use it at all, 20.3% used it rarely, 11.4% used it to some extent, 5.9% used it frequently, meanwhile 2.5% used it very frequently.

This table also indicates that 7.4% respondents did not use YouTube at all, followed by 17.3% respondents who used it rarely, 33.7% of respondents used YouTube to some extent, 22.8% respondents who used it frequently, while 18.8% respondents used it very frequently.

This table reveals indicates that 16.3% respondents did not use Instagram at all, followed by 16.8% respondents who used it rarely, 20.8% respondents who used it to some extent, 31.2% respondents used Instagram frequently, meanwhile 14.9% respondents used it very frequently.

According to this table 25.7% respondents did not use TikTok at all, 11.9% used it rarely, 17.3% used it to some extent, 23.8% used it frequently, while 21.3% respondents used it very frequently.

This table also indicates that 2.5% respondents did not use WhatsApp at all, followed by 6.9% respondents who used it rarely, 7.9% used it to some extent, 25.7% used it frequently, meanwhile 56.9% of respondents used it very frequently.

Table 4: Social Media Platforms and Spreading of Intolerance

| Values | Responses | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| Not at all | 31 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 15.3 |
| Rarely | 46 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 38.1 |
| To some extent | 51 | 25.2 | 25.2 | 63.4 |
| Frequently | 43 | 21.3 | 21.3 | 84.7 |
| Very Frequently | 31 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 100 |
| | | | | |
| Not at all | 59 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Rarely | 55 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 56.4 |
| To some extent | 45 | 22.3 | 22.3 | 78.7 |
| Frequently | 25 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 91.1 |
| Very Frequently | 18 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 100 |
| | | | | |
| Not at all | 33 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 16.3 |
| Rarely | 63 | 31.2 | 31.2 | 47.5 |
| To some extent | 59 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 76.7 |
| Frequently | 30 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 91.6 |
| Very Frequently | 17 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 100 |
| | | | | |
| Not at all | 40 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 19.8 |
| Rarely | 57 | 28.2 | 28.2 | 48 |
| To some extent | 50 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 72.8 |
| Frequently | 32 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 88.6 |
| Very Frequently | 23 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 100 |
| | | | | |
| Not at all | 38 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| Rarely | 30 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 33.7 |
| To some extent | 40 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 53.5 |
| Frequently | 45 | 22.3 | 22.3 | 75.7 |
| Very Frequently | 49 | 24.3 | 24.3 | 100 |
| | | | | |
| Not at all | 83 | 41.1 | 41.1 | 41.1 |
| Rarely | 44 | 21.8 | 21.8 | 62.9 |
| To some extent | 25 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 75.2 |
| Frequently | 15 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 82.7 |
| Very Frequently | 35 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 100 |
| | Not at all Rarely To some extent Frequently Very Frequently Not at all Rarely To some extent Frequently Very Frequently Not at all Rarely To some extent Frequently Very Frequently Not at all Rarely To some extent Frequently Very Frequently Not at all Rarely To some extent Frequently Very Frequently Not at all Rarely To some extent Frequently Very Frequently Not at all Rarely To some extent Frequently Very Frequently Not at all Rarely To some extent Frequently Very Frequently | Not at all 31 Rarely 46 To some extent 51 Frequently 43 Very Frequently 31 Not at all 59 Rarely 55 To some extent 45 Frequently 25 Very Frequently 18 Not at all 33 Rarely 63 To some extent 59 Frequently 30 Very Frequently 17 Not at all 40 Rarely 57 To some extent 50 Frequently 23 Not at all 38 Rarely 30 To some extent 40 Frequently 45 Very Frequently 45 Very Frequently 49 Not at all 83 Rarely 44 To some extent 25 Frequently 15 | Not at all 31 15.3 Rarely 46 22.8 To some extent 51 25.2 Frequently 43 21.3 Very Frequently 31 15.3 Not at all 59 29.2 Rarely 55 27.2 To some extent 45 22.3 Frequently 18 8.9 Not at all 33 16.3 Rarely 63 31.2 To some extent 59 29.2 Frequently 30 14.9 Very Frequently 17 8.4 Not at all 40 19.8 Rarely 57 28.2 To some extent 50 24.8 Frequently 32 15.8 Very Frequently 23 11.4 Not at all 38 18.8 Rarely 30 14.9 To some extent 40 19.8 Frequently 45 22.3 Very Frequently 45 22.3 Very | Not at all 31 15.3 15.3 Rarely 46 22.8 22.8 To some extent 51 25.2 25.2 Frequently 43 21.3 21.3 Very Frequently 31 15.3 15.3 15.3 Very Frequently 55 27.2 27.2 27.2 To some extent 45 22.3 22.3 Frequently 25 12.4 12.4 Very Frequently 18 8.9 8.9 8.9 |

