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| **Abstract** Today, in line with the rapid changes and developments in the technological field, as in every field, school administrators holding an important place in the education sector, should keep up with technological developments. In this context, the aim of school administrators' use of social networks becomes prominent. In this study, it was aimed to examine the purpose of school administrators' use of social networks in terms of gender, age, title, educational status, year of service and the institution they belong to. Research is a descriptive study in the descriptive survey model. The population of the research is the school administrators in Sakarya province. The sample was chosen from the population by simple random sampling method based on the principle of unbiasedness. The sample consisted of 478 school administrators. In the analysis of the obtained data, descriptive statistical techniques were used in accordance with the problem situations studied in the research. According to the results of the study, it was determined that the “Collaboration” has the highest score where “Initiating Communication” has the lowest score within the purposes of school’s administrators’ use of social networks. According to this, school administrators use social networks more for cooperation. In addition, school administrators mostly preferred “Facebook” and “WhatsApp” social media applications.**Key words:** Social Network, School Administrators, Social Network Use Intentions. |

**Introduction**

Today, with the development of Web 2.0 technologies that prioritize social interaction, cooperation and sharing, different Internet environments have been used. Social networking sites which is considered as one of the most important components of Web 2.0 technology, and one of the most popular sharing media is one of these environments (Karal and Kokoç, 2010). Considering the world's most popular websites, which are determined by various criteria such as the number of visitors, data exchanges and page views, it is seen that most of the sites at top are social networking sites (SimilarWeb, 2018; eBizMBA, 2018; Alexa, 2018). When the studies are examined, the social networks are generally used for communication, sharing, cooperation, social interaction, education, entertainment and so on (Cheung, Chiu and Lee, 2011; Hew, 2011; Selwyn, 2009; Karal and Kokoç, 2010). From this point of view, it can be argued that the social networks which play an important role in the daily life of the majority of the individuals, mostly young people, can be put into the context of education, these tools can be used as a tool for educational technology, and individuals need to use these environments for educational purposes (Mazman, 2009).

The usage purpose of social networks used throughout the world may vary from person to person. Usually social networks is used for different purposes such as communicate, maintain communication, find friends, entertainment, follow developments, research, collaborate, share, learn, etc.. (Mazman and Usluel, 2010; Şener, 2009; Usluel, Demir and Çınar, 2014).

It is possible to list the characteristics of the era in which we are in general as information age as scientific and technological developments, development and increase of knowledge, globalization, innovation and and the change and development innovation brings (Kılıçer, 2011; Kurtuluş, 2012). As in all areas of life, rapid developments in information and communication technologies have also had an impact on the field of education and have brought about changes in the structure, operation and scope of education as well as the roles of people in the education sector (Mazman, 2009). Along with today's technological developments, school administrators had to keep up with technology to meet the needs of individuals. In order to achieve the speed of change, managers need to renew themselves continuously, especially on social networks and information technologies (Ciğerci, 2016). The fact that the managers who are in charge of survival and development of the organization inevitably and partly necessarily adapting to the technological and scientific changes and developments and being knowledgeable about social networks, will help them to be more effective on the dynamics of the organization. In this context, it can be asserted that the purpose of school administrators using social networks appears to be a functional research subject to examine.

The usage of the social networks of school administrators who hold an important place in the education sector in line with all these changes and developments is the problem of this study. This research is important for school administrators working at all levels of compulsory education to examine the purpose of using social networks. The sub-problems of the study are as follows:

1. What are the objectives of school administrators' use of social networks?
2. Is there a meaningful difference between the use of social networks regarding the dimensions in terms of gender, age, title, educational status, years of service and the variables of the institution school administrators are related to?

**Method**

This research is a descriptive study in the survey model. The descriptive survey model aims to describe a situation as it is in the past or today (Karasar, 2012). Within the scope of the research, the purpose of school administrators' use of social networks was determined in terms of various variables.

