



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Subramanian, A., Kodavati, K. P., Kanchustambam, J. & Gothwal, V. K. (2024). Social media use and vision impairment in adults between the ages of 18 and 35 years in India. *Optometry and Vision Science*, 101(6), pp. 329-335. doi: 10.1097/OPX.0000000000002098

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/33063/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1097/OPX.0000000000002098>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

Title of the paper

Social Media Use and Vision Impairment in Adults between the Ages of 18 to 35 Years **in**

India: Enablers and Barriers

Short title

Social Media Use and Vision Impairment

Ahalya Subramanian¹ BS, PhD

Krishna Priya Kodavati,^{2,3} BS

Jahnvi Kanchustambam^{2,3} BS

Vijaya K Gothwal,^{2,3} PhD, FAAO

¹Centre for Applied Vision Research, School of Health and Psychological Sciences, City, University of London, United Kingdom

²Meera and L B Deshpande Centre for Sight Enhancement, Institute for Vision Rehabilitation

³Brien Holden Eye Research Centre – Patient Reported Outcomes Unit, L V Prasad Eye Institute, Hyderabad, India

Total number of words: **3913**

Number of tables: 3

Number of figures: 2

Corresponding author: Ahalya Subramanian

Ahalya.Subramanian.1@city.ac.uk

Department of Optometry and Visual Sciences
School of Health and Psychological Sciences
Northampton Square, City, City, University of London
United Kingdom
London EC1V OHB

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Social media use is popular with an estimated 4.48 billion people using it in one form or the
3 other.¹ Social media '*are Internet-based channels that allow users to opportunistically interact*
4 *and selectively self-present, either in real-time or asynchronously, with both broad and narrow*
5 *audiences who derive value from user-generated content and the perception of interaction*
6 *with others*'.² There are several types of social media with the most popular channels being
7 networking sites (e.g. Facebook) and communication platforms (e.g. WhatsApp). Previous
8 studies have demonstrated the positive impact of social media on the overall quality of life of
9 adults in the general population. For example, using Facebook has been associated with
10 increased self-esteem,³ improved social support,^{4,5} and life satisfaction.⁶ However, studies
11 have also highlighted the adverse impact of social media such as social pressure and stress.
12 ^{7,8}

13 Although there is widespread use of social media in the general population, some groups may
14 struggle to use social media due to their disabilities.⁹ This could be particularly problematic for
15 the 2.2 billion people globally with a vision impairment because the use of social media
16 happens predominantly through electronic devices such as smartphones and tablet
17 computers;¹⁰ some individuals with vision impairment may not have access to these devices.¹¹
18 Access issues could be as a result of financial barriers brought about by higher unemployment
19 in vision impaired individuals ¹², level of vision impairment, the accessibility functions of the
20 device ¹³, and the screen size of the device. Previous researchers have shown that people
21 with vision impairment use social media despite accessibility issues.^{14,15} This is largely as a
22 result of in-built accessibility options such as text-to speech, screen readers and written
23 descriptions of photo content which can be read aloud via text-to-speech allowing even those
24 with very poor levels of vision to access content via audio description.

25 Several previous studies have investigated platform accessibility or the use of specific
26 platforms such as Facebook^{15,16} but very few have investigated which social media platforms
27 individuals with vision impairment use, what they use these platforms for, and the benefits of

28 social media use for this group of people.^{17,18} More importantly, a majority of studies have
29 been conducted in high income countries and very few have been conducted in lower- and
30 middle-income countries, such as India.^{17,18} In addition, studies carried out in lower- and
31 middle-income countries are limited by their sample size.^{15,19} With rapid improvements in
32 technology, it is important to update the literature on social media use in adults with vision
33 impairment. Although some studies have compared social media use in adults with vision
34 impairment to findings from the general population,^{19,20} no studies have addressed the
35 comparison of social media use among adults with vision impairment and age-matched groups
36 with normal vision from a similar environment.

