

# The Relationship of Social Media Usage to the Satisfaction and Practice of Friendship (*Silaturahmi*) among Students of Universitas Sumatera Utara

Feni Khairifa<sup>1</sup>, Suwardi Lubis<sup>2</sup>, Iskandar Zulkarnain<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D Student in State Islamic University of North Sumatera (UINSU), Medan, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer in Universitas Sumatera Utara (USU), Medan, Indonesia

[fennikhairy@gmail.com](mailto:fennikhairy@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** *The study aims is to find out The Relationship of Social Media Usage to the Satisfaction and Practice of Friendship (Silaturahmi) among Students of Universitas Sumatera Utara. This research is conducted at Universitas Sumatera Utara, Dr. Mansur Street, Padang Bulan, Medan. The result shows that there is a relationship between the use of social media and social satisfaction among students of the University of North Sumatra. The form of relationships is low, but certain relationships. In addition, the relationship between the two variables is positive, which means more and more use of social media, the satisfaction of friendship among students of the University of North Sumatra will also be higher. This is because, there is a positive side to social media. A variety of features are offered, making it easier for users to communicate. Distance, space and time are no longer a barrier to stay in touch (communication).*

**Keywords:** *Social media usage; satisfaction; practice of friendship; students.*

## I. Introduction

Social media in the real world is connecting with people or colleagues, friends, and using that media to meet new people. In cyberspace, the principle is the same, but the power of technology provides another advantage, namely users are no longer obstructed by place and space. Users can view people's profiles and send e-mails anytime and from any computer. In fact, sometimes, communicating through cyberspace feels more comfortable and complete than communicating face to face. Overall adults tend to use social media for personal reasons and not work.

Today the opportunity to stay in touch is wide and wide open. There is no reason for anyone not to be able to stay in touch in a wider scope. Because people who always stay in touch, Allah SWT will expand his fortune and extend his age. In hospitality, humans involved in communication transactions play a certain role, namely as senders and recipients, which are generally carried out simultaneously. As a sender he compiles a message and starts communicating it to others in the hope of getting a response. Students as one of the users of social media applications indirectly make friendships that cannot even be separated from their daily lives. Social media seems to attract the attention of students to access it wherever they are, because now social media can be accessed via laptops and mobile phones equipped with mobile data. Social media can be considered as a tool to build communication and interaction media. A hospitality process can be done through social media making it easier for users to establish communication with friends and relatives, even with strangers. For example, through Facebook someone can meet with old friends who have not been in contact for a long time. Making friends, communication is indeed a basic human need. Today's technology then spoiled it. They no longer need to go far or meet face to face to be able to communicate.

In this study the authors chose the students of Universitas Sumatera Utara undergraduate programs who are still actively studying as research respondents. Researchers

assume that the student as an object of research is known to be close to the use of social media, namely the Facebook, Line, Instagram, and others. In this case they are accustomed to connecting to the internet or chatting to communicate or meet their needs as students. Different personalities of students bring different responses to an object, in this case is a response to the use of social media in establishing hospitality.

## II. Review of Literature

### 2.1 New Media

New media developed in the late the 20<sup>th</sup> century to illustrate the emergence of digital, computer, or information technology networks. During the 20<sup>th</sup> century, new media entered a phase called web 2.0 (web two point-o), where everything became more interactive and became an area for everyone. Everyone can now directly take part in new media. The development of web 2.0 as a platform has changed interactivity on the web in opening the universe to media users. Whereas the web page metaphor 1.0 is only allowed to download information along and is therefore not much different from the consumption of broadcast media, while the web 2.0 application allows users to become autonomous producers. Youtube, Blog, Ebay, Flickr, online social networking sites and others, allowing media users to have a broadcast experience. The importance of web 2.0 is that broadcast media produce a context of instant national and international social relations, there are several ways in which individuals get valuable interactions to make real global connections. The fact is that users can now work with broadcast media as a way to develop public space.<sup>1</sup>

New media itself is a media with all its characteristics. New media has its own technology, how to use, scope of service, content and image. The internet does not have, be controlled or managed by a single body but is an internationally connected computer network and operates based on mutually agreed protocols. A number of organizations, especially telecommunications providers and agencies play a role in new media operations.<sup>2</sup> According to Leah A. Lievrouw and Sonia Living, stone new media are information and communication technologies and related social contexts, and infrastructure which consists of three components, namely: tools that will be used to communicate or convey information, activities in which people are involved in communicating or sharing information and social arrangements or organizational forms that develop through these tools and activities.

