OPINIONS OF STUDENTS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS TEACHING ON THE USE OF SOCIAL NETWORK SITES

Gülten HERGÜNER
Sakarya University Education Faculty
Physical Education and Sports Teaching Department
Sakarya, Turkey
herguner@sakarya.edu.tr

ABSTRACT
Because an important period of time of daily life has been spent on the Internet, the way people communicate has recently changed. One of the most important reasons for this change is social network sites (SNS). It can be seen that the most adhesive users of SNS in Turkey which have gained an increasing global quality are students. This descriptive study was made in order to determine the aims of 180 students who attend Sakarya University (SU) Physical Education and Sports Teaching Department (PESTD) in 2010 to use SNS, the duration they use SNS and their opinions on the credibility of SNS. Data were obtained through an interview and a questionnaire established by the researcher. They were evaluated by the program SPSS 15.0. In the statistical evaluation factor analysis, T-test, ANOVA and Chi-Square tests were implemented. At the end of the study, it was found that the participants use SNS mostly in order to learn what their friends are doing (66,7 %), to spend time (57,2 %), to be informed about sports organizations (55,6 %); and that they use the Internet to log in SNS (53,9 %) 1-2 hours (40,6 %) or less than 1 hour (24,4 %) a day. Moreover, it was found that SNS cause interference in their private lives (58,4 %); their negative effects are more than positive ones (46,2 %); and SNS are not safe (43,9 %). When results are evaluated generally, it can be said that the participants are conscious of SNS and the Internet.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, the communication uses of the Internet have become a very important part of young people's lives (Gemmill & Peterson, 2006; Jones, 2002; Lenhart & Madden, 2007; Subrahmanyam & Greenfield, 2008). Recent reports find that the youth spend nearly 10 hours a day using some form of technology, with socially networked media playing a large role in their daily lives (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010). Sites such as MySpace and Facebook have over 100 million users, many of whom are adolescents and emerging adults (Subrahmanyam, Reich, Waechter & Espinoza, 2008).

The communication forums of the Internet are many and varied and include applications such as instant messaging, email, and chat rooms as well as Internet sites such as blogs, SNS, photo and video sharing sites such as YouTube, and virtual reality environments such as Second Life. The mechanism of socialized Internet improves close interpersonal relationships and provides nonverbal communication media such as multimedia audio-visual objects, images, pictures, and other diverse media. By communicating and sharing with others through resourceful media, interpersonal interaction becomes closer (Huang, Yang, Huang & Hsiao, 2010).

Social Network Sites (SNS)

The social network is utilized to sustain existing offline relationships or support offline connections, as opposed to meeting new people. These relationships may be based on frail ties, but typically there is some common offline connection among individuals (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007). Boyd (2006) defines SNS as a category of Web sites with profiles, semi-persistent public commentary on the profile, and a traversable publicly articulated social network displayed in relationship to the profile.

SNS 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, 2007). Almost all SNS allow various levels of privacy controls, the most important of which is the level of "visibility." In Facebook, the default visibility level is visibility to everyone in the network. There is no such walled area in Myspace. However, both in Facebook and in Myspace, one may also restrict the profile to "friends only," meaning that only other profiles that are explicitly linked as a "friend" can access one's profile. It is important to note that "friend" in a social network site is not synonymous with "friend" as it is generally understood, but there is some overlap between the concepts (Tüfekçi, 2008).

Uses of SNS for Teaching and Learning

Nowadays, many researches try to use the trend of Web 2.0 to push forward a new learning model, for example, applying blogs in learning and conducting knowledge sharing through blogs. Furthermore, due to the progress of wireless Internet and mobile devices, the mobile learning environment has gradually become stable and mature, for example, the mechanism of providing learning services in the mobile learning environment (Huang, Yang, Huang & Hsiao, 2010).