N = 200

This table reveals the responses of respondents about social media platforms which they thought spread intolerance. Table no.5 indicates that 15.3% of respondents believed that Facebook did not spread intolerance at all, 22.8% thought it rarely did, 25.2% respondents believed that Facebook spread intolerance to some extent, followed by 21.3% respondents who believed it did so frequently, while 15.3% respondents thought it did very frequently.

This table indicates that 29.2% of respondents thought that X/ Twitter did not spread intolerance at all, while 27.2% believed it rarely did, 22.3% felt that Twitter spread intolerance to some extent, 12.4% believed it did so frequently, and 8.9% respondents thought it did very frequently.

This table shows that 16.3% respondents thought YouTube did not spread intolerance at all, followed by 31.2% respondents who believed YouTube rarely spread intolerance, 29.2% felt that YouTube spread intolerance to some extent, 14.9% believed it did so frequently, and 8.4% thought it did very frequently.

This table reveals that 19.8% of respondents thought Instagram did not spread intolerance at all, 28.2% respondents believed Instagram rarely spread intolerance, 24.8% felt that Instagram spread intolerance to some extent, 15.8% believed it did so frequently, and 11.4% respondents thought it did very frequently.

According to this table 18.8% of respondents thought it did not spread intolerance at all, 14.9% believed it rarely did, 19.8% felt that TikTok spread intolerance to some extent, 22.3% believed it did so frequently, while 24.3% of respondents thought TikTok spread intolerance very frequently.

This table also shows also indicates that 41.1% of respondents thought that WhatsApp did not spread intolerance at all, while 21.8% believed it rarely did, 12.4% felt that WhatsApp spread intolerance to some extent, 7.4% believed it did so frequently, meanwhile 17.3% respondents thought it did very frequently.

| Table 5: <i>Implementation of</i> | of Stricter Policies to | Combat Intolerance by S | Social Media Platforms |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | |

| Values | Responses | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Strongly disagree | 12 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
| Disagree | 21 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 16.3 |
| Neutral | 56 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 44.1 |
| Agree | 82 | 40.6 | 40.6 | 84.7 |
| Strongly agreed | 31 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 100.0 |

N = 200

This table indicates the opinions of respondents on whether social media platforms should implement stricter policies to combat intolerance. This table reveals that 5.9% of respondents strongly disagreed with the idea of social media platforms implementing stricter policies to combat intolerance, 10.4% disagreed with the notion, followed by 27.7% respondents who remained neutral in their stance, 40.6% of respondents agreed that social media platforms should implement stricter policies to combat intolerance, while 15.3% of respondents strongly agreed with the idea.

Table 6: Social Media Platforms Effects on Culture and Society

| Values | Responses | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Very negatively | 27 | 13.4 | 13.4 | 13.4 |
| Somewhat negatively | 106 | 52.5 | 52.5 | 65.8 |
| No effect | 12 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 71.8 |
| Somewhat positively | 41 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 92.1 |
| Very positively | 16 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 100.0 |

N=200

This table indicates that perceptions of respondents about how social media platforms affect their culture and society. This table reveals that 13.4% of respondents felt that social media platforms affect their culture and society very negatively, 52.5% respondents believed that social media platforms affect their culture and society somewhat negatively, 5.9% respondents felt that social media has no effect on their culture and society, followed by 20.3% of respondents who thought that social media has a somewhat

positive impact, meanwhile 13.4% of respondents felt that social media platforms affect their culture and society very negatively.