### 2.2 Friendship (*Silaturahmi*)

The word *silaturahmi* itself comes from the word *صلة* which means relationship or connects and also the word *rahm*, comes from the root words *rahima*, *yarhamu*, *rahmun*, *rahmatan* which means soft and compassion; like *taraahamal qaumu* means the people love each other and *taraahama 'alayhi* means to pray for someone to get mercy.

Thus, the word friendship itself more or less means as a relationship between someone with full tenderness and affection. A person is said to have established friendship when he has established a relationship of affection in kindness, not in sin and immorality.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Littlejohn, *Teori Komunikasi*(Jakarta: Salemba Humanika, 2009), p. 686.

<sup>2</sup> Dennis McQuail, *Mass Communication Theory* (London: Stage Publication Ltd, 2009), pp. 28-29.

<sup>3</sup> Nurlaela Isnawati, *Rahasia Sehat dan Panjang Umur dengan Sedekah, Tahajud, Baca Al-Qur'an, dan Puasa Senin Kamis* (Print. I. Sabil, 2014), p. 49.

The essence of hospitality is a sense of grace and affection. Connecting affection and connecting brotherhood, can also be interpreted as connecting a kinship and connecting relatives. This is highly recommended by religion for security and peace in the life of the nation and state society.

### 2.3 Uses and Gratifications Theory

Every research requires a clear starting point or thinking base in solving problems or highlighting the problem. Nawawi states, for this reason, a theoretical framework should be drawn up containing points of thought that illustrate from what angle the research will be highlighted.<sup>4</sup> With a theoretical framework, researchers will have a strong foundation in determining the direction of research objectives. The relevant theory in this research is Theory of Use and Satisfaction of Needs.

Uses and Gratifications Theory is described as a starting point in communication research that has diverted attention from what the media does to the audience to what the audience does to the media. In this theory, human needs are derived from social and psychological wills.

Uses and Gratifications Theory is a theory rooted in the 1940s, in which researchers are interested in examining why audience behavior is influenced by the media obtained, such as listening to the radio, and reading newspapers.

Then Swanson describes this theory as "a dramatic break with the effects of traditions of the past" which is a dramatic leap from the hypodermic needle approach that considers the media audience to be passive. The use and satisfaction theory considers the audience of every individual actively using (uses) the media to meet their needs (gratification). From here arises the terms uses and gratifications, the use and satisfaction of needs.

## III. Methodology

This research was conducted at Universitas Sumatera Utara, Dr. Mansur Street, Padang Bulan, Medan. History of Universitas Sumatera Utara (USU) began with the establishment of Universitas Sumatera Utara Institution on June 4, 1952. The Institution was founded by the Governor of North Sumatera to fulfill the wishes of the people of North Sumatera in particular and the Indonesian people in general.

## IV. Discussion

### 4.1 Single Table Analysis, Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1. Gender

No	Gender	Frequency	Percent
1.	Male	219	55.7
2.	Female	174	44.3
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 1/ FC. 1

<sup>4</sup> Hadari Nawawi, *Metode Penelitian Bidang Sosial*, Cet. ke-3 (Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press, 1995), p. 40.

The results showed that the majority of respondents in the study of male were 219 people (55.7%). While female respondents numbered 174 people (44.3%). Thus the number of male respondents turned out to be more. This is because at the time the questionnaire was being distributed, students at Universitas Sumatera Utara were more easily found by men, compared to female respondents.

**Table 2.** Age

No	Age	Frequency	Percent
1.	<18 years old	66	16.8
2.	19-25 years old	196	49.9
3.	>25 years old	131	33.3
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 1/ FC. 2

Based on table 2 it can be seen that the majority of respondents aged between 19-25 years old, amounting to 196 people (49.9%). While respondents aged less than 18 years were 66 people (16.8%).

The results also showed that there were 131 respondents over the age of 25 (33.3%). From these data it can be seen that, the majority of students who actively study at the age of 19-25 years.

