Journal of Education and Practice
ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online)
Vol.8, No.27, 2017

High School Students' Social Media Usage Habits

Assoc. Prof. Erdoğan TEZCİ
Balıkesir University, Faculty of Education

Ress. Asst. Mustafa İÇEN
Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Education

Abstract
Social media which is an important product of Computer and Internet Technologies has a growing usage level day by day. Increasing social media usage level gives opportunity for new software developments and making investments in this area. From this aspect, therefore, social media has not only economic function but also make persons participate in social life. Furthermore, it also provides opportunities for undemocratic actions and operations as in terms of democratic society life. Identifying users' habits has an important function on determining economic, social and cultural effects of social media. From this perspective, this research aims to determine social media usage habits of high school students. The data was collected from 853 students in total (419 female and 434 male). In research, "Frequency of Social Media Instruments Usage Scale" for determining usage frequency of 10 different social media instrument, and to determine the reasons of these instruments' usage "Reasons of Social Media Usage Scale" consisting of 20-item are used for collecting data. Scales are also rated on 5-point scale. The results show that the most commonly used social media among the students participating in questionnaire is "Youtube", and "Facebook" follows it in the second place. "MySpace" and "LinkedIn" are the least used social media sites. Top reasons of students' social media usage are sharing document, information and opinion, and entertainment. It was determined that students do not use social media instrument for presenting themselves by using others profiles too much. Gender differences has an important impact on social media usage. Students access and use social media mostly with using their smartphones. Students spend between 1-3 hours daily on social media.
Keywords: Social Media, Hıgh School Students, Technology Usage Habits, Educational Usage of Social Media

Introduction

A rapid change and development is observed in both software and hardware as a result of the innovative nature of Computer and Internet technologies. Social media is one of these. Social media is used as a wide definition of various network tools and technologies that emphasize the social characteristics of the internet as the communication and cooperation instrument of the 21st century which resulted from the developments in internet technologies. Although social media, which is a rapidly improving field, is dated back to 1969 when CompuServe was used as an online service (Banks, 2007), it can be considered that it began in 1997 in the modern sense in which the internet offered users to create their own profiles and make friends with other people (Boyd and Ellison, 2007). At the end of the 1990's, people began sharing messages, photos, and videos with each other through their own blogs. Together with the increase in the usage degree that occurred as a result of the establishment of Facebook in 2004, YouTube in 2005, Slideshare and Twitter in 2006, it was observed that social media settings, which served for various fields, were improved (Boyd and Ellisoni 2008; Dao, 2015; Grosseck and Hotescu, 2008).

In general, social media includes Web 2.0 or interactive internet-based applications that are interchangeably used as social software *(Obar and Wildman, 2015).* Kaplan & Haenlein (2010: 61) define Social Media as "Social Media is a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and that allow the creation and exchange of User Generated Content". According to another definition, social media is "a broad term consisting of blogs, microblogs, forums, dialogues, images, sounds, videos, networks, social web profiles and other social networks" (Eley and Tilley, 2009: 78). It is possible to consider social media as a comprehensive umbrella term consisting of network-based applications that enable users to create their own contents through social means and share these as texts, audio, video, image settings individually or in groups.

Although there are different definitions and explanations about social media, these definitions emphasize the increasing function of social media. These functions can be listed as; social media websites being web-based sites that allow for social communication, the users being able to create online communities and share information with these communities as well as allowing for a two-way communication. With respect to educational processes, they can be listed as; enabling interaction between teachers and students, creating materials and allowing the students to share materials with each other and their teachers etc. (Boyd and Ellison 2007; Dabbah and Rao, 2011; Dan, 2015; Duffy and McDonald, 2011, Tonbuloğlu and İşman, 2014). With these features, social media is competent in responding to the demands that have arisen from the change in today's

understanding in learning. Today, learners are no longer passive receivers of information but active creators of their own meanings. Leaners create their own contents. Learning by means of social media contributes to learners' motivations. In addition, as an internal part of a rich school experience, it supports the informal side of teachers, self-orientation and self-determination of the learners (Dabbah and Kitsantas, 2012; Grosseck and Hotescu, 2008; Solomon and Schrum, 2007). It offers a learning environment for learners to manage and sustain their own learning. It offers learners a time and space-independent opportunity to contact their peers and to manage their own learning activities (Selwyn, 2007; Solomon and Schrum, 2007).

Hansen, Shneiderman and Smith (2011) state that the development and variety in social media paved the way for new interaction choices among users and this can assumed to be achieved through hundreds of social media settings such as sharing texts, photos and videos (Churchill, 2009). That social media can be used through mobile devices, that it is interaction, user and society-based and that it is user-friendly have been effective in it becoming widespread (Ada, Çiçek and Kaynakyeşil, 2013; Hanna, Rohn and Crittenden, 2011). However, in the study conducted by Perrin during 2005-2015 on social media usage profiles, it was stated that 65% of American teenagers are social media users. Researches on social media settings (Grosseck and Hotescu, 2008; Kabilan, Ahmad and Abidin, 2010; Lenhart, Purcell, Smith and Zickuhr, 2010; McCool, 2011; Wright, 2010) have shown that social media can be used in administrative processes, social needs, searching for information and entertainment for educational purposes. Dabbagh and Kitsantas (2011) state that social media supports formal and informal learning and enables learners to arrange their own personal learning settings.

