T. C.
BALIKESİR ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS' INTERACTIONS WITH THEIR STUDENTS ON FACEBOOK

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

RABİA BÖREKCİ

Balıkesir, 2017

T.C.
BALIKESİR ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS' INTERACTIONS WITH THEIR STUDENTS ON FACEBOOK

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

RABİA BÖREKCİ

Tez Danışmanı
Doç. Dr. Selami AYDIN

Balıkesir, 2017

Enstitünüzün Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Bilim Dalı'nda 201412553003 numaralı Rabia BÖREKCİ' nin hazırladığı "Foreign Language Teachers' Interaction with Their Students on Facebook" konulu YÜKSEK LİSANS tezi ile ilgili TEZ SAVUNMA SINAVI, Lisansüstü Eğitim Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliği uyarınca 13/07/2017 tarihinde yapılmış, sorulan sorulara alınan cevaplar sonunda tezin onayına OY BİRLİĞİ ile karar verilmiştir.

Üye- Doç. Dr. Selami AYDIN (Danışman)

İmza...

Üye- Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mustafa Yavuz KONCA

İmza...

Üye- Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fatih YAVUZ

İmza...

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduklarını onaylarım.

20/07/2017

Enstitü Müdürü

Doç. Dr. Halil İbrahim ŞAHİN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Interaction is perceived as a problematic area in the foreign language (FL) learning process and along with the technological improvements, interaction on Facebook is assumed time-consuming and syntactic which have adverse effects on teacher-student interaction. In Turkey, where English is taught as a foreign language, interaction on Facebook is also recognized as a challenge for both teachers and students. The aim of this study is to examine the level of foreign language teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook and effects of certain variables such as gender, age, teaching experience, teaching level, graduation level, Facebook use in years, the frequency of visit, time spent on Facebook, the number of friends, the number of student friends, the device used for Facebook connection and in-service training course regarding computer use on interaction on Facebook. For this reason, interaction on Facebook and its effects on teacher-student interaction need to be examined.

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude and thanks to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Selami AYDIN for his encouragement, patience, and support throughout the study. Without his guidance, it would have been impossible to accomplish the process.

I also would like to express my gratitude to my professors, Prof. Dr. Mehmet BAŞTÜRK, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dilek İNAN, Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatih YAVUZ and Asst. Prof. Dr. Dilek TÜFEKÇİ CAN for their contributions throughout my master education.

I am also thankful to all teachers participated in this study. Without their participation, this study could not have been achieved.

Last but not least, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my family for their endless support and love.

ÖZET
YABANCI DİL ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN FACEBOOK ÜZERİNDEN ÖĞRENCİLERİ İLE ETKİLEŞİMLERİ

BÖREKCİ, Rabia

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı,

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Doç Dr. Selami AYDIN

2017, 104 Sayfa

Yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin Facebook üzerinden öğrencileri ile etkileşimleri üzerine çok az çalışma yapılmıştır. Özellikle, Türkiye'de yabancı dil öğretimi kapsamında, öğretmenlerin Facebook üzerinden öğrencileri ile etkileşimleri konusundaki ilgili alan yazın oldukça yetersizdir. Bu nedenle, bu betimsel çalışma bir sosyal paylaşım sitesi olarak Facebook'ta yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin öğrencileri ile olan etkileşim düzeyleri ve yaş, cinsiyet, mesleki tecrübe, okul türü, mezuniyet düzeyi, Facebook kullanım yılı, kullanım sıklığı, Facebook'ta harcanan süre, arkadaş sayısı, öğrenci arkadaş sayısı, Facebook bağlantısında kullanılan aygıt ve bilgisayar kullanımı ile ilgili alınan hizmet-içi kurslar gibi çeşitli değişkenlerin bu etkileşim düzeyine etkisini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Örneklem grubu, Balıkesir il merkezinde çeşitli düzey okullarda çalışan 146 İngilizce öğretmeninden oluşmaktadır. Örneklem gruba, veri toplama aracı olarak bir arka plan anketi ve 46 maddeden oluşan, yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin Facebook üzerinden öğrencileri ile etkileşimleri ve öğrencileri ile ilgili algılarına yönelik bir anket uygulanmıştır. Ardından, yüzdelik frekanslar, aritmetik ortalama, ve standart sapma hesaplanmıştır. Ayrıca, değişkenler ve ölçek maddeleri arasındaki ilişkiler bağımsız örneklem *t*-testi ve ANOVA ile analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar, yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin öğrencileriyle Facebook üzerinden etkileşimlerinde çoğunlukla edilgen davranışları tercih ettiğini göstermiştir. Benzer şekilde, yabancı dil öğretmenleri, öğrencilerinin de Facebook üzerinden etkileşim konusunda edilgen davranışları tercih ettikleri algısına sahiptirler. Ek olarak, cinsiyet, okul türü, mezuniyet düzeyi ve Facebook'ta geçirilen sürenin bazı maddeler üzerine etkisi olduğu görülmektedir. İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Facebook üzerinden olumlu etkileşim ortamları oluşturma konusunda bilgi sahibi olmaları ve böylece, öğretmenlerin, öğrencilerinin kişisel ve akademik gelişimlerini desteklemeleri önerilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yabancı dil; Facebook; etkileşim; öğretmenler; öğrenciler.

ABSTRACT

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS' INTERACTIONS WITH THEIR STUDENTS ON FACEBOOK

BÖREKCİ, Rabia

Master's Thesis, Department of English Language Teaching

Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Selami AYDIN

2017, 104 pages

Limited studies are conducted to investigate foreign language teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook. Specifically, in the Turkish FL context, related literature on FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook is quite insufficient. Therefore, this descriptive research aims to examine the level of FL teachers' interactions with their students on the social networking service, Facebook, and the effects of certain variables such as age, gender, teaching experience, teaching level, graduation level, Facebook use in years, the frequency of visit, time spent on Facebook, the number of friends, the number of student friends, the device used for Facebook connection and in-service training course regarding computer use on this interaction. The sample group consisted of 146 FL teachers working at different levels of schools in Balıkesir, Turkey. A background questionnaire and a survey which contains 46 items to investigate the level of FL teachers' interactions on Facebook and their perceptions about students' were administered to the sample group. Then, the frequencies, mean scores, and standard deviation were computed. Besides, the relationship between certain variables and survey items were analyzed with t-test and ANOVA. The results indicate that FL teachers prefer mainly passive behaviors while interacting with their students on Facebook. Similarly, FL teachers also have the perceptions that their students prefer passive behaviors while interaction on Facebook. Additionally, gender, school type, graduation degree and time spent on Facebook have effects on some items in the scale. It is recommended that FL teachers should be aware of creating a positive environment for interaction on Facebook and in that way, teachers support their learners' personal and academic development.

Keywords: Foreign language; Facebook; interaction; teachers; students.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my children who inspire me to struggle for a better world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA   **:** Analysis of Variance

BA   **:** Bachelor

EFL   **:** English as a Foreign Language

ESL   **:** English as a Second Language

ESOL   **:** English for Speakers of Other Languages

FL   **:** Foreign Language

L1   **:** First Language

L2   **:** Second Language

MA   **:** Master

SLA   **:** Second Language Acquisition

SNS   **:** Social Networking Sites

SPSS   **:** Statistical Package for Social Sciences

ZPD   **:** Zone of Proximal Development

1. INTRODUCTION

In this section, the statement of the problem, the purpose, and significance of the study and research questions are introduced. For this purpose, first, overall statement of problems in the Turkish FL context is presented. In addition, problems in relation to the interaction between teachers and students, problems related to interaction on social media and problems related to interaction on Facebook are clarified. Second, the purpose of the present study is given. Once the significance of the study is explained, research questions are introduced. After introducing the research questions, limitations of the study are presented. Finally, terms, definitions, concepts are listed.

1.1. Problem

1.1.1. Problems in the Turkish FL Context

In Turkey, learning English has attracted great attention and becomes the focus (Buyukkantarcıoglu, 2004; Celik, 2011; Doğançay-Aktuna & Kızıltepe, 2005; Kizildag, 2009). With recent regulations, English has become obligatory in early stages of Turkish National system and every stakeholder of the system has given great importance to the language learning process. In other words, English is a compulsory subject and teaching English has started in second grade. In spite of this importance given to English classes, there exist several problems in the Turkish FL context. These problems can be listed as the problems related to learners, problems related to teachers and problems related to current curriculum and teaching environment. To begin with, research show that the language learner's learning strategy, language level, preferences (Celik & Toptas, 2010), perception and attitudes (Aydın, 2007; 2009; 2013; Güngör & Yaylı, 2012; Subası, 2010), motivation and

expectations (Tercanlıoğlu, 2005) towards language learning, anxiety (Aydın, 2009; 2011; Subaşı, 2010; Tok, 2009), cultural and schematic knowledge (Alptekin, 1993) may affect the process adversely. For instance, Aydın (2009, 2011) points out different types of anxiety and its adverse effects on language learning process. Second, teacher's beliefs and attitudes (Tercanlıoglu, 2005) towards the process, competency, efficiency and confidence level (Basaran, 2013; Celik, Arıkan & Caner, 2013) and error correction (Erel & Bulut, 2007) affect language learning process. For instance, teachers' beliefs, and attitudes towards language learning (Tercanlıoğlu, 2005) may lead elimination of certain factors, which might be effective for the process, because teachers are dubious in what ways language learners are going to use it for a specific purpose. Last of all, curriculum design and changes on English teaching policy in Turkish National Education System, interaction environment (Aydın, 2012;2013, Celik et al., 2013), teaching content, textbooks, teaching time, large class sizes and the lack of required resources to acquire English (Kirkgoz, 2007) constitute problems in Turkish FL teaching and learning processes. For instance, minimum hours are allocated for every grade is insufficient for either performing the syllabus or acquiring any skills. Additionally, crowded classes are a problem in Turkish FL context (Celik & Kasapoğlu, 2014). Among those problems, interaction stands as one of the most crucial ones that affects the language learning process in Turkish FL context as interaction is related to all problems concerning learners, teachers, curriculum and teaching environment.

