



FACULTY MEMBERS VS STUDENTS: HOW THEY USE SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES PERSONALLY AND EDUCATIONALLY

Omer Faruk ISLIM, Nese SEVIM-CIRAK

Abstract: Youngsters use social networking sites (SNSs), especially Facebook, to stay in touch with their friends as well as for entertainment. In this quantitative research, a cross-sectional survey design and purposeful sampling method were utilized. The data were gathered from 53 faculty members and 373 undergraduate students. According to the results of the study, the most common SNS was Facebook. Both faculty members and students were conscious about friendship requests, and that both were able to send and/or accept friend requests from each other without hesitation. On the other hand, faculty members preferred that students did not communicate with them via SNSs. Only one-third of the faculty members created groups on SNSs in order to communicate and share with their students. Institutional SNS accounts and groups were seen as a requirement by both students and faculty members for announcements and sharing on an institutional level.

Key words: Facebook, college students, faculty members, educational use of Facebook, SNSs

1. Introduction

The Internet has become an important part of many people's lives, particularly for youngsters as it helps them to socialize more easily. Youngsters especially use Social Networking Sites (SNS) in order to stay in touch with their friends, as well as for the purposes of entertainment (Gemmill & Peterson, 2006). SNSs can be considered as virtual communities that enable people to interact and connect with each other about specific subjects or purely for meeting and chatting in an online virtual environment (Murray & Waller, 2007). Boyd and Ellison (2008) describes SNSs as the communication tools in which users can create private or public profiles in order to communicate with people in their networks. More specifically, SNSs are;

Web-based services that allow individuals to: (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system. (Boyd & Ellison, 2008, p. 211)

Ten years on, and there are now many SNSs that serve a variety of practices and interests, and membership of these sites has increased exponentially. Among the social networking sites, Facebook is the considered the most popular in Europe and the United States (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Hampton, Sessions Goulet, Rainie, & Purcell, 2011; Madge, Meek, Wellens, & Hooley, 2009; Smith, & Anderson, 2018). It is seen that especially college students prefer to use it compared to other SNSs (Cheung, Chiu, & Lee, 2011; Deng & Tavares, 2013; Educause, 2006; Golder, Wilkinson, & Huberman, 2007; Selwyn, 2009) and it has become an important part of their social life (Deng & Tavares, 2013). Due to this reason, the current research focuses on the SNS usage of both undergraduate students and faculty members. Moreover, it investigates how they use it for educational purposes. SNSs display an important effect on students, classroom climate, the learning and motivation of students, and effective learning (Mazer, Murphy, & Simonds, 2007). As stated by Cheung et al. (2011), investigating how undergraduate students use Facebook is important. Likewise, Kalin (2012) suggests that students' usage of technology should be better understood before

Received March 2019.

Cite as: Islim, O. F. & Sevim-Cirak, N. (2019). Faculty Members Vs Students: How They Use Social Networking Sites Personally and Educationally. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, 12(2), 1-14, DOI: 10.24193/adn.12.2.1.

investigating its benefits. In addition to undergraduate students, faculty members' usage of Facebook should also be taken into consideration since they are the authority for technology usage in the classroom. It is believed that this current research might help practitioners and researchers about how faculty member and students use Facebook for both educational and personal purpose.

2. Literature review

2. 1. Facebook

Facebook was created in 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg, Eduardo Saverin, Dustin Moskovitz, Andrew McCollum, and Chris Hughes when studying at Harvard in order to help university and college students identify students from other halls of residence. Zuckerberg described Facebook as "an online directory that connects people through social networks at colleges and universities" (Zuckerberg, 2005, p. 1). While Facebook was initially only available for Harvard University students in 2004, other universities were soon added, and then it was launched into the public domain in 2006 (Sheldon, 2008), and the popularity of Facebook soon spread far beyond the USA. Since then, the number of Facebook users has increased rapidly. In December 2006, 12 million people used the website, while by December 2009, it had attracted 350 million users (Facebook, 2009). However, by December 2017, a total of 2.129 billion people actively use Facebook on a monthly basis, and 51 million of those are registered users from Turkey (Statista, 2018). Today, it is used for many purposes in addition to interpersonal communication. People share personal information, photographs, videos, news, political viewpoints, comedy, as well joining special groups with shared similar interests (Buckman, 2005; Hew, 2011), and/or use the application for the purposes of entertainment with online games and other applications (Hew, 2011).

2. 2. General use of Facebook among college students

Facebook is considered as the most popular SNS among college students (Cheung et al., 2011; Deng & Tavares, 2013; Educause, 2006; Golder et al., 2007; Selwyn, 2009; Smith, & Anderson, 2018) and this in turn has made researchers question its impact on the life of its users (Barratt, Hendrickson, Stephens, & Torres, 2005). There is debate as to the effect of Facebook on students' life. Munoz and Towner (2009) claimed that it can positively affect the life of college students since it helps students to contact other friends about their course assignments, projects, and helps instructors to communicate with their students and to provide a useful link to them. However, Hew (2011) warned of negative effects of Facebook on students. He stated that students might upload inappropriate pictures to their profiles which might endanger their future careers and be the cause of inaccurate interpretation by potential future employers (Hew, 2011).