According to a study conducted on social media usage habits (Ada et al., 2013; Fernández, 2011; Kocadere and Aşkar, 2013; Lenhart et al., 2010; Li, Bernoff, Pflaum and Glass, 2007; Şener, 2009; Vural and Bat, 2010) it was observed that social media was used mostly for commenting on others' profiles, reading blog posts, listening to music, making friendship requests, examining someone else's status and participating in various social, educational etc. activities. Kamiloğlu and Yurttaş (2014) conducted a study on Turkish Culture and emphasized that the most commonly used social media was Facebook and was primarily used for acquiring information, entertainment and as a free time activity.

Studies in the literature (Chaffey, 2016; Perrin, 2015) show that use of social media is increasing. There is an increase in the use of social media parallel with the increase in the variety of social media tools. In addition, studies suggest that there is a constant increase in social media usage (Anderson and Rainie, 2012) and that teenagers have a higher level of social media usage than adults (Fernández (2011; Lenhart et al., 2010; Şener, 2009). When this variety and increase is considered, identifying which purposes social media is used for by teenagers will contribute to its effective use in the students' learning-teaching processes. Thus, it will contribute to educational leaders in developing policies and to teachers as implementers in designing the teaching-learning processes. In addition, it will shed light on clarifying student behaviors in high school with respect to social media. Based on the fact that determining student purposes on using social media will contribute to measures taken against harmful effects such as cyber violence, inappropriate content, schism and security (O'Keeffe and Clarke-Pearson, 2011), the study aimed at determining the relationship between high school students' social media usage frequency and purposes and these variables.

Participants

There were three different samples in the study. The first and second samples were collected in February, 2015. The first sample was used in conducting the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and reliability analysis. This group consisted of 217 high school students. 146 (67.28%) of the students were male and 71 (32.72%) were female. The second sample was used in conducting the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Along with various other opinions, some researchers (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988; Kline, 2011) underlined that it is not appropriate to conduct both EFA and CFA on the same data set. Thus, CFA was decided to be carried out in the study with the data collected from 220 students. Among the students participating in the second sample of the study, 138 (62.72%) were male and 82 (37.28%) were female. The third sample was collected after the EFA and CFA. The third sample was collected to shed light on the purpose of this study. The data from the third sample were collected in May-June term of 2016. The study consists of the students studying in high schools in İstanbul. A total of 853 students, 419 (49.1%) male and 434 (50.9%) female, participated in the study. The students participating in the study were volunteer students who were present in the classroom in the days when the study was carried out at the end of the 2015-2016 academic term. The ages of the students ranged between 14 and 18. The age mean of the students was 16. The students stated that they spare mean 3.06 hours a day for using social media.

Data Collection Tools

The data collection instrument, consisting of 3 stages, was used in the study to determine Social Media using habits of the students. The first is the "Personal Information Section" where the demographic data were collected. Questions related to the gender, age, social media usage duration of the participants were included in this section.

The second section involves determining the frequency of the usage of 10 different social media tools. The "Frequency of Social Media Instruments Usage" (FSMIU) scale, consisting of 10 items, was developed to determine the students' social media usage levels. The "Purposes of Social Media Usage" (PSMU) scale, consisting of 20 items, was developed as the third scale of the study to determine the purposes of why the students use social media.

The FSMIU scale was graded as 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Slightly, 4=Sometimes and 5=Frequently and an item pool of 10 items was created. The PSMU scale was graded as a 5 point Likert scale as "1=Totally Inappropriate, 2=Inappropriate, 3=Neither, 4=Appropriate and 5=Totally Appropriate" and an item pool of 22 items was created. Experts were consulted for their opinions after the scale items were ready. No changes were made after expert opinions and the scale form was conducted on 5 high school students face-to-face; as a result whether or not the items were clear was determined and was set as a test implementation.

The FSMIU and PSMU scales were conducted on 217 students as a pilot implementation and an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was decided to be carried out initially to determine factor structures. The KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure) value and sample sufficiency were identified so as to determine whether or not the measures were convenient for analysis (Kline, 1994). The KMO value for the FSMIU scale was .846 and .891 for the PSMU scale. The Bartlett's Test of Sphercity values were observed to be significant (X^2=1674.603 for FSMIU, X^2=4740.369 for PSMU) p<.05. This shows that measures based on items can be factorable (Büyüköztürk, 2003). Because the measures were found to be convenient for analysis, factor structures were examined with the Principle Components Analysis through the Varimax Rotation technique. The EFA is used for examining which factors the items belong to, identifying cyclical items and items that belong to more than one factor and in determining internal validity of the items (Kline, 1994; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). Items with .40 and above factor load value were selected for Social Sciences (Velicer and Fava, 1998). According to the analysis results, the FSMIU scale has a two factor structure. Two items in the PSMU scale were excluded from the scale because one item had a factor load value below .40 (Item 13., .381) and one item had an overlapping (Item 17, .632 and .571). Factor structures of the scales, explained variance and results of the reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) are given on Table 1.

