

# Perception of Students of a Nigerian Federal University on Internet Censorship

O. T. Oladele<sup>1</sup>, R. A. Oyekunle<sup>2</sup> and B. A. Adebisi<sup>3</sup>

Department of Information and Communication Science,  
University of Ilorin,  
Ilorin, Kwara State,  
Nigeria

Email: <sup>1</sup>oladelemrs@yahoo.com,

<sup>2</sup>ummusumayyal@yahoo.com

<sup>3</sup>adebiyi\_basirat@yahoo.com

---

## ABSTRACT

*Censorship is one of the ways of curbing the threats posed by the internet on its users. However, the literate is rife with argument for and against the need for internet censorship in the educational system. This paper therefore investigates students' perception on internet censorship by conducting a descriptive research survey using a well-designed, structured questionnaire. A total number of two hundred and ten (210) copies of Questionnaires were administered and two hundred and two (202) copies were returned which constitute 3% of the sample size. Majority of the respondents said they were faced with the challenge of not getting the information they wanted when conducting research for school work. The data gathered were analyzed using a calculator. Results show that students do not want internet censorship adopted/enforced because they feel it can violate their civil rights. School authorities should make effort to adopt content regulation within the campus in order to control and prevent student from accessing illegal and harmful material which can affect them negatively also Government and school authorities should educate students on internet censorship by creating programs or seminar in order to create awareness about obscene contents and its effect on the students and society at large.*

**Keywords:** Internet Censorship, Nigerian Federal University, Questionnaire, Students

---

## African Journal of Computing & ICT Reference Format:

O. T. Oladele, R. A. Oyekunle and B. A. Adebisi (2019),  
Perception of Students of a Nigerian Federal University on  
Internet Censorship,  
*Afr. J. Comp. & ICT*, Vol.12, No. 3, pp. 18 - 31.

© Afr. J. Comp. & ICT, September 2019; ISSN 2006-1781

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Internet is the world's largest platform for free speech and expression. It is a highly interconnected network of millions of computers connected together

throughout the world to form what we call the World Wide Web. The advent of internet and ICT has expanded the frontiers of education globally. In fact ICT and internet have revolutionize almost all human areas of endeavor such as education and research in so many ways. However, the Internet also poses some threats to its

users in general and to education as a whole. It is claimed in [5] that a great deal of information is questionable, inaccurate or misleading, leaving teachers with the responsibility of teaching their students how to use the internet in a respectable manner. Also, teachers have to update themselves on technological development. The various threats that come with internet usage has led government of various countries such as China and Saudi Arabia to cut down on what people can experience when they go online. Censorship came as a result of concerns raised by groups such as parents, teachers and the clergy as well as politicians, political candidates, law-enforcement officials, school administrators or board members and trustees of various organizations [4].

There are various reasons for censorship; sometimes information is censored because of political, social, economic, religious, philosophical, moral, ideological, military, corporate, and educational reasons, where people feel some information from the internet offers an attack on themselves and their personal values. There has been evidence of the internet being an environment that is filled with illicit issues such as pornography and formulas for drugs or bomb, and where rapist stalk innocent people, so there is need for censorship in those areas. In the process of sweeping website areas that deserve censorship it may hinder websites that offer positive, helpful information that can be of great benefit mostly to students. Another important argument supporting internet censorship is that there is a general agreement on the need to intensify efforts to combat cyber-crime mainly because the growth of the Internet has created opportunities for cyber hackers and criminals [3].

Internet censorship may be necessary in the Education system when students are exposed to information that can be used as a vehicle for criminal activities and terrorism. Information over the Internet is controlled because open communication technology carries a certain amount of potentially harmful or illegal content [12]. Universities have however been regarded as upholders of free speech and as a place where censorship is undesirable because students are given the freedom to explore differing opinions but with the thought that hate speech will increase, this act is often questionable by the government[15]. In addition, it is argued in [11] that students need to be given the freedom, responsibility, and training to make good decisions instead of practicing censorship. The reason being real learning, the genuine practice of exercising one's ability to make good choices,

cannot occur in a protected and censored environment that never gives one the chance to make mistakes [11]