37 Understanding social media use among individuals with vision impairment is important given
38 the potential benefits offered by social media such as improved wellbeing,²¹ and life
39 satisfaction all of which can be impacted for individuals with vision impairment.^{6,22-24} Thus,
40 data on social media use in individuals with vision impairment in India was gathered as part of
41 a larger cross-sectional study investigating the effects of social media and social networks on
42 loneliness in adults between the ages of 18 to 35 years with vision impairment. Loneliness
43 may be a concern for individuals with vision impairment, as vision is an important sensory
44 modality for interpersonal interactions and social communication. In this report, we present
45 the demographic profile and patterns of social media use among adults with vision impairment
46 aged 18 to 35 years and compare it to an age-matched normally sighted group. In addition,
47 we explored the barriers to use of social media among adults with vision impairment. We
48 envisage that the results from this study will contribute to a more accurate understanding of
49 the use of social media in individuals with vision impairment.

50

51 **METHODS**

52 Included participants were adults aged 18 to 35 years with vision impairment, users and non-
53 users of social media, and were able to converse in English or one of the local languages
54 (Hindi, Telugu). Participants with known additional disability (such as hearing, motor,

55 intellectual) were excluded. In addition, we recruited age-matched normally sighted healthy
56 peers (self-reported normal vision) in the control group. Individuals with vision impairment
57 were recruited from the Institute for Vision Rehabilitation at the L V Prasad Eye Institute
58 (LVPEI), Hyderabad, India. The centre provides multidisciplinary care for individuals with
59 vision impairment. Age and gender matched participants with normal vision (control group)
60 were recruited from the caregiver population attending the Institute for Vision Rehabilitation
61 along with individuals with vision impairment and from the staff at LVPEI.

62 The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the LVPEI, Hyderabad, India,
63 and the research adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. Written informed consent
64 was obtained from all participants. Participants answered a questionnaire which was produced
65 in three languages (English, Hindi and Telugu) to make it as inclusive as possible to the
66 potential recruitment pool. The questionnaire was developed by the research team after
67 reviewing the literature and in consultation with a visually impaired service user who regularly
68 used social media. A pilot version of the questionnaire was trialled on six representative
69 participants and minor changes (in wording) were suggested that were incorporated into the
70 final version. The questionnaire could either be completed by the participants themselves
71 (normally sighted group) or with the help of a research assistant who read the questionnaire
72 out aloud and recorded responses (vision impairment group). The administration of the
73 questionnaire took about thirty minutes. The questionnaire data was collected between August
74 2021 to November 2021.

75 The initial part of the questionnaire collected demographic data such as age, educational level,
76 employment status, and duration of vision loss (only applicable to the vision impairment
77 group). Following on participants were asked which electronic devices they owned, for
78 example, a computer and whether they had access to the internet. Participant's use of social
79 media platforms was then examined. They were asked which social media platforms they used
80 and how often they used them for, for example, once a day. To qualify as a non-user of social
81 media participants had to answer 'None' to all 4 questions which enquired about the use of

82 various social media platforms. Where applicable, participants were also asked how long they
83 spent on these platforms daily, for example, less than 30 minutes and what they used them
84 for, for example, obtaining information. Finally, they were asked about barriers to using social
85 media, for example, costs associated with data usage. This question applied to all users even
86 if they did not use social media. A copy of the questionnaire (Appendix 1) is available at
87 <http://links.lww.com/OPX/>.

88 It should be noted that the term accessibility as used in our study relates to individuals being
89 able to visually access the content of social media or access to internet/Wireless-Fidelity (Wi-
90 Fi)/devices. It does not refer to access related to psychosocial factors, such as depression,
91 loneliness and isolation.

92 **Statistical Analyses**

93 All data was entered into an excel spreadsheet. Differences between the group with vision
94 impairment and the normally sighted control group for users of social media, and between the
95 two vision impairment groups (social media users; non-social media users) were explored
96 using the independent t-test or Chi-square test. No formal statistics were carried out to check
97 for differences between the groups that did not use social media as the numbers were small
98 particularly in the normally sighted group (vision impairment =39; normally sighted=4).
99 Statistical significance was set at $P<.05$.

100 **RESULTS**

101 **Demographic data**

102 In total, 422 individuals (201 visually impaired; 221 normally sighted) participated, of whom
103 379 (89.8%) used social media (162 visually impaired; 217 normally sighted). Participant
104 characteristics and social media usage are listed in Table 1. No statistically significant
105 differences were found the two groups who were social media users in terms of their age
106 (vision impairment group= 24.5 ± 4.89 , control group 25.2 ± 4.67 ; $P=.16$), socioeconomic
107 status ($P=.47$), or educational qualifications ($P=.17$) Social media users with vision

108 impairment were less likely to be in employment (n=93; 57% unemployment) when compared
109 to the control group (n=58; 27% unemployment) ($P<.001$). Interestingly in the vision
110 impairment group that were not social media users, the unemployment rate was lower (n=12;
111 30.7% unemployment).