Table 1: Results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis

Scale	**Factor**	**Explained Variance**	**Total Variance**	**Cronbach's Alpha**
Frequency of Social Media Instruments Usage Scale (FSMIU)	Factor 1. (5 Items)	31.196%	31.196%	.816
	Factor 2. (3 Items)	22.356%	53.552%	.725
			General	.775
Purpose of Social Media Usage (PSMU)	Factor 1. (8 Items)	22.479%	22.479%	.873
	Factor 2. (7 Items)	21.519%	43.998%	.890
	Factor 3. (4 Items)	13.258%	57.256%	.804
			General	.891

The 10 item FSMIU scale consists of two factors. Factor 1. accounts for 31.196% of the variance and the second factor accounts for 22.356%. The total variance explained was 53.552%. The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency of the overall scale is 0.78. The main factor of why the scale has two factors is due to usage level. Frequently used social media types have one factor, the less frequently used types are factored under another factor. The Purpose of Social Media Usage (PSMU) scale consists of 20 items and 3 factors. The first factor accounts for 22.479% of the variance, the second factor 21.519% and the third factor accounts for 57.256%. Reliability of the overall scale is 0.89. The scales and factor loads of the items are given on Appendix 1. After the EFA, the scales were conducted on 220 students again and factor convenience was tested through the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). CFA aims at testing the model resulting from the EFA and its convenience based on certain criteria. It is used for testing whether or not there is a sufficient relationship between the factors determined with the EFA, for identifying which variable is related to which factor, for testing whether or not the factors are independent from each other and whether or not the factors are sufficient in explaining the model (Bentler and Bonett, 1980; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The fit indices resulting from the CFA were examined and the model convenience that resulted from the contributions of the variables was observed (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1996; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The fit indices of both scales are given on Table 2.

Table 2: EFA Fit Indices of the Social Media Scales

Scale	X^2	Sd	RMSEA	NFI	NNFI	CFI	IFI	RFI	RMR	AGFI
Frequency of Social Media Instruments Usage Scale (FSMIU)	32.166	34	.000	.97	1.00	1.00	.99	.97	.032	.96
Purpose of Social Media Usage (PSMU) Scale	362.78	165	.061	.94	.97	.97	.97	.94	.047	.87

The fit indices of the FSMIU scale are close to perfect level. The Chi-Square value has a very low rate with the degree of freedom (32.166/34=0.94). The RMEA is 0.00 and the other indices are very close to 1. The scale has a two factor structure. These factors are related to the usage level of social media instruments stated in the scale items. The instruments stated under Factor 1 are very rarely used and the ones stated under Factor 2 are used more frequently than the instruments under Factor 1. A medium level positive relationship was detected between the two factor structure (r=.31).

The rate of the PSMU scale's Chi-Square value with the degree of freedom is 2.19. All of the fit index values apart from RMSEA are close to perfect level. A relative decrease was detected in the Chi-Square value (X^2=345.52, SD=164) and RMSEA value (.059) after a modification was done in the suggested error variances of the scale. A small increase was observed in RFI and AGFI fit indices. Because there were no changes in the other indices of the scale, it was suggested that the present structure of the scale was convenient for use. Factor 1. of the PSMU scale was identified as "Entertainment", Factor 2 was identified as "Social Interaction" and Factor 3. was identified as "Educational" purpose. It was observed that there is a medium level positive relationship between Entertainment and Social Interaction purposes (r=.47) and between Educational and Social Interaction purposes (r=.34). A low level relationship (r=.21) was observed between the Entertainment purpose dimension and Educational purpose dimension. The EFA, CFA and reliability analysis results show that the scales can be effectively used in determining how frequently students use social media instruments and their purposes of using these instruments.

Data Analysis

A descriptive analysis was conducted to determine how frequently students use Social Media Instruments and the reasons why they use social media. A t-test analysis was conducted to determine whether or not social media types and the purposes why students use them differ according to gender and a correlation analysis was conducted to determine whether or not there is a relationship between social media types and the degree of using them.

Findings

Frequency of Social Media Instruments Usage

The students stated their level of using the 10 types of social media instruments through a 5 point scale (1=Never, 5=I Use it Frequently) as stated above. Analysis results concerning the Social Media usage level are given on Table 3.