1.1.2. Problems in Relation to Interaction between Teachers and Students

Interaction in the FL teaching and learning processes is a problematic area due to several factors such as language learners' negative attitudes, beliefs and self-perceptions, anxiety, error correction and task complexity (Kim, 2009, Swain & Lapkin, 1998). In addition, under certain circumstances, learners may experience difficulties in personal improvement or self-expression to authentic communication (Maftoon & Ziafer, 2014), which may affect the language learning process negatively and decrease their motivation levels (Brown, 2008). To add, anxiety may become another key factor, as high level of anxiety prevents learners from interaction and gaining competence in the target language (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991; Morton & Jack,

2005). Error correction is another factor, as it distorts interaction in language classes (Sato & Kleinsasser, 2004). In other words, error correction during an interaction may prevent language learners from receiving comprehensible input. Another problematic area is the degree of task complexity that is a key element, as a learner may become a part of on-going interaction or start an interaction in case she is able to produce something or accomplish a task. Otherwise, without any production, a language learner cannot become sufficient or independent while tasks are being carried out (Wu, Yen & Marek, 2011).

In Turkish FL context, problems related to the interaction between teachers and students show similarities with global context and these problems can be related to learners, teachers or interaction environment. To begin with, language learners' negative attitudes, beliefs and perception towards interaction (Aydın, 2007; Tok, 2009), anxiety (Aydın, 2007; Subası, 2010) and lack of motivation (Solak & Bayar, 2015) have adverse effects on this interaction. For instance, students might have the perception that it is the responsibility of the teacher to create an environment that facilitates interaction between teachers and students (Celik et al., 2013). Thus, this may lead the evaluation of teacher's teaching ability and effectiveness with bias because teachers become the authority that has to create a positive interaction environment (Sarac-Suzer, 2007; Telli et al., 2008). Similarly, teachers' self-confidence, attitudes (Tercanlıoğlu, 2005) and error treatment (Erel & Bulut, 2009) negatively affect the interaction between teachers and students. For instance; a FL teacher who has the perception of having a lack of knowledge and competence may have difficulties in creating positive interaction environment (Beceren, 2015). Finally, interaction environment has negative effects on the interaction between teachers and students, since in traditional language learning environment teachers are accepted the authority and students are expected to show passive behaviors (Alagözlü, 2007; Aydın, 2013). Thus, in a teacher-centered environment, language learners tend to demonstrate passive behaviors as otherwise these behaviors may be perceived as a threat (Aydın, 2007; 2013). Moreover, interaction environment that lacks authentic materials, overuse of mother tongue and creating a more traditional environment creates boundaries between teachers and students in the FL learning context (Solak & Bayar, 2015).

1.1.3. Problems Related to Interaction on Social Media

Recent developments in information and communication technologies have potential contributions to interaction on social media, while interaction on social media becomes problematic in some ways. Aydın (2012, 2014a) underlines the point that there is a lack of research in Turkish FL context about interaction level or effects of certain variables on this interaction. However, these limited studies indicate that problems can be categorized under three sub-headings; problems related to learners, teachers or environment. To begin with, teacher's attitudes and perceptions on social media interaction (Kinik, 2004), lack of competency, knowledge, and confidence about using social media (Aydın, 2013) are problematic issues since interaction on social media is highly related to the ability of the teacher who adopts the social media to serve it for certain needs. For instance; FL teachers who have negative perceptions of interaction on social media are uncertain about its effects (Kinik, 2014). Second, learners' attitudes and perceptions towards interaction on social media (Aydın, 2014a) are other concerns. Last, research shows that interaction on social media is perceived as a syntactic world and causes social isolation (Boulos & Wheeler, 2007). Inappropriate comments and contents and cyber-bullying have also negative effects on interaction on social media (Aydın, 2014b). That is, either teacher's or learner's comments, which contain harmful contents affect both sides negatively, which becomes a serious problem in Turkish FL context.

1.1.4. Problems Related to Interaction on Facebook

The problems related to interaction on Facebook are vague when recent research is taken into account. In this scope, problems related to interaction on Facebook can be categorized into problems related to learners, teachers, and environment. To begin with, learners' attitudes and perceptions towards interaction on Facebook are problematic (Aydın, 2014b). That is, Facebook attracts learners' attention and becomes an entertaining and creative environment for interaction (Aydın, 2014b). However, some learners may not be ready to adopt interaction on Facebook (Baran, 2010). Second, interaction on Facebook affects the teacher's credibility adversely (Wang, Novak, Scofield-Snow & Traylor, 2015), especially in Turkey where teachers are perceived the prominent of the society. Additionally, teacher's ability to use Facebook interaction is highly related to the teacher's perception of Facebook

interaction (Aydın, 2012; 2014b). Last, interaction on Facebook is perceived as useful for social purposes but not equally effective for educational purpose (Akyıldız & Argan, 2012) as educational purposes are not the main aim of Facebook. Time consumption by interaction on Facebook (Mazman & Usluel, 2010) also causes problems. Moreover, Facebook addiction (Eroğlu, 2016), accuracy (Çoklar, 2012), inappropriate comments and actions and cyberbullying (Aydın, 2012; Balçıkanlı, 2015; Çoklar, 2012) are other problems related to interaction on Facebook.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

In the light of issues related to problems are also highly related to attitudes and perception of students and teachers about interactions on Facebook and their ability to use them. Moreover, some Facebook interaction issues such as accuracy, inappropriate comments and actions and cyber-bullying are problems listed above. Hence, in accordance with these problems, this current study has two main purposes. The first purpose of this study is to investigate the current level of interaction between teachers and students on Facebook in the Turkish FL context. The latter is to examine the possible effects of certain variables on interaction on Facebook. These variables include gender, age, teaching experience, teaching level, graduation level, Facebook use in years, the frequency of visit, time spent on Facebook, the number of friends, the number of student friends, the device used for Facebook connection and in-service training course regarding computer use.

1.3. Significance of the Study

The current study is significant for several reasons. To begin with, in the scope of interaction, this study contributes to the related literature in global context regarding FL teaching and learning contexts. Second, this study also contributes to the related literature in Turkish FL context, as there has been a serious lack of research on the interaction between teachers and students on Facebook. Last, this study makes a contribution to the related literature in terms of practical recommendations for teachers, learners, curriculum developers, material writers, and policy makers.

1.4. Research Questions

The main problems, in the lights of issues, are mentioned above interaction is crucial in language learning process on global and in the Turkish context. Thus, the level of interaction and effects of certain variables need to be clarified.

- What is the level of FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook?
- Does FL teachers' interaction level with their students on Facebook differ in accordance with certain variables such as gender, age, teaching experience, teaching level, graduation level, Facebook use in years, the frequency of visit, time spent on Facebook, the number of friends, the number of student friends, the device used for Facebook connection and in-service training course regarding computer use?

1.5. Limitations

There are several limitations that can be noted. First of all, this study is limited to 146 FL teachers working in Balıkesir, Turkey. In terms of demographic descriptives, there has been a gender dominance in favor of females, which stems from the overall gender distribution of FL teachers in Turkey. Additionally, in terms of school types, there has been high school dominance over other school types. Second, the scope of this study is limited to a descriptive research design that includes a background questionnaire and a scale designed by Teclehaimanot & Hickman (2011). The tool for collecting data is confined to a background questionnaire and a survey, which consists of 46 items. Moreover, the focus of the research is confined to the dependent variables. Last, the findings include Turkish FL teachers' perceptions of interaction on Facebook. That is, the findings of this study are limited to FL teachers' perspectives.

1.6. Definitions

Autonomous Learning: A theory which claims that learns should take the responsibility of their own personal learning process.

Collaborative Learning: A type of learning which two or more people attempt to learn or learn together.

Comprehensible Input: A hypothesis which asserts that learners acquire a language when sufficient and appropriate input is provided.

Constructivism: A theory which claims that learners construct knowledge from their experiences, ideas, and beliefs.

Cooperative Learning: An approach which focuses on cooperation to reach a target.

Developmental Learning: A theory which claims that learners establish knowledge through the world in a social context.

English as a Foreign Language: The use or study of English in countries where English is not one of the official languages.

Experiential Learning: A theory which claims that learning takes place through experiences.