Boyd (2007) presented four important properties of mediated publics, which are persistence, searchability, replicability, and invisibility. Emergence of new online technologies expands the way people use online SNS, which may require these properties to be refined. As educators begin integrating online social networking within curriculum and instruction, it is important to consider how these properties influence the way the youth interact, socialize, and make personal and group decisions. Boyd included examples of how teachers may use and teach online social networking to teens.

In order to understand how to incorporate online social networking tools into the academic setting, one must understand how these tools are used to socialize, communicate, and interact online (Miller, 2009). SNS represent an opportunity for administrators and faculty members to reach out in a way that is more relevant to students than traditional email or classroom conversation. Traditional online course software also may receive little attention from students. But Facebook is where students live. It is not uncommon for students to log onto Facebook nearly every hour. In fact, some students have recognized that they spend too much time using Facebook, to the detriment of other aspects of their social life (Hoffman, 2008).

The technology itself does not improve learning, but social media might help students become more connected and engaged with their school communities. Online SNS widen a students' access to resources and social support and may have beneficial effects on their development. Conversely, as student access to the world widens, they are inevitably exposed to potentially negative material and interactions (Ahn, 2010). Although the Internet technology has made it possible for people to collaborate effectively without staying physically together, they have led to the unintended consequence of increasing isolation among people with respect to their academic peers (Huang, Yang, Huang & Hsiao, 2010). Karpinski (2009) found that college Facebook users had lower GPAs than students who were not users of the site. The author also found that Facebook users were more likely to participate in extra-curricular activities and also come from science, technology, engineering, and math fields.

The simplest strategy to limit liability and to safeguard school districts is to ban access to these new digital tools. However, such policies neglect the potentially large benefits of using social media in the classroom. To alleviate this dilemma, educators and policymakers need a deeper understanding of social media and the youth. Several questions are critical in the area of youth learning with social technologies (Ahn, 2010):

- Which groups of youth are using particular social technologies?
- How do they use these technologies to communicate, develop relationships, socialize, and learn?
- What are the effects of these technologies on youth development?
- What are the effects of these technologies when applied in educational contexts such as the classroom?

Considering these facts, in this study, it is aimed to assess the usage of SNS and the Internet of the students at Sakarya University Physical Education and Sports Teaching (SUPESTD).

METHOD

In the research, descriptive/survey method was used to determine the situation. Theoretical framework of research was created following the literature review. Research data were collected using the survey and interview. The survey developed by the researcher was composed of four parts. The first part investigates the purpose of the use of SNS; the second part investigates usage times of the Internet and SNS; the third part investigates the information and the thoughts of individuals concerning the reliability and intervention of SNS to private lives of persons; and the fourth part covers personal/demographic information. Validity and reliability of survey were checked and Cronbach Alpha value was found as 0,901. The survey was applied to the sample group composed of consciously selected 180 SUPESTD students. The data of this quantitative and qualitative research were collected through a survey and an interview in two stages. Quantitative data were obtained through multiple-choice survey questions and qualitative data through open-ended questions in the survey and face-to-face interviews with "structured interview form".

Population and Sample

The population of research comprised students receiving Physical Education and Sports Teaching Education at SU in 2010 Fall Semester. In this context, students of physical education and sports teaching, sports administration, coaching, and recreation receive education on the same campus together. 193 students who will be teachers of children and the youth in the future were consciously selected as sample. The application was carried out by the researcher. 7 students could not be reached because of such reasons as being in national team training camps, illnesses and other reasons. Because 8 surveys were filled in wrongly and incompletely, they were eliminated and 180 surveys were evaluated.

Data Collection and Analysis

Survey and face-to-face interview were carried out by the researcher. Surveys were given to students one by one and filled surveys were collected instantly. Identity information was not taken so that the questions were answered objectively and the students were never intervened while answering the survey. Results obtained from the multiple options in the survey constituted the quantitative data. Besides, data obtained from open-ended questions in the survey and face-to-face interviews with structured interview form were evaluated with appropriate statistical calculations.