Table 3: Frequency of Social Media Usage and Analysis Concerning Gender

	N	R	S	So.	F	Mean	Sd	Gender	Mean	Sd	t	p
1-Facebook	22.7	8.6	6.8	19.1	42.8	3.51	1.62	Female	2.94	1.68	-10.757	.000*
								Male	4.06	1.35		
2-Twitter	35.2	5.8	10.8	24.6	23.6	3.01	1.57	Female	2.89	1.59	-2.441	.015*
								Male	3.15	1.54		
7-YouTube	5.4	6.4	6.6	29.7	51.9	4.17	1.15	Female	3.99	1.20	-4.437	.000*
								Male	4.34	1.06		
4-Discussion Forums	31.3	13	12.1	26	17.6	2.81	1.56	Female	2.58	1.57	-4.163	.000*
								Male	3.03	1.52		
3-Blogs	87.0	3.3	2.5	3.9	3.4	1.37	.94	Female	1.33	.94	-.970	.332
								Male	1.40	.96		
5-MySpace	93.9	3.3	0.9	1.1	0.8	1.12	.53	Female	1.09	.40	-1.808	.071
								Male	1.16	.63		
6-Flickr	93.8	3.5	0.7	0.5	1.5	1.14	.58	Female	1.11	.47	-1.334	.183
								Male	1.16	.67		
8-GoogleCircles	72.6	14.5	2.3	3.8	6.8	1.53	1.15	Female	1.49	1.11	-.972	.331
								Male	1.57	1.17		
9-Linkedln	93.9	3.5	0.9	0.6	1.0	1.12	.53	Female	1.09	.42	-1.604	.109
								Male	1.15	.62		
10-Pinterest	90.0	3.4	1.8	2.9	1.9	1.25	.78	Female	1.29	.83	1.403	.161
								Male	1.22	.73		
General	62.48	6.53	4.54	11.22	15.13	2.11	.56	Female	1.98	.54	-6.403	.000*
								Male	2.22	.56		

*p<.05; N=853; Female=423; Male=430 SD=851; N=Never, R=Rarely, S=Slightly, So=Sometimes, F=Frequently

According to the analysis results, students have a low social media usage level (mean=2.11; SD=.57). The most common and frequently used instrument is YouTube (mean=4.17; SS=1.15) which is followed by Facebook (mean=3.51; SS=1.62). Twitter (mean=3.01, SD=1.57) and Discussion Forums (mean=2.81, SD=1.56) are used slightly. The other social media instruments are used very rarely. The most rarely used instruments are

MySpace (mean=1.12; SD=.53) followed by LinkedIn (mean= 1.12; SD=.53), Flickr (mean=1.14; SD=.58), Pinterest (mean=1.25; SD=.78), Blogs (mean=1.37; SD=.94) and GoogleCircles (mean=1.53; SD=1.15).

According to the T-test analysis results, which was conducted to determine whether or not there is a relationship between the types of social media that the students use and gender, male students (mean=2.22; SD=0.54) use them more than the female students (mean=1.98; SD=.56) (t=6.408, p<.05). Specifically, when social media instruments are considered, there is a statistically significant difference between male and female students' score averages on using Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and discussion forums (p<.05). There was no difference concerning gender among the other instruments (which have low means) (p>.05).

Purposes of Social Media Usage

Descriptive and gender-based analysis results of the data concerning the 20 item scale which was conducted to determine the purposes why students use social media are given on Table 4.

Table 4: Descriptive and Gender-Based Analysis of Purposes of Social Media Usage

	Mean	SD	Kurtosis	Skewness	Gender	N	Mean.	SD	t	p
Educational	4.00	.73	-.407	-.216	Female Male	419 434	4.02 3.98	.71 .74	.746	.456
Entertainment	3.73	.78	-.513	.127	Female Male	419 434	3.70 3.75	.78 .77	-.948	.343
Social Interaction	2.89	.96	.180	-.441	Female Male	419 434	2.81 2.98	.95 .96	-2.655	.008*
General	3.54	.67	-.288	.444	Female Male	419 434	3.51 3.57	.67 .68	-1.357	.175

*p<.05, df=851

The highest mean (mean=4.00, SD=.73) concerning the students' purposes of social media usage was observed to be on the educational purpose. This is followed by the purpose of entertainment (mean=3.73, SD=.78). Students have a low level of social media usage concerning the purpose of social interaction (mean=2.89, SD=.96). Using Social Media for Social Interaction differs according to gender (t=2.665, p<.05). Usage degrees of male students (mean=2.98, SD=.96) is higher than the usage degrees of female students (mean=2.81, SD=.95).

Relationship between Social Media and Usage Purposes

A correlation analysis was conducted to determine the type of social media used by students and the purposes of why they use these media. However, the correlations of Blogs, MySpace, Flickr, GoogleCircles, LinkedIn and Pinterest, which were rarely or never used, were not considered in the correlation analysis. Analysis results are given on Table 5.

