



P-ISSN: 2394-1685  
E-ISSN: 2394-1693  
Impact Factor (RJIIF): 5.38  
IJPESH 2023; 10(5): 04-06  
© 2023 IJPESH  
[www.kheljournal.com](http://www.kheljournal.com)  
Received: 08-07-2023  
Accepted: 10-08-2023

**Selçuk Gençay**  
Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam  
University, Sport Sciences  
Faculty, Turkey

## Investigation of physical education teachers and trainer candidates' use of facebook as a social media tool in terms of different variables

**Selçuk Gençay**

### Abstract

Social media is a new type of online media. This study aims to examine the use of Facebook as a social media tool by physical education and sports teacher candidates and coach candidates in terms of different variables. It consists of a total of 185 teacher and coach candidates, 100 female and 85 male, with an average age of  $21.87 \pm 2.36$  years, studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences. As a data collection tool, as a data collection tool, developed by Karakoç *et al.* "Facebook Usage Motivation Scale" was used. Obtained data were analyzed with an independent sample test and a One-way ANOVA test. Facebook usage of students does not differ in terms of gender. ( $p > 0.05$ ). There is a statistically significant difference in the average score of Facebook according to why students connect to Facebook ( $p < 0.05$ ). According to this, the fact that his friends also use Facebook makes Facebook stand out as a meeting point where friends come together even in a virtual environment. There is a significant difference in Facebook usage motivation scores between students who have been a member of Facebook for up to two years and those who have been members for more than two years ( $p < 0.05$ ). As a result, the motivation of Facebook use of physical education teacher and coach candidates did not differ in terms of gender, depending on why the students were connected to Facebook. It was found that there is a statistically significant difference in the averages of Facebook scores, differing according to the duration of being a member of Facebook

**Keywords:** Physical education and sports teacher, trainer, social media, Facebook

### Introduction

With the Web 2.0 transformation since 2005, the Internet has become a social space beyond being a communication tool (Yurtkoru, *et al.* 2010; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2009) <sup>[4, 6]</sup>. This place provides users with the opportunity to meet foreigners, as well as the opportunities to find their old friends, meet their friends' acquaintances, make their circle of friends visible, and thus reshape social relations forms (Boyd & Ellison, 2007) <sup>[2]</sup>. It is an area called Social media can be defined as a medium whose content is completely determined by individuals, where individuals can constantly share, interact and discuss with each other without time and place limitations, and communicate interactively through various applications (Erkul, 2009) <sup>[5]</sup>. In this way, ordinary people have gained the power to speak, collaborate and create value together in real time (Scott & Jacka, 2011) <sup>[15]</sup>. Social media is a new type of online media. The main features of social media include "participation" (supporting the participation of anyone who wants to), "openness" (social media providers encourage participants to vote, advise and share information and do not prevent them from posting), "talk/chat" (Mayfield, 2008) <sup>[11]</sup>.

University youth, in terms of their age and location, while continuing their daily lives, frequently enter and exit virtual spaces, putting the internet and social media and related facts in their daily lives.

University youth, also referred to as virtual world travelers, are in the process of being in education life, wanting to access information more quickly and easily, being curious, and needing to exchange more information, files, and ideas in the process of gaining identity He uses the internet and social media intensively for reasons such as being able to express himself more easily (Karaca, 2007:11-16) <sup>[7]</sup>.

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Selçuk Gençay**  
Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam  
University, Sport Sciences  
Faculty, Turkey

Facebook, one of the best-known Web 2.0 applications, is a social networking site that aims for people to communicate with their friends and exchange information and was founded on February 4, 2004 by Harvard University student Mark Zuckerberg (McLoughlin & Lee, 2007) [12]. Facebook, which has wide participation all over the world, was designed in early 2004 as a special social communication network for Harvard University students. In order to become a member of Facebook, users had to have a "harvard.edu" e-mail address (Boyd & Ellison, 2007) [2]. Facebook, which later included schools around Boston, covered all Ivy League schools within two months. In the first year; All schools in the United States are on Facebook. Previously, members could only become members with the e-mail address of the aforementioned school (.edu, .ac.uk, etc.). Later, high schools and some large companies joined the network. On September 11, 2006, Facebook was opened to all e-mail addresses with some age restrictions. In July 2007; It had the world's largest university-based users with 34 million users. Many Web 2.0 technologies are used on Facebook, such as tagging, content scoring, content sharing, widgets, and APIs. Users can virtually communicate with their friends in the areas reserved for them, see their pictures, and view media such as the videos they share (Reid, 2011) [13]. This study aims to examine the physical education teacher candidates' use of Facebook as a social media tool in terms of different variables.