Data were evaluated by SPSS 15.0 program. Bartlett-Ball test was applied to decide whether there is the same variance for each variable by calculating factor analysis results made on survey variables, and Chi-square value was found 2391,740 and p value was found 0,000. This result showed that the data obtained was suitable for factor analysis.

KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) test value of survey was found 0,859 and because this value is bigger than the value of 0,5 it was seen that the results of factor analysis were acceptable. Cronbach Alpha reliability parameter was checked to measure the reliability of factor analysis and this value was found 0,901. 8 dimensions were determined following the factor analysis results of variables in the usage scale of SNS.

Factor analysis and definitive statistics were used in the evaluation of working data. T-test and ANOVA test were used in comparison of qualitative data and Chi-square test was used in comparison of quantitative data. Results were evaluated in 95% confidence interval and at the $p<0,05$ significance level.

Findings and Discussion

The findings of the study are as follows:

Table 1: The Distribution of the purpose of the use of SNS

Aims for using SNS	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Have no idea	Agree	Totally agree
S1: I have a good time.	4,4	10,0	16,7	57,2	11,7
S2: I guess the results of sports matches.	9,4	27,8	18,9	33,3	10,6
S3: I meet new people.	15,6	21,7	10,0	40,6	12,2
S4: I share my photos and videos with people.	8,3	13,9	7,2	53,3	17,2
S5: I share/discuss developments on the agenda with my friends.	2,8	7,8	5,6	55,0	28,9
S6: I get rid of my loneliness.	17,8	27,8	19,4	27,2	7,8
S7: I can reach my old friends.	2,2	3,3	5,6	47,8	41,1
S8: I can express myself more comfortably.	8,9	28,9	18,9	32,8	10,6
S9: I can have a good time during the day.	7,8	13,9	22,2	44,4	11,7
S10: I can be informed about technical developments in Physical Education and Sports.	6,7	9,4	10,6	52,8	20,6
S11: I enjoy logging on these sites.	7,2	12,8	18,3	47,8	13,9
S12: I can share my feelings and opinions.	5,0	13,9	15,0	53,9	12,2
S13: I think I strengthen my social ties.	9,4	19,4	25,0	38,3	7,8
S14: I feel more peaceful and happier.	11,7	28,9	28,3	25,0	6,1
S15: I can learn what my friends are doing.	3,3	3,9	8,3	66,7	17,8

S16: I keep informed about sports organizations.	3,3	10,6	8,9	55,6	21,7
S17: I am recognized more easily among colleges/students.	9,4	20,0	22,8	34,4	13,3
S18: I can reach funny/interesting photos, videos and notes.	3,9	3,3	2,8	55,6	34,4
S19: I can communicate with prominent people in my field.	7,8	18,3	16,1	39,4	18,3
S20: I can spend my free time.	8,9	13,9	11,7	53,9	11,7
S21: I can be away from the environment that makes me feel bored.	12,2	21,7	19,4	36,1	10,6
S22: I can look at the photos of my friends and see how much they change.	2,8	4,4	3,3	56,1	33,3
S23: I can keep informed about the events on Physical Education and Sports.	3,3	13,3	11,7	53,3	18,3
S24: I improve my culture of Physical Education and Sports.	5,6	21,7	22,8	37,8	12,2
S25: I can share my knowledge and opinions on Physical Education and Sports.	5,6	20,0	16,7	46,7	11,1
S26: I can find solutions to the problems I face in my profession field.	6,1	21,7	21,7	37,2	13,3
S27: I can learn the lives of people prominent in my field.	5,6	20,0	17,8	41,1	15,6
S28: I think I spend my time effectively.	16,7	30,0	32,2	16,1	5,0
S39: I can share my political and social opinions.	16,7	24,4	11,7	37,8	9,4
S30: I have the feeling that I am involved in a social group.	16,7	34,4	16,1	24,4	8,3
S31: I can share my comments on sports events.	12,8	11,7	10,0	47,2	18,3

