

A Study on the Use of Social Networks by Turkish and German University Students in the Globalization Process

Nurhayat Çelebi¹, Gülenaz Selçuk², Huriye SevinçPeker³

¹Prof. Dr., Karabük University, Faculty of Letters, Educational Sciences Department, Turkey

²Asst. Prof. Dr., Manisa Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences Department, Turkey

³Asst. Prof. Dr., İstanbul Arel University, School of Health Sciences, Department of Social Work, Turkey

Correspondence: Nurhayat Çelebi, Prof. Dr., Karabük University, Faculty of Letters, Educational Sciences Department, Turkey.

Received: October 10, 2018

Accepted: October 24, 2018

Online Published: November 29, 2018

doi:10.11114/jets.v6i11a.3804

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i11a.3804>

Abstract

Today's rapidly evolving technology is expanding the use of innovative communication technologies and their usage areas. to traditional communication technologies today; smartphones, laptop computers, handheld computers, and tablets are also added. Wireless communication technology removes time and space limits, allowing people to communicate both voiced and visual whenever and wherever they wish. Every day, millions of people communicate with each other through social networking networks and share their experience day by day with other network users. The social networks that people often use are also affecting interpersonal relationships. The purpose of this research is to determine the aims of Turkish and German university students to use social networks and how effective social influence is in interpersonal communication. A total of 338 students, 236 Turkish students studying at Karabük University and 102 German students studying at Kassel University in Germany, participated in the research in the academic year of 2016-2017. As a data collection tool, a 10-item questionnaire developed by Özdayı (2010) and a 13-item, "social impact scale" were used. 4 items of the questionnaire used in the study were arranged in the form of "yes-no" and the other items were arranged by the participants to point to the box opposite to the statement they found appropriate. Each participant can mark a few of the options suitable for him / her. Secondly, the "social impact scale" is 5-Likert type. In the face of each article (5) from its fully appropriate expression, (1) Not suitable at all, a gradation to the statement was made. Percentages, mean and t test for binary comparison were used as statistical analysis in the study. According to research findings; all students have smartphones and they use whatsapp, facebook and youtube most from social networks. By students, social media is used to look at mails, homework, study, follow current events, read news, communicate with friends, make new friends, get informed about activities, share videos and photos and have fun. Also by students travel, shopping, technology and cinema blogs are the most preferred. In the survey, in the social dimension of social networks; there was no significant difference between the groups regarding "communication, self-expression, staying out of the group, becoming popular, joining groups, getting social environment, getting status in social environment and sharing". On the other hand, social networking has become an important means of communication and interaction among people today. For this reason, academicians should encourage students who are interested in new technology and communication applications to support the achievement of up-to-date information within the context of lifelong learning, and to conduct research for their own development in the teaching-learning process.

Keywords: communication, globalization, social media, social impact, social blogs, social network

1. Introduction

Today, the rapid development and widespread use of technologies are increasing the usage areas. Traditional communication technologies now include smartphones, laptop computers, handheld computers, and tablets that are mediated by wireless communications technologies. Wireless communication technology removes time and space limits so that people can communicate both anywhere and at any time with both voice and video. Every day, millions of people communicate with each other through social networks and share their experiences during the day with other network users. The reason for this sharing is that the effects of mass media are spreading over large areas as one of the great consequences of globalization. In other words, the reflection of globalization in all areas makes mass media an essential part of everyday life (Tomlinson, 2004).

Globalization has also launched a new era in which thought become crucial, and knowledge is enriched increasingly. The source of the globalization process is knowledge and the technology it produces. The world is at a time when the developments in communication technologies have facilitated access to information in the last years, and all kinds of information have created social changes in an unprecedented extent (Perşembe, 2005; Uysal and Tezci, 2004). The changes in the communication field affect social relations as well as social building. The needs of the social structure bring about the development of new technologies (Demirel, 2015).

Globalization, especially in the field of media, has enabled the globalization process to accelerate even further. The lifestyle of the cultural industry and the unilateral understanding of multinational corporations are the negative impact of the target on globalization (Kasap, Dolunay and Mirçık, 2018). In addition, the process of globalization makes itself felt in every aspect of the media. Television programs and films, especially concepts such as different identity perceptions, present a lifestyle that is a phenomenon of target audience. Published television series, television programs and films have caused many people to be greatly affected; especially with the advent of new communication technologies and their use in daily life after 2000s, the target audience has begun to be more influenced by visual media products. This situation also affects the identities of the people (Kasap, Dolunay, Mirçık and 2018).