2. 3. Educational use of Facebook

Facebook is the most popular SNS integrated into the educational context. The literature provides many examples of its educational usage and its subsequent effect on the learning and teaching process (Manca & Ranieri, 2013; Tess, 2013). It is seen that within an educational context, Facebook is mainly used in five areas: 1) supporting class discussion and increasing student engagement in collaborative learning; 2) content development; 3) sharing educational resources; 4) delivering content to expose students to extracurricular resources; and 5) supporting self-managed learning (Manca & Ranieri, 2013).

Facebook is suggested for use in educational settings for many reasons. It is claimed that it can increase student engagement and active learning, support knowledge construction, significantly positively affect the performance of students, and improve their learning outcomes through increased self-esteem, leading to adaptation to the culture of the university, allowing their social acceptance and helping them to adapt to university life (Cheung et al., 2011; Madge et al., 2009; Selwyn, 2009). In addition, Facebook can be used as a communication tool as befitting the preferences of today's students (Junco, 2012a; Selwyn, 2010). Bowers-Campbell (2008) found that Facebook might increase self-regulated learning and self-efficacy by enhancing communication with classmates and instructors.

Likewise, Selwyn (2009) proposed that Facebook can help students to learn “being a student” informally. Greenhow (2011) suggested that in addition to learning support, Facebook can be used as an environment in which students can both learn and help each other to become more academically engaged, as well helping them individually. It allows for the forming of communities of practice for learning and teaching, and thereby expands the boundaries of the learning process (Yang, Wang, Woo, & Quek, 2011). Facebook can enhance students’ motivation, connect instructors and students, increase collaborative models of learning, and create a comfortable classroom climate (Goertler, 2009; Mazer et al., 2007).

Robelia, Greenhow, and Burton (2011) prepared a special Facebook application in order to examine whether or not Facebook can increase the awareness of climate change. They found that Facebook app users had average knowledge about climate change and due to the peer modeling on their app; they performed more pro-environmental behaviors. Similarly, Schroeder and Greenbowe (2009) created a Facebook group that supplemented classroom instruction of an organic chemistry laboratory and found that it increased student participation and communication. They showed that although only 41% of the students in the chemistry class had joined the class Facebook group, they posted 400% more than in the course management systems. Also, the Facebook group created more complex topics and replied in greater detail than in the course management systems. Irwin, Ball, Desbrow, and Leveritt (2012) tested the use of Facebook as an interactive learning tool from the students’ perspective. They prepared Facebook pages for four separate courses at their university. Their research showed that students favored the usage of Facebook for academic purposes. They thought that Facebook pages were effective for many reasons such as the promotion of interaction and participation in course-related discussions, and that it gave them access to course-related media and learning materials. Kabilan, Ahmad, and Abidin (2010) revealed that Facebook was considered as a meaningful online environment by the students, and helped them to increase their English learning in doing so. McCarthy (2012) found that according to students, Facebook was a valuable learning resource which enhanced their academic networking, discussion, and critique. Likewise, Yu, Tian, Vogel, and Kwok (2010) found that Facebook helped to develop relationships which led to an improvement in self-esteem, through evaluation of student performance and their satisfaction with campus life.

Facebook is also compared with learning and course management systems (LCMS) due to its similarity of certain features. Wang, Woo, Quek, Yang, and Liu (2011) examined the features of Facebook and claimed that it offers many features like LCMSs such as a provision for academic/class announcements, the sharing of resources, and for conducting discussions. To compare Facebook and LCMS, in their research, Hurt et al. (2012) divided students into two groups and assigned them to use Facebook or LCMS in two similar courses. Their study showed that the Facebook users achieved a better educational outcome when compared to their colleagues who used LCMS. Moreover, while 43% of the LCMS users stated that if they had used Facebook, they would have contributed greatly, only 12% of the students assigned to Facebook claimed that they contributed more than if they had used LCMS. In a similar manner, Hollyhead, Edwards, and Holt (2012) reported that if there was no official course-related sites or systems, students preferred to create Facebook groups rather than using the LMS. Schroeder and Greenbowe (2009) demonstrated that higher education students preferred to use Facebook instead of WebCT for online discussions.

In addition to the educational potential and proven benefits of Facebook, the literature includes many research studies which prove that multitasking with technology, especially with social networking sites offering instant messaging, decreases productivity and efficiency within an educational environment (Bowman, Levine, Waite, & Gendron, 2010; Fox, Rosen, & Crawford, 2009; Jacobsen & Forste, 2011). Kirschner and Karpinski (2010) pointed out that although Facebook users and nonusers did not differ in the amount of time spent using the Internet, when compared to nonusers, Facebook users tended to spend less time on their studies and had lower GPA scores. A research study conducted by Junco (2012a) showed a negative relationship between the frequency of Facebook checking, the time spent using it, and their engagement in educational activities. Similarly, a negative relationship was found between the time spent on Facebook, the number of logins, and students’ overall GPA and time spent on preparing for class; whereas, a positive relationship was found between GPA and checking in with friends and sharing links (Junco, 2012b). Contrarily, Pasek, More, and Hargittai

(2009) found no correlation between grades and Facebook usage by students. Likewise, Kolek and Saunders (2008) pointed out that Facebook users did not significantly differ from nonusers in terms of their GPA scores.

