AN APPLICATION ON THE USE OF FACEBOOK BY GENERATION Z IN THE CONTEXT OF SOCIAL NETWORK AS A MEANS OF VIRTUAL COMMUNICATION

Benan YÜCEBALKAN
Assist. Prof. Dr., Kocaeli Üniversitesi, byucebalkan@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-0333-1115

Barış AKSU
Lecturer Dr., Kocaeli Üniversitesi, barisaksu@yahoo.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-0660-0368

ABSTRACT

According to data from 2018, 3.19 billion people, which is 42% of world population have social media accounts. With the virtual communication carried out on a global scale, a virtual culture and environment arises between individuals and societies; people living in different conditions and cultures get closer and a cultural change takes place. Moreover, a research conducted in 26 countries by Reuters Institute of Oxford University in 2016 to learn about people's news sources revealed that 51% of the participants used social media to get weekly news. This rate is 73% for Turkey. The number of users in Facebook, which can be accessed through 19 language options today and expressed as the world's largest social network, is close to 2 billion. The purpose of this study which is structured upon these phenomena is to approach social networks as one of the virtual communication tools and to determine the usage preferences of generation Z, who were born in the years 1995-2012. The universe of the study consists of university students living in Turkey, born in and after 1995, which is considered the first year of Generation Z. The sample is 364 students of Kocaeli University Kandıra Vocational School of Higher Education. Survey method is used in the research. The conclusion reveals that the 29% of generation Z members do not use Facebook and the 10% do not have an active Facebook account. Those who use Facebook actively stated that they predominantly prefer following the humor pages, that they don't use it for playing games or listening to music, that they prefer in person communication rather than communicating via Facebook, that they do not refrain expressing their true feelings and thoughts through posts and comments, that they are not interested in advertisements in the pages and there are not affected by them, and that they are disturbed by fake accounts, attempts of fraud, harassments, voyeurisms, and by those who use their personal accounts for commercial purposes.

Keywords: Virtual communication, social networks, Generation Z, Facebook.

INTRODUCTION

The virtual world which is expressed as the creation and consummation of content by millions of people on an "online" universe is the digital new world that enables people to communicate within the social networks that use the internet infrastructure independently of time and space.

In the first decade of the 21st century, the number of people connected to the internet around the world increased from over 350 million to over 2 billion and today this number exceeds half of the world's population reaching to 4 billion. While in the same decade, the number of people using cell phones were 750 million, today almost two third of world population have at least one cell phone. It is envisaged that most of the world's population would be free to access all the information in the world with a device that fits in the palm of the hand by 2025, and most of the population of 8 billion will be online if the pace of technological innovation continues (Schmidt and Cohen, 2015: 12).

The advent of the internet gave rise to a process of interactive communication. Unlike the lack of audience response in the traditional media, it is possible through the internet to receive instant responses from the audience. Moreover, text-sound and image are used in a common medium in the online communication; which makes communication more effective than traditional media. Thus, the Internet presents a more powerful source of information by bringing together the assets of newspaper, radio and television in the same environment. Another advantage of virtual communication is that, unlike traditional media, everyone can participate in the communication process as an individual. Each internet user is a member of the targeted mass by being both a broadcaster -in other words a source- and a consumer of content. On the other hand, within the framework of the virtual communication created by the internet, a "virtual culture" environment has emerged with rapprochement and common interest among individuals and societies. In virtual culture formed by virtual communication, internet users (net-mates) get closer and cultural change occurs with the amalgamation of people living in different conditions and cultures (Çakır and Topçu, 2005: 76).

Moreover, a research conducted in 26 countries by Reuters Institute of Oxford University in 2016 to learn about people's news sources revealed that 51% of the participants used social media to get weekly news. This rate is 73% for Turkey. The number of users in Facebook, which can be accessed through 19 language options today and expressed as the world's largest social network, is close to 2 billion. But according to a study by eMarketer in the US, Facebook is losing a significant portion of its young users. Although it wins new users, an important part of this group consists of people of middle age and above. The results of the research indicate that, "In 2018, the number of users aged 11 and under in the USA will decrease by 9.3%, 12-17 age group will be reduced by 5.6% and the 18-24 age group will be reduced by 5.8%" (OdaTV, 2018).

Based on these facts, the aim of this study is to explore social networks among virtual communication tools and to determine the preferences -and their effects- of Generation Z, which is also known as the digital generation, on Facebook as one of the most popular social networkscomparing with the situation in the USA.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual foundations of the study consist of the historical development of communication in the virtual environment, social networking and the identity of the Z generation, which constitutes the sample of the research with Facebook. These concepts are discussed below in general terms.

Historical Development of Virtual Communication

The first appearance of the concept of "virtual" was when the psycho-acoustic (study of the effects of sounds on the human nervous system) professor Joseph Carl Rebnett Licklider used the term "virtual memory" to describe a presumed memory of computers in 1952. Following that, Zimmerman used the concept of "virtual" to describe organizations, workplaces or companies that have effects without having a physical existence. The lexical meaning of "virtual" is something that does not actually exist but is perceived as if existing (Çavuşoğlu, 2004: 318).

Today, internet as a virtual communication tool, which has become the indispensable part of daily life and business life, can be defined as a network of millions of computers connected to each other in the world. The number of users is constantly increasing due to the easy access to information, the dissemination of information and the ability to store information as well as providing a fast and low-cost communication (Güçdemir, 2015: 24).

The Internet was born in 1969 with the ARPANET network established to provide exchange of information between ministerial computers by DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Project Agency) of the US Department of Defense. The first cycle of the ARPANET was UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles), the second cycle was "Augmentation of Human Intellect", a project by Doug Engelbart of SRI (Stanford Research Institute), the third cycle was UCSB (University of California, Santa Barbara), and the fourth cycle was the University of Utah (Taşdemir and Aslan, 2017: 12).

One of the important developments about the Internet is the transfer of ARPANET to www (World Wide Web). The Web or www was developed by Tim Berners-Lee who had conducted many researches on high-energy physics in many places around the world, in March 1989 as an effective interpersonal communication platform in the CERN (European Particle Physics Laboratory). In 1990, ARPANET was replaced by Web or Web 1.0 (Taşdemir and Aslan, 2017: 12). Web 1.0 is a multi-hypermedia system that provides compact and interactive transportation of different structured data such as text, picture, sound, film or animation (Güçdemir, 2015: 30).

The first internet connection in Turkey took place on April 12, 1993 at METU. Then, Ege University (1994), Bilkent University (1995), Boğaziçi University (1995) and İTÜ (1996) followed. In 1996, the TURNET project provided internet to homes and business organizations in Turkey (Taşdemir and Leo, 2017: 12). In addition to that, ULAKBIM (National Academic Network and Information Center) was established in 1996 under TÜBİTAK (Çakır and Topçu, 2005: 75).

Today, Web 2.0 period is experienced on the Internet. Web 2.0 refers to the environments from social networking sites (social networks), web-based encyclopedias, forums, podcasts to other online platforms of second-generation internet-based web services (Güçdemir, 2015: 31). In the near future, the Web 3.0 period, which is defined as the third-generation internet network and associated with the "semantic web", will be introduced. Semantic web is a system where machines are able to read, understand and interpret data. In other words, all content on the web will be a single database. For example; search engines will be able to understand and analyze what the sentences on the page is about, and artificial intelligence robots will be able to respond to user needs by making logical inferences based on users' choices on the Internet (Güçdemir, 2015: 34-35). In this way, Web 3.0 can act as an individual helper. On the other hand, Web 4.0 studies are also progressing rapidly. With the advent of Augmented Reality into the web world, it is envisioned that each individual will have an avatar to represent themselves in the virtual world. Moreover, even the operation systems called Web OS will be found in cloud realms. A transition from semantic web which is completely based on the concept of consumer ownership to an intelligent web is configured (Baloğlu, 2015: 37, 44).