112 Normally sighted individuals (n=217; 98%) were more likely to be social media users when
113 compared to individuals with vision impairment (n=162; 80.6%) ($P<.01$). Gender differences
114 in social media use were also found, but only for the group with vision impairment. There was
115 a male preponderance in the visually impaired social media user group (n=137; 85%).
116 However, there was no such difference in the control group (n=109 male; 50% and n=108
117 female; 50%). Also, there were no gender differences between the visually impaired
118 individuals (54% male; 46% female) and control group (50% male; 50% female) who were not
119 social media users.

120 The duration of sight loss in the groups with vision impairment (social media user and non-
121 social media user) ranged from less than one year to greater than ten years. Approximately
122 half of each group had vision impairment since childhood and no significant differences were
123 found between the two groups ($P=.33$). The level of vision impairment in these groups ranged
124 from mild to profound loss. Significant differences were found in visual status between the
125 vision impairment group that were social media users and those who were not ($P<.001$). Figure
126 2 shows the distribution of the level of vision impairment among social media users and non-
127 users. As can be seen from the figure, social media users were more likely to have moderate
128 vision impairment. By comparison, non-users were more likely to have severe or profound
129 vision impairment.

130 Individuals in both social media user groups had access to a variety of technology including
131 desktop and laptop computers. Smartphones were the most popular device used (vision
132 impairment = 161; 99%; control= 206; 95%) with tablet PC/iPad being the least popular (vision
133 impairment = 5; 3%; control= 12; 6%). No significant differences were found between device
134 usage in both groups ($P=.55$), however, the control group was more likely to own multiple

135 devices (two or more; $P=.009$). Although formal analysis was not conducted about device
136 usage on the groups that were not social media users, it was interesting to note that all controls
137 had access to some form of technology, 38.5% of individuals with vision impairment had no
138 access to technology.

139 Social media users had access to either Wi-Fi at work or at home or both or 3G/4G internet
140 and no significant difference in access were found between these groups ($P=.79$).

141 No significant differences were found between the frequency ($P=.24$), duration ($P=.38$) and
142 reasons ($P=.34$) for using these platforms. Nearly 80% of all individuals across both groups
143 used these platforms either between 2-5 times/day or greater than 5 times/day. The duration
144 of use varied with one-third of participants across both groups spending between 30-60
145 minutes/day, whilst the other third spent greater than 2 hours/day.

146 **Barriers to use of social media**

147 Approximately one-third of individuals across both groups who used social media reported
148 barriers to use (vision impairment =48, 29.6%; control=74, 34%) and this was statistically
149 significant between the groups ($P<.001$). Individuals with vision impairment were more likely
150 to cite accessibility issues of having to rely on audio rather than vision to navigate social media,
151 whereas the control group were more likely to report having to share a phone with another
152 family member (Figure 1).

153 **Social Networking and video/photo sharing platform**

154 Table 2 presents the usage of social networking and video/photo-sharing platform by the
155 visually impaired and normally sighted group. No significant differences were found either in
156 networking ($P=.15$) or video/photo sharing ($P=.17$) platform usage between the two groups.
157 Facebook was the most commonly used networking platform (vision impairment = 133; 82%;
158 control= 131; 60%) followed by Twitter (vision impairment = 35; 22%; control= 53; 24%).
159 YouTube was the most commonly used media/video/photo sharing platform (vision
160 impairment = 161; 99%; control= 203; 94%) followed by Instagram (vision impairment = 109;

161 67%; control= 134; 62%). Across both groups a majority of individuals (greater than 80%) used
162 these platforms to watch videos or movies. The second most common reason for using these
163 platforms (approximately 65%) was to obtain information. Individuals were less likely to use
164 these platforms for dating or peer support.