Facebook: An SNS tool which helps people socializing.

Foreign Language: The study and use of different languages by non-native speakers.

Input Hypothesis: A hypothesis which expresses the language acquisition process.

Interaction Hypothesis: A theory which claims that language learning occurs through interaction and communication.

Negotiation: A concept which explains the speakers' efforts to clarify the intended meaning.

Self-determination Theory: A theory which focuses on motivation and personality.

Situated Cognition: A theory which asserts that learning is situated in activities bound to social, cultural and physical contexts.

Social Media: A technology which allows creating and sharing information.

Statistical Package for Social Studies: A software used for statistical analysis.

Web 2.0 tools: New generation technologies which allow generating content, cooperation, and interaction.

Zone of Proximal Development: A concept which explains the area between the what people can do with or without help.

2. RELATED LITERATURE

This section consists of two parts. First section summarizes the theoretical framework of the study which includes; general definition of the term "interaction", the importance of interaction in human life, types of interaction, the relationship between interaction and learning, factors affecting interaction in the learning process, the relationship between learning environment and interaction and interaction and technology, the importance of interaction in FL learning, theories and hypotheses related to interaction and FL learning, social media and its contribution to education, FL learning and interaction, general definition of Facebook, Facebook as an interaction environment, theoretical background of the use of Facebook in interaction, Facebook as an educational and FL learning environment. The second section reviews the related literature to the role of interaction in FL learning, Facebook as an educational environment, Facebook as an FL learning environment, Facebook as an interactional environment and teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

In this subsection, first detailed definition of interaction is introduced; second, the importance of interaction in human life is explained; third, types of interaction are listed; and fourth the relationship between learning and interaction is described. This sub-section contains factors affectin interaction in the learning process, the relationship between learning environment and interaction and interaction and technology. Then, the importance of interaction in FL learning is briefly clarified and on the basis of theories and hypotheses related to interaction and FL learning are explained. Social media and its contribution to education, FL learning, and interaction are explained in detail. Additionally, general definition of Facebook, Facebook as an interaction environment are described and the theoretical background of the use of Facebook in interaction is explained on the basis of related theories and

hypothesis. Facebook as an educational and FL learning environment and its positive and adverse effects are listed. At the end of this sub-section, theoretical background of the use of Facebook in FL learning is clarified on the basis of related theories and hypothesis.

2.1.1. What is Interaction?

In the broadest perspective, interaction can be defined as a reciprocal action or influence that requires at least two objects, events (Wagner, 1994) and participants that reflect mutual acceptance and establishment upon the roles of the encounters and rules of the defined situation related to the setting (Goffman, 1967). Interaction is also a process which contributors participate and adjusts their behaviors according to response (Wheeler & Nezlek, 1977). It is also defined as any encounter with another person. Moreover, interaction also covers the activities that encourage people to coordinate their behaviors with the others (Reis & Collins, 2004) since interaction, which is the ability to evolve satisfying social relations with the others (Nezlek, 2001), is the expected result of social life (Verma, 2010). In addition, interaction is the result of all human behavior that creates a relationship between the human and its environment (Bisno, 1952) as people are interdependent and interaction is a tool to regulate social behaviors in the group (Nezlek, 2001). Interaction is also a process that people improve their abilities and capacities to be a member of a social group (Friedlander, 1958) because interaction takes place when an individual communicates with another (Ellis, 1999, p. 1). Consequently, interaction is the mutual influence of interlocutors and it directly affects each other. Due to this influence, the need for cooperation and regulation is provided with the assistance of interaction. In that way, people are able to adapt themselves new or ongoing conditions and interaction prevents the possible ambiguities.

2.1.2. Importance of Interaction in Human Life

Interaction in human life is extremely significant, as mentally and emotionally well-being of human affect the personal and social development. To begin with, interaction has positive effects on mental health (Sinha & Verma, 1994) which mean the more people interact with others, the less they are prone to mental

illnesses (McGuire & Raleigh, 1986). That is, interaction helps to promote general cognitive functioning and supply healthy brain and mind (Ybarra et al., 2007). Second, interaction is a predictor of emotional well-being, since meaningfulness of interaction defines the level of loneliness (Wheeler & Nezlek, 1983). In other words, by empathy and sympathy, humans become cognitively active; that is, interaction adjusts emotional well-being of human to be a part of better communication facilities with the others (Lopes et al. 2004). Third, interaction supports personal growth that affects cognitive development of human, as according to Vygotsky (1978), cognitive development is highly affected by the environment and its elements. Interaction is a precondition for this mutual affection, as in isolation, people could not support their improvement (Driscoll, 2005; Ormrod, 2004). Interaction is also one of the components that defines social processes, activities, and interchanges (Wertsch, 1985). Moreover, interaction provides the cognitive relation with past and present (Goffman, 1983) in that way, people are able to organize their activities, behaviors and language. Interaction makes children develop the ability to make logical conclusions (Roazzi & Bryant, 1998). Fourth, because human is a social being, they are related to a society and culture and share the same background. Interaction occurs in a context of culture, the main reason is the discourse is largely formed with different forms from words to language and as a result, interaction becomes social phenomena (Tappan, 1997). Fifth, interaction supports people to share time and do several activities together (Cartright & Zander, 1953) and support human's social development as people are related socially to each other. Thus, interaction encourages people to create a tight and straight relationship with others while working, learning and watching. In addition, while doing these activities interaction provides social coordination, which makes their lives not only easier (Finkel et al., 2006) but also more valuable (Ybarra et al., 2007). As, coordination with others sometimes becomes quite uneasy, inefficient and effortful, interaction enables people to come over these obstacles (Finkel et al., 2006). That is to say, interaction encourages people to provide efficient coordination to work in harmony to complete some tasks such as cooking or doing homework, which is interpersonal and requires coordination and self-regulation. Acquiring feedback is an inevitable part of human interaction since utterances should be quick and suitable enough in social context. By this way, people are able to be a part of the social process (Linell, 1982). Eventually, mental well-being of the human, presence as a society member, personal

11

development and social improvement highly depend on the effective interaction level with others. Consequently, the mental and emotional well-being of human is highly related to the individual development, for interaction in human nature positively affects both personal and social progress.

2.1.3. Types of Interaction

Interaction could be classified into two categories depending on the context since its type is highly related to the on-going context between the interlocutors (Linell, 1982). The first one is non-verbal interaction that embraces written forms and visual aids such as gestures, mimicry, facial expressions, body language (Heins et al., 2007; Streeck & Knapp, 1992), manners and other behaviors of human (Jiang-Yuan & Wei, 2012). The second one is verbal interaction that contains voice included sounds, words, and word-utterances (Poyatos, 1992). In other words, the former one is visual; while the latter one is spoken. On the other hand, these two types increase the effectiveness of the interaction in daily life and nonverbal and verbal interaction could compensate or substitute for each other to enable people to interact more functionally and effectively (Linell, 1982).

2.1.4. Interaction and Learning

Interaction is a phenomenon whose value in education dramatically has risen during past decades in the educational landscape. To begin with, interaction is a connective activity that helps learners contact with each other (Daniel & Marquis, 1988) and a precondition of the learning process that learners will be able to reach a higher level of cognitive development (Parker & Parker, 2013). Turmond and Wambach (2010) defines interaction as "…the learners' engagement with the course content, other learners, the instructor, and the technological medium used in the course" (p. 4); it is assumed to be one of the components of constructivist learning environment which provides connection between new and old knowledge (McInnerney & Roberts, 2004) and each other's perspectives (Jonassen, 1991). Moreover, interaction is a component which shapes the learning process and context and it is highly critical (Anderson, 2004). In this context, Dewey and Bentley (1946) define interaction as something that is interconnected and balanced in the learning process. Furthermore, interaction is the starting point of the learning process and the

means of cooperation with people, as it enables learners to improve learners' autonomy (Little, 1995). Since learning needs cooperation and coordination, interaction in learning both operates and controls developmental and experiential learning. Interaction is also a function that is a feature of influential instruction (Wagner, 1994) and takes place when objects, people or events influence each other (Wagner, 1997).

The role of interaction in learning process has been well defined and searched deeply and it is assumed that interaction has a widespread and highly significant role in the learning process. To begin with, interaction is the source of human development (Vygotsky, 1978); according to the ZDP, it is accepted that interaction between competent and less competent person results in less competent person's improvement. As, in learning process less competent one, after interaction with more competent one becomes independently proficient (Chaiklin, 2003). Moreover, interaction is defined as an inevitable part of comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) and a process to help the development of communicative competence (Segovia & Hardison, 2009). Furthermore, interaction is a path that encourages people to reflect thoughts from individual to the other (Piaget, 1959). In the learning process, a child could be a participant of interaction provided that a learner has the mature psychological function and enough capability to comprehend the significance of assistance during interaction (Chaiklin, 2003). Even locally developed learning opportunities become beyond borders, so interaction provides more convenient access to target learner and available to everyone (Collis & Remmers, 1997).