Social Networks and Facebook

The emergence of virtual communities is closely linked with internet technologies. Various initiatives have taken place in the historical development process, but with the development of www, virtual communities have become widespread and diversified. The historical development of virtual communities is shown in Table 1 (Erdoğan and Torun, 2009: 54):

Table 1. The Historical Development of Virtual Communities

1969	ARPANET was established
1972	First e-mail is sent, and a mailing list was created
1976-1977	Virtual science community, EIES, was established
1978-1981	First Usenet newsgroup, BBSs and MUDs were developed
1980-1981	CSNET and BITNET were developed
1980-1985	Commercial online service providers were created
1985	The 'Lectronic Link (the Well) began working around the world
1988	Internet Relay Chat (IRC) was created
1990-1991	World Wide Web (www) was created
1994-1995	Netscape was launched and sharing communities started to emerge (such as amazon.com)
1998-1999	Community sites started to be added to portals (yahoo, msn etc.)
2000-2001	Internet became widespread
2002-cont.	The latest trend: social networking software exploded

Resource: Valck, Kristine De (2005), "Virtual Communities of Consumption", Erasmus Research Institute of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam, p. 25.

According to 2018 data, 53% of the world's population, 4.02 billion people use the internet and 42% of the world's population, 3.19 billion people have social media accounts (Dijilopedi, 2018).

Social networks can be defined as groups of people who are connected to each other through a single common resource. The term "social media" refers to web-based applications that are built on the technological and ideological foundations of Web 2.0 and provide user-centric exchange and production of content (Kasap, 2014: 125).

The first social network, created in 1997, was SixDegrees.com (Güçdemir, 2015: 41). Social networks that are widely used in the world today are Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, WhatsApp, Instagram, Pinterest, Foursquare, LinkedIn et al.

In the research of 2016 conducted by Oxford University Reuters Institute in 26 countries (USA, UK, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Belgium, Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria, Hungary Czech Republic, Poland, Greece, Turkey, South Korea, Japan, Australia, Canada, Brazil) to reveal the news sources of people, 51%of the participants were found to use social media as a source of weekly news. The details of the report concerning Turkey demonstrate that 90% internet (73% of this is social media), 80% television, 54% newspapers and 41% radio is used to get weekly news. The 2017 report of the institute states that the percentages of use of social media to reach news in Turkey are as follows: Facebook 64% (-10% compared to 2016), YouTube 32% (+1% compared to 2016), Twitter 25% (-5% compared to 2016), WhatsApp 25% (+8% compared to 2016), Instagram 12% (+5% compared to 2016) (Taşdemir and Aslan, 2017:14).

Facebook was founded on February 4, 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg, a 19-year-old computer science student from Harvard University in Boston, USA. Zuckerberg's first social site "facemash" was a portal used jointly by Harvard University students which was soon terminated by the management of the college due to the unauthorized publish of the photographs and data of students. After this event, Zuckerberg took 1 year off from college to set up a social networking site where people would interact with each other, play virtual games, share their photos, personal information and interests, and encoded the basics of Facebook in his dorm room together with two friends who supported him. The name of the site then was "The Facebook". The word Facebook comes from the term "paper facebook" which is a form that is used by college students, academics, and staff for identification. The website was made available to Harvard University students, and soon became widespread in the surrounding schools, then extended to companies and high schools in the region. In the September of the same year, the "wall" feature was added, and The Facebook reached 1 million users in its first year. During this period, it received financial support by partnering PayPal and renamed as "Facebook" in the august of 2015. Today Facebook, the world's largest social network, which is accessible via 19 languages including Turkish, German, English, Chinese and Dutch (Techworm, 2018), has reached 2 billion users (CNN Türk, 2018).

Facebook is an application that operates both on the basis of maintaining the social ties of physical life in the virtual environment and establishing new ties. It mainly operates on physical life-based identities (Kasap, 2014; 126, 127). Facebook can be defined as in a kind of cultural capital that consists of "knowledge ownership,

achievements, formal and informal qualifications through which an individual can obtain a position within certain social circles, professions and organizations or secure its position". Although it is an example of popular culture, it can be said that it also adds to the definition of popular culture (Kabir, 2014: 292-293).

The Identity of Generation Z, Sample of the Research

Generation is the term which society is defined as the group of individuals who form the age groups of about twenty-five and thirty years in other word descendant. As a philosophical term, it is a community of individuals who were born in the same years shared the conditions of the similar ages, hence similar problems, and who were responsible for similar duties (Büyük Türkçe Sözlük).

Generations were usually distinguished by definitive political events in the USA through the middle of the 20th century. A research on many university students conducted by Arthur Levine et al. revealed that the students who were born in the first decades of 20th century were seen to have characterized common experiences such as the Kennedy assassination, the Vietnam War, the Watergate scandal, the space shuttle disaster, and the September 2001 Twin Towers attack. However, after the early years of the 21st century, the political events remained in the background, while the common experience of the generation became the Internet, the web, the smart phones, and most of all the social sharing platform Facebook (Gardner and Davis, 2013: 61). In this respect, it can be concluded that the intergenerational slices will be narrowed considering that technology is the main determinant factor in the new generations of 21st century and it is developing and renewed rapidly.

The study focuses on the generation X before the generation Z, and then on the Y generation (Yücebalkan, Aksu, 2013: 18-19):

X Generation (Baby Burst)

X generation is who was born between the years 1965-1977 is an intermediate generation, in Turkey is called "Transition Period Children" or "Lost Generation". They face the economic problems that are the reflection of the changing world dynamics, they are as convincing as possible, they are sensitive, loyal, idealistic, skeptical and struggling against social problems. Since they coincided with the technological revolution, they started to use technology. It is claimed that they are the first generation who are interested in brands and even initiate identification by brand. It is a generation that is respectful to authority, has a high work motivation, is loyal in business life and has a high sense of opinion. Their future concern has focused them on working hard, making a career and making more money. The X generation has also led to a break in the traditional family model, women started to have less children with joining the business life.

Y Generation (Echo Boom or Next Generation)

Y generation is who was born in 1977-1994. This generation is called "After 80 Generation" in Turkey. In the world, they called themselves like "Non-Nuclear Family Generation, the Wannabees, the Feel-Good

Generation, the CyberKids, the Do-or-Die Generation, and the Searching-for-an-Identity Generation". The generation Y is the technology-friendly, individual and comfortable children of the world while the PC and GSM technologies are born, and begin to globalize. The most important feature that distinguishes them from X generation is that they have a voluntary relationship with technology and consumption. Thanks to their specialization in the use of internet, they have acquired multiple identities. Since the virtual world of the Internet has replaced the real-world perception, it has led people to build themselves and their relationships through the symbols which offered by this virtual world; by creating a break in the perception of world-based production, they were the first generation to open the door to the world of consumption. The technology which they grow in has become increasingly complex, but has become easier to use. Y generation do not only use technology, they also want to create it.

Z Generation

Generation Z consists of those who are born between 1995 and 2012 (Stillman and Stillman, 2017: 13). The members of this generation born in a digital era and living together with technology are also called "Generation I", "Internet Generation", "Next Generation", "iGen" and "Instant Online". The office of Mission and Ministry calls them "digital generation" and ".com generation". Generation Z is defined as having the highest level of motor-skills synchronization of human history. Strauss and Howe stated that this generation will most probably suffer from loneliness due to excessive individualization. The most distinct feature of Generation Z is the fact that they witness a period in which the change is experienced very fast and in the form of breaks. The individuals of the generation who can connect very easily with the people living in all parts of the world, draw a technology-dependent, hasty, internet-dominated, creative, multi-attention and multi-decision-making, fast-consuming profile (Saracel, Taşseven & Kaynak, 2016:53; Altuntuğ, 2012: 206).