#### For this purpose, answers to the following sub-problems were sought

1. Are there any differences in the use of Facebook by physical education teacher candidates according to their gender?
2. Does the history of being a member of physical education teacher candidates affect their Facebook perception levels?
3. Is there a difference in the average Facebook score of the physical education teacher candidates according to why they connect to Facebook?

#### Materials and Methods

##### Example

The sample of the research consists of 185 teacher and coach candidates, 100 female and 85 male, with an average age of  $21.87 \pm 2.36$  years, studying at Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Faculty of Sports Sciences in the 2020-2021 academic year.

Students voluntarily participated in the research. Before applying the questionnaire, the candidates were given explanatory information about filling out the questionnaire. Answering the questionnaire took a total of 15 minutes.

##### Data Collection Tools

In the study, the scale developed by Karakoç and Gülsünler (2012) [8] was applied to the students, as well as the questions containing their demographic information.

This scale is a scale that aims to determine the Facebook Usage Motivation level of the individual. In this study, the scale's "How well does it describe you?" Likert format was used, in which answers ranging from "not at all" to "very well" can be given with five points. The scale consists of 21 items.

The entire scale is scored. An increase in the score indicates an increase in Facebook Usage Motivation. The internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.885,

and the internal consistency coefficient of the scale used in the current study was found to be  $\alpha=0.80$ .

#### Analysis of Data

The collected data were processed in the SPSS 18 Package program. Z values of skewness and kurtosis were examined to determine whether the obtained data showed a normal distribution. The Z value was found to be between -1.96 and +1.96 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and the distribution was considered normal by the Tabachnick & Fidell. According to this; Independent Samples T Test was used for differences between independent and paired groups, and one-way analysis of variance (Anova) was used for comparisons of more than two groups. In statistical comparisons, their significance was interpreted according to  $p < 0.05$  values.

#### Findings

**Table 1:** Classification of teacher candidates according to some socio-demographic characteristics

		F	%
Gender	Male	85	45,9
	Female	100	54,1
	Total	185	100
age	18-20	65	35,1
	21-23	90	48,6
	23-40	30	16,2
	Toplam	185	100
	Village	20	10,8
The place where you grew up	Town	21	11,4
	City	97	52,4
	Big city	47	25,4
	Total	185	100
Class	1	45	24,3
	2	67	36,2
	3	43	23,2
	4	30	16,2
	Total	185	100
Mother education level	Can't Read or Write	35	18,9
	Primary school	102	55,1
	Middle school	26	14,1
	High school	17	9,2
Father's education level	University	5	2,7
	Total	185	100
	Can't Read or Write	6	3,2
	Primary school	81	43,8
Perceived income	Middle school	55	29,7
	High school	26	14,1
	University	17	9,2
	Total	185	100
Perceived income	Very low	11	5,9
	Low	20	10,8
	Middle	102	55,1
	Good	47	25,4
Perceived income	Very good	5	2,7
	Total	185	100

**Table 2:** Facebook motivation score averages by gender, t-test results

Gender	N	M	SD	DF	T	P
Male	85	3,4718	69908	183	853	395
Female	100	3,3860	66580			

The difference between the average Facebook motivation score of men and women is not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 3:** Facebook membership duration and Facebook score average t-test results

Gender	N	M	SD	DF	T	P
1-2 years	78	3.2128	73451	183	3.753	000
3 years and above	107	3.5804	59589			

There is a significant difference in terms of Facebook score averages between those who have been a member for up to two years and those who have been members for more than two years ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 4:** One Way ANOVA results according to the reason for connecting to Facebook

Why is it connecting	N	M	Sd	F	P
Because my friends are members	3.1789	57	85883	5,772	004(1-2) (1-3)
To satisfy my curiosity	3.5762	43	65502		
Because it's on the agenda	3.5159	85	50316		
Total	3.4253	185	68263		

There is a statistically significant difference in the average score of Facebook according to why students connect to Facebook ( $p < 0.05$ ). According to this, the fact that his friends also use Facebook makes Facebook stand out as a meeting point where friends come together even in a virtual environment.

### Discussion and Conclusion

In this section, the sub-problems created in line with the purpose of the research were evaluated statistically and the obtained findings were interpreted and discussed respectively.