A study done by [10] on the concerns of internet usage that led to censorship of the internet focused on a wide range of topics, including pornography, hate speech, and bomb-making instructions. He also noted that the justification for censorship of such content is that it would lead to a greater social good, even if individuals are limited in what they can consume on the internet. Hence, internet censorship movements have taken a major form to limit what can be viewed or what can be posted on the internet. According to [11], it noted that library training inculcates support of free, uncensored access to information for children, as well as for adults, regardless of format. Thus, the existence of potentially objectionable materials should not be used as a reason to deny children access to the Internet. He also argues that students need to be given the freedom, responsibility, and training to make good decisions instead of practicing censorship. The reason being that real learning, the genuine practice of exercising one's ability to make good choices, cannot occur in a protected and censored environment that never gives one the chance to make mistakes. Based on the fact that there is a thin line between those against and those in support of internet censorship as cited by the above mentioned scholars.

The Internet has become the primary medium of information exchange in the world which has attracted lots of good and offensive materials by various users, which brings forth the need for internet censorship in various sectors in Nigeria. But there is a low level of adoption of internet censorship in the Educational sector in Nigeria most especially in tertiary institutions. The censoring of contents in tertiary institutes will help reduction of student getting biased information online; it will also eliminate obtrusive content such as pornography, hate speeches, and bomb making. It will also eliminate theft of digitized information.

However, internet censorship brings with it disrespect for private life and dignity of human beings, it also blocks useful content that might be beneficial to students thereby restricting the level at which they can source for information online[14]. In [16], the effect of Internet censorship on freedom of expression in African countries was carried out. The authors observed that Internet Censorship in Nigeria continue to constitute a threat to freedom of expression in general and Internet freedom in particular. The theory of structural threats was applied to

Internet research in [18]. The study examined the impact of internet censorship on young adults' political expression and protest, using a web survey of university students in China.

Among other things, results show that Internet censorship as an intended threat leads to political protest, but the relationship between Internet censorship and political protest is mediated through online political expression. The implications of the results for freedom of speech and Internet regulation under an authoritarian regime were also discussed. It is reported in [20] that only two countries (South Africa and Kenya) have free cyberspaces. The rest of African countries are rated not free or partially free, in terms of Internet freedom. It goes without saying that this poor performance has mainly been due to the African countries' adoption of very stringent cyber laws and draconian approaches to dealing with (perceived) abuses of the Internet.

In the light of the above, there is a need to find out student's perception on internet censorship in the University of Ilorin, considering the merits and demerits that come with internet censorship if they feel they want it adopted in the University or not. This research intends to add to the body of knowledge on the adoption of internet censorship in the University of Ilorin and also to recognize the perception of University of Ilorin students on Internet Censorship. This study will create awareness on the benefits and dangers of internet censorship to the students and the university as a whole. We therefore formulate two hypotheses:

H0: There is no significant relationship between information students think should be censored and their faculty.

H1: There is a significant relationship between information students think should be censored and their faculty.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Censorship is based on the fact that every society has customs, taboos or laws by which their speech, dress, religious observance, and sexual expressions are regulated in order to protect the family, religious bodies and the society at large according to [8]. According to [4], Censorship is no longer restricted to printed media and

videos. Its effect is felt much more strongly with regard to Internet related resources of information and communication such as access to websites, email and social networking tools which is more enhanced by abundant access through mobile phones and tablets. Every ethnic group in Nigeria has its own unique cultural heritage and stories of where its ancestors came from. These vary from tales of people descending from the sky to stories of migration from far-off places. This, to a very great extent, regulates the kind of information that is allowed to circulate in the Nigerian society, as there is need for tolerance of all cultures for the purpose of peaceful co-existence. It is hoped that in this age of information explosion and overload in Nigeria, censorship is inevitable else, some information disseminated would do more harm than good.

Censorship can be prior or post; **Prior censorship:** This is when an information material is being banned or censored before publication. This may be done by publishers, government and its agencies, organizations, individuals, religious or other associations, etc. and may be done by force or negotiations. **Post censorship** is when an information material is banned or censored after it has been published. A good example is the banning of Idris Abdulkareem' Nigeria djagha djagha by the then President Olusegun Obasanjo.