Being an inseparable component of every form of education (Lou et al., 2006), interaction has five components. These components are activity, cooperation, diversity, expectation, and responsibility (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). To begin with, activity is the creativity of the human that helps to internalize and externalize the process (Engeström et al. 1999), whereas cooperation is the supporter of the learners' that provides individual development (Sfard, 1998).It is also an element of composing connections between the learner and the others (Cook-Sather, 2010). Then, diversity is an essential component for every human since it is the core of every biological system and enables learners to be successful (Grobstein, 1989). In a narrower scope, diversity could be separated into two categories as cultural and linguistic diversity (Cummins, 1997). The former means distinguishing the human groups according to their historical, sociological or anthropological background

13

(Pratte, 1979), while the latter is the difference between all languages which contains both written and oral forms (Bloom & Keil, 2001). Expectation is the capacity of evaluating the quality of work in the learning process (Jonassen, 1991). Last, responsibility, shared by both learners and instructors (Haberman, 1996), is the mutual relationship in the learning process (Knowles, 1980). That is to say, although, in traditional teaching and learning transaction, the responsibility of the learner and instructor is distinct and different, learners not only take the responsibility of their own learning process but also share the responsibility of others in the classroom (Cook-Sather, 2010).

2.1.4.1. Factors Affecting Interaction in the Learning Process

There are several factors that affect interaction in learning process and these factors could be listed as learners' needs and expectations, personality, age, cognitive abilities and learning styles (Kearsley, 1995), learner autonomy (Keegan, 1996), culture (Parker & Parker, 2013), the teaching philosophy of the instructor (Moore & Kearsley, 1996) and interdependence (Johnson, Johnson and Smith, 1998). First of all, learners' needs and expectations are the factors that affect interaction in learning process for learners have specific needs and expectations (Okan, 2003). Second, personality becomes a significant factor in the learning process because people are individually different; this difference affects the academic success of learners (Komarraju et al., 2011). Third, age is another factor that affects interaction in the learning process. Fourth, cognitive ability is one of the factors, which influences interaction in the learning process. It is defined as the capacity that people do things (Mayer & Massa, 2003) such as coding, deducing, scaling, utilization, confirmation and provision (Sternberg, 1979). It also enables learners to process accurate and convenient information (Carroll, 1993). Developments of cognitive abilities are dependent on declarative and procedural stage (Anderson, 1982) and they alter during one's lifespan into positive or negative (Halpern, 2013). For instance; in the early stages of human life, cognitive abilities are limited, then they develop according to individual's need and make several contributions to one's life. Moreover, interaction, which is socially supported, enables cognitive abilities to improve (Shepard, 2000). Next, learning style is a factor which enables learners to become academically successful (Komarraju et al., 2011) because people learn and acquire new information differently (Salehi et al., 2015). Learning styles are also

14

related to the development of autonomy, a process that encourages learners to supply their learning needs and accepts learning as a lifelong process (Gockov et al., 2014). Learner autonomy is also something that continually alters and under suitable conditions, learners could create a balance between personal improvement and human interdependence (Allright, 1990). Additionally, culture, defined as the shared goals, interests and historical background of human, is a factor that affects interaction in the learning process; however, human interaction could be set up in an environment that learners understand each other instead of sharing same background (Heath, 1986). According to Culture Clash Hypothesis (McGinnis, 1994), interaction with a native speaker is one of the three areas of cross-cultural interaction and this type of interaction enables learners to improve intercultural competence (Paige et al., 2000). The dynamics of human interaction in cultural context facilitates both instructors and learners to discover suitable ways to present target culture in the learning environment (Paige et al., 2000). Moreover, according to Vygotskian perspective, culture serves as a stabilizer which enables learners to respect the effects of cultural, social and historical distinctions and alters the psychological condition of individual and improves one's condition (Wertsch, 1991). Culture also provides opportunities for social interaction and human becomes more sensitive to differences in either social or cultural context (Tappan, 1997). Teaching philosophy is another factor that affects interaction in the learning process. Traditionally, teaching philosophy means compensating intellectual capacity and guiding learners to improve this capacity (Stern, 2003, p. 420). However, this traditional concept has changed and broadened to applying instructors' knowledge and experience to handle educational issues (Beck, 1974). Moreover, teaching philosophy influences the length and the nature of interaction in the learning environment (Moore & Kearsley, 1996). Hence, learners are encouraged to collaborate in the learning process as the philosophy of teaching mainly becomes interaction and development of individual's life (Kreijns et al, 2003). Last, interdependence is a factor that affects interaction in the learning process (Johnson, Roger & Karl, 1991). The improvement of interdependence is highly correlated with the instructor, perceptions, behaviors and values of a learner (Abrami et al., 2011). For instance, a learner who participates in a small group is positively interdependent to other members and also has personal responsibility (Abrami Chambers et al, 1995).

### 2.1.4.2.	Learning Environment and Interaction

Environment is an effective factor in the learning process, as according to Pavlov (1927), human conditioned willingly or unwillingly depending on the environment. Hence, environment, where learning takes place, becomes one of the keystones in the process and sharply influences the effectiveness of the process. Specifically, positive learning environment enhances the process; on the contrary, the negative learning environment decreases the value of the process. In other words, given that the learning environment is organized positively, learners could be able to acquire the all the necessary skills and environment could be used as an integrating the context for learning in every area (Lieberman & Hoody, 1998). Learning environment could influence, reshape and improve the special needs of learners. Moreover, learning environment consistently has an impact on the goals and outcomes of the process and directly affects the approach used during the process (Lizzio, Wilson & Simmons, 2002) and it is the combination of factors such as methods, motivation, and outcome (Lizzio et al., 2002). The learning environment, which learners organize their own process, is directly related to the interaction of learners' with the instructor or other participants (Meeuwisse et al., 2010; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005). Moreover, it helps the establishment of feeling related to the context (Meeuwisse et al., 2010), as environment supports the creativity, observation ability and controlling opportunities of the learners (Weinstein & Mayer, 1983) and provides accurate feedback which enhances the process (Soyer & Hogart, 2015).

The learning environment, which is organized similarly to real life, has two main effects on the learning process. First, learning environment motivates learners (Huang, 2002) and helps instructors and learners to create a process that spontaneously resembles the real life, which has limitations, opportunities and complexity and inspire the learners to improve complex schema and active learning (Newmann & Wehlage, 1993). Second, the learning environment is significant to make learning more enjoyable, meaningful and permanent, when it is suitable to learners' needs (Wlodkowski, 2004). In other words, the more learners are involved in the process, the better they become aware of the elements of the process (Dam, 1995).

2.1.4.3.   Interaction and Technology

Technology is a crucial component, which enhances interaction in the learning environment. Being that, interaction is strongly connected with technology tools and its application due to several reasons (Soo & Bonk, 1998). First of all, technology increases the quality of interaction (Anderson & Elloumi, 2004) as the interaction between learners can be improved with the help of technology appliances and methods (Parker & Parker, 2013). Moreover, technology enables learners to enhance their cognitive abilities and develop individual's knowledge (Collis & Remmes, 1997). Second, interaction also provides cooperation and collaboration in the learning environment (Dabbagh & Kitsantas, 2011; Dede, 1996; Huang, 2002) and with the help of technology, learners could be a part of this interaction synchronously or asynchronously (Huang, 2002; Soo & Bonk, 1998). Moreover, technology allows learners to interact with others (Dede, 1996). Learners' achievement is highly related to the interaction with the technology and the manner and frequency are factors that affect this process (Parker & Parker, 2013). Third, computer mediated technology enables instructors and learners to form ideal social environment and this environment both affect the interaction dynamics that composes the groups (Gunawardena, 1995). In addition to creating an ideal social environment, utilizing technology for interaction provides and enhances effective learning environment that is crucial for learning (Teclehaimanot & Hickman, 2011). Finally, technology is one of the supporters of scaffolding (Bell & Davis, 1996), as scaffolding is supported by not only technology but also peer interaction (Puntambekar & Hubscher, 2005) and it becomes possible with the help of interaction and technology in the learning environment (Puntambekar & Hubscher, 2005). To sum up, technology with its tools and applications that enable learners and instructors to enhance interaction in the learning process is keystone which has deep effects.

There are various factors that have effects on using technology during interaction in the learning environment. First of all, functions of technology and its tools affect its practicality and widely usage (Collis & Remmes, 1997). Namely, technology develops interaction on condition that it is easy to apply (Soo & Bonk, 1998) and the key point of using technology in a learning environment is simplicity. As, extra time spent on acquiring the appropriate knowledge to apply the technology

distracts learners' attention and makes them unable to focus on the content (Abrami et al., 2011). Second, the conditions of technology are affected by both the familiarity of the learner to the current technology and the limitations which refrain learners from being a part of interaction because technology not only helps learners but also limits the learning process in online learning environment. Hence, provided that the technology is unable to assist interaction, interaction becomes limited (Soo & Bonk, 1998). Third, the type of interaction deeply affects the appropriate technology (Abrami et al., 2011). In other words, the more suitable technology tools are adopted, the better learners collaborate, communicate and cognitively develop (Abrami et al., 2011). Fourth, applying technology while the interaction is highly affected by the age of the learners since the younger learners become, the better they adapt the changing technology (Prensky, 2001). Last, learners' attitudes towards using technology in education become crucial as using technology in learning requires learners' to be confident enough to overcome the prejudices and use technology more effectively (Parker & Parker, 2013). Learners' application of technological tools defines the level of success as increasing effectiveness and gaining overall objects are quite possible with the help of interaction provided by technology (Bruning, 2005; Burnett, Bonnici, Miksa & Kim, 2007; Kearsley, 2000).