When the answers on the purpose of use of SNS are analyzed, it is clear that 66,7 % of the participants agree with the statement "I can learn what my friends are doing", 57,2 % agree with the statement "I have a good time", 55,6% agree with the statement "I keep informed about sports organizations", and 55,6% agree with the statement "I can reach funny/interesting photos, videos and notes". When it is analyzed from another respect, 16,1% of the participants agree with the statement "I think I spare my time on good things", 24,4% agree with the statement "I have the feeling that I am involved in a social group", and 25,0% agree with the statement "I feel more peaceful and happier". It can be understood from the table that the PESTD students are conscious users. The statement which is preferred at the highest level is related with friends, which shows that university students use SNS to realize communication and share among university students. And the statement which is preferred at the third level is related with sports and profession, and it shows that they use SNS properly. The most important thing is that the one which is preferred least is the statement "I think I spare my time effectively" and it indicates that they do not have the sense of belonging, and that it is not SNS that make them feel peaceful or happy and get rid of loneliness.

SNS which improve fast isolate individuals, especially children and the youth from their families and social and humane environments. And while they are getting into a virtual sociality, they begin to be in a distrustful mood to the outer life. PESTD students who seem to be aware of these risks can be said to be conscious users.

Table 2: Gender distribution of the participants

Gender	N	%
Female	53	29,4
Male	127	70,6
Total	180	100,0

It was found that 70,6% of the participants are males, and 29,4% are females. Since female student applicants are admitted to SUPESTD at the rate of 1/3, therefore, the result is parallel to the strategy of admitting applicants. This result demonstrates that participants use SNS for similar reasons.

Table 3: The distribution of the place where the participants have lived during most of their lives

Place where they have lived during most of their lives	N	%
Big Cities	51	28,3
City	59	32,8
Town	56	31,1
Small town	4	2,2
Village	10	5,6
Total	180	100,0

It was found that 32,8% of the participants have lived in cities, 31,1% have lived in towns, 28,3% have lived in big cities. It can be generalized that most of the participants have lived in cities and towns. Nowadays, parents are trying to create an environment in which their children can enjoy good conditions, and so they prefer big cities instead of small places. Children, who can begin to do sports in their childhood, since they are supported by the opportunities of big city, live their lives in big cities through either their families or their clubs.

Table 4: The distribution of with whom the participants live

With whom they live	N	%
Alone	11	6,1
With their friends	67	37,2
With their families	49	27,2
In a dormitory	51	28,3
Other	2	1,1
Total	180	100,0

The results show that 37,2% of the participants live with their friends, 28,3% live in a dormitory, and 27,2% live with their families. It is understood that the first choice of university students is to live with their friends. Sports students prefer living with their friends in private houses. Because of the reasons such as times of training, sports organizations, they may feel comfortable at home.

There is no statistically significant relationship between the distribution of purpose of use of SNS and their gender.

Table 5: The results of ANOVA test on the relationship between the purpose of use of SNS and the place where they have lived

	N	Average	Standard deviation	F	p
Big city	51	3,5218	,63271	2,407	0,051
City	59	3,3751	,49959		
Town	56	3,4447	,54853		
Small town	4	2,8629	,82384		
Village	10	3,0677	,67433		

There is no statistically significant relationship between the purpose of use of SNS and the place where they have lived. As there is an Internet access even in the villages, there are no place and time boundaries for logging into these SNS.

Table 6: The results of ANOVA test on the relationship between the purpose of use of SNS and with whom they live

	N	Average	Standard deviation	F	p
Alone	11	3,4076	,42116	1,081	,368
With a friend	67	3,5156	,55472		
With family	49	3,3094	,71718		
In a dormitory	51	3,3599	,49169		
Other	2	3,6129	,04562		

There is no statistically significant relationship between the purpose of use of SNS and with whom they live. And yet, in average, those who live with their friends use SNS more. It can be said that they encourage each other to talk to their mutual friends, to search for the things they wonder, or to communicate with their families.