On the other hand, the concept of identity also undergoes a transformation in the digital world of 21st century. This transformation affects not only the Generation Z, but also anyone who lives with the internet. The identity of anyone who lives in the digital age is increasingly becoming a synthesis of the offline self-expression in the real field and the online self-expression in the virtual world. Thus, the individual has become a social identity not only through what he says about himself or what he is doing about himself, but also through what his friends say and do (Palfrey and Gasser, 2017: 32).

METHOD

Scope

The universe of the study consists of university students living in Turkey, born in and after 1995, which is considered the first year of Generation Z. The sample is 364 students of Kocaeli University Kandıra Vocational School of Higher Education.

Limitations

The research is restricted to the students of Kocaeli University Kandıra Vocational School of Higher Education, considering the difficulties of transportation, accessibility and time.

METHOD

Survey method is used in the research. In the preparation of the survey questions, the 22-item scale develop by Kuyucu to explore the Facebook use of Generation Z is referred (Kuyucu, 2014). The scale is developed into 5-point Likert scaled questions consisting of 55 items which are categorized under the headings of "scope", "socialization", "sharing", "affectedness", "behavior", "positive aspects" and "negative aspects". There are also 9 questions about the demographic characteristic of the participants, two of which are open-ended. Simple Random Method was used in the selection of participants. The application was realized in May 2018 in two weeks. A total of 364 individuals participated in the study.

The data obtained from the study were analyzed with SPSS 21 statistical package program and reliability validity tests were performed. T-test and Friedman tests were used to analyze the data. The results are presented with summary tables of frequency distribution (n), mean and standard deviations. The significance level was taken as 5% (p = 0.05) in all analyzes.

FINDINGS (RESULTS)

Of the 364 participants who participated in the study, 106 (29.12%) stated that they did not use Facebook, while 38 (10.44%) stated that their Facebook account was not active. The findings in the following section belong to the 220 participants (60.44%) who stated that they use their Facebook accounts actively.

The distribution of the participants according to the birth years is displayed in the Table 2. Accordingly, the highest number of participants were born in 1997 and 1998.

Table 2. Distribution of the Participants According to Birth Year

Birth Year	n	%
1995	10	4.5
1996	21	9.5
1997	60	27.3
1998	87	39.5
1999	42	19.1
Total	220	100

When the demographic information of the participants is examined, it is seen that a density of 62.3% is made up of women and 58.7% of them do not have a relationship. The monthly income of family is below 3000 TL in the majority of the participants.

Table 3. Demographic Data

		n	%
Gender	Woman	137	62.3
	Men	83	37.7
Relationship status	Single	128	58.7
	In a Relationship	90	41.3
Family income	2000 and below	86	39.6
	2001-3000	78	35.9
	3001-4000	35	16.1
	4001 and above	18	8.3

The education levels and working conditions of the parents of the participants are given in Table 4. According to this, it is observed that both mothers and fathers are mostly primary and secondary school graduates. While 71% of mothers do not work, fathers are workers with a rate of 36.8%.

Table 4. Education Levels and Working Conditions of Parents

		Mother		Father	
		n	%	n	%
Education Level	Illiterate	14	6.4	4	1.9
	Only Literate	8	3.6	7	3.3
	Primary	93	42.3	80	37.9
	Secondary	70	31.8	61	28.9
	High school	28	12.7	43	20.4
	College/Bachelor's	7	3.2	14	6.6
	College/Master's	0	0.0	2	0.9
Employment Status	Unemployed	152	71.0	14	6.7
	Worker	39	18.2	77	36.8
	Officer	4	1.9	14	6.7
	Self-Employed	7	3.3	49	23.4
	Retired	12	5.6	55	26.3

The average monthly expenditure of the Z generation Facebook users who participated to the research is 688.24 TL. Their Facebook accounts have been used actively for an average of 6.19 years. They also stated that they used Facebook 56.53 minutes per day on average (Table 5).

Table 5. Monthly Expenditure, Years of Active Account, Use of Facebook per Day

	Min	Max	Avg.	s
Monthly expenditure	100	3000	688.24	393.59
Years active	1	13	6.19	2.66
Minutes per day	1	270	56.53	48.68

When the monthly expenditure, the duration of active usage and the daily usage time is examined in the context of gender differences, it is seen that men spend more than women (p = 0.016) and that their Facebook accounts are active for more years (p = 0.000). However, no significant difference was found between the two genders in terms of duration of daily use (Table 6).

Table 6. Monthly Expenditure, Years of Active Account, Use of Facebook per Day in Terms of Gender

	Gender	**Avg.**	**s**	**p***
Monthly expenditure	Woman	636.94	333.70	**0.016**
	Man	773.08	466.52	
Years active	Woman	5.62	2.60	**0.000**
	Man	7.11	2.52	
Minutes per day	Woman	52.66	45.71	0.209
	Man	62.17	52.54	

*Independent t-test is applied.

58.7% of the participants do not have a relationship. These individuals did not show a significant difference according to relationship status in terms of monthly expenditure, Facebook account activity time and daily usage period (p> 0.05).

Table 7. Monthly Expenditure, Years of Active Account and Daily use of Facebook in Relation to Relationship Status

	Relationship Status	**Avg.**	**s**	**p***
Monthly expenditure	Single	646.58	357.70	0.064
	In a relationship	749.71	434.81	
Years active	Single	6.28	2.69	0.546
	In a relationship	6.06	2.63	
Minutes per day	Single	57.36	51.91	0.787
	In a relationship	55.31	43.89	

*Independent t-test is applied.

The statements of the participants about their use of Facebook are examined in terms of the factors of scope, socialization, affectedness, behavior, positive aspects and negative aspects. The distribution and the basic statistical values of the obtained data are displayed between the Table 9 and Table 15. The Cronbach Alpha values obtained as a result of the reliability test performed for each factor examined are presented in Table 8. Accordingly, it is observed that the majority of the examined factors have a high level of reliability.

Table 8. The results of reliability analyses

Factors	Cronbach's Alfa
Scope	0.830
Socialization	0.742
Sharing	0.604
Affectedness	0.828
Behavior	0.653
Positive aspects	0.826
Negative aspects	0.929

Table9. Scope

SCOPE	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree		Avg.	s
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Facebook is one of the most important sources of news for me	79	36.1	35	16.0	39	17.8	46	21.0	20	9.1	2.51	1.40
Instead of following the news from the newspaper, I receive news from the posts on Facebook.	98	44.7	32	14.6	25	11.4	44	20.1	20	9.1	2.34	1.44
I listen to music via Facebook	179	81.7	23	10.5	6	2.7	6	2.7	5	2.3	1.33	0.85
I follow the Facebook pages of the newspapers, radio and TV channels.	109	50.0	20	9.2	18	8.3	43	19.7	28	12.8	2.36	1.55
I follow the art pages on Facebook	96	43.8	27	12.3	26	11.9	39	17.8	31	14.2	2.46	1.53
I follow pages on politics on Facebook	117	53.9	23	10.6	19	8.8	24	11.1	34	15.7	2.24	1.56
I follow the pages on literature on Facebook	76	34.7	24	11.0	32	14.6	48	21.9	39	17.8	2.77	1.55
I follow the pages about sport on Facebook	90	40.9	23	10.5	21	9.5	33	15.0	53	24.1	2.71	1.67
I follow the humor pages on Facebook	63	28.8	22	10.0	22	10.0	50	22.8	62	28.3	3.12	1.62
I follow the pages about cooking on Facebook	116	53.0	23	10.5	29	13.2	25	11.4	26	11.9	2.19	1.47
I follow the pages of brands on Facebook	69	31.7	21	9.6	37	17.0	47	21.6	44	20.2	2.89	1.54
I enjoy spending time playing games on Facebook	126	57.3	29	13.2	21	9.5	22	10.0	22	10.0	2.02	1.41

As it can be seen in Table 9, 81.7% of the participants stated that they don't listen to music through Facebook; 53.0% don't follow food pages on Facebook and 50.0% don't follow Facebook pages of newspapers, radio and TV channels.