2.1.5. The Importance of Interaction in FL Learning

Over 40 years, interaction has been a popular and deeply investigated subject in foreign language learning because interaction is accepted as a term that is highly related to the language acquisition process (Gass & Mackey, 2002). Hence, there have been varied definitions of interaction in language learning process. For instance; interaction in language learning is a mutual influence to each other (Wagner, 1994, p. 8) and reciprocal events that include at least two people, objects or events (Anderson & Elloumi, 2004). Moreover, interaction is the target of language learning and also an instrument that enables learners to acquire communicative language (Anderson, 2003). Long (1990) defines interaction as a provider for linguistic forms and functions and it is also a supporter of interaction between components of language learning process such as task and group interaction, whereas Brown (1994) defines interaction as the core of communication for learning a foreign language and a way to interact with the target people. In addition, it is a way to acquire new perspectives to comprehend the world better and get in touch with

different cultures and define common features and differences. (Archila, 2014) Hence, learning a foreign language is regarded as a social process so interaction between social context and learner are interrelated and inseparable parts for language acquisition (Foster & Ohta, 2005). Interaction is also a variable which highly affects the language acquisition process. According to Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1985) language acquisition takes place in an environment where learners expose knowledge or linguistics competence beyond their current level and meaning is acquired through interaction which also affects mutual understanding (Heins et al., 2007). That is to say, to comprehend each other mutually, learners need to improve different aspects of language. Moreover, interaction is defined as an instinct, which is a must for language acquisition process (Lee et al., 2009, p. 5). Interaction is the main goal for individuals and their own language learning ability (Ellis, 1999).

Interaction in FL learning is considerably important in language learning and teaching processes due to several reasons. First, interaction affects personal capacity in a positive way and also improves motivation. Namely, interaction strengthens the self-confidence of the learner and enhances motivation and improves the ability to apply the target language (Wu et al, 2011). In addition, learners' motivation improves when they get in touch with authentic materials and native speakers. Thus, learners overcome the hesitancy to use the target language (Wu et al., 2011) as even little interaction enhances learners' self-esteem (Yashima et al,, 2004). Second, interaction creates an effective environment, which is positive, rich and full of co-operation (Long & Porter, 1985). Active participation during interaction facilitates language learning, in that way learners are able to come across the structurally advanced output (Mackey, 1999). It enables learners to cooperate and collaborate in language learning process because communication is the precondition for interaction (Philp & Tognini, 2009). That is to say, learners feel attachment and they are motivated to be a part of the interaction (Lee et al., 2009, p. 9). As a result of this cooperation and collaboration, learners receive feedbacks which highly affect the learning process (Mackey, 2006). Third, interaction helps learners to provide input and output (Braidi, 2002), with the help of these input and output provided by interaction learners' capacity to obtain linguistic knowledge increases. As, interaction has a significant role in a way that learners expose to target language, receive feedback and adopt outcome during interaction (Pica et al., 1996). In addition, interaction enables learners to perceive semantics and syntax of input and

modify the output to become more comprehensible (Hegelheimer & Chapelle, 2000, p. 42). Repetition, paraphrasing and modification of input also occur through interaction (Pica, 1994). It also supports both reception and production process in language learning (Gass & Varonis, 1994; Pica et al., 1986) and helps learners to adapt their output according to the on-going context (Swain, 1985, 1995). Last, interaction provides learners for negotiating the meaning which encourages them to co-construct meaning for better communication facilities and conducts their attention to language learning process (Chapelle, 2003, p. 56). To sum up, interaction in language learning process not only affects the improvement of individuals' capacity but also develops cooperation and collaboration and improvement of reception and production process.

In FL classes, the importance of interaction has become widely known so the application of interaction has become common and three types of interaction are categorized in language learning process. These categories are conversational interaction, negotiation, and instructional interaction. To begin with, conversational interaction is helpful for comprehension and highly effective with the application of modified input (Pica, 1994), enables learning language (Mackey, 1999) and provides conversational input for learners. Second, negotiation which learners convert the interaction through negotiation enhances the possibility of the learning process (Pica et al 1996). Lastly, instructional interaction is the collaboration of learner-learner or learner-instructor that takes place during the language learning process (Woods & Baker, 2004).

2.1.6. Theories and Hypotheses Related to Interaction and FL Learning

2.1.6.1.   Constructivism and Social Constructivism

Constructivism has established the idea that individuals construct knowledge from experiences, ideas and beliefs (Duffy & Jonassen, 1992, p. 139). According to Vygotsky's Social Development Theory, social interaction has a crucial role in cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985). In this sense, Vygotsky (1978) underlines the importance of social interaction and cooperation in the learning process (Steffe & Gale, 1995). Moreover, according to Social Constructivism, social interaction enhances knowledge and enables learners to form meaning (Orey, 2010). Moreover, interaction is also a component that provides learners to engage with the

subject in the learning process. In other words, knowledge is based on social interaction in social constructivism (McDonald & Gibson, 1998). Moreover, interaction helps learners to overcome learning obstacles with the help of technology through social interaction, collaboration among learners improve (Huang, 2002).

2.1.6.2.　　Cooperative Learning

Cooperative Learning is defined as cooperation among learners to reach a target (Johnson et al., 1986). Thus, social interaction is a precondition for learning (Arnold, 1999) and learning experiences become reconstructed and broadened. As a result, learners become wholly integrated into the process (Orey, 2010, p. 303). In FL context, Cooperative Language Learning emphasizes the importance of interaction in language learning process as in Cooperative Language Learning, learners acquire adequate comprehensible input, output, and opportunity for negotiation of meaning (Zhang, 2010). Specifically, interaction enables learners to negotiate the meaning and clarify vague input so input becomes more comprehensible and output could be modified (Crandall, 1999). Interaction helps learners to perform better language which is more accurate and suitable for ongoing context. As a result, interaction becomes an inseparable part of communication and listening comprehension in Cooperative Learning (Zhang, 2010). Moreover, Cooperative Learning supports interaction because Cooperative Language Learning environment facilitates language acquisition (Brufee, 1993). By doing so, Cooperative Learning environment which supports interaction among learners is ideal for language learners and also a precondition for foreign language learning (Neves, 1983). Social interaction among learners also enhances learners' ZPD as there are mutual benefits for both less capable learners and efficient learners (Vygotsky, 1978).

2.1.6.3.　　Autonomous Learning

Autonomous Learning is the capability of taking the responsibility of own personal learning process (Holec, 1981). In Autonomous Learning, learners become in charge of their own decision process (Van Lier, 2014, p. 13). Hence, the more autonomous a learner becomes the more effective they participate in their personal learning process (Zimmerman, 1989). Namely, a learner who is aware of her strength to improve and weakness to deal with can easily take her own responsibility for

learning because learning is mostly based on learner's autonomy (Kumaravadivelu, 1994). Autonomy in language learning is based on the improvement of making decisions and acting independently (Little, 1991, p. 4; Littlewood, 1997, p. 81). Thus, improving the conscious of a language learner directly affects the language learning process. As in that way a learner can make necessary adaptations about the language learning process, learning becomes systematic (Kumaravadivelu, 1994). In addition, through interaction, learners have opportunities to improve not only personal learning process but also personal capacity such as critical thinking and creativity (Freire, 1970). In this sense, interaction develops learners' language awareness and supports them to become autonomous (Van Lier, 2014).

2.1.6.4. Developmental and Experiential Learning

Developmental learning is defined as learners' serious efforts to establish knowledge in a social context (Zuckerman, 2003, p. 177). That is to say, a learner is in charge of the learning process and she defines the target and finds ways to reach it. In addition to its current complementary role, interaction enhances learners' capacity and reshapes it for future experiences (Zuckerman, 2003) because in a social context the ability to launch and preserve interaction becomes useful (Zuckerman, 2003). Moreover, development of a learner could be increased naturally constructed or organized interactions among learners (Davydov, 1995).

Experiential learning is defined as a process that underlines the importance of personal efforts and experiences for learning process (Oxendine et al., 2004). Furthermore, experiential learning provides knowledge about the way people learn, live and improve (Kolb et al., 2000) and it is a cycle that consists of some stages (Kohonen, 1992). Besides, personal improvement, learning process, and task are components that support language learning process in experiential learning (Kohonen, 1992). Interaction both enables learners to develop personal concepts and form these concepts (Rogers, 1975) and encourages them to evaluate their level and progress (Kohonen, 1992, p. 81).