Social networking is defined as web-based sites where users are connected via a common online social networking source, can create their own profiles, view the profiles of other users, and communicate with each other (Boyd and Ellison, 2007). Sites such as Facebook, My Space where users are communicating with their friends are examples of social networking sites. One of these sites, Facebook has a large user base to support critical thinking and problem-solving skills in people, to follow everyday events, news, contacts, or groups and to participate in discussion environments (Gülbahar Kalelioğlu and Madran, 2010). On Facebook, users create personal profiles, share their political views, religion and consumption preferences. This information is an important source of linkage between people with the same enjoyment and preferences (Gane and Beer, 2008). In addition, social networking networks such as Facebook can help establish connections with the physical world and strengthen relationships in real life (Güçdemir, 2010). These social networking networks, which have millions of users, connect the people in the virtual environment and transform the physical distance into virtual closeness (Özdayı, 2010). In online environments, friendships established through digital interactions can also turn into real friendships. In addition, social networking is an application in which users create a profile with their personal information and reach the profiles of friends and colleagues they follow and send e-mails and instant messages to each other (Kaplan and Haanlein, 2010).

The impacts of social networks clearly indicate that the individuals of our age must be media literate. Media literacy is defined as the ability to reach, analyze, evaluate, and transmit messages in a wide variety of written and non-written formats (television, video, cinema, advertisements, internet etc.). In addition, media literacy contributes to the informed reading of the media allowing people to express themselves freely and to participate in social life more actively and constructively (Demirel Özdayı, 2015).

According to the United Nations Population Fund, the world population has risen to 7 billion 593 million by January 2018. Today, 3 billion 190 thousand people in the world use social media (Sabah, 2018). According to a survey, mobile phone and internet usage have reached 5 billion people worldwide. This number corresponds to about 67 percent of the world's population. Moreover, about 80 percent of these 5 billion people use smartphones. Among these internet users, the number of those using social media is 2.89 billion. The number of social media users using smartphones is 2.59 billion (S özc ü 2017).

At this point, as a communication network connecting computers around the world, the Internet offers users and organizations the ability to quickly access and spread information. For this reason, the internet is a well-structured computer network that is used all over the world. The Internet is a two-way communication system in which everyone is a potential message receiver and provider (Kaye and Medoff, 1998). This two-way communication makes the internet different from all other communication technologies. Features such as e-mail, feedback, chat, blogging, MSN, etc., have brought an interactive communication tool feature. At the same time, it allows people to make their own blog or website, allowing them to be interactive (Bakker and Sadaba, 2008).

Slide 3Slide 4Slide 5Slide 6Slide 7Slide 8Slide 9Social media has many internet-based channels. Blogs, video-image sharing sites, social networks, microblogs, wikis, podcasts, and email are the main social media channels. The availability of cost-free activities in these channels, communication with customers, and accessing their ideas and suggestions in a short way creates great advantages for all small and large businesses (K öksal and Özdemir, 2013). Through blogs, users can have their identity on the internet, share their own ideas and images. Blog owners sometimes gather their own lives entirely in a virtual diary, and sometimes they create a blog thematically based on their own interests (Gen ç 2010).

Social networks also influence the environment in which schools are located, and the interaction with social networks has led school staff, and therefore society, to more active participation. Coordination and information sharing between the student-management and the teaching staff is carried out to achieve the educational objectives, and it makes easy to

reach the desired objectives (Özmen, Aküzüm, Sünkür and Baysal, 2011: 42-47). Williams (2006) argues that people are not communicating with each other while watching TV, but that personal communication is established through e-mail, instant messaging services, and social networking. Twitter, one of these networks, is a site that asks users to ask the question "What's happening now?" because they basically offer a one-way flow of information and want users to share the section of their lives at that time. Thanks to the application, also called microblog application, users can follow the people they know (Genç, 2010).