165 **Social media communication platform usage**

166 Table 3 presents the usage of social media (communication platform) by the visually impaired
167 and normally sighted group. Statistically significant differences were found between the
168 communication platform usage ($P=.001$) between the groups. Although the majority in both
169 groups used WhatsApp (97% or greater) to communicate, the differences were largely due to
170 other platforms that were also used in conjunction with WhatsApp. Vision impaired individuals
171 were more likely to use Google hangouts (vision impairment = 44; 27%; control= 39; 18 %),
172 whereas the control group were more likely to use Zoom (vision impairment = 51; 31%;
173 control= 99; 46%). No significant differences were also found in the reasons for using
174 communication platforms ($P=.99$). Unsurprisingly, a majority of individuals (85% or greater)
175 across both the groups used these platforms to keep in touch with friends and family.

176 **DISCUSSION**

177 The current study reports on the profile of social media users among visually impaired adults
178 aged 18 to 35 years in comparison to a normally sighted control group in India. To the best
179 of the author's knowledge this is the first time that control groups have been used.

180 Findings are in line with previous research which found that there is good uptake of social
181 media amongst users with vision impairment. In the current study, 81% of individuals with
182 vision impairment used social media. Brady et al. found a higher proportion (92%) but their
183 study was carried out in the United States and used a broader age range which may account
184 for the differences.¹⁴ Although the proportion of individuals with visual impairment using social
185 media was high in the current study, it was still not as high as the normally sighted control
186 group where almost everyone surveyed (98%) used social media. This proportion of usage is

187 substantially higher than the 33.4% reported for the general Indian population.²⁵ This is
188 unsurprising since India is a large country and there is likely to be significant variation across
189 the country. Our study sample was recruited from a large tertiary eye care centre and
190 consisted of caregivers of individuals with vision impairment and staff members working at the
191 institution. The findings suggest that there is still some ground to be covered before visually
192 impaired users reach the same level of social media penetration as their normally sighted
193 counterparts.

194 There were gender differences in social media use. Whilst no gender differences were found
195 for the control groups, there were substantially more males (85%) than females (15%) in the
196 visually impaired group that used social media. These findings are similar to those of Bashir
197 et al. whose study had 90% male participants.¹⁹ However, the findings are in contrast to that
198 of Brady et al. whose study had more female survey respondents (56%).¹⁴ The differences are
199 likely attributable to several factors: Firstly, the regional differences. While Brady et al's study
200 was carried out in the United States, the current study and that by Bashir et al were carried
201 out in the Indian subcontinent. Secondly, the source of participant recruitment. Our study
202 recruited visually impaired participants from a large tertiary eye centre and it is well established
203 that women are less likely to seek eye care than men,²⁶ and this may have resulted in a male
204 preponderance. Finally, the age group that was studied. Brady et al. recruited a wide age
205 range including adults over the age of 50, whereas we recruited adults aged 18-35 years and
206 Bashir et al. recruited university students.

207 There were some interesting findings regarding the employment status of participants with
208 vision impairment. Taken as a whole and combining groups, unsurprisingly, visually impaired
209 participants were less likely to be in employment when compared to their normally sighted
210 peers. This is in agreement with previous studies that have reported lower rates of
211 employment for vision impairment individuals compared to that of the general population.¹²
212 However, when individuals with vision impairment were separated into users and non-users
213 of social media, the number of unemployed visually impaired individuals in the non-user group

214 decreased to 30% which was similar to the 27% unemployment reported for the normally
215 sighted group. Given that the non-user visually impaired group was small (n=39) it is difficult
216 to understand why this might be the case; nonetheless, it was interesting to note that despite
217 being in a working environment at least some individuals with vision impairment did not use
218 any form of social media. Individuals with vision impairments who did not use social media
219 were more likely to have a severe or profound vision impairment when compared to visually
220 impaired individuals who used social media and were more likely to have a moderate vision
221 impairment. Although social media accessibility has been improving issues remain, for
222 example, in interpreting pictures and it is likely that as a result some individuals with vision
223 impairment do not use social media.²⁷ Some of the reasons for not using social media
224 included lack of access to Wi-Fi, 92% of visually impaired individuals did not have Wi-Fi; non-
225 ownership of appropriate devices: 38% of visually impaired individuals did not own a device;
226 49% had a keypad phone which would be unsuitable for browsing the internet and 10% owned
227 a smartphone but it is possible that screen size was a constraint limiting its use.