Table 5: Relationship between Various Types of Social Media and Usage Purposes

	Educational	Entertainment	Social Interaction	Facebook	YouTube	Twitter
Entertainment	.476**					
Social Interaction	.247**	.499**				
Facebook	.219**	.276**	.161**			
YouTube	.267**	.291**	.144**	.268**		
Twitter	.151**	.173**	.236**	.285**	.242**	
Discussion groups	.138**	.176**	.205**	.332**	.283**	.646**

*p<.05

According to the correlation analysis results, the highest correlation is between using social media for educational purposes and YouTube, which is a type of social media, (r=.27, p<.05). This is followed respectively by Facebook (r=.22, p<.05), Twitter (r=.15, p<.05) and discussion groups (r=.14, p<.05). The highest correlations between using social media for the purpose of entertainment and social media types was between YouTube (r=.29, p<.05), Facebook (r=.28, p<.05), Discussion groups (r=.18, p<.05) and Twitter (r=.17, p<.05). Twitter has the highest correlation value among the social media types used with the purpose of social interaction (r=.24, p<.05). This is followed by discussion forums (r=.21, p<.05), Facebook (r=.16, p<.05) and YouTube (r=.14, p<.05) respectively.

Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

High school students' social media usage levels and purposes were determined in this study. With this respect, the social media usage scale and purposes of social media usage scale were developed. In order to develop the scales, the Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted on the data collected from 217 high school students. It was observed that both scales had a three factor structure. After determining the factor structures, it was carried out on 220 other students and the Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted. Analysis results showed that the

factor structures determined with the Exploratory Factor Analysis could be modelled. With respect to internal consistencies of the scales, the reliability analysis results were observed to be at sufficient level. There are various definitions in the literature about the types of social media (Looy, 2016; Schau and Gilly, 2003). The factor analysis results on social media types in this study were not included in any category within the literature. It was observed that in the factor analyses there is a factorization on the students' social media usage degrees. For example, YouTube and Facebook along with a social media type like Twitter were placed under one factor. Thus, instead of using the Frequency of Social Media Usage (FSMU) scale directly on various cultures, it would be beneficial to conduct another factor analysis on it and to take this into consideration while preparing the measurement instruments.

It was observed in the study that YouTube was the most frequently used social media by students, second Facebook and third Twitter. YouTube is a social setting where multimedia contents can be uploaded and watched. Facebook and Twitter are categories that can be referred to as content societies (Safko and Brake, 2009). As it enables a video sharing setting and body language in the communication process, YouTube offers more communication than content providers such as text, sound and photograph (Looy, 2016). Facebook and Twitter enables you to send private messages. They are the most commonly used social networks. It was observed that the most common social media used by students was settings that provide a social network. This finding of the study is similar with the studies conducted by Lenhart et al. (2010), Moran, Seaman and Tinti-Kane, (2011) and Şener (2009). In a study conducted by Michaelidou, Siamagka and Christodoulides (2011), it was stated that the most popular social media is Facebook followed by Twitter and then LinkedIn. A difference in social media usage was observed with respect to gender. The difference is in YouTube, Facebook, Twitter and Discussion Form which are mostly used. No differences were observed in other social media types. The difference is in favor of males. Results of most of the studies in the literature on the gender effect in social media usage (Eyrich, Padman and Sweetser, 2008) are parallel with the results of this study. In addition, Lenhart et al. (2010) state that females use Twitter more than males. Şener (2009) did not observe any difference in using Facebook with respect to gender.

Results of the analysis conducted to determine the purpose of why students use social media indicate that they use it firstly for educational purposes and secondly for entertainment. Using social media for social interaction was at low level. This is thought to be a state resulting due to culture. Kennedy (2009) underlines that social media usage differs according to culture. While Facebook isn't preferred by Japanese teenagers because it isn't found secure, it was observed that it is used in Mexico for keeping in touch with friends and making new friendships. Researches in the literature (Goodwin, Kennedy and Vetere, 2010; Grosseck, Bran and Tiru, 2011; Selwyn, 2009) underline that social media such as Facebook and YouTube are effectively used in learning-teaching processes and that they support peer interaction along with informal learning. No differences were observed in students' using social media for educational and entertainment purposes. However, there is a difference in favor of males with the purpose of using it for social interaction. Male students carry out activities such as making friends, presenting himself to others, knowing new people, becoming a member of groups, reading comments more than female students. While there is a difference in the mostly and sometimes used social media by students, there is no difference in rarely or never used social media. Findings of this study, which was conducted concerning student purposes of using social media, are similar with the studies carried out in the field (Li, Bernoff, Pflaum and Glass, 2007).

While students mostly use social media for educational purposes, YouTube was observed to have the highest mean. The correlation between these two variables is the highest. YouTube has the highest correlation in using for educational purposes and Twitter as the highest correlation in using for social interaction. With this respect, it can be said that students use social media such as Facebook, YouTube along with Twitter and discussion forms for their learning processes along with for social interaction and entertainment. With this respect, the results of this study support the results of the study carried out by Kamiloğlu and Yurttaş (2014) on high school students. With regards to the social dimension of social media, self-presentation/self-expression is a type of social interaction referring to people's desire to control other people's impressions about themselves. This is the desire to affect others to gain their appreciation. This is the work of a person for creating a modest image about themselves (Schau and Gilly, 2003). Individuals open themselves while presenting themselves to others. They do this through their feelings, emotions and desires. With this respect, social media can be considered to serve students in socializing and acquiring information. YouTube, which is considered as a content society, and Facebook, which is considered as a social network web-site (Looy, 2016), have the potential to contribute to learning and teaching processes. For example, in their studies Barbour and Plough (2009), deVilliers (2010) and Hew and Cheung (2013) emphasized that, students mostly used Facebook in their learning processes and that using Facebook in the learning-teaching process increases satisfaction in the learning process and is linked to achievement. Moran et al. (2011) carried out a study on university students and stated that using social media for educational purposes was very low but online videos were used for educational purposes. With this respect, YouTube can be considered to have a crucial function in presenting multimedia-based contents.