From the students' perspective, Facebook is seen as a social technology instead of teaching technology (Madge et al., 2009; Selwyn, 2009), but students want to use SNSs more in their courses (Educause, 2012; Smith & Caruso, 2010). Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe (2011) showed that higher education students used Facebook to connect with their high school friends and build bonds with their new friends at university (Ellison et al., 2007, 2011) in order to gain new information about them while sustaining their friendship. According to Junco (2015), connecting with both high school and college friends helps students to overcome homesickness while building new connections as well as protecting the old ones which leads to success. Research conducted by Madge et al. (2009) showed that college students primarily used Facebook for social purposes. According to the students, Facebook creates an environment for informal learning by providing communication and interaction. The researchers found that although students thought that it could be used for formal teaching and learning process, and even though they conducted discussions with their peers about academic matters, most of the students were not keen on using it for formal discussions about teaching-and-learning or for communicating with their instructors (Madge et al., 2009).

While Facebook is considered to increase the learning process, it is shown that some faculty members are unwilling to adapt Facebook to their courses (Cloete, de Villiers, & Roodt, 2009; Roblyer, McDaniel, Webb, Herman, & Witty, 2010). It is seen that higher education faculty members use Facebook more than the other social networking sites for personal purposes. Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2013) showed in their research that 57% of faculty members visited Facebook "at least monthly." In addition, they found that only 8.4% used it for educational purposes. Faculty members preferred Facebook more than Twitter, but less than podcasts, LinkedIn, and wikis for educational purposes. Mazer et al. (2007) examined teachers' self-disclosure within the Facebook environment and found that when students reached the teachers' Facebook page where teachers showed high self-disclosure, they showed higher levels of motivation, effective learning, and a more positive classroom climate, which could lead to better student outcomes. But, Madge et al. (2009) warned instructors to be careful when entering the social networking space of their students. Mazer et al. (2007) notified faculty members about their disclosure as it was seen that it might negatively affect their credibility.

3. Method

In this quantitative research, survey method was employed in order to understand students' and faculty members' beliefs about social media and their usage habits. In survey studies, there is no manipulation, treatment, or purpose to explain cause and effect (Creswell, 2007, 2009). Survey method is generally used to understand or describe the beliefs, opinions, attitudes, behaviors, or characteristics of the population via administering a number of questions to a sample or to the entire population (Creswell, 2007, 2009; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012).

From many different survey methods, a cross-sectional survey design was utilized for this study. A cross-sectional survey study might best explore current beliefs, attitudes, opinions, practices of a single group, or might compare two or more groups (Creswell, 2007, 2009). Moreover, data of the study might be collected at just one point in time, even though collecting all data takes more time (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

3.1. Participants of the study

A purposeful sampling method was utilized, and two groups of participants were selected for the study. Purposeful sampling is one of the nonrandom sampling methods that is used to select participants based on their characteristics, such as prior knowledge, education, ethnicity, etc. that might provide essential data for the study (Creswell, 2007, 2009; Fraenkel et al., 2012; Miles & Huberman, 1994). A Faculty of Education at a Turkish university was selected as the population of the current study. There were two main reasons behind this selection. The first and main reason is the role played by faculties of education in Turkey, as they are responsible for preparing new-to-service

teachers who need to embrace and use technology effectively, both in and out of the classroom. Moreover, many non-educational materials, tools, or applications are used for educational purposes with faculties of education for a more effective education. Secondly, the Faculty of Education at the researchers' university is considered to be one of the most crowded faculties, offering many different majors that ensures variability within the population.

The first group of participants consisted of 53 faculty members from the Faculty of Education, which included one full professor, 15 associate professors, 16 assistant professors, 10 instructors, and 11 research assistants. While 36 (68%) of the group's participants were male, 17 (32%) were female. The level of experience within their field differed from less than one year to 45 years.

The second group of participants consisted of 373 undergraduate students studying seven different majors at the Faculty of Education (see Table 1). While 134 of the students (35.9%) were male, 239 were female (64.1%). The age of the students ranged from 18 to 27.

Table 1. Numbers of students and their departments

Department	Number of students	Percentage (%)
Elementary Math Education	101	27.1
Computer Education and Instructional Technology	86	23.1
Elementary Education	70	18.8
Elementary Science Education	43	11.5
Psychological Counseling and Guidance	30	8.0
Turkish Language Education	26	7.0
Social Sciences Education	17	4.6

3.2. Instrument and procedures

Data of the study were collected via a "Social Media Usage Questionnaire" prepared by the researchers. The items in the questionnaire were prepared based on the literature and the aim of the study. A draft version of the questionnaire was then sent for review by four experts. Each expert had a Ph.D. in instructional technology and was also a public university faculty member. The questionnaire was revised and finalized based on the comments and suggestions of the experts. The finalized questionnaire consisted of 46 questions under three sections. In the first section, there were 16 questions to determine participant demographics. In the second section, there were five questions to determine social media intensity, which was adopted from Sumuer, Esfer, and Yildirim (2014). Lastly, there were 25 questions in the third section to determine the social media usage habits of the participants and their opinions about the use of it for educational purposes. Even though the final questionnaire was printed and administered within the classes, participation to the study remained voluntary.