228 Both visually impaired individuals and normally sighted controls used social networking and
229 video/photo sharing sites in a similar way. Similar to previous research, Facebook was the
230 most popular networking site.¹⁴ The use of Twitter varies across studies in the literature. For
231 example, Brady et al found that 52% of their sample used Twitter, whereas Bashir et al found
232 that only 2% of individuals used Twitter. In our study, 22% of visually impaired adults reported
233 using Twitter.^{14,19} The differences in the usage rates of specific platforms are likely as a result
234 of differences in the populations and geographic regions studied, and the penetration of Twitter
235 in these countries. Unsurprisingly, YouTube was the most commonly used photo/video
236 sharing platform followed by Instagram. YouTube is considered to be the largest video
237 platform in the world with over one billion viewers and across both groups a majority of
238 individuals reported using these platforms either for obtaining information or for watching
239 videos and movies.²⁸

240 Some differences were found in the way in which individuals with vision impairment and
241 normally sighted controls use social media communication platforms. Although WhatsApp
242 which has a large market penetration in India was by far the most popular communication
243 platform used across both groups with over 97% of individuals using the platform to
244 communicate, differences were found in other platforms used.²⁹ Individuals with vision
245 impairment were less likely to use Zoom but more likely to use Google hangouts. However, it
246 should be noted that we did not collect data regarding the accessibility of individual platforms
247 or devices, so it is difficult to know if the lack of use of particular platforms was due to issues
248 of accessibility by the visually impaired group, Zoom has reduced functionality when available
249 at no cost, whereas Google hangouts has full functionality (also available at no cost) and this
250 may account for differences in popularity particularly as individuals with vision impairment are
251 less likely to be employed and may find the latter more economical.

252 It is interesting to note from our study that individuals in the vision impairment group were not
253 using any of the platforms for peer support, for inspiration, for dating, to meet new friends, or
254 to find employment. Given this, it is difficult to know if they were using other means to obtain
255 those goals or not, or if the platforms as currently designed are not able to provide visually
256 impaired adults a means to obtain those goals.

257 Both groups cited barriers to using social media. The visually impaired group unsurprisingly
258 were likely to cite accessibility barriers linked to using voice over to access social media.
259 Interestingly, the normally sighted group cited device sharing as a barrier. Although this group
260 was more likely to have multiple devices it would seem that at least some individuals had to
261 share devices with others. A recent study highlighting the impact of COVID-19 on visually
262 impaired children found that one of the barriers to device use was that families tended to share
263 the device which meant that the device was not always available for use.³⁰ In the current study,
264 only 1% of individuals with vision impairment mentioned device sharing as a barrier. Despite
265 a significant level of unemployment in the visually impaired group cost was not cited as a
266 barrier perhaps suggesting that individuals had other means of financial support.

267 There are some shortcomings. Firstly, the study did not recruit an equal number of subjects
268 across all groups. This meant that statistical analysis was not performed on the groups that
269 did not use social media in comparison to groups that did. Secondly, the sample was recruited
270 from patients and their caregivers attending a single tertiary eyecare centre located in South
271 India or staff working at the centre. Although this group is unlikely to be representative of the
272 general population of India, LVPEI is a tertiary care referral centre and patients from all over
273 the country access the services. Moreover, about 50% of the services are provided at no cost
274 to those from economically underprivileged backgrounds so patients from different strata of
275 the society avail the services making the sample relatively representative of the
276 socioeconomic distribution across the population. Thirdly, we did not assess the traditional
277 measurement properties of the survey instrument in terms of its internal consistency and test-
278 retest reliability. However, we assessed the content (face) validity of the instrument and found
279 it to be reliable given that the item generation included the views of an individual with long
280 standing vision impairment who used the services of the Institute for Vision Rehabilitation at
281 LVPEI and was an avid social media user. Lastly, our study investigated accessibility of social
282 media in terms of only being able to visually access content and access to the internet/Wi-Fi
283 and suitable devices. We did not investigate lack of access due to issues such as psychosocial
284 factors (depression, loneliness and isolation), and the limited use of social media by peers
285 who are also visually impaired, thereby making it less important for visually impaired
286 individuals to socialize or communicate using social media. It will be important to differentiate
287 between these factors in future studies.