Communication with social networks brings the "social impact" dimension with it. Social impact is defined as "a change in the beliefs, attitudes, behaviors, and emotions of one person brought by another person or people" (Bilgin, 1998, p.77). Deutsch and Gerard speak of two influences. The normative social effect is defined as "to meet the positive expectations of another", and the cognitive effect is defined as "accepting knowledge obtained from another about reality as evidence" (Deutsch and Gerard, 1966:402). Many factors influence conformity behavior as a social impact. These can be given as cognitive influences, adoption behavior, desire to be right, communication, social impact, obedience, individual factors, group behavior, need to belong, need to love- be loved (Gökdağ, 2004; Güney, 2004; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2008; Özkalp, 1998).

As you can see, today's social media tools create a new and different virtual environment for users apart from their real life. In these virtual environments, users exchange information, read and track each other's content, follow each other and communicate with each other interactively (Özdayı, 2010). In this study, it was aimed to reveal the purposes of using social networks of Turkish and German university students in the process of globalization, which blogs they prefer, and whether there is a difference between the two countries in the use of social networks. For this purpose, the following questions have been answered.

1. What are the situation of Turkish and German students using computers and having computers?
2. How often do Turkish and German students use the computer?
3. What are the situation of Turkish and German students using social networks and having their own blog?
4. For what purpose do Turkish and German students use social networks?
5. What are the blogs that attract the most attention of Turkish and German students?
6. What are the purposes of Turkish and German students using social blogs?
7. Which links do Turkish and German students use?
8. What are the reasons why Turkish and German students prefer social media?
9. What are the social impact dimensions of Turkish and German students using social networks?
10. Does the social impact dimension of Turkish and German students use social networks differ significantly according to national variables?
11. Does the social impact dimension of Turkish and German students use social networks differ significantly according to gender?

2. Method

The research is a descriptive study in the screening model. General screening model was used in the study. The general screening model is a scan of the whole universe or a group from the universe in order to reach a general judgment in the universe consisting of many elements (Karasar, 2009). In the research, easily accessible situation sampling was used from purposeful sampling methods. The students who participated in the study were selected by using the easily accessible situation sampling method.

Study Group

The study group of research is composed of students from the Faculty of Human Sciences and Faculty of Economics at Kassel University in Germany (102) and students from the Science and Technology, Literature, and Economics faculties at Karabük University in Turkey (236). The research was conducted with a total of 338 students. German students participating in the survey were 102 person, and 55.3% (N=57) of them are male and 43.7% (N=45) female. According to age; 58% (N=6) were younger than 20 years, 48.5% (N=50) were between 21-24 years, 30.1% (N=31) were between 25-28 years, 14.6% (N=15) were 28 and above. The distribution of the students according to departments; the social sciences are 22% (N=8), math 14.7% (N=15), economics 11.7% (N=12), fine arts and sports 14.7% (N=15), and technology 10.7% (N=11). Turkish students are 236 person and 59% (N=138) of them are male and 41% (N=98) female. According to age; 2.1% (N=5) were younger than 20 years, 58.7% (N=138) were between 21-24 years, 7.7% (N=65) were between 25-28 years, 11.5% (N=27) were 28 years old and above. According to the semesters; 10.5% (N=27) of the students were in the 1st and 2nd semester, 15.3% (36) were in the 3rd and 4th semester, 14.5 (34) were in the 5th and 6th semester, 59.1% (139) were 7th and 8th semester. The distribution of the students according to departments; the

social sciences are 41.7% (N=98), science 28.5% (N=67), technology 13.6% (N=32), fine arts and sports 7.2% (N=17) and economy 8.9% (N=22).

Data Collection Tool

As a data collection tool, a 10-item questionnaire developed by Özdayı (2010) and a 13-item, social impact scale were used. 4 items of the questionnaire used in the study were arranged in the form of "yes-no" and the other items were arranged by the participants to point to the box opposite to the statement they found appropriate. Each participant can mark a few of the options suitable for him / her. Secondly, the "social impact scale" is 5-Likert type. In the face of each article (5) from its fully appropriate expression, (1) Not suitable at all, a gradation to the statement was made. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was .9080 (Özdayı, 2010). In this study, the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the "social effect scale" was .899.

Analysis of Data

In the analysis of the data; percentage, mean and standard deviation from the descriptive criteria were used. The t test was used to determine the difference between the two groups.