Table 7: The frequency of the information and the thoughts of participants about the intervention of SNS to private lives of persons

Their thoughts about whether social network sites intervene in private lives of persons	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
S40: I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) are indispensable communication sources of our day.	12,8	22,8	15,6	28,9	20,0
S41: I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) are secure sites.	16,7	27,2	30,6	18,9	6,7
S42: I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) have more negative effects than positive effects.	7,2	17,2	29,4	30,6	15,6
S43: I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) cause intervention of private life of persons.	7,2	18,3	16,1	41,7	16,7
S44: I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) keep my personal information, photos, and videos safely.	16,7	24,4	29,4	21,1	8,3
S45: I see no harm to upload photos and videos to social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube etc.).	13,3	17,2	26,1	32,8	10,6
S46: I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) take necessary precautions to protect my photos and videos.	18,3	21,7	22,8	30,0	7,2
S47: I am concerned that unwanted persons and/or the people I don't know can reach my information, photos and displays through social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube etc.).	11,7	20,6	13,9	40,0	13,9

When the answers of participants about the intervention of SNS to private lives of persons are analyzed, participants agreed with the statement "I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) are indispensable source of communication of our day" at the rate of 48.9%.

43.9% agree with the statement "I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) are secure sites" but 30.6% are undecided. This result is an indication that half of the youth find SNS highly unsecure.

46.2% agree with the statement "I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) have more negative effects than positive effects". It is seen that 29.4% are undecided. According to this result, although students are users, they are aware of the negative sides of SNS.

58.4% agree with the statement "I think SNS social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) cause intervention of private life of persons". This result indicates that the youth perceive SNS as an intervention factor to their private lives.

There is a result indicating that 41.1% do not agree with the statement "I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) keep my personal information, photos and videos safely". With this result they confirm their opinions about the unreliability of SNS.

43.4% agree with the statement "I see no harm to upload photos and videos to social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.)". This result is surprising because it can be thought that participants make sharing only with wanted ones by limiting, constituting a password or barriers in their special accounts.

40% do not agree with the statement that "I think social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.) take necessary precautions to protect my photos and videos". It shows that SNS are perceived as unsecure, inconsiderate, and imprudent.

53.9% agree with the statement "I am concerned that unwanted persons and/or the people I don't know can reach my information, photos and displays through social network sites (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.)". This result indicates that PESTD students do not trust SNS.

Table 8: T test results of the relationship between the information and thoughts of individuals and gender in terms of the intervention of SNS to private lives of individuals

	N	Average	Standard deviation	t	p
Women	53	2,9858	,50219	-1,468	,144
Men	127	3,1201	,58086		

A statistically significant relationship was found between information and thoughts of individuals and gender in terms of the intervention of SNS to private lives of individuals. This result may root from the parallelism of opinion that common opinions of both groups are in the direction that SNS intervene in their private lives.

Table 9: The distribution of the SNS mostly used by participants

Mostly used SNS	N	%
Facebook	88	48,9
Twitter	33	18,3
YouTube	16	8,9
Netlog	20	11,1
Windows Live	15	8,3
Other	8	4,4
Total	180	100,0

48.9% of the participants use Facebook, 18.3% use Twitter, and 11.1% use Netlog. This result coincides with the result reported by Göker et al (2010). Having over 350 million users, Facebook is the most known social network on the Internet.

Table10: The distribution of the intended uses of the Internet by participants

Intended uses of the Internet	N	%
Chat	19	10,6
Playing game	36	20,0
Research and information	24	13,3
Entering SNS (Facebook, Twitter YouTube etc.)	97	53,9
Other	4	2,2
Total	180	100,0

Intended uses of the Internet are as follows: 53.9% of participants enter social network systems; 20% play games, and 13.3% do research and get information. It is evident that participants mostly use the Internet to communicate with each other and to share. This result coincides with the results reported by Göker et al (2010).