**Table 3.** Parents' Job

No	Parents' Job	Frequency	Percent
1.	Government employees	196	49.9
2.	Private employees	117	29.8
3.	Others	80	20.4
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 1/ FC. 3

For parental work, there are 196 people (49.9%) answering that their parents work as civil servants. As many as 117 people (29.8%) work their parents private employees, while carrying out other work as many as 80 people (20.4%).

From the table 3 above shows that the majority of parents of Universitas Sumatera Utara students work as civil servants. In other sectors as laborers, farmers, and traders, fishermen.

**Table 4.** Pocket Money

No	Pocket Money	Frequency	Percent
1.	≤ Rp 50.000,- / week	59	15.0
2.	Rp. 51.000,- – Rp 99.000,- / week	208	52.9
3.	≥ Rp. 100.000,- / week	126	32.1
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 4/ FC. 4

Table 4 shows the allowance that the respondent had in one week. A total of 126 people (32.1%) had an allowance of Rp. 51,000 up to Rp. 99,000. Furthermore, as many as 59 respondents (15.0%) had pocket money of  $\leq$  Rp 50,000. The majority of respondents were 208 people (52.9%) had an allowance of Rp. 51,000 up to Rp 99,000 per week. This is because, there are respondents in addition to getting pocket money from parents, and they also get it from a side job.

**Table 5.** Residence

No	Residence	Frequency	Percent
1.	Parent's House	228	58.0
2.	Boarding House	92	23.4
3.	Others	73	18.6
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 5/ FC. 5

**Table 6.** Frequency of Using Social Media

No	Frequency Using Social Media	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	0	0
2.	Seldom	0	0
3.	Often	180	45.8
4.	Very Often	213	54.2
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 6/ FC. 7

Table 6 shows the results of the study, the majority of respondents namely 213 people (54.2%) very often use social media, because it makes it easier for them to communicate, play online games, send photos. Specifically to speak directly, just use the WhatsApp calling facility. Respondents only use quotas from package cards from various brands and quotas contained in the package card. In addition there are also various bonuses offered.

**Table 7.** Social Media Used

No	Social Media Used	Frequency	Percent
1	Facebook	65	16.5
2	Instagram	53	13.5
3	WhatsApp	236	60.1
4	Vlog	0	0
5	Others	39	9.9
	Total	393	100.0

Sources: P. 7/ FC. 8

**Table 8.** The Length Has Been Using Social Media

No	The Length Has Been Using Social Media	Frequency	Percent
1.	< 1 year	0	0
2.	1-2 years	66	16.8
3.	3-4 years	262	66.7
4.	> 4 years	65	16.5
	Total	393	100.0

Sources: P. 8/ FC.9

**Table 9.** Number of Social Media Accounts Accessed in a Day

No	Number of Social Media Accounts Accessed in a Day	Frequency	Percent
1.	≤ 2	197	50.1
2.	3-4	130	33.1
3.	≥ 5	66	16.8
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 9/ FC. 10

**Table 10.** The Most Often Accessed Social Media

No.	The Most Often Accessed Social Media	Frequency	Percent
1.	Facebook	0	0
2.	Instagram	0	0
3.	WhatsApp	393	100.0
4.	Vlog	0	0
5.	Others...	0	0
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 10/ FC. 11

**Table 11** Time to Access Social Media

No	Time to Access Social Media	Frequency	Percent
1.	Morning	53	13.5
2.	Daytime	74	18.8
3.	Afternoon	89	22.6
4.	Evening	177	45.0
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 11/ FC. 12

The results showed that the majority of respondents, as many as 177 people (45.0%) accessed social media at night. Then for the evening category as many as 89 people (22.6%). While for the daytime category there were 74 people (18.8%), and for the morning there were 53 people (13.5%).

From these data it can be seen that the time used by respondents to access social media varies. The table also shows that the majority of respondents have free time to access social media during night breaks.

Accessing social media in the afternoon because at that time students have returned from college. While accessing social media during the day. This was done because at that time students were waiting for lecturers to enter lectures, and access social media the morning before they left for college.