3. Findings

In this section, following topics are reviewed; students' computer usage circumstances and frequency, the use of social networks and having their own blogs, the purposes of using social networks, what kind of blogs attract their interest and their purpose to use these blogs, what links students use, the reasons of students' preference for social media, the social impact dimension of social networks, and whether social impact of social networks differ by nationality and gender.

Table 1. Computer use and computer ownership circumstances of Turkish and German students

<i>Computer use</i>								<i>Having computer or not (Computer owner)</i>							
Turkish students				German students				Turkish students				German students			
<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>		<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>		<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>		<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
229	97.4	6	2.6	100	100	-	-	217	91.9	19	8	100	100	-	-

According to Table 1, it is stated that 91,9% (N=217) of the Turkish students have computers and 97.4% (N=229) of them use computers, and all of the German students have and use computers.

Table 2. The frequency of computer using by Turkish and German students

Turkish students								German students							
<i>0-1 hour</i>		<i>2-3 hours</i>		<i>4-6 hours</i>		<i>7+ hours</i>		<i>0-1 hour</i>		<i>2-3 hours</i>		<i>4-6 hours</i>		<i>7+ hours</i>	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
35	14.8	110	46.6	58	24.6	32	13.6	12	11.7	59	57.8	17	16.6	14	13.7

In Table 2, 46.6% (N=110) of Turkish students and 57.8% (N=59) of German students are using the computer for 2-3 hours most frequently. It is stated that the least frequent computer use is 7 hours or more in 13.6% (N=32) of Turkish students, and 11.7% (N=12) of German students use computers in less than one hour.

Table 3. Turkish and German students' use of social networks and having a blog of their own

<i>Use of social networks</i>								<i>Having a blog of their own</i>							
Turkish students				German students				Turkish students				German students			
<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>		<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>		<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>		<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
227	96	9	4	90	88	14	13.7	127	53.8	109	46.1	89	87.2	13	12.7

According to Table 3, 96.6% (N=227) of Turkish students use social networks. Only 9 students stated that they did not use social networks.

Table 4. The purpose of Turkish and German students to use social networks

<i>The purpose of using social networks</i>		Turkish		German	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Checking e-mails, messaging	231	98	102	100
2	Banking transactions	108	45	63	62
3	Doing homework, studying	229	97	65	64
4	Downloading music, listening to music	198	84	47	46
5	Reading the news, following current events	204	86	75	74
6	Chatting	86	42	50	49
7	Using social networks like Facebook	212	90	85	83
8	Watching TV	65	27	26	25
9	Listening to the radio	41	17	37	36
10	Research	82	35	36	35
11	Watching the series on the videos	127	54	66	65
12	Shopping	101	43	69	68
13	Playing	59	25	22	21
14	Reading	18	8	19	18
15	Other (finding friends-lovers)	9	4	5	4

According to the distribution in Table 4; Turkish students use social media mostly for checking e-mails %98 (231), doing homework % 97(f=229), using social networks like Facebook % 90 (f=212), reading the news, following current events% 86(f=204), and downloading music, listening to music % 84(f=198). German students use social networks for checking e-mails %100 (f=102), Facebook % 83 (f=85), reading the news, following current events, reading newspaper % 69 (f=70), shopping % 68(f=69). 53.8% (f=127) of the Turkish students have social blogs. 88% (f=90) of German students use social networks. Again, 87.2% (f=89) of German students have their own blogs.

Table 5. Most attention blogs for Turkish and German students

<i>Most attention blogs</i>		Turkish		German	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Travel	112	47	28	27
2	Technology	106	45	71	69
3	Shopping	89	38	5	5
4	Fashion	56	24	8	8
5	Decoration	47	20	2	2
6	Daily	50	21	5	5
7	Food	44	12	3	3
8	Cinema, theatre	79	33	1	1
9	Hobby (Sewing, hand work, food, etc.)	31	13	5	5
10	Others	3	1	6	1

According to Table 5, the blogs that attract the most interest of Turkish students are the blogs related to travel 47% (f=112), technology 45% (f=106), shopping 38% (f=89), and the blogs that attract the most interest of German students are related to technology 69% (f=71).