### Censorships in the Nigerian society

Moral censorship is the banning of materials because they are morally objectionable to some of the cultural norms in the Nigerian society, knowing that Nigeria is a heterogeneous society, having numerous sets of norms and values. Military censorship is the banning of information materials that tend to expose military tactics and national information for security reasons. Political censorship occurs when the Nigerian government needs to keep secrets from its civilians in order to prevent disruption. Religious censorship is the banning of materials because they are religiously questionable. Corporate censorship is used by Corporations to ban materials unfitting to them or their partners. Internet censorship is the control of what can be accessed, published, or viewed on the internet enacted by regulators or their own initiative.

### Methods of censorship in Nigeria

There are various ways materials are being censored in Nigeria. Some of this ways are:

Self-censorship can be part of the price of rational dialogue. The artist Ben Shahn's poster illustration reads: "You have not converted a man because you have silenced him." Silence can indicate a forced assent, or conversely, it can be contemplative, a necessary part of dialogue that rises above the disturbance of everyday life. Censorship through consensus there is the adherence to a shared social, though not religious, code as a fact of life in Nigeria. Understanding that entails discerning where the boundaries of expression are, and where they might be interfered with in a consensus situation. Economic/political censorship individuals tend to censor information for economic or political reasons. In a situation where there is economic censorship, it is either isolated or undertaken in conjunction with some type of political censorship.

### Concept of Internet Censorship

Internet censorship involves limiting the information that can be accessed online to some degree for a variety of different reasons [4]. Making any type of information or website not accessible to online users is a form of censorship. This is due to the fact that censorship simply involves the suppression of publishing or accessing content on the internet. This means that the content or subject matter that is censored could be done at either time of publishing or site controls designed to inhibit accessing in some form. Having administrative control over the information that can be accessed online is not seen as ideal by many, but it is seen as necessary by others.

### How Internet Censorship Works

Censorship on the Internet can be done in a number of ways including filtering and denial-of-service attacks, as well as through harassment of those who publish information online (i.e. through fear). Filtering is the technical blockage of the free flow of information across the Internet. The following filtering mechanisms are known: **TCP/IP header filtering**: the censor's router can inspect the Internet Protocol [IP] address and port number of the destination. If the destination is found to be on a blacklist, the connection is dropped or redirected to a page indicating that access to the destination is denied. **TCP/IP content filtering**: is a similar method to header filtering except that the censor's router inspects the packet contents for any patterns or keywords that may be blacklisted. The focus is not on content, but rather on where packets are going to or coming from. **Hyper Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP) Proxy Filtering**: in some cases, users are forced to use HTTP proxies that are

assigned for accessing the Internet. Those proxies may be the only way to reach the Internet and hence they can monitor all traffic that goes through them. Such a method is more powerful than TCP/IP header and DNS filtering.

**Denial-of-Service (DoS) attacks**: Denial-of-service attacks can be launched on the host server. Such attacks are usually done by having a large number of computers requesting service from a particular server and hence, overwhelming it with too much traffic which causes the server and its connection to stall.

**Server takedown**: Through legal, extra-legal or pressure methods, a company hosting a specific server could take it down and disconnect it from the Internet. The owner of the server may be able to transfer the server's contents, however – provided that a backup copy exists – to another hosting company within hours. **Social techniques** includes the requirement to show photo identification (ID) before using public computers at libraries or Internet cafés; social or religious norms that force Internet users to avoid opening particular content are another form of social censorship. Families that place the computer in the living room to enable monitoring of their children's use of the Internet are another example of a social technique of censorship. Lastly, **Self-censorship** is another filtering technique that is practiced by online discussion forum moderators, who often remove contributions that could lead to the blocking of their websites.

### Nontechnical means of censorship:

This method is usually implemented by the government of a country; it could be a use of force and terrorization through threats, beatings, prosecutions, offline surveillance and similar policies that target online journalists, bloggers and cyber activists. [2] Concluded that such acts contribute greatly to increasing levels of self-censorship. A growing number of countries worldwide are imposing mandatory requirements on Internet service providers to prevent their subscribers from accessing overseas content that would be banned under local laws. It is well known that undemocratic states such as China implement online censorship; but a number of democracies with constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression are also imposing digital filters. Some countries have further put pressure on Web publishers to remove content hosted outside their jurisdiction. Another simple form of nontechnical means of censorship is done by either charging exorbitant fees for accessing the Internet or by confining access to selected populations such as universities.