Table 10. Socialization

SOCIALIZATION	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree		Avg.	s
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
I found my childhood friends through Facebook	77	35.0	35	15.9	22	10.0	38	17,3	48	21,8	2,75	1,60
I follow the birthdays of my relatives on Facebook	49	22.3	29	13.2	22	10.0	38	17,3	82	37,3	3,34	1,61
I invite my relatives and friends to events like parties, engagements or weddings through Facebook	129	58.9	24	11.0	15	6.8	24	11,0	27	12,3	2,07	1,49
I prefer announcing a change in my life through Facebook rather than in person	157	71.4	28	12.7	18	8.2	8	3,6	9	4,1	1,56	1,06
I prefer announcing a change in my life through Facebook rather than on the phone	165	75.0	23	10.5	16	7.3	10	4,5	6	2,7	1,50	1,00
I like chatting via Facebook messenger more than talking on the phone	151	68.6	24	10.9	21	9.5	15	6,8	9	4,1	1,67	1,15
I had new friends through Facebook	94	42.9	24	11.0	45	20.5	33	15,1	23	10,5	2,393	1,43
I know every one of my Facebook friends in person	56	25.7	19	8.7	33	15.1	47	21,6	63	28,9	3,19	1,57

As it can be seen in Table 10, 75% of the participants stated that they don't prefer announcing something through Facebook to telling their friends on the phone. 71% of them stated that they don't prefer Facebook to telling their friends in person. 68.6% stated that they don't like chatting via Facebook instead of talking on the phone. Lastly, 58,9% stated that they do not invite friends and relative to the special events like weddings and parties through Facebook.

Table 11. Sharing

SHARING	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree		Avg.	s
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
I refrain from sharing my emotions freely on Facebook	125	56.8	27	12.3	27	12.3	23	10,5	18	8,2	2,01	1,36
I refrain from sharing my thoughts freely on Facebook	127	58.3	24	11.0	28	12.8	19	8,7	20	9,2	2,00	1,38
I share the posts that I like on Facebook	55	25.1	15	6.8	35	16.0	39	17,8	75	34,2	3,29	1,60
I share the posts that I think will be liked on Facebook	86	39.8	27	12.5	27	12.5	39	18,1	37	17,1	2,60	1,56
I refrain from sharing my true emotions in the comments on Facebook	151	69.9	21	9.7	21	9.7	9	4,2	14	6,5	1,68	1,20
I refrain from sharing my true thoughts in the comments on Facebook	149	69.6	20	9.3	23	10.7	12	5,6	10	4,7	1,66	1,16
When I like the posts of my friends, I share them as well	71	32.9	23	10.6	31	14.4	39	18,1	52	24,1	2,90	1,60

As it can be seen in Table 11, 69.9 % of the participants stated that they do not refrain from sharing their emotions in the comments on Facebook, while 69.6% stated that they do not refrain from sharing their thoughts in the comments. In general, 58.3% stated that they do not refrain from sharing their thoughts and 56.8% do not refrain from sharing their emotions on Facebook.

Table 12. Affectedness

AFFECTEDNESS	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Disagree		Avg.	s
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
When I'm interested in a product my friend bought and shared on Facebook, I also buy it	118	53.6	24	10.9	26	11.8	31	14,1	21	9,5	2,15	1,44
When I'm interested in a place my friend went and shared a picture of, I also go there	90	40.9	26	11.8	37	16.8	38	17,3	29	13,2	2,50	1,49
When I'm interested in a region my friend went and shared a picture of, I also go there	112	50.9	27	12.3	28	12.7	33	15,0	20	9,1	2,19	1,42
I follow the suggestions of my friends and I attend concerts that they suggest	107	48.6	27	12.3	39	17.7	27	12,3	20	9,1	2,21	1,39
I follow the suggestions of my friends and I attend events that they suggest	106	48.6	28	12.8	36	16.5	29	13,3	19	8,7	2,21	1,39
Advertisements on a Facebook page catch my attention	132	60.0	30	13.6	28	12.7	19	8,6	11	5,0	1,85	1,23
I can be influenced by the ads to buy a product	146	67.0	22	10.1	19	8.7	15	6,9	16	7,3	1,78	1,28

As can be seen in Table 12, 67% of the participants stated that they don't buy products, by getting affected by the advertisements and 60% of them stated that they are not interested in the advertisements on Facebook pages. 53.6% stated that they do not buy a product when interested in a photograph of the product their friends shared. 50.9% stated that they do not travel to a region because of being interested in a photograph of it a friend shared on Facebook.

Table 13. Behavior

BEHAVIOR	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree		Avg.	s
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
I find another world in Facebook	137	62.3	31	14.1	34	15.5	8	3.6	10	4.5	1.74	1.13
I feel something is missing in my life when I'm not on Facebook	171	77.7	26	11.8	9	4.1	9	4.1	5	2.3	1.41	0.92
I can't imagine life without Facebook	184	83.6	16	7.3	8	3.6	7	3.2	5	2.3	1.33	0.87
I only scroll through Facebook without posting myself	59	26.9	28	12.8	30	13.7	45	20.5	57	26.0	3.06	1.57
I only scroll through Facebook without liking posts	78	35.9	31	14.3	29	13.4	39	18.0	40	18.4	2.69	1.55
Before liking a post, I consider whose post it is	80	36.7	21	9.6	33	15.1	32	14.7	52	23.9	2.79	1.62

It can be seen in Table 13 that 83.6% of the participants disagree with the statement "I can't imagine life without Facebook". 77.7% stated that they do not feel any missing in their life, when they don't use Facebook actively, and 62.3% do not find a new and different world in Facebook.

Table 14. Positive aspects

POSITIVE ASPECTS	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree		Avg.	s
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
I find fast news spread on Facebook useful	45	20.5	19	8.7	50	22.8	34	15,5	71	32,4	3,31	1,51
Practical information on Facebook is useful for me	51	23.2	23	10.5	37	16.8	45	20,5	64	29,1	3,22	1,54
Technological information on Facebook is useful for me	60	27.5	16	7.3	32	14.7	43	19,7	67	30,7	3,19	1,61
I like it when my posts are liked	68	30.9	27	12.3	41	18.6	39	17,7	45	20,5	2,85	1,53

As can be seen in Table 14, participants do not have a prominent statement about the positive aspects of Facebook.