The population of the study consists of school administrators working in 735 schools in different types and levels in Sakarya province. The sample of the study consisted of 272 school principals and 206 deputy principals, who were assigned to all schools affiliated to MoNE in the province of Sakarya during 2016-2017 academic year and who were selected by simple random sampling method based on volunteerism. This sampling was chosen in the name of reliability, economics and effective time usage. In order to obtain the research data,” Purpose of Usage of Social Networks Scale” and “Personal Information Form” prepared by the researcher were used.

The purpose of usage of social networks scale was developed by Usluel et al. (2014). The scale consists of 26 questions, classified as 7 sub-dimensions: research, collaboration, initiating communication, maintaining communication, communicating, content sharing and entertainment. The number of factor items in the scale varies between 2 and 6. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of the scale factors are given in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Reliability coefficients according to factors

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Factor** | **Reliability coefficient** |
| Research | .78 |
| Collaboration | .86 |
| Initiating Communication | .67 |
| Maintaining Communication | .87 |
| Communicating | .82 |
| Content Sharing | .87 |
| Entertainment | .81 |

The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .92. The reliability coefficients of the factors were found as .67 to .87 where the item total correlations were ranged between .331 and .717. The answers to the items of the scale vary between “Strongly agree “(7) and “Strongly disagree” (1). A maximum of 182 and minimum 26 points can be obtained from the scale. The high arithmetic mean of any use factor is interpreted as the intense use of social networks for this purpose. In our study, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .87. The reliability coefficients of the factors were .72 to .85; the total correlations of the scale were found to change between .338 and .645. While developing the scale of the purpose of use of social networks, whether the scale items are appropriate for the purpose of measurement, the comprehensibility and distinctiveness of the expressions have been evaluated by 3 field experts, and have been checked by 2 Turkish Language experts have checked for linguistic validity, the necessary arrangements had been resettled in the light of the returns of the field experts.

The data obtained from the study were analyzed by using SPSS 20.0 package program. Kolmogorov-Smirnow test was used to test whether the data were normal distribution and non-parametric tests were used since the data were determined not to be normally distributed (Table 2.). Percentage, frequency, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, Spearman correlation test, Mann Whitney U Test, and Kruskal Wallis tests were applied to the data analysis depending sub-problems. Significance level was accepted as .05 for testing the significance of the differences.

**Table 2.** Distribution of data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Kolmogorov-Smirnov** | **Shapiro-Wilk** |
| **Sub Dimensions** | **Statistics** | **Degrees of freedom** | **p** | **Statistics** | **Degrees of freedom** | **p** |
| Research | ,104 | 478 | ,000\*\* | ,962 | 478 | ,000\*\* |
| Collaboration | ,081 | 478 | ,000\*\* | ,977 | 478 | ,000\*\* |
| Initiating Communication | ,159 | 478 | ,000\*\* | ,875 | 478 | ,000\*\* |
| Maintaining Communication | ,117 | 478 | ,000\*\* | ,940 | 478 | ,000\*\* |
| Communicating | ,064 | 478 | ,000\*\* | ,974 | 478 | ,000\*\* |
| Content Sharing | ,061 | 478 | ,000\*\* | ,990 | 478 | ,002\*\* |
| Entertainment | ,080 | 478 | ,000\*\* | ,984 | 478 | ,000\*\* |

\*p <.05; \*\* p <.01

**Findings**

The findings obtained from the analysis of the data are given below by taking into consideration the sub-objectives of the research and the order of these objectives.

According to Table 3, to the data obtained from school administrators participated in study, it was determined that “Facebook” and “WhatsApp” applications are mostly preferred for social network usage (29.9%).