Table 6. The purpose of Turkish and German students to use social blogs

<i>The purpose of using social networks</i>	Turkish		German	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
1 Communicating with friends	30	13	8	8
2 Keeping a diary, relaxation	23	10	1	1
3 Creating public opinion (such as animal rights)	21	9	1	1
4 Expressing thoughts that they couldn't expressed in everyday life	22	9	4	4
5 Informing people about innovations (technology, fashion, shopping, etc.)	20	8	3	3
6 Share my experiences (sightseeing, food, etc.)	32	14	2	2
7 Others	8	3	-	-

According to Table 6, Turkish and German students stated that the purpose of using social blogs is to communicate with their friends (Turkish students 13% (f=30), German students 8% (f=8). Turkish students also use it to share experiences such as travel and food, to write a diary, to follow innovations. German students do not show much interest in social blogs.

Table 7. Links used by Turkish and German students

<i>Which links</i>	Turkish		German	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
1 Facebook	196	83	63	61
2 WhatsApp	220	93	84	82
3 YouTube	149	63	38	37
4 LinkedIn	22	9	8	7
5 Instagram	40	17	32	31
6 Twitter	24	10	26	25
9 Skype	48	20	12	11
10 Netlog	7	3	-	-
11 Delicious	11	4	-	-
12 My space,	14	5	2	1
13 Others (Link Arena, StumbleUpon 1TR, Dig 1TR, StudiVZ, Xing, Life Journal, Foursquare, FriendFeed, blogger)	11	5	13	13

According to Table 7, Turkish and German students use WhatsApp (Turkish students %93 (f=220), German students %82 (f=84)), Facebook (Turkish students % 83 (f=196), German students %61 (f=63), and YouTube (Turkish students % 63 (f=149), German students %37 (f=38).

Table 8. Reasons of why Turkish and German students prefer social media

<i>Reason of why students prefer social media</i>	Turkish		German	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
1 Easy access to friends	110	47	45	44
2 Following your friends	86	36	34	17
3 Sharing experiences and thoughts	102	43	53	52
4 Being update of new events	147	62	11	11
5 Video-photo sharing	123	52	3	3
6 Creating a group to follow school education	99	42	3	3
7 Fun	107	45	2	2
8 Messaging	119	50	55	54
9 Socialization	48	20	9	9
10 Playing	66	28	50	49
11 Making new friends	20	8	13	13
12 Other (Making business contact, marketing, help etc.)	11	5	5	5

Reasons why students prefer social media according to Table 8; Turkish students stated as "Being update of new events" % 62 (f=147), "Video-photo sharing" %52 (f=123), "Messaging" %50 (f=119), and German students stated as "Messaging" %54 (f=55), "Sharing experiences and thoughts" %52 (f=53), "Gaming" % 49 (f=50), "Easy access to friends" % 44 (f=45).

Table 9-10-11 presents the results of the analysis according to the answers given in "impact dimension of social networks". However, the number of surveys taken into account is 226 for Turkish students and 102 for German students.

Table 9. The use of "social impact dimension of social networks" by Turkish and German students

		<i>The Impact of social networks</i>				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
		Turkish		German			
		<i>X</i>	<i>Sd.</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Sd.</i>		
1	Participation in the community of friends and contribution to its development	2,54	1.21	2.48	1.35	.428	.669
2	Positive contribution of feedback to personal (comment, message etc.) relations	2.70	1.25	2.11	1.13	4.04*	.000
3	Not getting outside the group of friends	2.55	1.21	1.54	1.00	6.75*	.000
4	Hiding your identity on some social networks	2.37	1.35	1.96	1.37	2.52*	.012
5	Being careful of expressions and thoughts in fear of reaction	2.58	1.34	2.00	1.20	3.67*	.000
6	Getting social status	2.39	1.26	1.47	.855	6.67*	.000
7	Being popular around friends	2.30	1.35	1.55	.964	5.11*	.000
8	Meeting people from different cultures	2.88	1.37	2.10	1.29	4.82*	.000
9	Using social networks (video, photo, mail, chat) actively	3.33	1.26	2.41	1.38	4.94*	.000
10	Relaxation when being bored and rest	2.74	1.25	1.96	1.15	5.89*	.000
11	Meeting people with common interests	2.38	1.22	1.97	1.26	2.72*	.007
12	Spreading information, sharing	3.34	1.27	3.14	1.51	1.25	.211
13	Creating public opinion	3.17	1.22	1.72	1.15	9.99*	.000