Table 11: The frequency of daily Internet use of participants

Frequency of daily internet use	N	%
Less than an hour	44	24,4
1-2 hours	73	40,6
3-4 hours	35	19,4
More than 4 hours	28	15,6
Total	180	100,0

40.6% of participants use internet for 1-2 hours daily, 24.4% for less than an hour daily, and 19.4% for 3-4 hours daily. The results show that the majority of participants use the Internet for 1-2 hour daily. It is clear that there is a concentration in the first two choices. The result coincides with the results reported by Göker et al (2010). In normal conditions, while these times of usage can be thought of as normal, it is known that this time increases in the case of intense information sharing such as homework, research, photo, video etc.

Table 12: The distribution of the relationship between the time spent for SNS by participants and time spent on the Internet

Time spent to SNS	Time spent on the Internet								Total	
	Less than an hour		1-2 hours		3-4 hours		More than 4 hours			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than an hour	36	43,4	31	37,3	7	8,4	9	10,8	83	100,0
1-2 hours	4	6,6	36	59,0	14	23,0	7	11,5	61	100,0
3-4 hours	2	9,5	3	14,3	14	66,7	2	9,5	21	100,0

4-5 hours	1	12,5	2	25,0	0	,0	5	62,5	8	100,0
5 hours and more	1	14,3	1	14,3	0	,0	5	71,4	7	100,0
Total	44	24,4	73	40,6	35	19,4	28	15,6	180	100,0

Chi-square: 93,675; p=0,000 (p<0,001)

There is a statistically significant relationship between the time spent for SNS by participants and the time spent on the Internet (p<0,001). The time spent for SNS and spent on the Internet are parallel to each other and if the time spent on the Internet increases, time for SNS will increase, too. This result coincides with the results reported by Göker et al (2001).

Table 13: The distribution of the relationship between the time spent for SNS by participants and time for using SNS weekly

Time spent for SNS	Use of SNS Weekly (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.)								Total	
	1-2 days		3-4 days		5-6 days		Regularly everyday			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than an hour	38	45,8	28	33,7	5	6,0	12	14,5	83	100,0
1-2 hours	11	18,0	17	27,9	7	11,5	26	42,6	61	100,0
3-4 hours	4	19,0	7	33,3	4	19,0	6	28,6	21	100,0
4-5 hours	1	12,5	2	25,0	1	12,5	4	50,0	8	100,0
5 hours and more	1	14,3	1	14,3	0	,0	5	71,4	7	100,0
Total	55	30,6	55	30,6	17	9,4	53	29,4	180	100,0

Chi-square=32,317, p=0,001

There is a statistically significant relationship between the time participants spend for SNS a day and the time for using SNS weekly (p<0,001). When the table is analyzed, the time participants spend for SNS daily affects the weekly usage time proportionally and it can be concluded that the more the daily usage time increases, the more weekly usage time will increase.

Table 14: The distribution of the relationship between home place of participants and the place where they log on the Internet mostly

Hometown	The place connected to the Internet mostly												Total	
	From Home		From Internet cafe		From Work		From school		From mobile devices		Other			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Big City	34	66,7	5	9,8	2	3,9	7	13,7	1	2,0	2	3,9	51	100,0
City	40	67,8	6	10,2	2	3,4	7	11,9	0	,0	4	6,8	59	100,0
Town	33	58,9	8	14,3	3	5,4	9	16,1	0	,0	3	5,4	56	100,0
Small town	2	50,0	1	25,0	0	,0	1	25,0	0	,0	0	,0	4	100,0
Village	3	30,0	2	20,0	1	10,0	3	30,0	0	,0	1	10,0	10	100,0
Total	112	62,2	22	12,2	8	4,4	27	15,0	1	,6	10	5,6	180	100,0

Chi-square: 10,914; p=0,948

A statistically significant relationship is not present between home place of participants and the place where they log on the Internet mostly (p>0,05).