288 In conclusion, young adults with vision impairment who were social media users were
289 predominantly male, had moderate vision impairment and were less likely to be in employment
290 as compared to a normally sighted control group. Both the visually impaired and normally
291 sighted adults used WhatsApp as the most common communication platform, and Facebook
292 followed by Twitter as the most commonly used networking platform. Those with vision
293 impairment cited accessibility issues of having to rely on audio rather than vision to navigate

294 social media, whereas the control group reported the need to share a phone with another
295 family member as the barrier to use of social media. Given some of the benefits of social
296 media use, there is potentially a case to encourage more visually impaired individuals to use
297 social media in addition to the industry continuously striving to make platforms more
298 accessible.

299

300 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:**

301 This work was supported by a GCRF grant to City, University of London, London, UK and
302 Hyderabad Eye Research Foundation, Hyderabad, India.

303 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

304 There are no conflicts of interest

305 **FUNDING**

306 This work was supported by a GCRF grant to City, University of London, London, UK and
307 Hyderabad Eye Research Foundation, Hyderabad, India.

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317 REFERENCES

- 318 1. Global Social Media Stats. DataReportal – Global Digital Insights. Available at:
319 <https://datareportal.com/social-media-users>. Accessed March 16, 2022.
- 320 2. Carr CT, Hayes RA. Social Media: Defining, Developing, and Divining. *Atl J Commun*
321 2015;23:46–65.
- 322 3. Best P, Manktelow R, Taylor B. Online Communication, Social Media and Adolescent
323 Wellbeing: A Systematic Narrative Review. *Child Youth Serv Rev* 2014;41:27–36.
- 324 4. Bender JL, Jimenez-Marroquin MC, Jadad AR. Seeking Support on Facebook: A
325 Content Analysis of Breast Cancer Groups. *J Med Internet Res* 2011;13:e16.
- 326 5. Liu CY, Yu CP. Can Facebook Use Induce Well-Being? *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw*
327 2013;16:674–8.
- 328 6. Nabi RL, Prestin A, So J. Facebook Friends With (Health) Benefits? Exploring Social
329 Network Site Use and Perceptions of Social Support, Stress, and Well-Being.
330 *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw* 2013;16:721–7.
- 331 7. Fox J, Moreland JJ. The Dark Side of Social Networking Sites: An Exploration of the
332 Relational and Psychological Stressors Associated with Facebook Use and
333 Affordances. *Comput Hum Behav* 2015;45:168–76.
- 334 8. The Dark Side of Information Technology -ProQuest. Available at:
335 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563214007018> Accessed
336 December 16, 2022.
- 337 9. Asuncion JV, Budd J, Fichten CS, et al. Social Media Use by Students with
338 Disabilities. *Acad Exch Q* 2012; 16: 30-35.
- 339 10. Vision Impairment and Blindness. Available at: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-impairment)
340 [sheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-impairment](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-impairment). Accessed March 16, 2022.
- 341 11. Crossland MD, Silva RS, Macedo AF. Smartphone, Tablet Computer and E-reader
342 Use by People with Vision Impairment. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 2014;34:552–7.