2.1.6.5. Zone of Proximal Development

ZPD, first used by Vygotsky (1978), is defined as "actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential

development as determined through the problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). That is to say, learners' effort to acquire a language can be enhanced on condition that suitable assistance is provided (Orey, 2010, p. 48). Thus, interaction with more knowledgeable peers or instructor increases learners' performance. Specifically, interaction in language learning process minimizes the ZPD because the area between the capacity and capability lessens. To add, interaction has positive effects and quite beneficial in language learning process (Orey, 2010, p. 205) and mostly becomes an effective way to overcome ZPD. As language learning is a process that takes place in the social environment (Gibbons, 2003), interaction also enables learners to improve capacities according to social instructions (Newman, Griffin & Cole, 1989). What is more, interaction with more competent learners helps to overcome cognitive gap (Vygotsky, 1978). Thus, ZPD becomes a starting point to learn a language (Gibbons, 2003).

2.1.6.6.   Comprehensible Input

Comprehensible Input in language acquisition/learning is every piece of foreign language input which language learners are able to understand (Higgs, 1985). There are characteristic features of Comprehensible Input (Krashen, 1985, p. 21). For instance; Comprehensible Input is required to be beyond learner's current knowledge and comprehending the received message enables learners to acquire a language (Krashen, 2013, p. 3). That is to say, learners become successful provided that s/he is able to understand the target language written or spoken form because it is the key component to acquire a language (Krashen, 2013, p. 4). Additionally, Comprehensible Input simplifies the language learning process because a language learner becomes competent by comprehending language structures (Higgs, 1985). Namely, Comprehensible Input provides input which is the pre-requisite of language acquisition process. Moreover, language competence is developed with the help of Comprehensible Input since it provides a challenge for the learners with knowledge beyond and in that way language learning process is supported. Interaction becomes a keystone in language learning/acquisition process since participating in interaction ensures Comprehensible Input owing to the fact that Comprehensible Input forces learners to produce output (Swain, 1985; 1995). Furthermore, Comprehensible Input is both essential and adequate for foreign language learning because comprehensible

input encourages learners to modify interaction (Krashen, 1981; 1982). In that case, modified interaction enables learners to comprehend the message.

2.1.6.7. Input Hypothesis

Input hypothesis, which, is a SLA hypothesis developed by Krashen (1981), consists of five hypotheses explaining the language acquisition process. These hypotheses are respectively; input, acquisition- learning, monitor, natural order and affective filter. One of these five hypotheses is Input Hypothesis and according to that hypothesis, learners acquire language when they comprehend the messages or receive adequate Comprehensible Input (Krashen, 1985, p. 2). In other words, the precondition of language learning process is that learners are able to understand the target language input beyond their current level of knowledge which is called *i+1*. Specifically, *i* stands for the current level of language competence and, *+1* stands for the level that is beyond the current level – next stage of the acquisition process (Krashen, 1981; 1982). Interaction with the instructor or other learners supplies learners' need for extra-linguistic context (Krashen, 1985, p2). Moreover, improving individuals' language competence takes place when interaction is supported because, in that way, interaction provides required condition for acquisition (Krashen, 1982, p. 2).

2.1.7. Social Media

2.1.7.1. Web 2.0 Tools and Social Media

Web 2.0 technologies, which have widened dramatically since 2003 and its importance in our daily lives has increased particularly (Barsky & Purdon, 2006), can be defined as below:

> "Web 2.0 is the network as platform, spanning all connected devices; Web 2.0 applications are those that make the most of the intrinsic advantages of that platform: delivering software as a continually-updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from multiple sources, including individual users, while providing their own data and services in a form that allows remixing by others, creating network effects through an "architecture of participation," and going beyond the page metaphor of Web 1.0 to deliver rich user experiences" (O Reilly, 2005).

In a general sense, Web 2.0 is the embodiment of the web that consists of old and brand new technologies (Alexander, 2006). All its components such as Twitter,

Facebook, Wikipedia, and blogs are labeled as social web (Boulos & Wheeler, 2007). Social media is content that users have created (Agichtein et al., 2008) and an area where people form the content, share, and mark (Asur & Huberman, 2010). That is to say, enormous information is shared among a huge number of people. Web 2.0 technologies also exemplify an innovative way of administrating new information and enable people not only reach this information but also adopt it according to individual's needs and store it (Boulos & Wheeler, 2007).

With its broad application, social media has several effects which users can be exposed. First of all, social media provides content which is easy to create and this content is also free (Barsky, 2006); users can publish it without confronting any difficulty (Boulos & Wheeler, 2007). Thus, social media becomes a platform where several sources and content are offered (Agichtein et al., 2008). Second, social media supports users to share common sense and cumulative knowledge and create common wisdom, which makes it widely applied (Boulos & Wheeler, 2007) and encourages users to collaborate (Buus, 2012). Specifically, collaboration among participants helps to get aid and counsel each other (Boulos & Wheeler, 2007). Third, social media is so innovative that its content changes fast and users are free to keep up with this content, use and reshape it (Boulos & Wheeler, 2007). Last of all, social media encourages the users to become more interactive and helps them to develop better interaction possibilities (Boulos & Wheeler, 2007). Specifically, interactivity both improves the sense of belonging and lessens the sense of isolation. Moreover, social media users foster several kinds of social media tools from Skype to Myspace and that adaptation enables them to become a member of community and participation during the interaction.

2.1.7.2.   Contribution of Social Media to Education

Application of social media in teaching and learning activities become widespread and social media has widely used as an educational environment. Some applications of social media such as wikis and blogs are popular in education (Boulos et al., 2006) and have the potential for improving learning process due to several reasons (Brynant, 2007). First of all, social media tools such as wikis, blogs and podcasts provide flexibility for both instructors and learners (Geser, 2007, p. 23). That is, learners and instructors become time and place independent and free to apply social media, create content, share and revise this content. Furthermore, this

flexibility provided by social media provides quick and easy access to information that encourages learners to become an active participant (Grosseck, 2009). Second, learners are able to search for the relevant source and supply their needs for learning. Familiar technologies enable both learners and instructors to use them easily and more effectively (Dohn, 2009). The authentic learning environment is provided by social media (Dohn, 2009; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1994). Web 2.0 technologies support learners to engage input or output that are more meaningful and comprehensible (Aydın, 2014b). With the help of these technologies, learning becomes more meaningful instead of compulsory or a combination of split activities; as a result, learners become motivated and have better interaction opportunities (Dohn, 2009). Third, with the help of social media learners become an active participant in their own learning process and under required conditions, learners collaborate with each other and learning becomes meaningful (McLoughlin & Lee, 2010; Virkus, 2008). Hence, social media creates connections between learners and the learning process (Mejias, 2006). Learners have open access to these social media application and as a result of this active participation that leads continuous production, shaping and reshaping the knowledge (Dohn, 2009). It encourages learners to accept their personal differences and supports learners to become an active participant in spite of these differences. That is to say, cooperation and collaboration are supported; learners become tolerant to these differences and learning process is enhanced (Mejias, 2006). Educational environment supported with social media encourages learners to create collaboration and an environment which supports communication (Geser, 2007). Social media encourages learners to become a part of the learning process, produce an outcome, collaborate with each other and engage learners to the learning process individually or cooperatively (Glud et al., 2010). Furthermore, Web 2.0 Technologies support collaboration to create common knowledge (Dohn, 2009) and the target of web 2.0 technologies is constructed on the participation, communication, and interaction with others, creating and sharing content.

On the other hand, applications of social media in teaching and learning process have some adverse effects on the process. First of all, learners' prior knowledge about these technologies affects social media application since appropriate knowledge is a pre-condition and affects not only as a motivator but also increases the effectiveness of the social media application (Bennett et al., 2012).

Namely, the familiarity of the user becomes crucial because the more familiar a learner or instructor becomes, the more effective the process is (Dohn, 2009). Second, the Web 2.0 technologies have to accomplish the objectives of the learning process because some applications of social media are inappropriate to some learning styles and the adaptation becomes time-consuming (Ebner et al., 2010; Glud et al., 2010). Third, social media contains a huge amount of information (Grosseck, 2009) and accuracy of this information leads confusion (Çoklar, 2012). Thus, under these conditions, it becomes an obligatory to define the source to prevent accuracy problems (Dohn, 2009; Harris & Rea, 2009); otherwise, inaccurate information usage makes the learning process ineffective. Last, the capability of the instructor to adopt the Web 2.0 and its technology to lessons become significant. Namely, social media and its application are continuously changing so it becomes highly difficult for an instructor to adopt fast changing context (Churcher et al., 2014; Virkus, 2008). In other words, the instructor needs to be selective and sense the appropriate social media application as social media is a mess (Grosseck, 2009)