**Table** **3.** Social network use of school administrators participating in the research

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Social Networks Used** | **N** | **%** | **Social Networks Used** | **N** | **%** |
| 2-3-4-5-6 | 1 | ,2 | 5 | 2 | ,4 |
| 2-3-4-5-6-7-8 | 1 | ,2 | 2 | 3 | ,6 |
| 2-3-4-5-7 | 1 | ,2 | 2-3-5-7 | 3 | ,6 |
| 2-3-4-5-7 | 1 | ,2 | 2-3-4-5-6 | 4 | ,8 |
| 2-3-4-5-7-8 | 1 | ,2 | 2-3-8 | 4 | ,8 |
| 2-3-4-5-8 | 1 | ,2 | 3 | 4 | ,8 |
| 2-3-4-6 | 1 | ,2 | 3-8 | 6 | 1,3 |
| 2-3-5-7-8 | 1 | ,2 | 3-5 | 8 | 1,7 |
| 2-3-6-7 | 1 | ,2 | 8 | 8 | 1,7 |
| 2-5 | 1 | ,2 | 3-4-5 | 9 | 1,9 |
| 3-4-5-6 | 1 | ,2 | 3-4 | 12 | 2,5 |
| 3-4-6 | 1 | ,2 | 2 | 15 | 3,1 |
| 3-7 | 1 | ,2 | 2-3-4 | 34 | 7,1 |
| 2-3-4-5 | 2 | ,4 | 2-3-5 | 56 | 11,7 |
| 2-3-4-5-6-8 | 2 | ,4 | 2-3-4-5 | 60 | 12,6 |
| 2-3-4-7 | 2 | ,4 | 3 | 84 | 17,6 |
| 2-3-4-8 | 2 | ,4 | 2-3 | 143 | **29,9** |
| 2-3-7 | 2 | ,4 |  |  |  |
| **Toplam** | **478** | **100,0** |

(1) None (2) Facebook (3) WhatsApp (4) Twitter (5) Instagram (6) Periscope (7) LinkedIn (8) Other:...

According to Table 4, usage purpose of social networks scale dimension of “Research” average is found as $´=$4,40, where “Collaboration” is $´=$4,65, “Initiating Communication” is $´=$2,46, “Communication” is $´=$4,03, “Communicating” is $´=$3,91, “Content Sharing” is $´=$3,98 and “Entertainment” is $´=$3,95.

**Table** **4.** Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of school administrators' social network use goals scores

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sub Dimensions** | **N** | $$´$$ | **Ss** |
| Research | 478 | 4,40 | 1,63 |
| Collaboration | 478 | 4,65 | 1,38 |
| Initiating Communication | 478 | 2,46 | 1,47 |
| Maintaining Communication | 478 | 4,03 | 1,60 |
| Communicating | 478 | 3,91 | 1,52 |
| Content Sharing | 478 | 3,98 | 1,22 |
| Entertainment | 478 | 3,95 | 1,24 |

As a result of the Mann Whitney U test according to Table 5, a significant difference was found in terms of gender variable in only “research”, “initiating communication” and “communicating” subscales in the scores of the school administrators' use of social networks scale (p <.05). In the “research” sub-dimension, statistically the mean scores of women were found to be significantly higher than the males (p =, 000). In addition, statistically the mean scores of the males were found to be significantly higher than the females in the subscales of “initiating communication (p =, 045)” and “maintaining communication (p =, 002)”.

**Table 5.** Mann Whitney U Test Table showing the difference between school administrators' scale of use of social networks regarding dimensions scores according to gender variable

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimensions** | **Gender** | **N** |  | **Rank Mean** | **Rank Total** | **U** | **p** |
| Research | Female | 77 | 14,93 | 290,55 | 22372,50 | 11507,500 | ,000\*\* |
| Male | 401 | 12,89 | 229,70 | 92108,50 |
| Collaboration | Female | 77 | 28,96 | 256,54 | 19753,50 | 14161,500 | ,237 |
| Male | 401 | 27,70 | 236,23 | 94727,50 |
| Initiating Communication | Female | 77 | 6,60 | 210,82 | 16233,00 | 13230,000 | ,045\* |
| Male | 401 | 7,56 | 245,01 | 98248,00 |
| Maintaining Communication | Female | 77 | 9,23 | 224,91 | 17318,00 | 14315,000 | ,002\*\* |
| Male | 401 | 9,81 | 242,30 | 97163,00 |
| Communicating | Female | 77 | 15,75 | 195,36 | 15043,00 | 12040,000 | ,308 |
| Male | 401 | 17,95 | 247,98 | 99438,00 |
| Content Sharing | Female | 77 | 21,00 | 237,90 | 18318,50 | 15315,500 | ,912 |
| Male | 401 | 20,95 | 239,81 | 96162,50 |
| Entertainment | Female | 77 | 10,55 | 230,30 | 17733,00 | 14730,000 | ,522 |
| Male | 401 | 10,75 | 241,27 | 96748,00 |