### Merits of Internet Censorship

One of the major concerns of Internet as stated in [7] is that the internet can serve as a platform where anyone can post a professional-looking website that contains biased, incorrect, or dangerous information. Therefore, there is serious concern especially when it comes to letting students use the Web, because the credibility of some websites is questionable. Thus it is often argued that censorship may be useful when it comes to students. Hence, Internet censorship movements have taken major forms to limit what can be viewed or what can be posted on the Internet.

**Theft of digitized information:** Entertainment, software, and other commercial industries have sought to capitalize on new means of distributing their products through digital networks, because they face the problem of theft of intellectual property as well as copyright violations. It is stated in [9] that there is a major concern that once information is digitized and placed on distributed networks, it is easy to duplicate and distribute, therefore it is deemed that censorship could help in that situation. **Racist activities:** Flyers and pamphlets that had traditionally been distributed locally by hand and had limited visibility can now be distributed and accessed globally through the Internet [1]. This is a great advantage of the Internet to reach masses of people instantly. However, alongside this is a founded prediction that the dissemination of racist content and other undesirable material would increase with the rapid growth of Internet use around the globe; this may force censorship to be implemented. **Offensive materials explored by university student on campus:** For centuries universities have been regarded as upholders of free speech and as places where censorship is undesirable because students are given the freedom to explore differing opinions. However, this attitude was developed at a time when information flowed less freely than in today's world of the Internet [15]. The communal nature of academia further complicates matters because controversial information is often accessed in computer labs, potentially exposing other computer users to information they may find offensive [15]. In such situations, Internet censorship is seen as a solution to the situation.

**Distribution of Illegal Information Related to Criminal Acts and Drug Abuse:** The Internet is also a platform filled with illicit issues such as illegal information on criminal acts and formulas for drugs or bombs, where pedophiles and rapists stalk the innocent and is marked by disorder and lawlessness [6]. These negative views about

the Internet tend to influence what happens at the school level because even though there are useful educational programs available through the Internet, these negative vibes pose challenges to parents, teachers and school librarians about the use of the Internet by students.

### Demerits of Internet Censorship

People refuse to accept internet censorship as this affects some internet advantages and opportunities that are beneficial to its users. **Government limiting internet access to some part of a population:** Some governments go beyond ensuring a safe environment for minors and traders, and limit the liberalizing effect of the Internet by denying access to entire segments of their populations, such as the government of China. **Negative effect on final year project:** Internet filtering will hinder the extent to which a final year student can explore the internet to get full-bodied access to material to assist with their research. A filter software blocking keywords such as marijuana, will make it difficult for a student researching on the topic Marijuana: Facts for Teenagers. **Violations on users' right:** These violations have to do with Surveillance, Privacy, and Anonymity.

### Theoretical framework on internet Censorship

The theory of Censorship takes into action the reasons for censorship, the stakeholder's involved and its impact on them [13]. The instances of censorship or a ban occur if an idea is perceived to be harmful to a person or a group's sensibility and this is not a contemporary phenomenon. Any ban imposed has to be viewed from the perspective of two primary variables. First, the effectiveness of the ban: this relates to the effectiveness with which subject of the ban is actually prohibited. Second, the discoverability of the ban which indicates how much of banners' actions are discoverable. Therefore, if the primary variables of a ban are effectiveness and discoverability, the output variables can be of three types. The first is support, Bans pronounced with the intentions of expressing support to key allies or interest groups. The second is deterrence. Bans imposed to deter individuals or group of individuals from repeating things that led to the ban. The third is retribution, the classic tit-for-tat where a ban is imposed is merely an act of retribution.

The first type is a public ban. This is a ban that is effective and discoverable. The topic of the ban leaves popular consciousness, and the actions of the authority enforcing the ban are clearly visible. Examples of such a ban include removal of a book by ordering the pulping of it.

The second type is a signalling ban. Signalling bans are ineffective and discoverable i.e., the topic of the ban fails to leave popular consciousness, but the actions of the authority is visible. Typically this kind of ban is promulgated to signal disassociation from a particular topic. With the advent of internet, most bans acquire a signalling characteristic except those that necessitate physical presence. The third type of ban is a futile ban. These are neither effective nor discoverable. This case is presented for theoretical completeness for it is hard to observe examples that fall under this category and if there are any, as the name suggests, they are futile.