With a richer content, it enables a richer communication. This can be factor for it to be used so commonly. Boyd (2008) stated that social media has a crucial function for educational purposes. With this respect, it can be said that using content society-based social media, such as Facebook and YouTube, is beneficial in designing classroom learning-teaching processes. In addition, Kilis, Rapp and Gülbahar (2014) and Öztürk, Öztürk and Özen (2016) conducted studies on social media usages of teachers and stated that they use it for professional development and personal goals rather than as a part of the teaching-learning process within the classroom. When types of social media usage and its purposes are considered, student habits support findings in the literature and research results on this subject (Dabbagh and Kitsantas, 2011, 2012; Karpinski, 2009; Rithika and Salvaraj, 2013).

Study results indicate that high school students use social media frequently for educational and entertainment purposes and use it less frequently for the purpose of social interaction. It can be advantageous if teachers take student tendencies into consideration and use social media effectively in the learning-teaching process. This way they can effectively guide them in using social media effectively and also in creating effective strategies against negative effects. This study contains a limited variable such as high school students' social media usage levels and purposes. Conducting study on different educational levels by taking various variables such as student expectations and barriers into account will contribute both to the field and also to the effective use in learning-teaching processes.

References

Ada, S., Çiçek, B., & Kaynakyeşil, G. (2013). Çevrimiçi sosyal ağ sitesi kullanımını etkileyen motive edici faktörler üzerine bir araştırma. In *Academic Informatics Conference, Antalya*. Retrieved on 12 May 2016, from: http://ab.org.tr/ab13/bildiri/206.pdf.

Aichner, T., & Jacob, F. (2015). Measuring the Degree of Corporate Social Media Use. *International Journal of Market Research, 57*(2), 257–275.

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(3), 411-423.

Anderson, J. Q., & Rainie, L. (2012). *Millennials Will Benefit And Suffer Due to Their Hyperconnected Lives.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Banks, M. A. (2007). The Internet, ARPANet, and consumer online. *Online*, *31*(1), 32-34.

Barbour, M., & Plough. C. (2009). Social networking in cyberschooling: Helping to make online learning less isolating. *TechTrends, 53*(4), 56-60.

Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin, 88*(3), 588-606.

Boyd, D. M. (2008). *Taken out of context: American teen sociality in networked publics*. Unpublished Doctoral Disetation. University of California, Berkeley.

Boyd, D. M. (2008). Why Youth Social Network Sites: The Role of Networked Publics in Teenage Social Life. Youth, Identity,and Digital Media. Edited by David Buckingham. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 119–142. DOI: 10.1162/dmal.9780262524834.119.

Boyd, D. M. & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer‐Mediated Communication*, *13*(1), 210-230. DOI: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.

Boyd, D., & Ellison, N. (2008). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 13*(1), 210—230.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2003). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı:* Ankara: Pegem Yay.

Churchill, D. (2009). Educational applications of Web 2.0: Using blogs to support teaching and learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 40*(1), 179–183.

Dabbagh, N., & Kitsantas, A. (2012). Personal Learning Environments, social media, and self-regulated learning: A natural formula for connecting formal and informal learning. *The Internet and higher education*, *15*(1), 3-8.

Dabbagh, N., & Reo, R. (2011). Back to the future: Tracing the roots and learning affordances of social software. (Eds: M. J. W. Lee, & C. McLoughlin), Web 2.0-based e-learning: Applying social informatics for tertiary teaching (pp. 1–20). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Dao, D. V. (2015). Social Media Classification Scheme in Online Teaching and Learning Activities: A Consideration for Educators. *International Journal of Education and Social Science*, *2*(4), 85-94.

deVilliers. M. R. (2010). Academic use of a group on Facebook: Initial findings and perceptions. *Informing Science & IT Education Conference (InSITE). Cassino. Italy.* Retrieved on 3 May 2015, from http://proceedings.informingscience.org/InS ITE2010/InSITE10p173-190Villiers742.pdf

Eley, B. & Tilley, S. (2009). *Online Marketing Inside Out*. Austraila: Sitepoint Pty. Ltd.