\*p < .05; \*\* p < .01

According to Table 6, when Kruskal Wallis test results were examined, it was found that scores of school administrators' scale of use of social networks related to dimensions significantly changed according to age of participants (p <.05). According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test conducted to see in favor of which group this difference is meaningful, between the mean scores of sub dimensions of “research (p=,035)” and “cooperation (p=,014)” of scale of usage of social networks of the age range of ”31-40” and the age range of “41-50”, a statistically significance difference has been found in favor of those aged between “31-40”. In case of sub dimensions “content sharing (p =,018)” and “entertainment (p =,097)”, a statistically significant difference has been found in favor of those aged between “41-50”.

For the “communicating” sub dimension mean scores of scale of usage of social networks of the ones aged “51 years and older ”and the age range of ”20-30” and the age range of “31-40”, a statistically significance difference has been found in favor of those aged “51 years and older” (p =, 048). In addition, for the “content sharing” sub dimension mean scores of scale of usage of social networks of the age range of ”20-30” and the age range of “41-50”, a statistically significance difference has been found in favor of those aged between “41-50” (p =, 018).

**Table 6.** Kruskal Wallis Test Table showing the differences of school administrators' social networks use objectives scale regarding dimensions scores according to age variable

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimensions** | **Age** | **N** | **Rank Mean** | **Std** |  | **p** | **Significant Difference** |
| Research | Age 20-30 | 21 | 268,71 | 3 | 8.60 | ,035\* | 2-3 |
| Age 31-40 | 180 | 259,49 |
| Age 41-50 | 179 | 219,96 |
| 51 and over | 98 | 232,22 |
| Collaboration | Age 20-30 | 21 | 254,17 | 3 | 10,560 | ,014\* | 2-3 |
| Age 31-40 | 180 | 260,84 |
| Age 41-50 | 179 | 214,34 |
| 51 and over | 98 | 243,12 |
| Initiating Communication | Age 20-30 | 21 | 270,50 | 3 | 3,997 | ,262 |  |
| Age 31-40 | 180 | 240,35 |
| Age 41-50 | 179 | 226,45 |
| 51 and over | 98 | 255,14 |
| Maintaining Communication | Age 20-30 | 21 | 285,33 | 3 | 7,911 | ,144 |  |
| Age 31-40 | 180 | 255,19 |
| Age 41-50 | 179 | 229,97 |
|  51 and over | 98 | 218,27 |
| Communicating | Age 20-30 | 21 | 265,95 | 3 | 5,409 | ,048\* | 1-4 2-4 |
| Age 31-40 | 180 | 245,34 |
| Age 41-50 | 179 | 221,71 |
| 51 and over | 98 | 255,60 |
| Content Sharing | Age 20-30 | 21 | 286,88 | 3 | 10,071 | ,018\* | 1-3 2-3 |
| Age 31-40 | 180 | 258,67 |
| Age 41-50 | 179 | 219,74 |
| 51 and over | 98 | 230,22 |
| Entertainment | Age 20-30 | 21 | 272,62 | 3 | 6,323 | ,097 | 2-3 |
| Age 31-40 | 180 | 251,78 |
| Age 41-50 | 179 | 220,22 |
| 51 and over | 98 | 245,06 |

\*p < .05; \*\* p < .01 1:age 20-30; 2:age 31-40; 3:age 41-50; 4:age 51 and over

As a result of the Mann Whitney U test according to Table 7, a significant difference was found only at “cooperation” and “maintaining communication” sub-dimensions of the school administrators' scale of use of social networks related to dimensions scores in terms of the title variable (p <.05). In the “cooperation” sub-dimension, statistically the mean scores of the school principals were found to be significantly higher than the deputy principals (p =, 033). In the sub-dimension of “establishing communication”, statistically the mean scores of the deputy principals were found to be significantly higher than school principals (p =, 030).