**Table 12.** The Length of Accessing Social Media In a Day

No	The Length Of Accessing Social Media In a Day	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	0	0
2.	≤ 1-2 Hours	209	53.2
3.	3-5 Hours	134	34.1
4.	≥ 6 Hours	50	12.7
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 12/ FC. 13

For the time taken by respondents to access social media, in general □ 1-2 hours, namely as many as 209 people (53.2%). A total of 134 people (34.1%) stated 3-5 hours, and only 50 people (12.7%) stated □ 6 hours. For those who state that they have never accessed social media in a day, no.

From the above data it can be concluded that according to the respondents, they access social media when there is free time, and also if the topic is actual.

**Table 13.** Social Media Makes It Easy to Interact

No.	Social Media Makes It Easy to Interact	Frequency	Percent
1.	Disagree	0	0
2.	Agree Less	0	0
3.	Agree	132	33.6
4.	Strongly agree	261	66.4
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 14.** Share Stories (Status Update)

No	Share Stories (Status Update)	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	0	0
2.	Rarely	84	21.4
3.	Often	117	29.8
4.	Very often	192	48.9
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 15.** Confirming Friend Requests from Other Users

No	Confirming Friend Requests from Other Users	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	0	0
2.	Rarely	65	16.5
3.	Often	197	50.1
4.	Very often	131	33.3
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 16.** Liked Information Provided By Other Users

No	Liked Information Provided By Other Users	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	0	0
2.	Rarely	53	13.5
3.	Often	211	53.7
4.	Very often	129	32.8
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 17.** See Other User Profiles

No	See Other User Profiles	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	0	0
2.	Rarely	42	10.7
3.	Often	167	42.5
4.	Very often	184	46.8
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 18.** Read other Information

No	Read other Information	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	0	0
2.	Rarely	135	34.4
3.	Often	137	34.9
4.	Very often	121	30.8
	Total	393	100.0



**Table 19.** Other Activities

No	Other Activities	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	0	0
2.	Rarely	109	27.7
3.	Often	120	30.5
4.	Very often	164	41.7
	Total	393	100.0

Source: P. 14.6/ FC. 21

**Table 20.** Access Social Media to Read Actual Information

No.	Access Social Media to Read Actual Information	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	13	3.3
2.	Rarely	57	14.5
3.	Often	249	63.4
4.	Very often	74	18.8
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 21.** Discuss about Current Information on Social Media

No.	Discuss about current information on social media	Frequency	Percent
1.	Never	47	12.0
2.	Rarely	206	52.4
3.	Often	74	18.8
4.	Very often	66	16.8
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 22.** Connecting Brotherhood through Social Media

No.	Connecting brotherhood through social media	Frequency	Percent
1.	Disagree	0	0
2.	Less Agree	0	0
3.	Agree	262	66.7
4.	Strongly agree	131	33.3
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 23.** Visiting Relatives through Communication on Social Media

No.	Visiting Relatives Through Communication on Social Media	Frequency	Percent
1.	Disagree	0	0
2.	Less Agree	72	18.3
3.	Agree	199	50.6
4.	Strongly agree	121	30.8
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 24.** Through Social Media Can Join Specific Communities

No.	Through Social Media Can Join Specific Communities	Frequency	Percent
1.	Disagree	0	0
2.	Less Agree	41	10.4
3.	Agree	249	63.4
4.	Strongly agree	103	26.2
	Total	393	100.0

**Table 25.** Always Wait (Confirm) When Getting Information from Social Media

No.	Always Wait (Confirm) When Getting Information from Social Media	Frequency	Percent
1.	Disagree	0	0
2.	Less Agree	0	0
3.	Agree	215	54.7
4.	Strongly agree	178	45.3
	Total	393	100.0

**Single Data Every Variable**

**Media Usage**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Often	198	50,4	50,4	50,4
Very often	195	49,6	49,6	100,0
Total	393	100,0	100,0	

### Friendship Satisfaction

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Satisfied	328	83,5	83,5	83,5
Very Satisfied	65	16,5	16,5	100,0
Total	393	100,0	100,0	

### Friendship Experience

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Good	268	68,2	68,2	68,2
Very good	125	31,8	31,8	100,0
Total	393	100,0	100,0	