Eyrich, N., Padman, M. L., & Sweetser, K. D. (2008). PR practitioners' use of social media tools and

communication technology. *Public relations review*, *34*(4), 412-414.
Fernández, A. (2011). Clinical report: The impact of social media on children, adolescents and families. *Archivos de Pediatría del Uruguay*, *82*(1), 31-32.
Goodwin, K., Kennedy, G., & Vetere, F. (2010). Getting together out-of-class: Using technologies for informal interaction and learning. In Curriculum, Technology & Transformation for an Unknown Future, (Eds. C. H. Steel, M. J. Keppell, P. Gerbic and S. Housego) *Proceedings of Ascilite,* Sydney, (pp. 387-392). Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydn ey10/procs/Goodwin-concise.pdf
Grosseck, G., Bran, R., & Tiru, L. (2011). Dear teacher, what should I write on my wall? A case study on academic uses of Facebook. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 1425-1430.
Grosseck, G. & Holotescu, C. (2008). Can we use Twitter for educational activities? The 4th International Scientific Conference: eLearning and software for education. Retrieved on 10 September 2015, from: https://adlunap.ro/eLSE_publications/papers/2008/015.-697.1.Grosseck%20Gabriela-Can%20we%20use.pdf.
Hanna, R., Rohm, A., & Crittenden, V. L. (2011). We're all connected: The power of the social media ecosystem. *Business horizons*, *54*(3), 265-273.
Hansen, D., Shneiderman, B., & Smith, M. A. (2011). Analyzing social media networks with NodeXL: Insights from a connected world. Boston: Elsevier.
Hew, K. F., & Cheung, W. S. (2013). Use of Web 2.0 technologies in K-12 and higher education: The search for evidence-based practice. *Educational Research Review, 9,* 47-64
Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1996). *LISREL 8: User's reference guide*. North Linon: Scientific Software International.
Kabilan, M. K., Ahmad, N., & Abidin, M. J. Z. (2010). Facebook: An online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education?. *The Internet And Higher Education*, *13*(4), 179-187.
Kamiloğlu, F. & Yurttaş, Ö. U. (2014). Sosyal medyanın bilgi edinme ve kişisel gelişim sürecine katkısı ve lise öğrencileri üzerine bir alan çalışması. *İLETİ-Ş-İM*, 21, 129-150.
Kaplan, A. M. & Haenline, M. (2010). Users of the world, Unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons, 53*(1), 59-68.
Karpinski, A. C., & Duberstein, A. (2009). *A Description of Facebook Use and Academic Performance among Undergraduate and Graduate Students.* San Diego, California: American Educational Research Association.
Kennedy, A., (2009). Whitepaper, The Global Facebook Phenomenon. Retrieved on 3 September 2015, from: www.beyondink.com/ Whitepaper-The-Global-Facebook-Phenomenon-by-Anne-Kennedy.pdf
Kilis, S., Rapp, C. & Gülbahar, Y. (2014). Eğitimde sosyal medya kullanımına yönelik yükseköğretim düzeyindeki eğitmenlerin algısı: Türkiye-Almanya örneklemi. *Journal of Instructional Technologies & Teacher Education, 3*(3), 2-28.
Kline, P. (1994). *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Kocadere, S. A., & Aşkar, P. (2013). Sosyal medya araçlarının katkıları ve kullanım sıklıkları: öğretmenlik uygulaması örneği. *İlköğretim Online*, *12*(4), 1120-1132. Retrieved on 12 May 2016 from: http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr
Lenhart, A., Purcell, K., Smith, A., & Zickuhr, K. (2010). Social media & mobile ınternet use among teens and young adults. millennials. *Pew internet & American life Project*. Retrieved on 10 October 2015 from: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED525056.pdf.
Li, C., Bernoff, J., Pflaum, C. & Glass, S. (2007). How consumers use social networks, forrester research. Retrieved on 3 September 2015, from http://www.eranium.at/blog/upload/consumers_socialmedia.pdf
Looy, A. V. (2016). *Social Media Management: Technologies and Strategies for Creating Business Value*. NY: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-3319-21990-5.
McCool, L. B. (2011). Pedagogical use of Twitter in the university classroom. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
Michaelidou, N., Siamagka, N. T., & Christodoulides, G. (2011). Usage, barriers and measurement of social media marketing: An exploratory investigation of small and medium B2B brands. *Industrial marketing management*, *40*(7), 1153-1159.
Moran, M., Seaman, J., & Tinti-Kane, H. (2011). *Teaching, Learning, and Sharing: How Today's Higher Education Faculty Use Social Media.* Boston: Research report published by Pearson, The Babson Survey Research Group, and Converseon. Retrieved on 2 May 2016 from http:///www.babson.edu/ESHIP/researchpublications/upload/Teaching_Learning_and _sharing.pdf
Obar, J. A. & Wildman, S. (2015). Social media definition and the governance challenge: An introduction to the special issue. Telecommunications policy, 39(9), 745–750. DOI:10.1016/j.telpol.2015.07.014.
O'Keeffe, G. S., & Clarke-Pearson, K. (2011). The impact of social media on children, adolescents, and families. *Pediatrics*, *127*(4), 800-804.

Öztürk, D. S., Öztürk, F., & Özen, R. (2016). Teachers' use of social-media tools for their professional development. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *13*(1), 7-21.