**Table 7.** Mann-Whitney U Test Table showing the difference between the scale of the purpose of using the social networks regarding dimensions scores of the school administrators according to the title variable.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimensions** | **Title** | **N** | **Rank Mean** | **Rank Total** | **U** | **p** |
| Research | Principal | 272 | 237,97 | 64727,50 | 27599,500 | ,780 |
| Deputy Prin. | 206 | 241,52 | 49753,50 |
| Collaboration | Principal | 272 | 251,19 | 68324,50 | 24835,500 | ,033\* |
| Deputy Prin. | 206 | 224,06 | 46156,50 |
| Initiating Communication | Principal | 272 | 233,52 | 63518,00 | 26390,000 | ,272 |
| Deputy Prin. | 206 | 247,39 | 50963,00 |
| Maintaining Communication | Principal | 272 | 227,68 | 61929,50 | 24801,500 | ,854 |
| Deputy Prin. | 206 | 255,10 | 52551,50 |
| Communicating | Principal | 272 | 238,49 | 64868,50 | 27740,500 | ,030\* |
| Deputy Prin. | 206 | 240,84 | 49612,50 |
| Content Sharing | Principal | 272 | 233,78 | 63589,50 | 26461,500 | ,298 |
| Deputy Prin. | 206 | 247,05 | 50891,50 |
| Entertainment | Principal | 272 | 246,26 | 66982,00 | 26178,000 | ,217 |
| Deputy Prin. | 206 | 230,58 | 47499,00 |

\*p <.05; \*\* p <.01

According to Table 8, when the results of Kruskal Wallis test are examined it was found that the scores of school administrators' scale of use of social networks related to dimensions differed significantly according to the education level of the participants (p <.05). According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test conducted in order to see in favor of which group this difference is meaningful, between the mean scores of sub dimensions of “communicating (p=,002)” and “ content sharing (p=,002)” of scale of usage of social networks of the educational status of ”Postgraduate” and the educational status of “Associate” and “Undergraduate”, a statistically significance difference has been found in favor of those aged between “31-40”. In case of sub dimensions “content sharing (p =,018)” and “entertainment (p =,097)”, a statistically significant difference has been found in favor of those with educational status of “Postgraduate”.

**Table 8.** Kruskal Wallis Test Table showing the difference of scores of school administrators' scale of use of social networks regarding dimensions according to the education level.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimensions** | **Education** | **N** | **Rank Mean** | **Sd** |  | **p** | **Significant Difference** |
| Research | Associate | 25 | 210,00 | 2 | 1,427 | ,490 |  |
| Undergraduate | 350 | 239,49 |
| Postgraduate | 103 | 246,71 |
| Collaboration | Associate | 25 | 245,06 | 2 | 4,275 | ,118 |  |
| Undergraduate | 350 | 231,96 |
| Postgraduate | 103 | 263,79 |
| Initiating Communication | Associate | 25 | 234,42 | 2 | 1,025 | ,599 |  |
| Undergraduate | 350 | 236,31 |
| Postgraduate | 103 | 251,56 |
| Maintaining Communication | Associate | 25 | 199,62 | 2 | 12,953 | ,269 |  |
| Undergraduate | 350 | 230,25 |
| Postgraduate | 103 | 280,60 |
| Communicating | Associate | 25 | 236,66 | 2 | 2,625 | ,002\*\* | 1-3 2-3 |
| Undergraduate | 350 | 233,97 |
| Postgraduate | 103 | 258,97 |
| Content Sharing | Associate | 25 | 186,38 | 2 | 11,998 | ,002\*\* | 1-3 2-3 |
| Undergraduate | 350 | 232,43 |
| Postgraduate | 103 | 276,40 |
| Entertainment | Associate | 25 | 227,68 | 2 | 1,013 | ,603 |  |
| Undergraduate | 350 | 236,98 |
| Postgraduate | 103 | 250,94 |