2.1.7.3.   Contribution of Social Media to FL Learning

Growing popularity of Web 2.0 and its applications enforces language learners and instructors to apply them in language learning process because social media contributes to language learning process for several reasons. To begin with, social media helps learners to improve their language skills such as reading, writing and speaking (Godwin-Jones, 2008; Sykes, Oskoz & Thorne, 2008). Moreover, it is assumed that social media applications support a positive attitude to language learning process and learners are motivated to communicate in the target language (Kabilan, Ahmad & Abidin, 2010). Social media also provides content which is meaningful for language development (Sykes et al., 2008) and feedback for learners (Ducate & Lomicka, 2008). Communicative competence and cultural awareness of language learners increase due to social media and its applications as learners have the opportunity to practice (Borau et al., 2009). Under provided conditions, language learners are prone to communicate more in social media and language learners' production is more sophisticated and well expressed (Kern, 1995). Second, there are some objectives for language learning such as self-expression, communication, and interaction that social media support learners to accomplish (McBride, 2009). Pedagogically, appropriate activities for language learning allow learners to be a part

of the learning process. As a result, language learners who express feelings and opinions become motivated and active (Borau et al., 2009; McBride, 2009) and have opportunities to spend extra time for the learning process (McBride, 2009). Third, social media provides authentic material for language learners (McBride, 2009). Social media and its applications enable instructors to publish drills, activities and other course content and a learner can join these courses and reach this content easily (Baird & Fischer, 2005). Moreover, social media enables language learners to reach contents which encourage collaboration and production (Sykes et al., 2008). Some applications of social media can facilitate the transformation of cultural knowledge and effortless and instant access opportunities for native speakers' speech. That is, linguistic and cultural knowledge are supported by social media and its applications (Herron et al., 2000). Lexically, syntactically and semantically, appropriate content creates better opportunities for language learning and raises awareness of linguistic and cultural clues (Sykes et al., 2008). Social media applications such as wikis and blogs help language learners to improve cohesion to investigate ways to improve its content and structure (Sykes et al., 2008). Last, social media enables language learners to improve personal development. Moreover, instructors, who include social media in their learning environment, provide several opportunities for language learners in the learning process and involve them in this process (Godwin-Jones, 2008). In addition, due to motivation and improvement of self-esteem, language learners are able to create connections with other learners or natives and they become autonomously developed (McBride, 2009).

Social media and its applications may have a negative impact on language learning. First of all, the appropriateness of social media application becomes crucial because which tools help language learners to improve the process and accomplish the objective of the language learning process are vague. Adopting social media and its applications is highly related to the appropriateness for instructors' objectives. Second, social media might require knowledge which language learners could not satisfy as classes could not accomplish the necessary knowledge on condition that their level is basic (Furman et al., 2009) so language level of the learners limits the process (Borau et al., 2009). Its application requires competency because supporting language learning with enough models is crucial (McBride, 2009). Specifically, learning material which is supposed to be authentic should be produced by a native; if the authentic material is not authentic enough, this might cause misapprehensions

that prevent learners from being an effective participant in the language learning process (McBride, 2009). Moreover, language learners' overexposure to syntactic information requires more cognitive ability so it becomes an obstacle in the learning process because language learners hesitate what to focus (Herron et al., 2000). Last of all, time is another problem as limited time has adverse effects on the process (Borau et al., 2009).

2.1.7.4. Contribution of Social Media to Interaction

Social media directly and closely contributes to users' interaction opportunities due to several reasons. To begin with, social media reflects high levels of user to user interaction (Agichtein et al., 2008). As, people are highly motivated by collaboration and socialization opportunities, interaction becomes the precondition for these opportunities (Bartle, 2004). Moreover, people apply social media and its applications for communicative interaction opportunities (Aydın, 2014a). In that way, users enrich social interaction (Aydın, 2014a; Boulos, Maramba & Wheeler, 2006) and conversational interaction, which becomes one of the dimensions of web 2.0 technologies (Mcloughlin & Lee, 2007). By this way, it dramatically increases interaction with the help of social media (Aydın, 2014a; Boulos et al., 2006). A positive level of learner-learner or learner-instructor interaction via social media improves the level and effectiveness, for becoming a part of interaction motivates the participants. Moreover, social media supports people to adopt a more humanistic approach that helps to improve group interaction and create a positive environment (Boulos et al., 2006; Minocha, 2009). Furthermore, peer interaction opportunities of social media also increase learners' capacity to discuss, revise and collaborate in an environment that supports scaffolding and improves the ZDP (Churcher et al., 2014). Last, interactions via social media help learners acquire knowledge instead of memorizing it (Churcher et al., 2014) and this type of interaction supports learners to apply social media and engage activities and collaborate (Dabbaugh & Kitsantes, 2011).

There are some adverse effects of interaction via social media. First of all, syntactic versus real world confusion which stems from interaction via social media. That is, social interaction via social media should not replace the real-world interaction (Boulos et al., 2006) although the application of social media becomes widely increased in individual's daily lives (Boulos et al., 2006). Second, interaction

via social media applications may lead users distracting their attentions and cause time management problems (Fischer & Reuber, 2010). For instance, some applications may be more effective and less time-consuming during interaction than the others (Fischer & Reuber, 2010) so the selection of appropriate application during the process becomes a crucial step for effective interaction. Otherwise, the whole interaction becomes useless, nonsense and time- consuming.

2.1.8. Facebook

2.1.8.1. What is Facebook?

Facebook is a social tie (Ellison et al., 2007), glue (Balçıkanlı, 2015) and utility (Locke, 2007) which addresses college and high school students (Acquisti & Gross, 2006). Furthermore, Facebook is an ideal platform for both communication and interaction (Aydın, 2012) and one of the popular ways of communication (Ross et al., 2009), which provides opportunities such as creating personal profiles, adding friends, sharing information and sending personal messages within a bounded system (Aydın, 2012; Boyd & Ellison, 2008; Ellison et al., 2007; Papacharissi & Mendelsohn, 2011; Yadav, 2006). Last, Facebook can be seen as a means of communication which enables users to connect either personally or within a group (Heiberger & Harper, 2008).

Facebook was established in 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg who was a former Harvard student (Kushner, 2006). The initial aim to create Facebook was to provide connection among Harvard students, preserve this connection and share the college experiences (Boyd & Ellison, 2008; Cassidy, 2006; Ellison, 2008; Ellison et al., 2007). When first Facebook was launched, it was not available for everyone, just limited to Harvard students. So, the precondition of being a part of this experience and community; users needed an e-mail address that ended with *harvard.edu.tr* (Greenwell & Kraemer, 2006). Then, in 2005 Facebook began to support other schools, colleges and organizations (Acquisti & Gross, 2006; Boyd & Ellison, 2008; Lampe, Ellison & Steinfield., 2007, Stutzman, 2006; Yadav, 2006) and it became open to other users in 2006 (Boyd & Ellison, 2008). Since then, Facebook has been available to every user.

Users have Facebook accounts for several reasons. To begin with, via Facebook students continue communication with other students and their families

(Aydın, 2012) for Facebook supports users building communication opportunities for either people they are acquainted with or people who are on their friend's list or know somehow (Boyd & Ellison, 2008). That is to say, Facebook enables its users to find people they have already known, acquire knowledge about their current conditions and keep contact with them (Acquisti & Gross, 2006). Second, people use Facebook to meet new people, collect "friends" who follows them and comment on their sharing and observe each other's' pages (Ellison et al., 2007). Facebook that encourages its users to share ideas, feelings, photos, videos and personal information provides an environment to do these activities (Eroğlu, 2016). Third, Facebook encourages interaction among users (Çoklar, 2012; Pempek et al., 2009) and users can create social connections (Mazman & Usluel, 2010) which can be either interpersonal or within a group (Heiberger & Harper, 2008; Huang, Yang, Huang & Hsiao, 2010). Last of all, people have Facebook accounts to become a participant in an educational environment (Aydın, 2012).

However, Facebook has two main harmful effects: ethical problems such as unsuitable actions/comments, online privacy and cyber-bullying (Aydın, 2012) and personal problems such as causing limited attention span, over sensation and empathy-free behaviors (Balçıkanlı, 2015). To begin with, unsuitable actions or comments take place when Facebook users express inconvenient or inappropriate actions or comments on Facebook (Butler, 2010). Second, on-line privacy, provided by Facebook and adapted to any user, is not strong enough owing to its design (Acquisti & Gross, 2006). Thus, on-line privacy becomes a hazard (Debatin et al., 2009) as users may face some issues such as people having several accounts, assuming to be another person or becoming the subject of bullying (Kwan & Skoric, 2013). Then, cyber-bullying that happens by using communication opportunities and threats the Facebook users' highly and cause psychological harm (Kwan & Skoric, 2013). Limited attention span, which is one of the personal harms, is derived from the fast changing content and instant interaction opportunities. Last of all, over sensation and empathy-free behaviors cause harmful effects on users since they affect individual's daily life negatively (Balçıkanlı, 2015).

2.1.8.2.   Facebook as an Interaction Environment

Facebook as an interaction environment is suitable for both communication and interaction (Aydın, 2012) It is also defined as a mirror of social interaction

(Debatin et al., 2009) and mainly a supporter of social interaction among people already known offline (Pempek et al., 2009). Facebook as an interaction environment is also an area that provides meaningful interaction and interaction possibilities (Abrams, 2006; Çoklar, 2012). It has a positive impact on users due to various reasons. Firstly, Facebook users have positive perception on the effects of Facebook as an interaction environment (Helliwell & Putnam, 2004) Second, Facebook as an interaction environment provides social interaction opportunities among users (Debatin et al., 2009; Joinson, 2008; Kwan & Skoric, 2013; Pempek et al., 2009). Moreover, it improves social presence (Bateman & Willems, 2012) as users join Facebook due to these opportunities (Aydın, 2012; Pempek et al., 2009). Third, interaction with a large number of people enables users to collaborate and share feelings and ideas instantly (Balçıkanlı, 2015; Lampe et al., 2006). In that way, Facebook as an interaction environment encourages interaction and collaboration among users (Bateman & Willems, 2012; Downes, 2007). Fourth, Facebook as an interaction environment supports interesting and different ways of interaction (Acquisti & Gross, 2006) such as instant messaging or video sharing. These different types have a positive outcome for not only individuals but also community (Ellison, 2008), whereas as an interaction environment, it positively affects users to adopt new cultures (Ryan et al., 2011). Last of all, Facebook as an interaction environment can help people to improve satisfaction level and self-respect (Ellison et al., 2007).