The fourth type of ban is a perfect ban. The primary variables will naturally lead to us defining an 'ideal' case. An ideal ban or a perfect ban is one that is completely effective (100 percent) and has zero discoverability i.e. the subject is completely removed and citizens are not aware of the existence of the subject. Idealized conditions allow us to arrive at simplified models devoid of 'noise'. The example for a perfect ban is one such case—"several classified documents whose existence is not known fall under this category [13].

### III. METHODOLOGY

To investigate the university of Ilorin students' perception on internet censorship, a descriptive research survey was employed. Four faculties were selected from a total of 15 faculties in the University of Ilorin. The four faculties are faculty of communication and information sciences, faculty of law, faculty of pharmacy and faculty of social science. A total number of six thousand seven hundred and one students registered for the 2016/2017 academic session in the four faculties out of which 202 students were sampled based on 3% of the registered students in each of the four faculties. A 23 items questionnaire modified from previous studies was used to collect data on demographic information, sources of information, blocked information, awareness and students' perception on internet censorship. Data analysis was performed using a calculator. The data were organized, summarized and presented using descriptive statistics of frequencies and simple percentage count in tables. Test statistics like p-value coupled with 5% level of significance were used to decide whether or not to accept or reject the stated

hypothesis. The hypotheses are assumed to be correct until/unless proven otherwise.

### IV. RESULTS

The results of data analysis are depicted in Table 2. The result of the analysis shows that, there is a perfect relationship among the identified variables because the P-value of all the variables gives a significant value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05. Since the  $p < .05$ , then null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) is rejected while alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) is accepted.

### V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Findings from this study revealed that some of the respondents' source for information through social network, search engine, television, newspaper, information from website of an organization and some of these sources are very reliable. Some of the respondents said they don't get the information they need from these sources and they don't know why therefore making them angry. More than half of the respondents said they are aware of internet censorship and they got to know through class lecture, friends, experience and online reading. The study reveals that racists' activities, materials on terrorists talk, pornography, hate speech, illegal criminal activities, material on drug use and bomb making instructions are seen on the internet. Some respondents want drug use, bomb making instructions, terrorists' talks, hate speech, pornography, racists' activities and illegal criminal activities to be censored in tertiary institutions. Furthermore some respondents support internet censorship while some said they are interested in sensitive topics. Lastly more than half of the respondents claimed there is no internet censorship in university of Ilorin and a significant percentage said they don't want its adoption in university of Ilorin.

From this research work, we found out that

Firstly, students mostly use social networks and search engine to source for information when doing research or assignments and this finding supports the claim in [17] which says that internet is a collection of various services and resources. Also, the students believe that the information from social networks and search engines are a very reliable.

Secondly, most times student face challenges of not getting a result for what they search for online while

doing assignments, reason for this is unknown to them. Students said the information they got are sometimes biased, untrustworthy, misleading and inaccurate. This result is in agreement with the findings in [5] which states that great deal of information on the internet are of questionable value, inaccurate and misleading. Furthermore the study revealed that unlawful or harmful content usually gets deleted online or not found online. E.g. intellectual property of others, translation of languages, latest news, aged data and irrelevant news. Vulgar materials are mostly commonly deleted materials known to the student.

Thirdly, this finding has shown that most students know about internet censorship. They got to know it via various platforms such as reading it online (which have the highest proportion of students), class lecture, experience, from friends.

Furthermore, the study revealed that students often come across racist activities and Terrorist Talks while hate speech, drug use and illegal information on criminal act, pornography are occasionally seen and it is interesting to also remark that this finding corroborates the findings in [5]. The students have different perspective about these obtrusive materials, some are okay with, some are not while others do not mind because they claimed it doesn't disturb them. However students want any form of obscene information to be censored in a tertiary institution which is in agreement with the report in [12] which states that information is controlled because open communication technology carries a certain amount of potentially harmful and illegal content.