4. Findings

4.1. Students

4.1.1. What students share on SNS. The result of the study revealed that Facebook was the most common SNS used among the students (see Table 1). The students were careful about friendship requests on SNS. More than half of the students had sent friendship request to their friends (83.9%, n=313), to classmates (79.9%, n=298), to friends from college (73.8%, n=275), to relatives (72.4%, n=270), to their roommates (63.6%, n=237) and to their instructors (56.9%, n=212), while a minority sent requests to everyone they know (37.3%, n=139) and even to friends of their friends (17.2%, n=64). In addition, although the majority accepted friendship request from friends (87.4%, n=326), classmates (87.4%, n=326), college friends (80.5%, n=300), relatives (76.4%, n=285), roommates (68.9%, n=257) and instructors (62%, n=231); less than half of them accepted friend requests from friends of friends (42.9%, n=160) and any kind of request, such as friend request, game request, etc. (21.4%, n=80).

Table 2. *Number of SNS users*

Name of SNS	Number of Users (n)	Percentage (%)
Facebook	296	79.36
Instagram	280	75.07
Twitter	191	51.21
Swarm	162	43.43
Google Plus	141	37.80
LinkedIn	69	18.50

Furthermore, the result of the study also indicated that students did not share all information about themselves on SNS. Name (81.5%, n=304), photographs-videos (72.1%, n=269), hometown (67.8%, n=253), and birthday (63%, n=235) were the main information shared by the majority of the students; whereas phone number (11.3%, n=42) and home address (8.8%, n=33) were the least shared information among the students.

4.1.2. Students'intended use of SNS. As a part of the study, the students were asked to identify the primary reason behind their SNS usage. The result indicated that students primarily used SNS to communicate with their current friends (86.9%, n=324), to be kept up to date (76.9%, n=287), to locate friends they had lost touch with (59.8%, n=226), to learn what other people do (53.1%, n=198), to follow celebrities or popular pages (49.9%, n=186), to follow institutions (48.8%, n=182), to trade (34.6%, n=129), and to find new friends (8.8%, n=113).

4.1.3. SNS intensity of students. In the second part of the questionnaire, the students were asked about their SNS intensity of usage. The result of the study revealed that only 28.1% (n=105) of the students were proud to tell people they were on SNS, with 31.1% (n=116) feeling out of touch when not having logged onto SNS for a while, and 33.8 (n=126) would be sorry if the SNS shut down. However, 40.5% (n=151) of the students felt they were a part of a SNS community, and 63.3% (n=236) of them agreed that the SNS had become a part of their everyday activity.

4.1.4. Opinions of students about SNS and their habits. The results of the study showed that the students were willing to follow their department, faculty, and university on social media especially on Facebook. Of the participants, 73.7% (n=264) wanted their faculty to create a Facebook page and to start sharing, while 70.9% (n=254) wanted to follow their university, and 62.6% (n=224) wanted to follow their department on Facebook. Again, the majority of the students were willing for their college (67.9%, n=243), university (54.2%, n=230) and their department (65.4%, n=234) to make announcements via social media and believed that social media accounts of universities (70.7%, n=253), faculties (66.8%, n=239) and departments (61.5%, n=220) could help students to develop positive attitudes towards them.

In addition, it is seen that students wanted to be friends with their instructors in the online social environment, especially on Facebook. More than half of the students stated that they would be happy if their instructors sent a friendship request to them (69.8%, n=250) and if their instructors accepted their friendship request (67.6%, n=242) on social media. Additionally, they did not feel uncomfortable if their instructors joined groups created by the students (46.1%, n=165), in fact, they wanted their instructors to join these groups on social media (56.4%, n=202). Related to disclosure, it was found that more than half of the students felt comfortable about their sharing in social media. The participants stated that they would feel uncomfortable if their instructors saw their personal sharing such as videos, photographs (67.9%, n=243), or those that they were tagged in (68.4%, n=245), or if their instructors commented on them (67.3%, n=241). Nearly half of the participants disagreed with the item "having an account on social media affected the opinions of instructors about me positively" (45.5%, n=163), while 34.1% (n=122) of them were neutral to that item. Besides, only 29.1% of the students (n=104) wanted their instructors to use social media to gain information about themselves. However, they had diverse ideas related to the disclosure of their instructors on social media. The data showed that only 33.5% of the students (n=120) believed that all faculty members should have a social media account and 39.7% of the participants (n=142) wanted to use social media to gain information about their instructors. Nearly half of the students agreed with the item "having an account on social media affected my opinions about instructors positively" (43.3%, n=155).