Table 7: Social Media Influence on Opinions and Beliefs than other Sources

| Values | Responses | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Not at all | 13 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Not very much | 38 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 25.2 |
| Neutral | 45 | 22.3 | 22.3 | 47.5 |
| To some extent | 86 | 42.6 | 42.6 | 90.1 |
| Significantly | 20 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 100.0 |

N=200

This table indicates the opinions of respondents on extent to which they believe social media has a greater influence on their opinions and beliefs compared to other sources of information. This table reveals that 6.4% of respondents indicated that social media has not influenced their opinions and beliefs at all, 18.8% mentioned that social media has not influenced them very much, 22.3% remained neutral on the matter, 42.6% of respondents felt that social media has influenced their opinions and beliefs to some extent, while 9.9% of respondents believed that social media has significantly influenced their opinions and beliefs.

Findings

The empirical analysis of the data reveals about the demographics of the respondents and reveals that male and female respondents are based on equal percentile, followed by more than 44% respondents with age group between 20-21, more than 24% respondents are from 3rd semester, 59.4% respondents are from science discipline, meanwhile more than 90% respondents are from BS programs. The exclusive analysis of the data reveals that overall, 100% respondents use social media followed by more than 37% respondents who use social media more than 5 hours. The empirical analysis of the data supports our first hypothesis i.e., "it is more likely youth of Hazara University spent more than 5 hours a day on using social media".

Data tabulation and its findings reveals that overall majority of the respondents more than 81% use WhatsApp social media application frequently followed by Instagram 45% while TikTok 44% and YouTube 40%, Facebook 32% and only 8% respondents use Twitter social media application their daily routine life. Data tabulation and its subsequent analysis reveals that overall majority of the students of Hazara University use WhatsApp frequently and the analysis of the data do not support our second hypothesis i.e., "it is more likely students of Hazara University frequently use TikTok social media as compared to other social media applications".

Data tabulation reveals that Tiktok social media application more than 46% frequently spread intolerance among the youth followed by more than 36% Facebook while Instagram 26%, WhatsApp 24%, and YouTube 23% along with Twitter 21% spreads intolerance among the youth through different social media contents. Data tabulation and its analysis reveals that overall, 46% respondents thinks that TikTok social media application spread intolerance among youth as compared to other social media application and exclusive analysis of the data do not support our third hypothesis i.e., "it is more likely Facebook social media application frequently spread intolerance among youth as compared to any other social media application".

The exclusive analysis of the data reveals that as for as opinions of respondents whether social media platforms should implement stricter policies to combat intolerance is concerned the empirical analysis reveals that overall, more than 55% of respondents agree that social media platforms should implement stricter policies to combat intolerance. the exclusive analysis of the data supports our fourth hypothesis i.e., "it is more likely youth of Hazara University agree with the statement that social media platforms should implement strict policies to counter intolerance".

The data tabulation and its analysis reveal the opinions of respondents on extent to which they believe social media has a greater influence on their opinions and beliefs compared to other sources of information and reveal that more than 42% of respondents feel that social media has influenced their opinions and beliefs to some extent. the exclusive analysis of the data does not support our sixth hypothesis i.e., "it is more likely social media applications effects on their beliefs".

Conclusion

The present research study is based on survey techniques to investigate and explore the effects of social media intolerance on youth belief and attitude. The empirical analysis of the data and its subsequent analysis determine that overall majority of the respondents use social media applications frequently for different purposes which include, information, entertainment, and education. Youth frequently face different intolerant content spread on social media applications. Therefore, it is concluded social media have great effects on youth behavior and attitude towards the issue of intolerance and its effects on their belief. Youth think that all the social media applications one way or other spread intolerant contents but there is no proper mechanism to encounter the spread of intolerance.

it is also concluded that all the social media applications before allowing any content to spread on social media applications must check and investigate whether the content increase the intolerance among the users or not and their must be a clear and cosine strategy to encounter the intolerance of all types which includes, social, personal, religious, political and professional.

Acknowledgements

None

Conflict of Interest

Authors declared NO conflict of interest.

Funding Source

The authors received NO funding to conduct this study.

ORCID iDs

Majid Ul Ghafar ¹ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0686-8893 Muhammad Adil Khan ² https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4111-493X Azhar Rashid ³ https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8840-8266

References

- Abro, A. A., Fateh, A., & Saeed, N. (2017). Intolerance Among Youth And Its Impacts On Pakistani Society: Sociological Analysis Of Urban Sindh. *Journal of Grassroot*, 51(1), 19-27.
- al Homran, M., Al-Swalha, A., & AlAweemer, Y. (2021). Role of social media in spreading the culture of extremism. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences*, 48(3), 33-39.
- Al-Khataibeh, Y. D. (2017). Social media-extremism ideas as an intellectual security threat: A case study of Jordanian university undergraduates. *British Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 18(1), 34-47.
- Alsalm, F. (2022). The role of Social media in radicalization and promoting extremism. *The Egyptian Journal of Media Research*, 79, 611-643.