- 343 12. Harrabi H, Aubin MJ, Zunzunegui MV, et al. Visual Difficulty and Employment Status
344 in the World. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e88306.
- 345 13. Wentz B, Lazar J. Are Separate Interfaces Inherently Unequal? An Evaluation with
346 Blind Users of the Usability of Two Interfaces for a Social Networking Platform. *Proc*
347 *iConference'11* 2011; 91–97.
- 348 14. Brady EL, Zhong Y, Morris MR, Bigham JP. Investigating the Appropriateness of
349 Social Network Question Asking as a Resource for Blind Users. *Proc CSCW'13*
350 2013;1225–36.
- 351 15. Quainoo MA, Serwornoo MW, Hammond C. Facebook Experiences of Visually
352 Impaired Students: A Deconstruction of the Challenges and Benefits. *Br J Vis Impair*
353 2021; 41: 400–13.
- 354 16. Brinkley J, Tabrizi N A Desktop Usability Evaluation of the Facebook Mobile Interface
355 using the JAWS Screen Reader with Blind Users. *Proc HFES* 2017; 61:828–32.
- 356 17. Wu S, Adamic LA. Visually Impaired Users on an Online Social Network. *Proc CHI'14*
357 2014; 14:3133–42.
- 358 18. Fuglerud KS, Tjøstheim I, Gunnarsson BR, Tollefsen M. Use of Social Media by
359 People with Visual Impairments: Usage Levels, Attitudes and Barriers. *ICCHP 2012*
360 *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2012; 1:565–72.
- 361 19. Bashir R, Fatima G, Malik M, Safdar M. Social Networking as a Learning Resource
362 for Persons with Visual Impairment. *ARInt* 2014; 5: 223-230.
- 363 20. Griffin-Shirley N, Banda DR, Ajuwon PM, et al. A Survey on the Use of Mobile
364 Applications for People who Are Visually Impaired. *J Vis Impair Blind* 2017; 111:307–
365 23.
- 366 21. Kim J, Lee JR. The Facebook Paths to Happiness: Effects of the Number of
367 Facebook Friends and Self-Presentation on Subjective Well-Being. *Cyberpsychol*
368 *Behav Soc Netw* 2011;14:359–64.

- 369 22. Brody BL, Gamst AC, Williams RA, et al. Depression, Visual Acuity, Comorbidity, and
370 Disability Associated With Age-Related Macular Degeneration. *Ophthalmology*
371 2001;108:1893–900.
- 372 23. Evans JR, Fletcher AE, Wormald RL. Depression and Anxiety in Visually Impaired
373 Older People. *Ophthalmology* 2007;114:283–8.
- 374 24. Mitchell J, Bradley C. Quality of Life in Age-Related Macular Degeneration: A
375 Review of the Literature. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2006;4:97.
- 376 25. Social Media Usage in India. Statista. Available at:
377 <https://www.statista.com/study/59959/social-media-usage-in-india/>. Accessed March
378 17, 2022.
- 379 26. Murthy G, Pant HB, Bandyopadhyay S, John N. Trends in Gender and Blindness in
380 India. *Community Eye Health* 2016;29:S04–5.
- 381 27. Bennett CL, E J, Mott ME, et al. How Teens with Visual Impairments Take, Edit, and
382 Share Photos on Social Media. In: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing
383 Systems 2018; 1–12.
- 384 28. YouTube. Statista. Available at: <https://www.statista.com/topics/2019/youtube/>.
385 Accessed March 17, 2022.
- 386 29. WhatsApp users in selected countries 2021. Statista. Available at:
387 <https://www.statista.com/statistics/289778/countries-with-the-most-facebook-users/>
388 Accessed March 17, 2022.
- 389 30. Gothwal VK, Kodavati K, Subramanian A. Life in Lockdown: Impact of Covid-19
390 Lockdown Measures on the Lives of Visually Impaired School-Age Children and Their
391 Families in India. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 2022;42:301–10.
- 392 31. Faverio M. Share of Those 65 and Older Who Are Tech Users Has Grown in the Past
393 Decade. Pew Research Center. Available at: [https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-
394 tank/2022/01/13/share-of-those-65-and-older-who-are-tech-users-has-grown-in-the-
395 past-decade/](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2022/01/13/share-of-those-65-and-older-who-are-tech-users-has-grown-in-the-past-decade/). Accessed March 17, 2022.
- 396

397 **Legend for Figures:**

398 Figure 1. Distribution of barriers to use of social media among young and emerging adults
399 with vision impairment and normally sighted control group.

400 Figure 2. Distribution of the levels of Vision Impairment among social media users and non-
401 users

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419 APPENDIX: Copy of the questionnaire administered to gather demographic and social
420 media use data

Table 1 Demographic data collected for all groups (social media users: vision impaired and normally sighted; non-social media users: vision impaired and normally sighted).