\*p <.05; \*\* p < .01 1:Associate; 2:Undergraduate; 3:Postgraduate

According to Table 9 when the results of Kruskal Wallis test are examined, it was found that purposes of school administrators' use of social networks scale was significantly differentiate only in the “research”, “cooperation” and “content sharing” sub dimension scores for the service years of the participants (p <,01; p <,05). Mann Whitney U test was conducted to see in favor of which group the difference is meaningful. In the “research” sub dimension of purposes of use of social networks scale; a statistically significant difference was found in favor of those who were in “0-5” years’ of service between mean scores of “0-5” years’ of service and “16-20” years’ of service (p =, 040). In the “cooperation” sub dimension of purposes of use of social networks scale; a statistically significant difference was found in favor of those who were in “0-5” and “6-10” years’ of service between mean scores of “16-20” years’ of service and mean scores of “0-5” and “6-10” years’ of service (p =, 040). In the “content sharing” sub dimension of purposes of use of social networks scale; a statistically significant difference was found in favor of those who were in “0-5” years’ of service between mean scores of “0-5” years’ of service and mean scores of “11-15” and “16-20” and “21 years and above” years’ of service (p =, 006). a similar result, a statistically significant difference was found in favor of those who were in “6-10” years’ of service between mean scores of “6-10” years’ of service and mean scores of “11-15” and “16-20” and “21 years and above” years’ of service (p =, 006).

**Table 9.** Kruskal Wallis Test Table showing the difference of scores of school administrators' scale of use of social networks regarding dimensions according to the service years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimensions** | **Service Years** | **N** |  | **Rank Mean** | **Sd** |  | **p** | **Significant Difference** |
| Research | 0-5 years | 27 | 15,51 | 303,70 | 4 | 10,008 | ,040\* | 1-4 |
| 6-10 years | 60 | 13,85 | 258,56 |
| 11-15 years | 99 | 13,56 | 248,53 |
| 16-20 years | 111 | 12,65 | 227,77 |
| 21 years and more | 181 | 12,82 | 225,86 |
| Collaboration | 0-5 years | 27 | 31,00 | 283,24 | 4 | 10,003 | ,040\* | 1-4 2-4 |
| 6-10 years | 60 | 29,93 | 269,16 |
| 11-15 years | 99 | 27,91 | 240,74 |
| 16-20 years | 111 | 26,04 | 211,67 |
| 21 years and more | 181 | 27,90 | 239,53 |
| Initiating Communication | 0-5 years | 27 | 8,25 | 250,78 | 4 | 3,093 | ,542 |  |
| 6-10 years | 60 | 7,81 | 253,53 |
| 11-15 years | 99 | 6,69 | 226,00 |
| 16-20 years | 111 | 7,23 | 228,47 |
| 21 years and more | 181 | 7,64 | 247,31 |
| Maintaining Communication | 0-5 years | 27 | 10,70 | 283,09 | 4 | 8,127 | ,102 |  |
| 6-10 years | 60 | 10,40 | 270,28 |
| 11-15 years | 99 | 9,72 | 241,40 |
| 16-20 years | 111 | 9,55 | 235,61 |
| 21 years and more | 181 | 9,44 | 224,14 |
| Communicating | 0-5 years | 27 | 20,21 | 294,22 | 4 | 7,717 | ,087 |  |
| 6-10 years | 60 | 18,08 | 250,95 |
| 11-15 years | 99 | 17,93 | 243,42 |
| 16-20 years | 111 | 16,62 | 216,94 |
| 21 years and more | 181 | 17,45 | 239,23 |
| Content Sharing | 0-5 years | 27 | 23,66 | 290,91 | 4 | 14,291 | ,006\*\* | 1-3 1-4 1-52-32-42-5 |
| 6-10 years | 60 | 23,08 | 289,43 |
| 11-15 years | 99 | 20,72 | 232,04 |
| 16-20 years | 111 | 20,37 | 227,22 |
| 21 years and more | 181 | 20,96 | 226,90 |
| Entertainment | 0-5 years | 27 | 11,85 | 272,91 | 4 | 6,922 | ,140 |  |
| 6-10 years | 60 | 11,60 | 267,02 |
| 11-15 years | 99 | 10,70 | 236,58 |
| 16-20 years | 111 | 10,12 | 217,35 |
| 21 years and more | 181 | 10,63 | 240,58 |