Patchin J. W. & Hinduja S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth Violence Juv Justice*, *4*(2), 148 –169.

Perrin, A. (2015). Social media usage: 2005-2015. PewResearch Center. Retrieved on 11 May 2016 from: http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/10/08/social-networking-usage-2005-2015/.

Rithika, M., & Selvaraj, S. (2013). Impact of social media on student's academic performance. International journal of logistics & supply chain management perspectives. *Pezzottaite Journals, 2*(4), 636-640,

Safko, L. & Brake, D. K (2009) *The Social Media Bible: Tactics, Tools, And Strategies For Business Success.* Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.

Schau. H. J.. & Gilly. M. C. (2003). We are what we post? Self-presentation in personal web space. *Journal of Consumer Research, 30*(3), 385—404.

Selwyn, N. (2009). Faceworking: Exploring students' education-related use of Facebook. *Learning, Media and Technology, 34*(2), 157-174.

Solomon, G., & Schrum, L. (2007). Web 2.0: New Tools, New Schools. Washington DC: International Society for Technology in Education.

Şener, G. (2009). Türkiye'de Facebook Kullanımı Araştırması. *inet-tr'09 - XIV. Türkiye'de İnternet Konferansı Bildirileri 12-13 Aralık 2009*. Bilgi Üniversitesi, İstanbul, Retrieved on 13 May 2016 from: http://inet-tr.org.tr/inetconf14/kitap/_inet09.pdf#page=53.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics (5th Ed.).* New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Tonbuloğlu, İ. & İşman, A. (2014). Öğretmenlerin sosyal ağları kullanım profillerinin incelenmesi. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 3*(1), 320-333.

Velicer, W. F. & Fava, J. L. (1998). Effects of variable and subject sampling on factor pattern recovery. *Psychological Methods, 3*(2), 231-251.

Vural, Z. B. A. & Bat, M. (2010). Yeni bir iletişim ortamı olarak sosyal medya: Ege Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Journal of Yasar University*, *20*(5), 3348-3382.

White, G. M. (2014). What types of social networks exist? Retrieved on 12 May 2015, from: http:// socialnetworking.lovetoknow.com/What_Types_of_Social_Networks_Exist.

Wright, N. (2010). Twittering in teacher education: Reflecting on practicum experiences. *Open learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning, 25*(3), 259–265.

EK 1: SCALE ITEMS AND FACTOR LOADING

Social Media Use Fruquency Scale

Social Media	1.Sub-scale	2. Sub-scale	Mean	SS
8-GoogleCircles	.775		1.53	.94
10-Pinterest	.732		1.51	.96
4- Linkendln	.723		1.50	.97
7- Flickr	.709		1.50	.95
1- MySpace	.687		1.51	.88
3- Blogs	.670		1.54	1.02
5- Twitter		.774	3.43	1.21
9- Tartışma Forumları		.760	2.97	1.62
2- Facebook		.711	3.40	1.19
6- YouTube		.685	3.45	1.18
Toplam Açıklanan Varyans	%31.196	%22.356		

Social Media Use Aim Scale

Scale Items	1.Sub-scale For fun	2. Sub scale: Social interaction	3. Sub scale: Educational	Mean	SS
12- Can sıkıntısını gidermek	.753			3.87	1.07
2-Eğlenmek için	.744			3.84	1.04
10-Televizyon programlarını takip etmek, izlemek için	.731			3.64	1.12
11-Sosyal konularda (haber, olay vb) görüşleri paylaşmak için	.731			3.56	1.19
8-Videolar yüklemek için	.730			3.65	1.03
7-Videolar izlemek, indirmek için	.702			3.59	1.16
4-Facebook, twitter gibi sosyal medyada durumu güncelleme, resim, fotoğraf paylaşma ve yorum yapmak	.701			3.82	1.12
5- Facebook sayfalarını veya diğer sosyal ağları, kontrol etmek	.669			3.76	1.07
14-Arkadaşlar edinmek		.748		2.90	1.13
15-Kendimi başkalarına sunmak /anlatmak		.746		2.77	1.21
19-Başkaları hakkında yazılan yorumları okumak		.743		2.78	1.23
16- Başkalarını tanımak (profillerini, sayfalarını incelemek)		.739		2.89	1.21
18-Gruplara üye olmak		.724		2.86	1.22
6- Başkalarının profillerini, fotoğraflarını izlemek		.697		2.86	1.25
20-Özel mesajlar iletmek		.685		2.92	1.29
17- Başkalarının profili ile kendini başkalarına sunmak		.648		2.74	1.19
13- Ödev, proje yapmak			.824	3.57	1.23
1-Sosyal medya ile bilgi araştırmak için			.779	3.94	1.09
3-Arkadaşlarla bilgi, belge, görüş vb paylaşımı için			.770	3.81	1.12
9-Mesaj, dosya, bilgi, belge paylaşmak için			.641	3.68	1.23
Toplam Açıklanan Varyans	%22.479	%21.519	%13.258		