Turkish Student (N=226), German Student.(N=102) df.326

According to Table 9, there were significant differences between the Turkish and German students, with the exception of 1st and 12th items, according to the social network impact. The most important difference according to the averages is "Positive contribution to personal relations" ($t=4.04$, $p<.000$), "Relaxation when being bored and rest" ($t=5.84$, $p<.000$), "Creating public opinion" ($t=9.99$, $p<.000$), "Not getting outside the group of friends" ($t=6.75$, $p<.000$), "Getting social status" ($t=6.67$, $p<.000$), "Using social networks (video, photo, mail, chat) actively" ($t=4.94$, $p<.000$). All these items have a meaningful difference in favor of Turkish students.

Table 10. Analysis of the social impact dimension of Turkish and German students using social networks by nationality variable

<i>Nationality</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Sd.</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Turkish	226	2.54	1.21	326	.428	.669
German	101	2.48	1.35			

According to Table 10, there is no significant difference between the two groups regarding the social impact of social networks of Turkish and German university students. Although Turkish students feel that the social impact of social networks is more effective than that of German students, this does not make a meaningful difference ($t = .428$, $p> .05$).

Table 11. Analysis of the social impact dimension of Turkish and German students using social networks by gender

<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Sd.</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Turkish-Male	138	2.77	.823	232	1.67	0.96
Turkish-Female	96	2.59	.843			
German-Male	57	2.09	.841	100	1.01	.313
German-Female	45	1.93	.642			

In Table 11, there was no significant difference in the social impact dimension of the social networks of Turkish German university students by gender (Turkish students: $t = 1.67$, $p> .05$, German students $t = 1.01$, $p> .05$). When we look at the average, Turkish students are more likely to think that the social impact dimension is more influential considering the Turkish male and female students are higher than German male and female students.

3. Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

According to the results of the research, there is no significant difference between the purposes and reasons of use of social networks of Turkish and German students. Almost all of the students have computers. Some Turkish students with no computer are connecting to the internet through university computers, while German students are connected to

the internet via a personal mobile phone. Half of the Turkish and German students use a computer for 2-3 hours a day. Half of the Turkish students and 87% of the German students have their own blogs. Social blogs that attract the most interest of Turkish and German students are the travel, technology, shopping blogs. Both groups use social networks WhatsApp, Facebook, and YouTube. Findings in the same direction were also obtained in the Özdayı's study on university students (2010). Valenzuela et al. (2009) note that social networking networks that support trust and mutual interaction, such as Facebook, allow users to feel connected with a community and learn about others and thus create collective action opportunities.

There are minor differences in the purpose of Turkish and German students to use social media. Turkish students prefer social media to check their e-mails, to do homework, to use Facebook, to be informed about new events, to share videos, photos, and to listen to music. German students also prefer social networks to check their e-mails, to read the news, to use Facebook, and to do shopping.

The reason why students prefer social media is to access their friends more easily, to be informed about new events, to share video-photographs and experiences. Moreover, while Turkish students prefer social media for entertainment, German students prefer for playing. In the study conducted by Özdayı (2010), Vural and Bat (2010) on university students, the students follow social media frequently and use it mostly for information exchange, leisure time, video and photo sharing. However, a striking finding in our research is that Turkish and German students have not used social media for some reason, such as building new friendships because they choose girl or boyfriends as a face to face relationship.

In their study of media literacy of teacher candidates, Devci and Çengelci (2008) stated that teacher candidate media literacy is to use social media such as monitoring the agenda, interpreting the news, drawing conclusions from the news, perceiving the messages, selective watching. In the research conducted by Özdayı (2010) on university students, students use Facebook most, and social networks are used for listening to music, meeting people from different cultures, instant communication, instant access to information, video, photo, and text sharing

Çetin (2009) and Özdayı (2010) has investigated the university students' trends to make new friends on Facebook and found that a large part of them can make friends. Users share their thoughts on Facebook social networking, comment on each other's thoughts, share videos, articles, events, and invitations. The "Fun" factor in the survey indicates that users use social networks for entertainment purposes.