\*p <.05; \*\* p < .01 1:0-5 years; 2:6-10 years; 3:11-15 years; 4:16-20 years; 5: 21 years and more

**Results, Conclusions and Recommendations**

Based on the findings obtained from the opinions of school administrators on the use of social networks, the results and discussions reached in the research are as follows:

It’s assessed that the school administrators who participated in the research prefer “Facebook” and “WhatsApp” applications as social media usage. Keskin (2014) also stated that Facebook is preferred at most as social network choice in his research conducted by using scale of purpose of usage of social networks. According to the results of Kuzu (2014) 's research on prospective teachers, the first network used by teacher candidates in their daily lives is expressed as Facebook. Similarly, Çavdar (2012) found Facebook as the most time-spent social network. According to many researches carried out in different masses, it is seen that Facebook is the most used application among social networks (Luckin et al., 2009; Leila and Khodabandelou, 2013). According to all these results, it can be suggested that Facebook is the most preferred social media usage.

It has also been found out that “cooperation” dimension has the highest point among school administrators' use of social networks and “initiating communication” dimension has the lowest value. Keskin (2014) found in his research on teachers, teacher candidates and students that the highest scores related to the purposes of using social networks belonged to use for initiating communicating and maintaining communication while the lowest average scores belonged to use for initiating communication, content sharing and research purposes. Çavdar (2012) also found that social networks were used primarily for communication purposes. According to those mentioned, it can be argued that people in the education sector use social media more for communication purposes.

It can be said that female school administrators use social networks more for research than male. Çavdar (2012) stated that the female teachers used social networks more for social interaction and educational purposes than males. It can be said that male school administrators use social networks to start communication and maintain communication more than women. Çavdar (2012) also found that boys use social networks more for entertainment than girls. Kırksekiz (2013), in his study on teaching staff, found that Facebook usage purpose levels of women are higher than men in terms of gender variable.

It can be said that the school administrators who are in the “31-40” age range use social networks for more research and cooperation purposes than the age range ”41-50“. It can be said that the “41-50” age group uses social networks for content sharing and entertainment. In addition, it can be said that school administrators use social media to communicate as their age increases.

School principals can be said to use social networks for cooperation more than vice-principals. It can be said that deputy directors use social networks to establish communication more than school principals.

It can be said that school administrators use social media to communicate and share content as their education level increases. It can be said that school administrator’s usage of social media in the first 10 years of service years is to provide cooperation. It can be said that the school administrators' use of social media for content sharing decreases after the 11th years of service. It has been determined that school administrators who are employed in state or private schools do not change the purpose of using social networks. According to this, it can be said that the use of social networks does not change as the institutions of the school administrators change.

According to the results, suggestions for the implementation and future researches can be listed as follows:

* School administrators can be guided on using social networks for rightful purposes with the help of in-service training on social networks and deliberate activities.
* Sharing of information like the activities in the school, making announcements, performing decisions taken in meetings, etc. by school administrators through social networks can strengthen the perception of school council collaboration and innovation, and therefore all school administrators can actively recommend using social media.
* These or similar studies should be repeated within certain time periods. Because, it is necessary to find out how the school administrators can adapt to the rapidly developing and constantly changing technology.
* This research is also applicable to teachers.
* The purpose of school administrators' use of social networks can also be investigated by using different scales.
* Quantitative methods were used in data collection and analysis. By using qualitative methods and techniques, different and explanatory results can be achieved on same subject.
* Conducting this research in other cities may add more dimensions to research.

Studies can be done to reveal the relationship between school administrators and the various factors that might have an impact on the use of social networks.
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