Variable, n (%)	Social media user		Non social media user	
	Vision Impaired	Normally Sighted	Vision Impaired	Normally Sighted
Sight loss category	162 (81)	217 (98)	39 (19)	4 (2)
Gender, n (%)				
Male	137 (85)	109 (50)	18 (46)	2 (50)
Female	25 (15)	108 (50)	21 (54)	2 (50)
Age				
Mean Age +/- SD	24.5 ± 4.89	25.2 ± 4.67	26.9 ± 5.27	28.9 ± 4.04
Socio economic status n (%)				
Upper	32 (20)	36 (17)	2 (5)	1 (25)
Middle	83 (51)	106 (49)	9 (23)	2 (50)
Lower	47 (29)	75 (35)	28 (72)	1(25)
Education, n (%)				
No formal education	4 (2)	5 (2)	15 (38)	1 (25)
10th standard/GCSE equivalent	24 (15)	16 (7)	12 (31)	3 (75)
12th standard/A level equivalent	25 (15)	61 (28)	7 (18)	0 (0)
Higher qualifications	109 (67)	135 (62)	5 (13)	0(0)
Employment, n (%)				
Paid employment	69 (43)	159 (73)	27 (69)	3 (75)
Not in paid employment	93 (57)	58 (27)	12 (31)	1 (25)
Technology used, n (%)				
Desktop computer	36 (22)	63 (29)	1 (3)	0 (0)
Laptop computer	49 (30)	65 (30)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Smartphone	161 (99)	206 (95)	4 (10)	1 (25)
Tablet PC/ iPad	5 (3)	12 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Keypad phone	1 (1)	2 (1)	19 (49)	3 (75)
Not using any technology	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (38)	0 (0)
WiFi access, n (%)				
At home only	55 (34)	92 (42)	1 (3)	0 (0)
At work only	51 (31)	78 (36)	1 (3)	0 (0)
Both home and work	33 (20)	61 (28)	1 (3)	0 (0)
Neither at home or work	0 (0)	0 (0)	36 (92)	4 (100)
Internet, n (%)				
3G/4G	128 (79)	130 (60)	2 (5)	0 (0)

Some users used more than one piece of technology

Table 2 Information about social networking and video/photo-sharing platform usage by vision impaired and normally sighted users

Variable	Vision Impaired	Normally Sighted
Networking platforms usage n (%)		
Facebook	133 (82)	131 (60)
Twitter	35 (22)	53 (24)
LinkedIn	15 (9)	27 (12)
Others	10 (6)	10 (5)
Video/photo-sharing platform use n (%)		
Snapchat	31 (19)	62 (29)
Pinterest	8 (5)	16 (7)
You tube	161 (99)	203 (94)
Vimeo	0 (0)	3 (1)
Instagram	109 (67)	134 (62)
Others	10 (6)	10 (5)
Reasons for using social networking/video/photo-sharing platforms n (%)		
Obtaining information	106 (65)	137 (63)
Online Discussion	6 (4)	40 (18)
Picture sharing	38 (23)	70 (32)
Watching video or movies	144 (89)	176 (81)
Attending social events	6 (4)	45 (21)
Attending educational events	45 (28)	75 (35)
Peer support	3 (2)	15 (7)
Keeping in touch with friends and family	81 (50)	116 (53)
Event planning	6 (4)	31 (14)
Buying and selling	10 (6)	54 (25)
Inspiration	5 (5)	41 (19)
News	100 (62)	113 (52)
Dating	2 (1)	4 (2)
To meet new friends	6 (4)	44 (20)
To find employment	9 (6)	41 (19)
To browse / pass time	69 (43)	52 (24)
Others	3 (2)	2 (1)

Table 3 Information about social media (communication platform use) by vision impaired and normally sighted users

Variable	Vision Impaired	Normally Sighted
Communication platform usage n (%)		
Mobile phone messenger	71 (44)	110 (51)
Skype	9 (6)	20 (9)
WhatsApp	158 (98)	211 (97)
FaceTime	3 (2)	16 (7)
Zoom	51 (31)	99 (46)
Teams	7 (4)	10 (5)
Google hangouts	44 (27)	39 (18)
Any others	19 (12)	14 (6)
Reasons for using communication platforms n (%)		
Obtaining general information	40 (25)	118 (54)
Peer support	3 (2)	10 (5)
Keeping in touch with friends and family	148 (91)	188 (87)
Event planning	2 (1)	28 (13)
Buying and selling	3 (2)	41 (19)
Inspiration	4 (2)	44 (20)
News	12 (7)	73 (34)
Dating	0 (0)	5 (2)
To meet new friends	2 (1)	45 (21)
To find employment	5 (3)	37 (17)
Others	8 (5)	4 (2)