- Amit, S., Rahman, I., & Mannan, S. (2020). Social media and radicalisation of university students in Bangladesh. *Journal of policing, intelligence and counter terrorism*, 15(3), 228-243.
- Britannica. (2024, January 16). *X* | *Company, History, Twitter, Elon Musk, & Uses*. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/topic/Twitter
- Costello, M., Barrett-Fox, R., Bernatzky, C., Hawdon, J., & Mendes, K. (2020). Predictors of viewing online extremism among America's youth. *Youth & Society*, 52(5), 710-727.
- Dixon, S. J. (2024, January 16). *Most popular social networks worldwide as of October 2023, ranked by number of monthly active users*. Statista. https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/
- Erbschloe, M. (2018). Extremist propaganda in social media: A threat to homeland security. CRC Press.
- Hall, M. (2024, January 16). Facebook | Overview, History, & Facts. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/topic/Facebook
- Hassan, S.A.U., Safdar, G. (2022). Relationship between Self-Esteem and Problematic Use of Facebook among University Students. *Annals of Social Sciences and Perspective*, 3(1), 199-217. DOI: 10.52700/assap.v3i1.83
- Hassan, T.U., Shabir, G., Safdar, G., Hussain, J.S. (2019). Social Media Defy Spiral of Silence Theory and Provides Baseline for new Spiral of Social Media Theory: Ground Perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 39(4), 1549-1558.
- Hawdon, J., Oksanen, A., & Räsänen, P. (2015). Online extremism and online hate. *Nordicom Inf*, 37, 29-37.
- Ismail, N., Jawhar, J., Yusof, D. M., Ismail, A. I., & Akhtar, R. M. K. (2022). Understanding Malaysian youth's social media practices and their attitude towards violent extremism. *Intellectual Discourse*, 30(1), 45-52.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *The public opinion quarterly*, 37(4), 509-523.
- LaFleur, G. (2024, January 15). TikTok. TechTarget. https://www.techtarget.com/WhatIs/definition/TikTok
- Neumann, P. R. (2013). Options and strategies for countering online radicalization in the United States. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 36(6), 431-459.
- Newton, J., Moner, Y., Nyi, K. N., & Prasad, H. (2021). Polarising Narratives and Deepening Fault Lines: Social Media, Intolerance and Extremism in Four Asian Nations.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1974). The spiral of silence a theory of public opinion. *Journal of communication*, 24(2), 43-51.
- Nordqvist, C. (2024, January 16). *What is media? Definition and meaning*. Market Business News. https://marketbusinessnews.com/financial-glossary/media-definition-meaning/
- Safdar, G. (2021). World Wide Web and Current Scenario of Internet among Pakistani Youth in Information Communication and its Impacts on Cultural Values. *Global Media Journal (Pakistan Edition)*, 14(1), 21-32.
- Safdar, G., Riaz, S. Khan, S. (2021). Social Media Use and Effects on Islamic Cultural Values among University Students: A Case Study of South Punjab, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Islamic Research*, 22(1), 171-184.
- Schackmuth, A. (2018). Extremism, fake news and hate: effects of social media in the post-truth era DePaul University].

- Shabir, G., Hameed, Y.M.Y., Safdar, G., Gilani, S.M.F.S. (2014). Impact of Social Media on Youth: A Case Study of Bahawalpur City. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *3*(4), 132-151.
- Shabir, G., Safdar, G., Jamil, T., Bano, S. (2015). Mass Media, Communication and Globalization with the perspective of 21st century. *New Media and Mass Communication*, *34*, 11-15.
- Syed, U.E., Safdar, G., Khan, A. (2023). Relationship between Social Anxiety, Social Comparison and Competitive Behavior among Social Media Users. *Online Media and Society, 4*(2), 101-108.
- Tomasis, R. (2024, January 16). *Social Media Platforms*. Wix-encyclopedia. https://www.wix.com/encyclopedia/definition/social-media-platforms