Table 15. Negative aspects

NEGATIVE ASPECTS	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree		Avg.	s
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
I am disturbed by the fake accounts on Facebook	36	16.4	10	4.5	6	2.7	8	3.6	160	72.7	4.12	1.55
I am disturbed by the fraud attempts on Facebook	31	14.1	7	3.2	5	2.3	11	5.0	166	75.5	4.25	1.46
I am disturbed by the harassments on Facebook	31	14.2	6	2.7	4	1.8	9	4.1	169	77.2	4.27	1.45
I am disturbed by the voyeurisms on Facebook	30	13.6	6	2.7	7	3.2	7	3.2	170	77.3	4.28	1.44
I am disturbed by those who use their personal accounts for commercial purposes	50	22.7	13	5.9	23	10.5	13	5.9	121	55.0	3.65	1.68

It can be seen in Table 15 that 77.3% of the participants stated that they are disturbed by voyeurisms, 77.2% by harassments, 75.5% by fraud attempts, 72.7% by fake accounts and 55% by personal accounts with commercial intents.

When the differentiation of the investigated factors within themselves was examined, it was found that all factors had a significant consistency within themselves ($p < 0.05$). However, the Friedman Test was applied to understand the differences between the factors. According to the result of this analysis, which presents a meaningful difference, the people who participated in the study highlight mostly the "negative aspects" of Facebook. The following factor emerges as "sharing" factor ($p < 0.05$) (Table 16).

Table 16. Intra-Factor and Inter-Factor Differences

	Avg.	s	Avg. Order	Intra-Factor*	Inter-Factor**
Scope	2.41	0.86	3.34	0.000	
Socialization	2.31	0.82	3.23	0.000	
Sharing	3.63	0.80	5.40	0.000	χ^2=484.955
Affectedness	2.12	0.97	2.72	0.000	sd=6
Behavior	2.17	0.79	2.80	0.000	p=0.000
Positive Aspects	3.14	1.25	4.59	0.000	
Negative Aspects	4.11	1.34	5.92	0.000	

* t-test, **Friedman test is used.

The differentiation of the factors according to gender is examined in Table 17. As a result of the analysis, a meaningful difference is obtained between the genders only in terms of "scope" and "sharing". According to the findings, men are more interested in "scope" than women (p = 0,005) and women shared posts on Facebook more often than men (p = 0,045).

Table 17. The Differentiation of the Factors According to Gender

	Gender	Avg.	s	t-test	sd	p
Time	Woman	2.20	0.84	-5.206	218	0.000
	Man	2.84	0.98			
Scope	Woman	2.28	0.87	-2.820	218	**0.005**
	Man	2.62	0.82			
Socialization	Woman	2.23	0.79	-1.872	218	0.062
	Man	2.44	0.86			
Sharing	Woman	3.72	0.78	2.019	218	**0.045**
	Man	3.50	0.82			
Affectedness	Woman	2.21	0.96	1.762	218	0.079
	Man	1.98	0.97			
Behavior	Woman	2.11	0.78	-1.302	218	0.194
	Man	2.26	0.80			
Positive Aspects	Woman	3.03	1.27	-1.749	218	0.082
	Man	3.33	1.21			
Negative Aspects	Woman	4.26	1.24	2.106	218	0.036
	Man	3.87	1.46			

The results of the tests made to determine how the factors differ according to the relationship status are given in Table 18. According to this, the only difference between those who have a relationship with those who don't is the "sharing" factor (p = 0.027). People who have a relationship share more posts on Facebook than single people.

Table 18. The Differentiation of the Factors According to Relationship Status

	Relationship Status	Avg.	s	t-test	sd	p
Time	Single	2.42	0.97	-0.485	216	0.628
	In a relationship	2.48	0.94			
Scope	Single	2.40	0.91	-0.415	216	0.679
	In a relationship	2.45	0.80			
Socialization	Single	2.37	0.83	1.187	216	0.236
	In a relationship	2.24	0.80			
Sharing	Single	3.54	0.82	-2.230	216	**0.027**
	In a relationship	3.78	0.76			
Affectedness	Single	2.10	0.93	-0.621	216	0.535
	In a relationship	2.18	1.01			
Behavior	Single	2.20	0.78	0.520	216	0.603
	In a relationship	2.15	0.80			
Positive Aspects	Single	3.29	1.27	1.806	216	0.072
	In a relationship	2.98	1.18			
Negative Aspects	Single	4.17	1.30	0.692	216	0.490
	In a relationship	4.05	1.38			

CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

29,12% of the Generation Z members who participated in the research stated that they did not use Facebook and 10,44% stated that their Facebook account was not active. This can be said to be consistent with the tendency in the USA. According to a study by eMarketer in the US, Facebook is losing a significant portion of its young users. Although it wins new users, an important part of this group consists of people of middle age and above. The results of the research indicate that, "In 2018, the number of users aged 11 and under in the USA will decrease by 9.3%, 12-17 age group will be reduced by 5.6% and the 18-24 age group will be reduced by 5.8%" (OdaTV, 2018).

In the research conducted on 364 Z generation people, it was determined that 60.44% of them actively use Facebook. The statements of the participants about their use of Facebook are examined in terms of the factors of scope, socialization, affectedness, behavior, positive aspects and negative aspects. The people who participated in the study highlight mostly the "negative aspects" of Facebook. The following factor emerges as "sharing" factor. The examination for the differentiation of the factors according to gender shows that men are more interested in "scope" than women and women shared posts on Facebook more often than men.

As a result of the research, the Z generation who actively uses their accounts mostly prefer not to play games (57.3%) and listen to music (91.7%) on Facebook; not interested in and not affected by the advertisements (60%), and are uncomfortable with Facebook fake accounts (72.7%), fraud attempts (75.5%), harassment (77.2%), voyeurism (77.3%) and the use of individual pages for commercial purposes (55%).

Virtual voyeurism that disturbs the Generation Z, displays that voyeurism has a new dimension due to the rapid development of the technology along with the social networks (Kabir, 2014: 291). According to Mike Schroepfer's statement on the blog newsroom.fb.com, 87 million people were affected by the scandal of sharing private information of Facebook with Cambridge Analytica. Statement was released shortly after the company announced that Mark Zuckerberg, founder and CEO of Facebook, would testify on the use and protection of user data on 11 April at the US House of Commerce Trade Commission. Data analysis firm Cambridge Analytica worked previously with Donald Trump's team in the recent US presidential election (BBC Turkish, 2018). Moreover, ex-CIA and NSA employee Edward Snowden stated that Facebook is not a victim but a collaborator in the scandal. He further asserted that (Bianet, 2018):

> "Those who collect and sell detailed records of private lives were once called 'intelligence agencies'. The fact that they call themselves 'social media' is the most successful deception ever since the 'Ministry of War' has been the 'Ministry of Defense'"

According to Çoban, Facebook usage practices are the most recent indicators of voluntary surrender of the subjects. By signing up Facebook, subjects who open themselves to the visual control of local and globalgovernments, face with their subjective disappearances while trying to prove their existence (Çoban, 2014: 304).

On the other hand, a campaign named "The Truth about Tech" is conducted by a non-governmental organization called The Center for Humane Technology and Common Sense, in the US. Tristan Harris, one of the campaign's entrepreneurs and previously one of the ethical advisors of Google, once expressed concern over the impact of Internet companies today (Gazete Duvar, 2018):

> "The idea that 50 people (in the center of Google) dominate and manipulate 2 billion people …
> No body is talking about this".

The Center for Humane Technology is supported by Roger McNamee, a former consultant of Facebook's founder Mark Zuckerberg, and former employees of Mozilla as well. The center also includes Justin Rosenstein, who developed the "Like" button on Facebook. The statement on the Group's website is as follows (Gazete Duvar, 2018):

> "Our society is seized by technology. The race that started to attract our attention now destroys the pillars of our society: mental health, democracy, social relations and children. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Google have developed amazing products that the world uses a lot. However, the companies that had to make money were also involved in a race to draw our attention. They are under constant pressure to perform better than their competitors, so they have to use increasingly persuasive methods to stick us on the screen."