67.8% living in big cities, 67.8% living in cities, 58.9% living in towns, 50.0% living in small towns, and 30.0% living in villages mostly log on the Internet from their homes. Because the Internet can be accessed all over Turkey, individuals both living in villages and big cities prefer sharing by connecting to the Internet from home easily.

Table 15: The distribution of the relationship between with whom/where the participants live and the place where they log on the Internet mostly

With whom to live	the place where they log on the Internet mostly												Total	
	From home		From Internet cafe		From work		From school		From mobile devices		Other			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alone	9	81,8	1	9,1	0	,0	0	,0	0	,0	1	9,1	11	100,0
With a friend	44	65,7	9	13,4	3	4,5	10	14,9	1	1,5	0	,0	67	100,0
With family	30	61,2	6	12,2	3	6,1	8	16,3	0	,0	2	4,1	49	100,0
In dormitory	28	54,9	6	11,8	1	2,0	9	17,6	0	,0	7	13,7	51	100,0
Other	1	50,0	0	,0	1	50,0	0	,0	0	,0	0	,0	2	100,0
Total	112	62,2	22	12,2	8	4,4	27	15,0	1	,6	10	5,6	180	100,0

Chi-square: 26,902; p=0,138

There is a statistically significant relationship found between with whom/where the participants live and the place where they log on the Internet mostly. 81.8% living alone, 65.7% living with a friend, 54.9% living in a dormitory mostly log on the Internet from home.

CONCLUSION

We can say that the most loyal users of SNS on the Internet are university students in Turkey as in several countries of the world since they were invented. Virtual environments take the place of real communication and sharing. A considerable amount of time slot is spent for SNS and this is accepted as the reflection of being modern individual among the youth and of being an important part of daily life. Joining SNS and maintaining the communication in this way find approval among the youth increasingly. This research made for the assessment was carried out with the purpose of determining the thoughts of 180 undergraduate SUPESTD students in the fall of 2010 about their intended uses of SNS, their usage time for the Internet and SNS and reliability of SNS.

Data were obtained through the survey developed by the researcher and an interview. They were evaluated with SPSS 15.0 program. Factor analysis, T-test, ANOVA and Chi-square test were used in statistical evaluation. It was found in this research that the majority of participants are men; a great majority of them spend their time in cities and live with friends.

Contrary to the opinion that generally acceptable SNS are used to find old friends or relatives, first three factors as the usage purpose of these SNS are totally different. The participants mostly use SNS to know what his/her friends do (66.7%), to have good time (57,2%), and to be informed about sports organizations (55.6%). Purpose of the use of the Internet is to enter SNS (53.9%), and they stay in SNS parallel to the time spent on the Internet and they generally use the Internet for 1-2 hours daily (40.6%) or less than an hour (24.4%). In light of these data, it can be said that participants are conscious users of SNS and the Internet.

A statistically significant relationship was not found between the reason for using SNS and gender of participants and the place where they live and with whom/where they live. The Internet is an unrivalled product of fast developing technology of today, and SNS are among the factors contributing to the acceleration of the globalization process. Findings of the research support this reality since all participants, regardless of place, time and gender difference, showed the tendency to social networking usage in similar proportion. All in all, thanks to the internet and SNS, participants are able to reach not only any national or international information, but also people from all around the world, which is both a result and an example of globalization.

As in our day the Internet usage purpose of majority of the participants is to enter into SNS, the Internet is getting common and an important time slot of the daily life is allocated to the Internet, social sharing, and thus communication way of individuals are changing. One of the important reasons of this change is SNS which are developed, increasing in number and gradually becoming widespread.