Related to communication, participants generally had positive opinions about communicating with their instructors via social media. Nearly half of them stated that they wanted their instructors to communicate with them via social media (52.5%, n=188) and believed that communicating with their instructor via social media positively affected their relationship (49.2%, n=176). Moreover, it was seen that participants generally disagreed with the statements, "I think communicating with my instructors via social media made me uncomfortable" (57.5%, n=206) and "I think communicating with my instructors via social media made them uncomfortable" (46.1%, n=165). More than half of the participants wanted their instructors to do sharing on social media (54.7%, n=196). Although 63.1% of them wanted to give "likes" to the sharing of their instructors (n=226), only 39.7% wanted to comment on them (n=142). Finally, 54.7% of the participants (n=196) wanted their instructors to make announcements via social media, and 67% of them (n=240) wanted their instructors to create groups in order to share things about their courses.

4.2. Instructors

4.2.1. What instructors share on SNS. The data gathered from this study revealed that Facebook was the most common SNS among instructors, while academic SNS were also widely used (see Table 3). Moreover, the faculty members were selective about friendship requests on their SNS account. More than half of the instructors sent friendship request to their friends (81.1%, n=43), relatives (64.2%, n=34), colleagues (50.9%, n=27); while a minority sent friendship requests to others (11.3%, n=6) or their students (3.8%, n=2). Similarly, more than half of them accepted friendship request from their friends (84.9%, n=45), relatives (73.6%, n=39), colleagues (66%, n=35), and students (62.3%, n=33); and few of them accepted friendship requests from anybody else they knew (15.1%, n=8), friends of friends (11.3%, n=6) or others (7.5%, n=4).

Table 3. Number of SNS users

Name of SNS	Number of Users (n)	Percentage (%)
Facebook	41	77.36
ResearchGate	38	71.70
Academia	29	54.72
LinkedIn	24	45.28
Twitter	22	41.51
Instagram	22	41.51
Google Plus	20	37.74
Swarm	10	18.87

Similar to the students, the faculty members did not share all information about themselves on their SNS profile. Name (77.4%, n = 41), place of work (66%, n = 35), photographs-videos (52.8%, n = 28), and their e-mail address (52.8%, n = 28) were the main information shared by faculty members. In addition to this, some faculty members also shared their hometown (43.4%, n = 23), birthday (34%, n = 18), telephone number/s (18.9%, n = 10), relationship status (18.9%, n = 10), home address (11.3%, n = 6), and political viewpoint (3%, n = 5.7).

Related to friendship requests from students, faculty members generally accepted friendship requests from research assistants in their departments (64.2%, n = 34), their Undergraduate students (58.5%, n = 31), Master's students (54.7%, n = 29), and Doctoral students (49.1%, n = 26). However, a small number of faculty members accepted friend requests from Pedagogical Proficiency Certificate students (18.9%, n = 10).

4.2.2 Instructors' Intended use of SNS. As well as students, this study aimed at revealing the primary usage of SNS. The results revealed that more than two-thirds of the instructors used SNS for communicating with their existing friends (67.9%, n = 36) and other academicians (64.2%, n = 34), as

well as to be kept up to date (50.9%, n = 27). On the other hand, they mostly did not use SNS to play games (5.7%, n = 3).

4.2.3 Social Media Intensity of Instructors. In the second part of the questionnaire, the instructors were asked about their social media intensity. The results revealed that only 11.3% (n = 6) felt out of touch when they had not logged onto SNS for a while or would be sorry if the SNS had shut down. Moreover, only 15.1% (n = 8) of the instructors felt that they were a part of the SNS's community, and 18.9% (n = 10) were proud to tell people they were SNS users. Lastly, 37.8% (n = 20) of them accepted that that SNS had become a part of their everyday activity.

4.2.4 Opinions of Faculty Members About SNS and Their Habits. The data showed that faculty members gave importance to the social media accounts of their universities and faculties. Although 49.1% (n = 26) of the instructors disagreed with the items, "I think all faculty members should have social media accounts," 69.8% (n = 37) believed that every university and 56.6% (n = 30) every department should have social media accounts. According to half of the faculty members in this study, they believed that social media accounts of universities (56.6%, n = 30) and departments (47.2%, n = 25) could help students to develop positive attitudes towards them.

Related to self-disclosure, it was seen that faculty members in this study felt comfortable interacting with their students in the social media environment. More than half of faculty members disagreed that they would be uncomfortable if their students sent them friendship requests (60.4%, n = 32). Moreover, they stated that they did not feel uncomfortable if their students saw their personal sharing such as videos, photographs or commented on them (60.4%, n = 32). In fact, the faculty members believed that interaction with their students on social media did not negatively affect their relationship. 75.5% (n = 40) of faculty members disagreed with the statement, "having an account on social media affected my students' opinions about me negatively" and 41.5% of them (n = 22) disagreed that "having an account on social media affected my students' opinions about me positively." However, 47.2% (n = 25) of the faculty members did not want to see their students' sharing on social media and 60.4% of them (n = 32) did not want to comment upon them. Similarly, 52.8% (n = 28) did not follow what their students shared and 71.7% of faculty members (n = 38) did not look at the social media accounts of their students in order to gain information about them, while 39.6% of them (n = 21) did not want their students to follow their own personal sharing. Likewise, 60.4% of the faculty members (n = 32) did not become members of social media groups created by their students.