To conclude; it can be said that communication processes produced by global scaled social networks both involves the traditional codes of action and questions them by excluding and distancing them in virtual reality which dematerializes the truth and is woven with abstract, variant, connected, complicated, emotional, dynamic, volatile, paradoxical, burry and fluid elements.

SANAL ORTAMDA İLETİŞİM ARACI OLARAK SOSYAL PAYLAŞIM AĞLARI BAĞLAMINDA Z KUŞAĞININ FACEBOOK KULLANIMI ÜZERİNE BİR UYGULAMA

TÜRKÇE GENİŞ ÖZET

Dünya üzerindeki yüz milyonlarca insanın yasaların bütünüyle kontrol altına alamadığı bir online âlemde sayısız dijital içerik yaratması ve tüketmesi olarak ifade bulan sanal dünya, insanların zamandan ve mekândan bağımsız olarak internet altyapısını kullanan sosyal ağlar içinde iletişim kurmasını sağlayan dijital yeni dünyadır. 21. yy.'ın ilk on yılında dünya çapında internete bağlananların sayısı 350 milyondan 2 milyarın üzerine çıkarken, bugün bu rakam dünya nüfusunun yarıdan fazlasını, 4 milyarı aşmış durumdadır. Aynı dönemde 750 milyon cep telefonu abonesi varken, bugün dünya nüfusunun neredeyse üçte ikisi en az bir cep telefonu sahibidir. 2025'de dünya nüfusunun büyük bölümünün avuç içine sığan bir aletle dünyadaki tüm enformasyona serbestçe ulaşabilir duruma geleceği ve teknolojik inovasyonun bu temposunun sürmesi durumunda 8 milyarlık nüfusun çoğunun online olacağı öngörülmektedir (Schmidt ve Cohen, 2015:12).

Nitekim 2016 yılında Oxford Üniversitesi Reuters Enstitüsü'nün insanların haber kaynaklarını öğrenmek üzere 26 ülkede yürüttüğü araştırmada katılımcıların % 51'inin sosyal medyayı haftalık haber kaynağı olarak kullandığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu oran, Türkiye için % 73'dür. Günümüzde 19 dil seçeneğiyle erişim sağlanabilen ve dünyanın en büyük sosyal ağı olarak ifade edilen Facebook'un ise kullanıcı sayısı 2 milyara yaklaşmış durumdadır. Ancak ABD'de eMarketer tarafından yapılan bir araştırmaya göre, Facebook genç kullanıcılarının önemli bir bölümünü kaybetmektedir. Site yeni kullanıcılar kazansa da, bunun önemli bir bölümünü orta ve üstü yaş gruplarındaki kişiler oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma sonuçlarında "2018 yılında ABD'de 11 yaş ve altındaki kullanıcıların sayısı % 9,3 oranında, 12-17 yaş grubu % 5,6 oranında, 18-24 yaş grubu ise % 5,8 oranında azalacak" tahminlerine yer verilmektedir (OdaTV, 2018).

Bu olgulardan yola çıkan çalışmanın amacı, sanal ortamdaki iletişim araçlarından sosyal paylaşım ağlarını genel hatlarıyla ele almak ve popüler sosyal paylaşım ağı olan Facebook'un dijital kuşak olarak da adlandırılan Z kuşağının Türkiye'deki üyeleri tarafından çeşitli başlıklar altında kategorize edilen kullanım tercihleri ile bu tercihlerin etkilerini belirleyerek, ABD'deki durum ile karşılaştırma ve değerlendirme yapmaktır.

İnternet, 1969 yılında ABD Savunma Bakanlığı'na bağlı DARPA (Defense Advanced Reserach Project Agency) tarafından bakanlık bilgisayarları arasında bilgi alışverişi sağlamak amacıyla kurulan ARPANET ağı ile doğmuştur. ARPANET'in ilk düğümü UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles), ikinci düğümü SRI (Stanford Research Institute)'den Doug Engelbart'ın "Augmentation of Human Intellect" adlı projesi, üçüncü düğümü UCSB (University of California, Santa Barbara) ve dördüncü düğümü Utah Üniversitesi olmuştur (Taşdemir ve Aslan, 2017:12). İnternetle ilgili önemli gelişmelerden biri ARPANET'in yerini www (World Wide Web)'e devretmesidir. Web ya da www, Mart 1989'da yüksek enerji fiziği konusunda dünyanın birçok yerinde araştırmalar yapan Tim Berners-Lee tarafından CERN (European Particle Physics Laboratory)'de, kişilerarası etkin ve kolay bir iletişim

platformu olarak geliştirilmiştir. 1990'da ARPANET kullanımdan kalkarak yerini Web'e ya da Web 1.0'a bırakmıştır (Taşdemir ve Aslan, 2017:12). Web 1.0; yazı, resim, ses, film, animasyon gibi farklı yapıdaki verilere kompakt ve etkileşimli ulaşımı sağlayan çoklu hiper ortam sistemidir (Güçdemir, 2015:30).

İnternette günümüzde Web 2.0 dönemi yaşanmaktadır. Web 2.0; ikinci kuşak internet tabanlı web servislerinden sosyal ağ sitelerine (sosyal networkler), web tabanlı ansiklopedilere, forumlara, podcast'lere ve diğer çevrimiçi paylaşımlara olanak sağlayan ortamları ifade etmektedir (Güçdemir, 2015:31). Yakın bir gelecekte ise üçüncü kuşak internet ağı olarak tanımlanan ve "semantik web" ile özdeşleştirilen Web 3.0 dönemine geçilecektir. Semantik web makinelerin okuyup, anlayıp, yorumlayabileceği bir sistemdir. Daha açık bir ifadeyle, web'deki tüm içerik tek bir veri tabanı olacak; örneğin arama motorları sayfadaki cümlelerin nelerden söz ettiğini anlayıp analiz edebilecek, yapay zekâlı robotlar kullanıcıların internetteki seçimlerine göre mantıksal çıkarımlar yaparak kullanıcı gereksinimlerine yanıt verebilecektir (Güçdemir, 2015:34-35). Böylelikle Web 3.0 bütünüyle bireysel bir yardımcı gibi davranabilecektir. Diğer yanda Web 4.0 çalışmaları da hızla ilerlemektedir. Artırılmış Gerçeklik (Augmented Reality)'in web dünyasına girişi ile tüm insanların sanal dünyada birer avatarının olacağı ve bu avatarlarla sanal ortamda gezinebildiği bir dünya öngörülmektedir. Ayrıca Web OS olarak da adlandırılan işletim sistemlerinin bile bulut ortamlarda bulunacağı, bütünüyle müşteri aidiyeti kavramı üzerine kurulmuş bulunan semantic (anlamsal) web'den akıllı (intelligent) web yapısına geçiş kurgulanmaktadır (Baloğlu, 2015:37, 44).

2018 verilerine göre dünya nüfusunun % 53'ü, 4.02 milyar insan internet kullanmaktadır ve dünya nüfusunun % 42'si, 3.19 milyar insanın sosyal medya hesabı bulunmaktadır (Dijilopedi, 2018). Sosyal paylaşım ağları, tek bir ortak kaynak üzerinden birbirine bağlanan insan grupları olarak tanımlanabilir. "Sosyal medya" terimi, Web 2.0'ın teknolojik ve ideolojik temelleri üzerinde inşa edilen ve kullanıcı merkezli içerik üretimi ve değişimine olanak tanıyan internet tabanlı uygulamaları ifade etmektedir (Kasap, 2014:125). İlk sosyal paylaşım ağı, 1997 yılında kurulan SixDegrees.com'dur (Güçdemir, 2015:41). Günümüzde dünya ölçeğinde yaygınlıkla kullanılan sosyal paylaşım ağları Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, WhatsApp, Instagram, Pinterest, Foursquare, Linkedin vd.'dir.