As to the reliability of SNS which have gained a global qualification as its usage areas and aims have become increasingly widespread, some opinions of users of SNS were determined as follows: It causes intervention to their private lives (58.4%), its negative effects are more than positive effects (46.2%) and SNS are not reliable (43.9%). Despite the threat perceived as directed to personal information security, negative perception about these SNS and their thoughts about the intervention of SNS to their private life, it was determined that they were

members of at least one of these sites and they spend much time on them. This proves that SNS are indispensable communication sources and an important technology opportunity in professional development despite all these negative perceptions.

SNS, growing fast thanks to the Internet, distance individuals and mostly children and the youth from their families, and real social and human environments with the same speed and even isolate them. Also, it is observed that it pulls users into virtual sociality and leads them into an unhealthy body caused by a step-wise long term inertia, a skeptic and insecure spiritual way. The number of users gradually increases despite all these risks. Especially children and the youth should see these negative sides, threats and risks and they should be conscious and rational users. Every individual should determine his usage strategy appropriate to his necessity. As long as it is used as goal-oriented and when necessary, facilities presented to us by technology are incontrovertibly many and beneficial.

The Internet and SNS present a means of communicating and sharing and provide fast and easy access to information by removing time and space constraints. It is essential to behave carefully and economically about the time spent for these time-consuming virtual environments to benefit from today's technologies efficiently and not to be captured by SNS.

REFERENCES

Ahn, J. (2010). *The influence of social networking sites on high school students' social and academic development*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Souther California.

Boyd, D. (2006). Friends, Friendsters, and MySpace top 8: Writing community into being on social network sites. *First Monday, 11*(12).

Boyd, D. (2007). Why youth (heart) social network sites: The role of networked publics in teenage social life. *In D. Buckingham (Ed.), MacArthur foundation series on digital learning- youth identity, and digital media volume*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Retrieved November 30, 2010, from http://www.danah.org//.

Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13,* 210−230.

Ellison, N., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook ''friends": Exploring the relationships between college students' use of online social networks and social capital. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 12* (3). Retrieved November 30, 2010 from: http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol12/ issue4/ellison.html.

Gemmill, E., & Peterson, M. (2006). Technology use among college students: Implications for student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal, 43*(2), 280−300.

Göker, G., Demir, M. & Doğan, A. (2010). Ağ toplumunda sosyalleşme ve paylaşım: Facebook üzerine ampirik bir araştırma. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, 5* (2), 183-206.

Hoffman, P. (2008). *"But are we really friends?": Online social networking and community in undergraduate students.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Graduate Faculty of the University of Akron.

Huang, J. J. S., Yang, S. J. H., Huang, Y.-M., & Hsiao, I. Y. T. (2010). Social Learning Networks: Build Mobile Learning Networks Based on Collaborative Services. *Educational Technology & Society, 13* (3), 78–92.

Jones, S. (2002). *The Internet goes to college.Washington D.C.: Pew Internet & American Life Project*. Retrieved November 30, 2010, from http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_College_Report.pdf.

Karpinski, A. C. (2009). *A description of facebook use and academic performance among undergraduate and graduate students.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Lenhart, A., & Madden, M. (2007). *Social networking websites and teens: An overview.Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project.* Retrieved August 9, 2007, from http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_socialnetworksites_Data_Memo_Jan_2007.pdf.

Miller, R. D. (2009). *Developing 21st century skills through the use of student personal learning networks.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Graduate Faculty of Northcentral University.

Rideout, V. J., Foehr, U. G., & Roberts, D. F. (2010). *Generation M2: Media in the lives of 8-18 year olds*. Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.

Subrahmanyam, K., & Greenfield, P. M. (2008). Communicating online: Adolescent relationships and the media. *The Future of Children: Children and Media Technology, 18*, 119−146.

Subrahmanyam, K., Reich, S.M., Waechter, N. & Espinoza, G. (2008). Online and offline social networks: Use of social networking sites by emerging adults. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 29*, 420-433.

Tüfekçi, Z. (2010). Can you see me now? Audience and Disclosure Regulation in Online Social Network Sites. *Bulletin of Science Technology & Society, 28*, 20-36.