In this study, it was also found that faculty members did not use SNS for announcements or for sharing with their students. While 52.8% of faculty members (n = 28) shared news and publications which might be beneficial to their students via their social media account, 50.9% of them (n = 27) did not use social media to share with their students specifically. Only 45.3% of faculty members (n = 24) made announcements via social media, while 47.2% (n = 25) preferred not to do so. Similarly, 62.3% (n = 33) did not create groups for the purpose of sharing with their students, while 22.6% (n = 12) did. However, 39.6% (n = 21) shared materials about their courses via social media. In fact, 35.8% of faculty members (n = 19) created special groups in order to share materials related to their courses.

For academic work, it was seen that faculty members shared their new publications in academic SNSs (56.6%, n = 30), whereas only 28.3% (n = 15) shared their new publications and 37.7% (n = 20) shared their projects they were working on in non-academic SNSs.

When the communication of faculty members with students via social media is examined, it can be seen that 49.1% (n = 26) did not want their students to communicate with them via social media, whereas 30.2% (n = 16) did. Only 32.1% (n = 17) created special groups in order to communicate with their students. 69.8% of faculty members (n = 37) believed that communicating with their students via social media might negatively affect their students' opinion about them. Contradictorily, 43.4% of them (n = 23) believed that communicating with their students via social media might positively affect their students' opinion about them. Finally, 62.3% of faculty members (n = 33) claimed that communicating with their students via social media made them feel uncomfortable and that communicating with their students via social media might harm the professional relationship between them.

Regarding with the interaction with graduate-level students in SNS, especially Facebook, it was seen that out of 40 faculty members only 33 of them had graduate-level students. 7.5% (n = 4) of the faculty members followed the students who the faculty members were mentoring on social media, 22.6% of them (n = 12) communicated with them, and 13.2% (n = 7) motivated them by way of social media. 26.4% of faculty members (n = 14) wanted the students they were mentoring to be a member of academic social networks, and 15.1% of faculty members (n = 8) wanted to follow grad students they are on their committee.

5. Discussions and Conclusions

The aim of the current study was to understand students' and faculty members' beliefs about social networking sites and its use for educational purposes, especially Facebook, as well as their usage habits. According to the results of the study, Facebook is the most common SNS amongst both students and faculty members, which is in a similar vein to former studies (e.g., Cheung et al., 2011; Deng & Tavares, 2013; Educause, 2006; Golder et al., 2007; Selwyn, 2009; Smith, & Anderson, 2018). Furthermore, it was seen that the main reason to use SNS was communication. Participants in this study mostly wanted to keep in touch with other people and to be kept up to date. Today, people use SNS as the initial source of information. Breaking news spreads faster with SNS than any other media, and is mostly without censorship. People can stream live videos when they encounter an interesting or unusual situation. Moreover, recent social circumstances that have occurred around the world revealed that people could organize and get together in an unbelievably short amount of time in response to social media posts.

Academic social networks were commonly used by faculty members subsequent to Facebook. More than half of the faculty members posted their newly published papers on academic social networks, while most of them did not do so on Facebook. This might indicate that faculty members prefer to make a distinction between their academic and personal life. On the other hand, Instagram is the most common SNS of students after Facebook. According to the PEW Research Center (2018), YouTube is the most common social media (85%), and Instagram is the most common social network (72%) amongst teens; whereas Facebook took third place on the list (51%) after Snapchat (69%). The number of Facebook users dropped from 71% to 51% since 2015, while the number of Instagram users increased from 52% to 72% (PEW, 2015). Facebook is no longer the dominant SNS used amongst teenagers. Even though the reasons behind this dropout needs to be investigated in a separate and more detailed study, teenagers might have thought that Facebook is now a place for adults rather than youth, since their parents and even grandparents now have an account (Sweney & De Liz, 2018; Wright, 2018), and now it is they who post embarrassing comments, videos, and photos etc.

Both faculty members and students were conscious about friendship requests. Both faculty members and students were able to send and/or accept friend request from each other's without hesitation. On the other hand, faculty members preferred not to communicate with students via SNS. This might be as a result of deliberately maintaining a personal/professional boundary. More than half of the faculty members thought that communicating with students via SNS might harm their professional relationship with their students and inadvertently eradicate the necessary boundaries. In this manner, only one-third of the faculty members created groups on SNS in order to communicate and share with their students. Furthermore, over half of the faculty members elected not to become members of SNS groups driven by students.

Institutional accounts and groups were seen as a requirement by both groups for the purpose of making announcements and for the sharing of institutional information via SNS. Independent of platform, students now regularly check their SNS accounts, whereas they would not have checked their e-mail accounts. The act of sharing over social media might be useful in order to reach more people when compared to e-mails.

In conclusion, students and instructors are careful in their use of SNS, especially Facebook, allowing only limited people to access their profile. Moreover, students also want to use SNS for educational purpose such as for accessing documents and for receiving announcements regarding their courses. On

the other hand, instructors do not use SNS for education, although they do not feel uncomfortable interacting with their students in the that environment. Hence, instructors should be informed about the desire of their students and how they could better utilize SNS especially Facebook within their courses.