Araştırmaya konu olan Facebook, hem fiziksel yaşamdaki toplumsal bağların sanal ortamda da sürdürülmesi hem de yeni bağların kurulması temelinde işleyen bir uygulamadır. Ağırlıklı olarak fiziksel yaşam temelli kimlikler üzerinden işlemektedir (Kasap, 2014;126, 127). Facebook, "sayesinde bir bireyin belli sosyal çevreler, meslekler ve örgütler içinde bir konum elde edebildiği veya konumunu güvence altına alabildiği bilgi mülkiyeti, başarılar, resmi ve gayri resmi niteliklerden" oluşan kültürel sermayenin bir türü olarak tanımlanabilir. Bu haliyle popüler kültürün bir örneği olmakla birlikte, popüler kültürün tanımına da eklemede bulunduğu söylenebilir (Kabir, 2014:292-293).

Araştırmanın evrenini ve örneklemini oluşturan Z kuşağı ise 1995-2012 yılları arasında doğanlardan oluşmaktadır (Stillman ve Stillman, 2017:13). Dijital bir çağda dünyaya gelen ve teknoloji ile iç içe yaşayan bu kuşağın üyelerine "Kuşak I", "İnternet Kuşağı", "Next Generation", "iGen", "Instant Online" (her daim çevrimiçi)

kuşağı da denilmektedir. Mission and Ministry kuruluşu ise onlara "Dijital Çocuklar" ve ".com Çocukları" adlarını uygun bulmaktadır. İnsanlık tarihinin el, göz, kulak vb. motor beceri senkronizasyonu en yüksek kuşağı olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Strauss ve Howe bu kuşağın aşırı bireyselleşerek yalnızlık yaşayacağını ifade etmektedir. Z Kuşağını diğerlerinden ayıran en önemli farklılık, değişimin çok hızlı ve kırılmalar şeklinde yaşandığı bir döneme tanıklık etmeleridir. Dünyanın her yerinde yaşayanlarla çok rahat bağlantı kurabilen Z'ler teknolojiye bağımlı, aceleci, internete hakim, yaratıcı, çoklu dikkat ve çoklu karar alma becerisine sahip, her şeyi çabuk isteyen ve anlık tüketen bir profil çizmektedirler (Saracel, Taşseven & Kaynak, 2016:53; Altuntuğ, 2012:206).

Diğer yanda 21. yy.'ın dijital dünyasında kimlik kavramı da değişime uğramaktadır. Bu değişim yalnızca Z kuşağını değil, internetle yaşayan herkesi etkilemektedir. Dijital çağda yaşayan herhangi birinin kimliği, giderek benliğin çevrimdışı gerçek alandaki ile çevrimiçindeki ifadesinin bir sentezi haline gelmektedir. Böylelikle birey yalnızca gerçekte yaptıklarıyla ya da kendisi hakkında söyledikleriyle değil, arkadaşlarının yaptıkları ve söyledikleriyle de biçimlenen "sosyal kimlik" olmaktadır (Palfrey ve Gasser, 2017:32).

Çalışmanın evrenini Z kuşağının başlangıç doğum yılı kabul edilen 1995 ve sonrasında doğmuş, Türkiye sınırları içinde yaşayan yükseköğretim öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır. Örneklem ise Kocaeli Üniversitesi Kandıra Meslek Yüksekokulu'nda öğrenim gören 364 katılımcıdır. Araştırma; ulaşım, erişim ve zaman güçlükleri dikkate alınarak Kocaeli Üniversitesi Kandıra Meslek Yüksekokulu'nda öğrenim gören öğrencilerle sınırlandırılmıştır. Araştırmada anket yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Anket sorularının hazırlanmasında Kuyucu'nun Y kuşağının Facebook kullanımını araştırmak için geliştirdiği 22 soruluk ölçekten yararlanılmış (Kuyucu, 2014); ölçek geliştirilerek "kapsam", "sosyalleşme", "paylaşım", "etkilenme", "davranış", "olumlu yönler" ve "olumsuz yönler" başlıkları altında kategorize edilen 55 maddeden oluşan 5'li Likert ölçekli sorular haline getirilmiştir. Ayrıca anket formunda 2 adet açık uçlu soru ile; katılımcıların demografik özelliklerini belirmeye yönelik 9 adet soru yer almaktadır. Katılımcıların seçiminde Basit Rassal Yöntem uygulanmıştır. Uygulama Mayıs 2018'de iki hafta sürede, toplam 364 katılımla gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Araştırmadan elde edilen veriler SPSS 21 istatistik paket programı ile analiz edilmiş, güvenirlilik geçerlilik testleri yapılmıştır. Verilerin analizlerinde t-test ve Friedman testlerinden faydalanılmıştır. Bulgular frekans (n) dağılımı, ortalama ve standart sapmalardan oluşan özet tablolarla sunulmuştur. Yapılan tüm analizlerde anlam düzeyi %5 (p=0,05) olarak alınmıştır.

Sonuç olarak; araştırmaya katılan Z kuşağı üyelerinin % 29,12'si Facebook kullanmadığını, % 10,44'ü ise Facebook hesabının aktif olmadığını ifade etmişlerdir. Bu durumun ABD'deki Facebook kullanma eğilimi ile tutarlılık gösterdiği söylenebilir. Hesabını aktif kullanan Z kuşağı, Facebook'ta oyun oynamayı ve müzik dinlemeyi tercih etmediklerini, arkadaşlarıyla Facebook aracılığıyla iletişim kurmak yerine yüz yüze iletişimi tercih ettiklerini, paylaşımlarda ve yorumlarda duygularını ve düşüncelerini özgürce ifade ettiklerini, sayfalardaki reklamların ilgilerini çekmediğini ve bu reklamlardan etkilenerek ürün satın almadıklarını ve Facebook'taki sahte hesaplardan, dolandırma girişimlerinden, tacizlerden, röntgencilerden, bireysel sayfasını ticari amaçla kullananlardan rahatsız olduklarını ifade etmişlerdir.

Z kuşağının rahatsız olduğunu ifade ettiği "sanal röntgencilik", modern teknolojideki patlamanın sosyal ağlar ile birleşimi sayesinde "röntgen" teriminin yeni bir boyut kazandığını göstermektedir (Kabir, 2014:291). Diğer yanda, bu araştırmanın gerçekleştirildiği tarihlerde ortaya çıkan Facebook'un kullanıcı bilgilerini uygunsuz biçimde Cambridge Analytica şirketiyle paylaşması skandalından dolayı şirketin teknoloji yetkilisi Mike Schroepfer tarafından newsroom.fb.com blogunda yapılan açıklamaya göre, 87 milyona yakın kullanıcı bu durumdan etkilenmiştir. Açıklama, Facebook'un kurucusu ve CEO'su Mark Zuckerberg, şirketin kullanıcı verilerinin kullanımı ve korunmasıyla ilgili olarak 11 Nisan'da ABD Temsilciler Meclisi Ticaret Komisyonu'nda ifade vereceğinin belli olmasından kısa süre sonra yayımlanmıştır. Veri analiz şirketi Cambridge Analytica, ABD'deki son başkanlık seçimlerinde Donald Trump'ın ekibiyle çalışmıştı (BBC Türkçe, 2018). Ayrıca, sürgünde yaşayan eski CIA ve NSA çalışanı Edward Snowden skandalda Facebook'un "kurban" değil "işbirlikçi" konumunda olduğunu belirterek şu ifadeleri kullanmıştır (Bianet, 2018).:

> "Özel hayatlara ilişkin ayrıntılı kayıtları toplayıp satanlar bir zamanlar 'istihbarat şirketi' olarak tanımlanırdı. Şu anda kendilerini 'sosyal medya' olarak adlandırmaları, 'Savaş Bakanlığı'nın 'Savunma Bakanlığı' oluşundan beri en başarılı kandırmacadır."