Lastly, the study revealed that most student think internet censorship is necessary and they do not mind if it is implemented because it does not annoy them although they are mostly interested in sensitive topics. Also, students perceive internet censorship as a right and moral act and should be allowed. They also agreed that internet censorship is not against their freedom of expression which is a contraction of the result in [11]. In addition, most students agreed that there is internet censorship in Nigeria; they claimed that there is no internet censorship when using the University of Ilorin Network and the study also revealed that most University of Ilorin students do not want the adoption of the internet censorship in the campus.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, even though some students want internet censorship to be implemented in the university of Ilorin because it is considered as a right and moral act which can protect teenagers from accessing illegal or harmful material which can be harmful to them and the society at large; majority of students don't want the adoption of internet censorship because they feel it can violate their civil rights such as freedom of access to information among others. Based on the findings of this study the following recommendations are made

- i. Student should explore other sources of information such as Television, Radio, and Newspapers among others while they are sourcing for information to help with their school work.
- ii. School authorities should make effort to adopt content regulation within the campus in order to control and prevent student from accessing illegal and harmful material which can affect them negatively.
- iii. Government and school authorities should educate students on internet censorship by creating programs or seminar in order to create awareness about obscene contents and its effect on the students and society at large.
- iv. Government should see internet or contents censorship as a national obligation in order to ensure national security and promote morality in our tertiary institutions.
- v. School authorities should make sure that sensitive contents or academic related material are available and accessible by students while trying to filter and regulate contents.
- vi. Individual should practice self-censorship as Government cannot fully achieve it alone
- vii. Government should enact law that hinders citizen from accessing illegal and harmful information online.
- viii. School authorities should make sure that freedom of speech is still upheld in the university but in a controlled manner.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Akdeniz., “Governing racist content on the Internet: national and international responses”, *University of New Brunswick Law Journal*, 56, 103-161, 2007.
- [2] W. Al-Saqaf, A. Grönlund, R. Heacock, D. Sasaki, J. Hellström. “Increasing transparency and fighting corruption through ICT empowering people and communities”, *SPIDER ICT4D*, Series, 3, 2010.
- [3] S.Bihani, S. Hamilton. “Third meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)”, *IFLA Journal*, 35(1), 59-62, 2009.
- [4] .C. M. L. Bitso, I. Fourie, and T. J. D. Bothma. “Trends in transition from classical censorship to Internet censorship: selected country overviews”, *IFLA-FAIFE SPOTLIGHT*, 1-18, 2013.
- [5] G. Chapman. “Federal Support for Technology in K-12 Education”. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, 307-343, 2000.
- [6] A. Clyde. “Censorship or protection? Children and access to the Internet”,. *Emergency Librarian*, 24(3), 48-50, 1997.
- [7] S. M. Colaric. Instruction for web searching: An empirical study. *College & Research Libraries*, 64(2), 111-122, 2003.
- [8] Dafiaghor, Kose Famous. Censorship of information and the Nigerian society. *International NGO Journal Vol. 6(7)*, 159-165, 2011
- [9] R. Deibert. Black code: censorship, surveillance and the militarisation of cyberspace. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 32(3), 501-530, 2003
- [10] C. A. Depken II . “Who supports Internet censorship?”, *First Monday*, 11(4), 2006. Retrieved February 12, 2012,
- [11] D. Johnson. “Internet filters: censorship by any other name?”, *Emergency Librarian*, 25(5), 11-13,1998.
- [12] McLeod, D. M., Eveland Jr, W. P., & Nathanson, A. I. Support for censorship of violent and misogynic rap lyrics: An analysis of the third-person effect. *Communication Research*, 24(2), 153-174, 2010.
- [13] V. Ramachandra. “A theory of censorship”,. *The Indian National interest review*.
- [14] D. Rajiv. “Education Awareness/ science and technology/ Internet Censorship”, Virtic M. P. DIVAI 2012 - 9th International Scientific Conference on Distance Learning in Applied Informatics, 2012.
- [15] A. Peace. “Balancing free speech and censorship: academia's response to the Internet”, *Comm. of the ACM*, 46(11), 105-109, 2003.
- [16] A. L. Vareba, V. P. Nwinaene and S. B. Theophilus. “Internet Censorship and freedom of Expression in Nigeria”, *International Journal of Media, Journalism and Mass Communication(IJMJC)*, 3(2), 25-30, 2017.
- [17] M. Deore. “The Educational Advantages of Using Internet”, *PVDT College of Education for Women*, SNDT Women’s University, Mumbai-20,Maharashtra, India, 2012.
- [18] J. Lu, Y. Zhao. “Implicit and Explicit Control: Modeling the Effect of Internet Censorship on Political Protest in China”, *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 3294–3316, 2018.
- [19] S. Y. Lee. “Surviving online censorship in China: Three satirical tactics and their impact”, *China Quarterly*, 228, 1061–1080, 2016.
- [20] Freedom on the Net (2016). *Silencing the Messenger: Communication apps under threat*. London: Freedom House