### Cross Tabulation between Variables X with Y1 and Variable X with Y2

#### Use of Social Media \* Hospitality Experience

Crosstab

		Hospitality Experience		Total	
		Good	Very good		
Use of Social Media	Often	Count	178	20	198
		% of Total	45,3%	5,1%	50,4%
Very often	Count	90	105	195	
	% of Total	22,9%	26,7%	49,6%	
Total	Count	268	125	393	
	% of Total	68,2%	31,8%	100,0%	

### Symmetric Measures

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error <sup>a</sup>	Approx. T <sup>b</sup>	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient	,425			,000
Interval by Interval Pearson's R	,470	,042	10,518	,000 <sup>c</sup>
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correlation	,470	,042	10,518	,000 <sup>c</sup>
N of Valid Cases	393			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

### Use of Social Media \* Satisfaction of Friendship

#### Crosstab

		Friendship Satisfaction		Total
		Satisfied	Very satisfied	
Use of Social Media	Often	Count 198	0	198
		% of Total 50,4%	,0%	50,4%
Very often	Count	130	65	195
	% of Total	33,1%	16,5%	49,6%
Total	Count	328	65	393
	% of Total	83,5%	16,5%	100,0%

#### Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error <sup>a</sup>	Approx. T <sup>b</sup>	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Contingency		,409			,000
Nominal by Coefficient					
Interval by Pearson's R		,449	,029	9,925	,000 <sup>c</sup>
Interval by Spearman Correlation		,449	,029	9,925	,000 <sup>c</sup>
Ordinal by Spearman Correlation		,449	,029	9,925	,000 <sup>c</sup>
Ordinal by Spearman Correlation		,449	,029	9,925	,000 <sup>c</sup>
N of Valid Cases		393			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

### Product Moment Correlation Analysis

#### Correlations

		Use of Social Media	Friendship Satisfaction	Hospitality Experience
Use of Social Media	Pearson Correlation	1	,513**	,638**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000
	N	393	393	393
Friendship Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	,513**	1	,622**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000
	N	393	393	393
Friendship's Experience	Pearson Correlation	,638**	,622**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	
	N	393	393	393

### Correlations

		Use of Social Media	Friendship Satisfaction	Hospitality Experience
Use of Social Media	Pearson Correlation	1	,513**	,638**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000
	N	393	393	393
Friendship Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	,513**	1	,622**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000
	N	393	393	393
Friendship's Experience	Pearson Correlation	,638**	,622**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	
	N	393	393	393

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### V. Conclusion

Based on the hypothesis test of the use of social media variables (variable X) to the satisfaction variable (variable Y1), the researcher concludes that there is a relationship between the use of social media and social satisfaction among students of the University of North Sumatra. The form of relationships is low, but certain relationships. In addition, the relationship between the two variables is positive, which means more and more use of social media, the satisfaction of friendship among students of the University of North Sumatra will also be higher. This is because, there is a positive side to social media. A variety of features are offered, making it easier for users to communicate. Distance, space and time are no longer a barrier to stay in touch (communication).

Furthermore, based on the hypothesis test of the variable use of social media (variable X) on the variability of relations of friendship (variable Y2), the researchers concluded that there is a relationship between the use of social media to the practice of social relations among students of the University of North Sumatra. , the relationship between the two variables is negative, which means more and more use social media, the practice of friendship relations among students of the University of North Sumatra will be lower.

This is because besides there is a positive side to social media there is also a negative side. Dissemination of hoaxes, which can provoke emotions, anger for other users who read, see them. Various kinds of fraud. In addition, there are negative comments on the status or posts of other users. It could just happen to your family, friends, relatives. In the end, it caused a reduction in even the breaking of ties (broken communication).