In their research, Toğay, Aktur, Yetişken, and Bilici (2013) reached the conclusion that social media is easy, useful, and necessary, and that it has increased the academic success of student. People come together on social networks, and they experience the feeling of belonging to a community here and satisfy their needs for entertainment and communication here again. Similarly, the use of social networking as a means of accessing information and interaction tool shows that users adapt to the characteristics of social networks and use it as a means of communication.

In the study conducted by forming experimental and control groups on university students, Ekici and Kıyıcı (2012) found that students using the social network-based application had significantly improved academic achievement compared to the control group. In their study, Solmaz and Yılmaz (2012) also reached the similar findings. It has been observed that the students follow the social media and use the internet the most. Students believe that media literacy develops critical and creative thinking.

Social media supported education environment and internet applications, which are able to collect audio, text, and image just like video chat on the Internet such as Social Networking websites (Facebook, Twitter), which are also popular in our country with the world, are becoming more and more common (Özdayı, 2010; Toğay et al., 2013). Another significant characteristic that emerges is that the learning is not only a mental activity but also has an emotional dimension. Some observers have pointed out that to use social networks, people are "learning together with others, dynamically reaching the resource, expanding the learning base of people, and actively participating in education" (Özmen, 2011).

In the social impact dimension of social networks, most of the students mentioned these items: "Using social networks (video, photo, mail, chat) actively", "Spreading information, sharing" and "Creating public opinion". German students have the highest average in the items "spreading information, sharing" and "Participation in the community of friends and contribution to its development". There is no significant difference between the two groups regarding the social impact of social networking of Turkish and German university students. Again, by gender, there is no significant difference in the impact dimension of social networks, but when compared to the average, there is a favorable state for men.

Social networking affects the relationships among people positively without interfering with face-to-face communication. People can avoid negative influences on their social lives by taking advantage of the positive effects of social networking, which provide interaction and communication. Nonetheless, it should never be forgotten that social networks cannot

substitute face-to-face communication. In recent years, as social networks have become an essential means of communication and interaction, new forms of communication with new technologies have become the focus of attention for academics and students.

As a result, this research is critical to show how efficient social networks are in intercountry communication. Cause globalization removes social differences between countries. It may be advisable for those who are considering to study on this topic to reach larger populations for a better understanding of the effects of social networks. For this reason, academicians should support students who are interested in new technology and communication applications to get updated information as a part of lifelong learning, and they should lead them to conduct research for their self-improvement during the teaching-learning process.

Acknowledgment

This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 4th International Conference on Lifelong Educaion and Leadership for all ICLEL 2018/July 3-5 2018/ Lower Silesia University Wroclaw-POLAND.