Nitekim Çoban'a göre, Facebook kullanım pratikleri, öznelerin gönüllü teslimiyetinin en güncel göstergelerindendir. Facebook'a kaydolarak yerel ve küresel iktidarların görsel denetimine kendisini açan özneler, varoluşlarını kanıtlamak isterken, gerçekte öznel yok oluşlarıyla karşı karşıya kalmaktadır (Çoban, 2014:304).

Diğer yanda ABD'de The Center for Humane Technology ve Common Sense adlı bir sivil toplum kuruluşu tarafından "The Truth About Tech" adlı bir kampanya sürmektedir. Kampanyanın girişimcilerinden ve bir zamanlar Google'ın etik danışmanlarından Tristan Harris, internet şirketlerinin günümüzdeki etkilerinden duyduğu endişeyi şöyle ifade etmektedir(Gazete Duvar, 2018):

> "İki milyar kişinin, 50 kişi (Google'ın merkezindeki) tarafından yönlendirildiği düşüncesi… Kimse bunun hakkında konuşmuyor."

The Center for Humane Technology, Facebook'un kurucusu Mark Zuckerberg'in bir zamanlar danışmanlığını yapan Roger McNamee ve Mozilla şirketinin eski çalışanları tarafından da desteklenmektedir. Merkezde, Facebook'un "beğen" seçeneğini bulan Justin Rosenstein da yer almaktadır. Grubun internet sitesindeki açıklama şöyledir (Gazete Duvar, 2018):

> "Toplumumuz teknoloji tarafından gasp ediliyor. Dikkatimizi çekmek için başlayan yarış, artık toplumumuzun direklerini yok ediyor: Akıl sağlığı, demokrasi, sosyal ilişkiler ve çocuklarımız. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram ve Google dünyanın çokça faydalandığı inanılmaz ürünler geliştirdiler. Ancak bu para kazanmaları gereken şirketler aynı zamanda bizim dikkatimizi çekmek için bir yarışa giriştiler. Rakiplerinden daha iyi performans göstermeleri için sürekli baskı altında

olduklarından, bizi ekrana yapıştırmak için artan bir şekilde ikna etme yöntemleri kullanmak zorunda kalıyorlar."

Sözün sonu olarak; soyut, değişken, bağlı, karmaşık, duygusal, hızlı, dinamik, uçucu, paradoksal, bulanık ve akışkan öğelerle örülü ve gerçeği maddesizleştiren sanal gerçeklikte; küresel ölçekte sosyal paylaşım ağları aracılığıyla üretilen iletişim süreçlerinin geleneksel eylem kodlarını hem kapsadığı, hem de dışlayarak sorguladığı ve ötelemelere yol aldığı söylenebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sanal ortamda iletişim, sosyal paylaşım ağları, Z kuşağı, facebook.

REFERENCES

Altuntuğ, N. (2012). Kuşaktan Kuşağa Tüketim Olgusu ve Geleceğin Tüketici Profili.*Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4 (2), 203-212.

Baloğlu, A. (Ed.) (2015). *Sosyal Medya Madenciliği*. İstanbul: Beta Yayınevi.

BBC Türkçe (2018). "Facebook skandalı 87 milyon kullanıcıyı etkiledi" https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-dunya-43649116, Access: 01.05.2018.

Bianet (2018). Snowden: "Facebook Bir İstihbarat Şirketi". http://bianet.org/bianet/dunya/195348-snowden-facebook-bir-istihbarat-sirketi, Access: 01.05.2018.

Büyük Tükçe Sözlük. Türk Dil Kurumu. http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_bts

CNNTürk (2018). "Facebook kullanan kaç kişi var?" https://www.cnnturk.com/teknoloji/facebook-kullanan-kac-kisi-var, Access: 02.05.2018.

Çoban, B. (2014). Yeni Panoptikon Gözün İktidarı ve Facebook. *Sosyal Medya Devrimi*. Haz. Barış Çoban, İstanbul: Su Yayınevi, 303-318.

Çakır, H., Topçu, H. (2005). Bir İletişim Dili Olarak İnternet. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 19 (2), 71-96.

Çavuşoğlu, M (2004). Sanal Organizasyonlar ve Elektronik. *Marmara Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*. 19 (1), 317-334.

Dijilopedi (2018). 2018 İnternet Kullanımı ve Sosyal Medya İstatistikleri. https://dijilopedi.com/2018-internet-kullanimi-ve-sosyal-medya-istatistikleri/, Access: 02.05.2018.

Erdoğan, Z., Torun, T. (2009). Bir İlişkisel Pazarlama Aracı Olarak Sanal Topluluklar. *Pazarlama ve Pazarlama Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4, 45-71.

Gardner, H., Davis, K. (2013). *App Kuşağı*. Çev. Ümit Şensoy, İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları.

Gazete Duvar (2018). Eski Facebook çalışanı: Toplumumuz teknoloji tarafından gasp ediliyor. https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/teknoloji/2018/02/07/eski-facebook-calisani-toplumumuz-teknoloji-tarafindan-gasp-ediliyor/, Access: 06.05.2018.

Güçdemir, Y. (2015). *Sanal Ortamda İletişim*. İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.

Kabir, S. (2014). Sanal Röntgencilik ve Facebook'ta Bireyselliğin Kullanımı. *Sosyal Medya Devrimi*. Haz. Barış Çoban, İstanbul: Su Yayınevi, 290-302.

Kasap, D. G. (2014). Çevrimiçi Müzakere Alanı Olarak Sosyal Medya Uygulamaları. *Sosyal Medya Devrimi*. Haz. Barış Çoban, İstanbul: Su Yayınevi, 117-138.

Kuyucu, M. (2014). Y Kuşağı ve Facebook: Y Kuşağının Facebook Kullanım Alışkanlıkları Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13 (4950), 55-83.

OdaTV (2018). Facebook artık resmen yaşlılar platform. https://odatv.com/facebook-artik-resmen-yaslilar-platformu-14021843.html, Access: 01.05.2018.

Palfrey, J., Gasser, U. (2017). *Doğuştan Dijital*. Çev. Nagihan Aydın, İstanbul: İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Saracel, N., Taşseven, Ö. Kaynak, E. (2016). Türkiye'de Çalışan Y Kuşağında İş Tatmini-Motivasyon İlişkisi. *Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5 (1), 50-79.

Schmidt, E., Cohen, J. (2015). *Yeni Dijital Çağ*. Çev. Ümit Şensoy, İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları.

Stillman, D., Stillman, J. (2017). *İşte Z Kuşağı*. Çev. Duygu Pınar Kayıhan, Ferhat Erduran, İstanbul: İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi Yayınevi.

Taşdemir, E., Aslan, E. (Ed.) (2017). *Sosyal Medya İletişimi*. Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı.

Techworm (2018). Facebook Tarihçesi. https://www.tech-worm.com/facebook-tarihcesi/, Access: 02.05.2018.

Yücebalkan, B., Aksu, B. (2013). Potansiyel İşgücü Olarak Y Kuşağının Transformasyonel Liderlerle Çalışabilirliğine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi.5 (1), 16-32.