---

## References

- Agusyana, Y. (2011). *SPSS 19*. Jakarta: Elex Media Computindo.
- Bagdakian, (2004) BH..*The New Media Monopology*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Baran, Stanley J. & Davis Denis K., (2009) *Mass Communication Theory Foundation, Ferment and Future*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: Wadsworth.
- Chen, G. M.. "Tweet This: A Uses and Gratifications Perspective on How Active Twitter Use Gratifies A Need to Connect With Others. Computers in Human Behavior," in *Research in Interactive Marketing*, 27 (2), 211.
- Dunne, Aine, *et al* (2010) "Young People's Uses of Online Social Networking Sites: a Uses and Gratifications Perspective," in *Research in Interactive Marketing*, 4(1).
- Effendi, Onong Uchayana. (1993) *Ilmu, Teori dan Filsafat Komunikasi*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Eugene, F. S. & R. Daniel. "Newspaper Readership in Two Towns", in *Journalism Quarterly* 56.
- Gallup, G. A.. "A Scientific Method Determining Reader Interest" in *Journalism Quarterly*.
- Herzog, H. (1954). "Motivation and Gratifications of Daily Listeners" in Wilbur Schramm, *The Process and Effects of Communications*. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Isfiannoor, Muhammad. (2009) *Pendekatan Statistika Modern Untuk Ilmu Sosial*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Kriyantono, Rachmat. (2008) *Teknik Praktis Riset Komunikasi*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Lievrouw, Leah A. dan Sonia Livingstone. (2006) *Handbook of New Media: Social Shaping and Social Consequences of ICTs*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Little, John. (2009) *Teori Komunikasi*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Mahsun, (2012) *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Jakarta: Grafindo Pesada.
- Mc. Quail, Denis. (2002) *Mc. Quail's Reader in Mass Communication Theory*. London: Sage Publications.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mass Communication Theory*. London: Stage Publication Ltd, 2009.
- Nawawi, Hadari. (2007) *Metode Penelitian Bidang Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Palmgreen, Philip (2001) *Communication Research Measure: A Sourcebook*. The Guilford Press,
- Rakhmat, Jalaluddin. (2004) *Metode Penelitian Komunikasi*. Bandung; Remaja Rosdakarya.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Psikologi Komunikasi*. Bandung; Remaja Rosdakarya, 2001.
- Schramm, Willbur & D. Robert (peny.)( 1954.) "What Missing the Newspaper Means". *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication*. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Process and Effects of Communications*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1954.
- Sendjaya, Sasa Djuarsa. (1994) *Teori Komunikasi*. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka.
- Septiawan, Santa Kurnia. (2009) *Jurnalisme Kontemporer*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Severin, Werner J. & James W. Tankard Jr. (2005). *Teori Komunikasi: Sejarah, Metode, dan Terapan di Dalam Media Massa*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Communication Theories: Origins, Methods and Uses in the Mass Media*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Longman Publishing Group, 1992.

- Singarimbun, Masri. (2008) *Metode Penelitian Survei*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Siregar, Ashadi & Sondang Pasaribu, (2001) *Bagaimana Mengelola Media Komunikasi Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Sugiyono, (2012) *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Swanson, David L. (1979). "The Continuing Evolution of the Uses and Gratifications Approach," in *Communication Research*. Sage Publications Inc. vol. 6 No. 1, January.
- Tan, A. S.. *Mass Communication Theories and Research*. Columbus: Grid Publishing, 1981.
- Whitney, D. C., E. Wartella & S. Windahl (peny.). (1982) *The Mass Media and Citizen Assesment or Issue Importance: A Reflection on Agenda Setting Research*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Wimmer, Roger D. and Joseph R. (2000) Dominick. *Mass Media Research: An Introduction*. USA: Wardworth Publishing Company, six<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Wright, Charles R. (1988) *Sosiologi Komunikasi Massa*. Bandung: Remadja Rosdakarya.

### **Journal**

- Humaizi. (1997) "Teori Penggunaan dan Pemuasan Kebutuhan" dalam *Wawasan*, Medan: FISIP USU.
- Ruggiero, T.E. (2000) "Uses and Gratifications Theory in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century", in *Mass Communication and Society*.
- Sikumbang, A., T. "Hubungan Pola Menonton Sinetron Keagamaan di Televisi dengan Pengamalan Agama Masyarakat di Kota Medan," in *Analytica Islamica*, vol. 9, No. 1.

### **Internet**

<http://www.beritanet.com/Technology/Berita-IT/situs-pertemanan-email.html>. Diunduh 14 April 2015.

<http://www.nielsen.com/id/en/press-room/2014>, diunduh, 01 Mei 2015

REPUBLIKA.CO.ID. diunduh 03 Juni 2015

<http://zimmer.csufresno.edu/~johnca/spch100/7-4-use.htm>. Diunduh 02 Desember 2013.

<http://kbbi.web.id>

Biro Administrasi Akademik Universitas Sumatera Utara Tahun 2015.