As with all studies, the current study had a number of limitations. The main limitation of the study was the participants themselves. Even though the study was conducted with a total of 373 students and 53 faculty members, all of the participants were from the same institution. Conducting a comprehensive study with more participants from different institutions might have resulted in statistically different results. The second limitation was conducting a study with faculty members, especially professors. Faculty members generally do not volunteer to participate in such studies. Furthermore, having a SNS account was a prerequisite to participation in the study, although many instructors, especially the older ones, did not have SNS accounts.

References

- Barratt, W., Hendrickson, M., Stephens, A., & Torres, J. (2005). Thefacebook.com: Computer mediated social networking. *Student Affairs Online*, 6(1), 1-5.
- Bowers-Campbell, J. (2008). Cyber “pokes”: motivational antidote for developmental college readers. *Journal of College Reading & Learning*, 39(1), 74-87.
- Bowman, L. L., Levine, L. E., Waite, B. M., & Gendron, M. (2010). Can students really multitask? An experimental study of instant messaging while reading. *Computers and Education*, 54(4), 927-931.
- Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2008). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-230.
- Buckman, R. (2005, December 8). *Too much information? Colleges fear student postings on popular Facebook site could pose security risks*. The Wall Street Journal. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB113400519172816925>.
- Cheung, C. M., Chiu, P. Y., & Lee, M. K. (2011). Online social networks: Why do students use Facebook? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(4), 1337-1343.
- Cloete, S., de Villiers, C., & Roodt, S. (2009). Facebook as an academic tool for ICT lecturers. In *Proceedings of the 2009 Annual Conference of the Southern African Computer Lecturer's Association* (pp. 16-22). New York: ACM.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9299.00177>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deng, L., & Tavares, N. J. (2013). From Moodle to Facebook: Exploring students' motivation and experiences in online communities. *Computers & Education*, 68, 167-176
- Educause. (2006). *7 Things you should know about Facebook*. Educause Learning Initiative. Retrieved from <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ELI7017.pdf>.
- Educause. (2012). *ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology 2012 (Research Report)*. Louisville, CO: EDUCAUSE: Center for Applied Research. Available at www.educause.edu/ecar.
- Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook “friends:” Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4), 1143-1168.
- Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2011). Connection strategies: Social capital implications of Facebook-enabled communication practices. *New Media & Society*, 13(6), 873-892.

- Facebook. (2009). *Company timeline*. Retrieved January 22, 2010 from <http://www.facebook.com/press/info.php?timeline>.
- Fox, A. B., Rosen, J., & Crawford, M. (2009). Distractions, distractions: Does instant messaging affect college students' performance on a concurrent reading comprehension task? *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 12(1), 51-53.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gemmill, E., & Peterson, M. (2006). Technology use among college students: Implications for student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal*, 43(2), 280-300.
- Goertler, S. (2009). Using computer-mediated communication (CMC) in language teaching. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 42(1), 74-84.
- Golder, S. A., Wilkinson, D., & Huberman, B. A. (2007). Rhythms of social interaction: Messaging within a massive online network. In C. Steinfeld, B. T. Pentland, M. Ackerman, & N. Contractor (Eds.), *Communities and Technologies 2007: Proceedings of the 3rd Communities and Technologies Conference* (pp. 41-66). London: Springer-Verlag Limited.
- Greenhow, C. (2011). Online social networks and learning. *On the Horizon*, 19(1), 4-12.
- Hampton, K., Sessions Goulet, L., Rainie, L., & Purcell, K. (2011). *Social networking sites and our lives*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project. Retrieved from https://wijvan.winkwaves.com/documents/2668/PIP_-_Social_networking_sites_and_our_lives.pdf.
- Hew, K. F. (2011). Students' and teachers' use of Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(2), 662-676.
- Hollyhead, A., Edwards, D. J., & Holt, G. D. (2012). The use of virtual learning environment (VLE) and social network site (SNS) hosted forums in higher education: A preliminary examination. *Industry and Higher Education*, 26(5), 369-379.
- Hurt, N. E., Moss, G. S., Bradley, C. L., Larson, L. R., Lovelace, M. D., Prevost, L. B.,...Camus, M. S. (2012). The "Facebook" effect: College students' perceptions of online discussions in the age of social networking. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(2), 1-24.
- Irwin, C., Ball, L., Desbrow, B., & Leveritt, M. (2012). Students' perceptions of using Facebook as an interactive learning resource at university. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(7), 1221-1232.
- Jacobsen, W. C., & Forste, R. (2011). The wired generation: Academic and social outcomes of electronic media use among university students. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 14(5), 275-280.
- Junco, R. (2012a). The relationship between frequency of Facebook use, participation in Facebook activities, and student engagement. *Computers & Education*, 58(1), 162-171.
- Junco, R. (2012b). Too much face and not enough books: The relationship between multiple indices of Facebook use and academic performance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(1), 187-198.
- Junco, R. (2015). Student class standing, Facebook use, and academic performance. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 36, 18-29.
- Kabilan, M. K., Ahmad, N., & Abidin, M. J. Z. (2010). Facebook: an online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education? *Internet and Higher Education*, 13(4), 179-187.
- Kalin, J. (2012). Doing what comes naturally? Students perceptions and use of collaborative technologies. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(1), 1-21.
- Kirschner, P. A., & Karpinski, A. C. (2010). Facebook and academic performance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1237-1245.