#### 1. Is there a difference in Facebook usage motivations of physical education teachers and coach candidates according to their genders?

In our study, no significant difference was found in the Facebook usage motivations of physical education teachers and coach candidates according to gender ( $p > 0.05$ ). In the study conducted by Kayaoğlu (2016) [9], it was determined that male students spend much more time on Facebook than female students, and this creates a statistically significant difference ( $p < 0.021$ ).

Acılar & Mersin (2015) [1] found no statistically significant difference between the genders in terms of privacy anxiety, although female students had higher privacy anxiety than male students.

Ngussa *et al.* (2021) [10] did not find a significant difference in the use of Facebook by students classified by gender and field of study.

#### 2. Does Facebook usage history affect Facebook motivation levels among physical education teacher and trainer candidates?

There is a significant difference between the students who have been a member of Facebook for up to two years and those who have been a member for more than two years in terms of their Facebook score averages ( $p < 0.05$ ).

#### 3. Does why physical education teacher and coach candidates connect to Facebook affect their motivation levels?

In Table 4, it is seen that the students differ in their Facebook motivations according to why they connect to Facebook ( $p < 0.05$ ). According to this, the fact that his friends also use Facebook makes Facebook stand out as a meeting point where friends come together even in a virtual environment. Cheung *et al.* (2011) [3] Social presence is the most important factor

that determines students' usage of Facebook. The features of social presence indeed can also encourage students to collaborate and work together. For instance, the special feature 'News Feed' allows users to sense the presence of their friends on Facebook. It also provides users with an overview of the activities of their friends on Facebook. In addition, the new function 'Facebook Chat' offers a function similar to MSN Messenger. Users can find out who is present and perform online chatting with them in a real-time. As a result, it was found that the motivation of the physical education teacher and the coach candidates did not differ in terms of gender, there was a statistically significant difference in the average score of Facebook according to why the students were connected to Facebook, and the motivation of using Facebook differed according to the duration of being a member of Facebook.

### References

- Acılar A, Mersin S. The relationship between university students' Facebook use and privacy concerns. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*. 2015;14(54):103-114.
- Boyd DM, Ellison NB. Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*. 2007;13(1):210-230.
- Cheung CMK, Chiu PY, Lee MKO. Online social networks: Why do students use Facebook? *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2011;27(4):1337-1343.
- Yurtkoru ES, Durmuş B, Ulusu Y, Kılıç B. We are on Facebook. Istanbul: Beta; c2010.
- Erkul RE. Usability of Social Media Tools (Web 2.0) in Public Services and Applications. *Turkish Informatics Association Journal of Informatics*. 2009;116:96-101.
- Kaplan M, Ve Haenlein M. The Fairyland of Second Life: About Virtual Social Worlds and How to Use Them. *Business Horizons*. 2009;52(6):59-68.
- Karaca M. Internet Youth as a Sociological Phenomenon: The Case of Elazığ. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Elazığ: FÜ. SBE; c2007.
- Karakoç E, Gülsünler ME. The Uses and Gratifications Approach: Facebook In Konya. *Journal of Akdeniz University Faculty of Communication*. 2012;(18): 42-57. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/akil/issue/48077/607859>
- Kayaoğlu MN. Gender Differences in Facebook usage among EFL students, *Participatory Educational Research*. 2016;4:40-48,
- Ngussa BM, Fitriyah FK, Dinngrat SWM. Correlation Between Facebook Use, Mental Health And Learning Engagement: A Case of universities in Surabaya City, Indonesia. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*. 2021;22(1):229-245. DOI: 10.17718/tojde.849912
- Mayfield, A. What is Social Media?; c2008. [icrossing.co.uk/ebooks](http://icrossing.co.uk/ebooks). Access Date: 20.09.2021.
- McLoughlin C, Lee MJV. Social software and participatory learning: Pedagogical choices with technology affordances in the web 2.0 Era; c2007. [www.ascilite.org.au/.../mcloughlin.pdf](http://www.ascilite.org.au/.../mcloughlin.pdf), Erişim Tarihi: 20.03.2021.
- Reid J. We don't Twitter, we Facebook: An alternative pedagogical space that enables critical practices in relation to writing. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*. 2011;10(1):58-80.
- Tabachnick BG, Ve Fidell, LS. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 8nd ed. Pearson Education; c2013. p. 167-168.
- Scott PR, Jacka JM. *Auditing Social Media*. New Jersey: John Wiley and Son; c2011.