References

- Bakker, P., & Sadaba, C. (2008). The impact of the internet on users. *The internet and the Mass Media*, Lucy Küng (der) London, Sage Publications, 87. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446216316.n5>.
- Bilgin, N. (1988). *Sosyal psikolojiye giriş*. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları No:48, 77.
- Boyd, D. B., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 11-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x>
- Çetin, E. (2009). Sosyal iletişim ağları ve gençlik: Facebook örneği. *Uluslararası Davraz Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı*, 24-27 Eylül 2009, Isparta: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, 1094- 1105.
- Demirel, Ö. E. (2015). Küreselleşme bağlamında sosyal paylaşım ağları ve eğitimde kullanılması. *Küreselleşme ve eğitime yansımaları*. Ed. N. Çelebi. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık. 363-403.
- Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1966). A study of informational social influence upon individual judgment. *Basic Studies in Social Psychology*. Harold Proshansky, Bernard Seidenberg (der) içinde, New York, Holt, Rinehart ve Winston, 1966, 402.
- Deveci, H., & Çengelci, T. (2008). Sosyal Bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının medya okur yazarlığına bir bakış. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(11), 25-43.
- Dünyada 3 milyar 190 bin kişi sosyal medya kullanıyor. (19 Mart 2018). *Sabah*. <https://www.sabah.com.tr/.../dunyada-3-milyar-190-bin-kisi-sosyal-medya-kullaniyor>. Erişim Tarih: 20.06.2018
- Dünyada kaç kişi sosyal medya kullanıyor?. (24 Haziran 20017). *Sözcü*. <https://www.sozcu.com.tr/.../dunyada-kac-kisi-sosyal-medyakullaniyor/> Erişim Tarih: 24.06.2018
- Ekici, M., & Kıyıcı, M. (2012). Sosyal ağların kullanımı. *Uşak Sosyal Bilgiler Dergisi*, 5(2), 156-167.
- Gane, N., & Beer, D. (2008). New media: The key concepts. Oxford. https://books.google.com/books/about/New_Media.html?hl=fr&id.. Erişim Tarihi: 10.07.2014.
- Genç H. (2010). İnternetteki merkezi sosyal ağlar etkileşim ve-iş 2.0. Uygulamaları. *Akademik Bilişim'10 - XII. Akademik Bilişim Konferansı Bildirileri*. 10 - 12 Şubat 201, Muğla Üniversitesi.
- Gökdağ, R. (2004). *Sosyal psikoloji*. Eskişehir: Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayını No.826.
- Güçdemir, Y. (2010). *Sanal ortamda iletişim. : Bir halkla ilişkiler perspektifi*. İstanbul: Derin yayınevi.
- Gülbahar, Y., Kalelioğlu, F., & Madran, O. (2010). Sosyal ağların eğitim amaçlı kullanımı. *XV. Türkiye'de İnternet Konferansı Bildiri kitabı*, 4-6 Aralık 2010, İstanbul: İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, 4-5. <http://inet-tr.org.tr/inetconf15/inet-tr10-ozet.pdf>. Erişim Tarihi:12.07.2014.
- Güney, S. (2008). *Davranış bilimleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2008). *Yeni insan ve insanlar*. İstanbul: Evrim Yayınevi.
- Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite. The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, 53(19), 59-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003>
- Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. 9.Baskı. Ankara: Nobel.
- Kasap, F., Dolunay, A., & Mirçık, A. (2018). Küreselleşmenin medya üzerinde etkileri: Küresel medyaya sürükleniş. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7(2), 515-532. <https://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i2.1417>

- Kaye, B. K., & Medoff, N. J. (1998). *The world wide web: A mass communication perspective*. California, Mayfield Publishing Company, 1998, s. 2.
- Köksal, Y., & Özdemir, Ş. (2013). İletişim aracı olarak sosyal medya'nın tutundurma karması içerisindeki yeri üzerine bir inceleme. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(1), 323-337.
- Okur, H. D., & Özkul, M. (2015). Modern iletişimin ara yüzü: sanal iletişim sosyal paylaşım sitelerinin toplumsal ilişki kurma biçimlerine etkisi (facebook örneği). *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(21), 213-246.
- Özdayı, E. (2010). *Sosyal etki açısından sosyal paylaşım ağlarının kişilerarası iletişim kullanımları: Facebook kullanıcıları üzerine bir araştırma*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.(Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul.
- Özkalp, E. (1998). *Davranış bilimlerine giriş*. Eskişehir: Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No:566.
- Özmen, F., Aküzüm., C., Sünkür, M., & Baysal, N. (2011). Sosyal ağ sitelerinin eğitsel ortamdaki işlevselliği. *6th International Advanced Technologies Symposium (IATS'11)*. 16-18 May 2011.Elazığ, Turkey. 42-47.
- Perşembe, E. (2005). Küreselleşme kültürü ve eğitimin işlevi. *On dokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(21-21), 103-114.
- Solmaz, B., & Yılmaz, R. A. (2012). Medya okuryazarlığı araştırması ve Selçuk Üniversitesinde bir uygulama. *Selçuk İletişim*, 7(3), 55-61.
- Toğay, A., Aktur, T. E., Yetişen, İ. C., & Bilici, A. (2013). *Eğitim süreçlerinde sosyal ağların kullanımı. Bir MYO Deneyimi*. Ab.org.tr. Erişim:02.04.2016.
- Tomlinson, J. (2004). *Küreselleşme ve kültür*. A. Eker (Edit). İstanbul: Ayrıntı yayınları.
- Uysal, A., & Tezci, E. (2004). Küreselleşen dünyada eğitimin yeni önceliği: Düşünmeyi öğrenme. *Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Araştırmaları*, 2(3),167-182.
- Valenzuela, S. (2009). Is there social capital in a social network site?: Facebook use and college students's life satisfaction, Trust and participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, 875–901. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01474.x>
- Williams, D. (2006). On and off the net: Scales for social capital in an online era. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11, 593–628. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00029.x>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.