- Kolek, E. A., & Saunders, D. (2008). Online disclosure: An empirical examination of undergraduate Facebook profiles. *NASPA Journal*, 45(1), 1-25.
- Madge, C., Meek, J., Wellens, J., & Hooley, T. (2009). Facebook, social integration and informal learning at university: it is more for socializing and talking to friends about work than for actually doing work. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34(2), 141-155.
- Manca, S., & Ranieri, M. (2013). Is it a tool suitable for learning? A critical review of the literature on Facebook as a technology-enhanced learning environment. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 29(6), 487-504.
- Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). I'll see you on Facebook: the effects of computer-mediated teacher self-disclosure on student motivation, affective learning, and classroom climate. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 1-17.
- McCarthy, J. (2012). International design collaboration and mentoring for tertiary students through Facebook. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(5), 755-775.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Munoz, C., & Towner, T. (2009). Opening Facebook: How to use Facebook in the college classroom. In I. Gibson, R. Weber, K. McFerrin, R. Carlsen, & D. Willis. (Eds.), *Proceedings of SITE 2009, Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference 2009* (pp. 2623-2627). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.
- Murray, K. E., & Waller, R. (2007). Social networking goes abroad. *International Educator*, 16(3), 56-59.
- Pasek, J., More, E., & Hargittai, E. (2009). Facebook and academic performance: Reconciling a media sensation with data. *First Monday*, 14(5). doi:<https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v14i5.2498>.
- PEW Research Center. (2015). *Teens, Social Media & Technology Overview 2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/04/09/teens-social-media-technology-2015/>
- PEW Research Center. (2018). *Teens, Social Media & Technology 2018*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2018/05/31/teens-social-media-technology-2018/>
- Robelia, B. A., Greenhow, C., & Burton, L. (2011). Environmental learning in online social networks: Adopting environmentally responsible behaviors. *Environmental Education Research*, 17(4), 553-575. DOI: 10.1080/13504622.2011.565118
- Roblyer, M. D., McDaniel, M., Webb, M., Herman, J., & Witty, J. V. (2010). Findings on Facebook in higher education: a comparison of college faculty and student uses and perceptions of social networking sites. *Internet and Higher Education*, 13(3), 134-140.
- Schroeder, J., & Greenbowe, T. (2009). The chemistry of Facebook: using social networking to create an online community for the organic chemistry laboratory. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, 5(4).
- Seaman, J., & Tinti-Kane, H. (2013). *Social media for teaching and learning. Pearson annual survey of social media use by higher education faculty*. Retrieved from <https://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/social-media-for-teaching-and-learning-2013-report.pdf>.
- Selwyn, N. (2009). Faceworking: exploring students' education-related use of Facebook. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34(2), 157-174.
- Selwyn, N. (2010). Looking beyond learning: Notes towards the critical study of educational technology. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 26(1), 65-73.
- Sheldon, P. (2008). Student favourite: Facebook and motives for its use. *Southwestern Mass Communication Journal*, 23(2), 39-53

- Smith, S. D., & Caruso, J. B. (2010). *The ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology*. In Research study (Vol. 6). Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research. Available at www.educause.edu/ecar.
- Smith, A., & Anderson, M. (2018). Social media use in 2018. *Pew Research Center, 1*.
- Sumner, E., Esfer, S., & Yildirim, S. (2014). Teachers' Facebook use: their use habits, intensity, self-disclosure, privacy settings, and activities on Facebook. *Educational Studies, 40*(5), 537-553.
- Sweney, M., & De Liz, A. (2018, February 16). *Parents killed it': why Facebook is losing its teenage users*. The Guardian. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/feb/16/parents-killed-it-facebook-losing-teenage-users>.
- Tess, P. (2013). The role of social media in higher education classes (real and virtual)—A literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*(5), 60–68
- Wang, Q., Woo, H. L., Quek, C. L., Yang, Y., & Liu, M. (2011). Using the Facebook group as a learning management system: an exploratory study. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 43*(2), 428-438.
- Wright, M. (2018, February 12). *Over 55s flock to Facebook as teenagers leave in droves for Snapchat*. The Telegraph. Retrieved from <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/2018/02/12/55s-flock-facebook-teenagers-leave-droves-snapchat/>.
- Yang, Y., Wang, Q., Woo, H. L., & Quek, C. L. (2011). Using Facebook for teaching and learning: a review of the literature. *International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Life-Long Learning, 21*(1), 72-86.
- Yu, A. Y., Tian, S. W., Vogel, D., & Chi-Wai Kwok, R. (2010). Can learning be virtually boosted? An investigation of online social networking impacts. *Computers and Education, 55*(4), 1494-1503. DOI: 10.1016/j.compedu.2010.06.015
- Zuckerberg, M. (2005). *Thefacebook.com*. Retrieved June 13, 2008 from <http://thefacebook.com/about.php>.

Authors

Omer Faruk ISLIM, Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Kirsehir (Turkey). E-mail: omerfarukislim@gmail.com

Nese SEVIM-CIRAK, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur (Turkey). E-mail: nsevim@mehmetakif.edu.tr