Figure 1: Theoretical framework on internet Censorship [13]

Table1: shows the reliability results of the Reliability coefficient:

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Information sources	.725	8
Reliability of the information sources	.803	8
Frequency of seeing Obtrusive materials online	.921	7
Materials to be censored in tertiary institutions	.879	7
Opinion about internet censorship	.865	8

Table 2: Data Analysis

		Faculty	Drug Use	Bomb making instructions	Terrorist Talks	Pornography	Hate speech	Racist activities	Illegal information on criminal acts
Faculty	Pearson Correlation	1	-.027	-.090	.017	-.039	-.026	.022	-.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.708	.219	.818	.596	.724	.764	.634
	N	202	189	190	183	191	185	190	186
Drug Use	Pearson Correlation	-.027	1	.011	.187*	-.019	-.067	.232**	.270**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.708		.886	.011	.798	.368	.001	.000
	N	189	189	184	183	184	182	185	184
Bomb making instructions	Pearson Correlation	-.090	.011	1	.374**	.317**	.401**	.336**	.413**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.219	.886		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	190	184	190	182	186	183	187	185
Terrorist Talks	Pearson Correlation	.017	.187*	.374**	1	.145	.423**	.380**	.401**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.818	.011	.000		.052	.000	.000	.000
	N	183	183	182	183	181	181	183	182
Pornography	Pearson Correlation	-.039	-.019	.317**	.145	1	.311**	.296**	.290**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.596	.798	.000	.052		.000	.000	.000
	N	191	184	186	181	191	183	187	184
Hate speech	Pearson Correlation	-.026	-.067	.401**	.423**	.311**	1	.406**	.423**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.724	.368	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	185	182	183	181	183	185	184	182
Racist activities	Pearson Correlation	.022	.232**	.336**	.380**	.296**	.406**	1	.369**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.764	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	190	185	187	183	187	184	190	185
Illegal information on criminal acts	Pearson Correlation	-.035	.270**	.413**	.401**	.290**	.423**	.369**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.634	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	186	184	185	182	184	182	185	186

Table 3: Frequency distribution of where students source for information and how frequent they make use of them

Information Source	Often		Occasionally		Never	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Television	54	26.7	123	60.9	25	12.4
Newspapers	42	20.8	107	53.0	53	26.2
Radio	45	22.3	105	52.0	52	25.7
Social networks	153	75.7	44	21.8	5	2.5
News that pop in chat applications	102	50.5	65	32.2	35	17.4
Search Engine (e.g. Google, yahoo etc.)	151	74.8	43	21.3	8	4.0
Official Websites of an Organization	82	40.6	92	45.5	28	13.9
Online Library (e.g. OPAC)	36	17.8	92	45.5	74	36.6

Table 4: Frequency of how Students searched for something online and couldn't get any result

Have you ever searched online for a research for school work with no result	Frequency	Percent
Yes	135	66.8
No	67	33.2
Total	202	100

Table 5: frequency of how students are awareness of Internet Censorship

Do you know about internet censorship	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Yes	99	49%	52.1%
No	91	45%	47.9%

Table 6: Frequency of How often students come across the following materials on the internet?

How often student's come across the following materials on the internet?	Often		Occasionally		Rarely		Never	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Drug use	61	30.2	68	33.7	47	23.3	26	12.9
Bomb making instructions	27	13.4	30	14.9	51	25.2	90	44.6
Terrorist Talks	68	33.7	42	20.8	51	25.2	41	20.3
Pornography	53	26.2	67	33.2	53	26.2	29	14.4
Hate speech	51	25.2	61	30.2	45	22.3	45	22.3
Racist activities	69	34.2	56	27.7	44	21.8	33	16.4
Illegal information on Criminal Acts	62	30.7	66	32.7	43	21.3	31	15.4

Table 7: Frequency of information students think should be censored in a tertiary institution

Information to be censored	Censor		Do not censor	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
Drug use	111	55.0	91	45
Bomb making instructions	143	70.8	59	29.2
Terrorist Talks	107	53.0	95	47
Pornography	151	74.8	51	25.2
Hate speech	129	63.9	73	36.1
Racist activities	128	63.4	74	36.6
Illegal information on Criminal Acts	128	63.4	74	36.6