On the other hand, Facebook as an interaction environment has some adverse effects on users. To begin with, Facebook is designed to increase interaction among users; however, privacy is dubious (Debatin et al., 2009). Second, Facebook interaction is insufficient to create a fresh relationship as users intentionally share some information that does not lead fresh relations (Dwyer et al., 2007). Third, Facebook interaction can raise the volume, origin and confusion on communication, which results in communication overload (Chen & Lee, 2013). This communication overload may lead to problems that are related to human psychology. Hence, communication overload and self-esteem become reasons for these problems (Chen & Lee, 2013). Last, Facebook as an interaction environment is an alternative to real interaction and people who prefer Facebook as an interaction environment is labeled as a coward (Mathias, 2011) due to lack of courage and self-esteem which is a necessity for real interaction. Hence, lurking or just following others, takes place and

affects users adversely and interrupts this interaction environment (Pempek et al., 2009).

2.1.9. Theoretical Background of the Use of Facebook in Interaction

2.1.9.1. Interaction Hypothesis

Interaction Hypothesis that is related to the foreign/second language acquisition processes was developed by Long (1983a, 1983b, 1985, 1996). According to the theory, Long (1996) claims that the proficiency of language learners is highly correlated with interaction and communication. Moreover, Hatch (1978) defines the conversation as a key term to improve grammar, whereas Krashen (1985) supports the idea that acquisition of a language becomes possible with the help of Comprehensible Input. Hence, a combination of these two ideas makes interaction the facilitator of language learning process in foreign/second language learning. As according to Long, interaction "connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (Long, 1996, p. 451). Several theoreticians make contributions to the Interaction Hypothesis. For instance; Ellis (1991) underlines the importance of interaction in language learning and categorizes them into two categories. The former is Comprehensible Input, which becomes the precondition for language learning, the latter is the negotiation of meaning (Ellis, 1991) because negotiation of meaning enforces language learners to produce comprehensible input and language learners can modify the on-going context both conversationally and linguistically (Mackey, 1999). In conclusion, Interaction Hypothesis positively supports the use of Facebook during interaction in terms of providing both comprehensible input and communication opportunities.

2.1.9.2. Social Interaction Hypothesis

Nezlek (2001) defines social interaction as an action or event which takes place in defined period of time. It is also basic, common and strong characteristic of human life (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999; Ybarra et al., 2008). According to Social Interaction Hypothesis, every human being is related to a community and her behaviors are originated from her social interaction either among the group or one by

one (Mead, 1934). Thus, an individual who becomes a participant of social interaction improves learning and thinking skills (Labinowicz, 1980) because social interaction is the natural proceed of group life (Verma, 2010). Enhancing social interaction among learners may also affect learners' cognitive skills (Peterson & McCabe, 1994) because these skills have roots of social interaction (Bruner, 1983) and when learners attend the conversation, they accomplish the needs with the help of social interaction (Ellis, 1991). Moreover, meaningful social interaction is crucial for language learners as it fosters natural and authentic conditions for language acquisition (Krashen, 1981; Long, 1996). Social interaction also enables language learners to convey the message in the target language and use it as an input for language acquisition process (Hatch, 1978). To sum up, Social Interaction Hypothesis affects the use of Facebook while interaction deeply because Facebook becomes a supporter of meaningful social interaction that is the basic element of human life.

2.1.9.3.   Conversational Interaction Hypothesis

According to Conversational Interaction Hypothesis, foreign/second language acquisition process is based on the negotiation of meaning between language learners and interlocutors and conversational interaction provides Comprehensible Input for language learners (Long, 1981, 1983a). Correlated with Long's Interactional Hypothesis, Conversational Interaction supports the idea that it promotes language acquisition process (Ellis, 1991). Moreover, it enables language learners to create connections between learner and input and improves learners' personal motivation and capacities. Hence, Conversational Interaction affects positively to the output because it fosters a process that improves production capacities of learners (Mackey, 1999). Furthermore, Conversational Interaction becomes the supporter of linguistic input defined as Comprehensible Input (Krashen, 1985). For instance, request for clarification, message confirmation, and other conversational structures promote Comprehensible Input (Long, 1985). To conclude, Conversational Interaction Hypothesis considerably influences the use of Facebook in interaction in terms of providing meaningful conversational interaction and negotiation opportunities.

2.1.9.4. Facebook as an Educational Environment

Facebook that can be applied as an educational environment provides extensive learning opportunities for not only educators but also learners who have diverse levels of academia, background or knowledge and it is described as below:

> "Any technology that is able to captivate for so many students for so much time not only carries implications for how those students view the world but also offers an opportunity for educators to understand the elements of social networking that students find so compelling and to incorporate those elements into teaching and learning" (EDUCAUSE, 2006, p. 2).

Thus, Facebook as an educational environment and adaptation of its applications to education become widespread (Balçıkanlı, 2015) since Facebook is accepted to have a positive influence (Techlehaimanot & Hickman, 2011) and benefits on learning process (Bateman & Willems, 2012). In this perspective, there are three factors, which deeply affect the application of Facebook as an educational environment. First, application of Facebook is related to the beliefs of instructors as Facebook can improve educational process and outcome of the learning process on condition that instructors believe its effectiveness (Techlehaimanot & Hickman, 2011). Second, learners' attitudes towards Facebook become crucial because Facebook is quite new and fast changing the world that learners feel uncomfortable, unfamiliar and doubtful (Boon & Sinclair, 2009; Heiberger & Harper, 2008). Hence, doubtful approaches to Facebook may hinder the effective use of Facebook as an educational environment (Boon & Sinclair, 2009). Last of all, software is another factor as, on condition that the software is inappropriate, Facebook as an educational environment becomes less useful and effective (Boon & Sinclair, 2009).

In a narrower scope, Facebook is an effective educational environment due to several reasons. To start with, applying Facebook as an educational environment encourages learners for social learning since learners are relatively young and easily adapt it to their lives. Hence, college students who prefer Facebook as a social networking site (Ellison, 2008) naturally become a part of the online learning environment and use Facebook as a tool for social learning (Techlehaimanot & Hickman, 2011). Due to learners' present membership to Facebook, it becomes logical to apply it as a learning tool because it enables learners and instructors to create and become a member of social context (Mason, 2006). Second, Facebook

supports multi-dimensional interaction among learners and between learner and instructor (Mason, 2006). Thus, learners acquire peer and teacher feedback as a result of this interaction (Balçıkanli, 2015; Mason, 2006). Third, Facebook aids learners to take part in educational communications and collaboration with faculty (Roblyer et al., 2007) and via Facebook learners recommend each other several academic sources such as journals, books, and essays (Selwyn, 2009). In that way, they collaborate and encourage personal development because Facebook supports cooperation and interaction (Krause, 2005; McCarthy, 2010). Fourth, Facebook provides creativity for learners and improve learners' personality and learning communication capacities (Boon & Sinclair, 2009; Greenhow, 2009). Specifically, Facebook emotionally and practically support learners' ideas and encourages them to circulate ideas and activities (Greenhow, 2009). Last of all, Facebook enables learners to engage and actively participate in the learning process and makes learning more meaningful (Heiberger & Harper, 2008) and fun (Burhanna et al., 2009, Balçıkanlı, 2015). Specifically, application of Facebook supports learners to create and share knowledge and mostly have fun that is largely common features (http/digitalnatives.org). Learners are able to improve their academic skill without depending on either time or place limitations (Çoklar, 2012; McCharty, 2010).

On the other hand, the effects of using Facebook as an educational environment are questionable due to some points. First, Facebook was not created as an educational environment so its application requires several adaptations (Boon & Sinclair, 2009). Second, the artificiality of Facebook may affect the learners adversely because learners feel uncomfortable and alone (Boon & Sinclair, 2009). Furthermore, on condition that learners are less effective to create collaboration with others, they become suspicious about using Facebook as an educational environment and its effectiveness becomes dubious (Heiberger & Harper, 2008). Third, the level of engagement and meaningful learning are questionable (Boon & Sinclair, 2009) for every learner has her own perspective. Learners also qualitatively and quantitatively differ in the level of engagement from one another (Heiberger & Harper, 2008). Last of all, peer guidance can cause problems while utilizing Facebook as an educational environment as instead of searching for a valid source relying on other learners' assumptions can damage the process (Selwyn, 2009) and learners may abuse shared information (Arnold & Paulus, 2010).

2.1.9.5.   Facebook as a FL Learning Environment

While Facebook as an FL Learning environment seems a new area, there is growing attention to utilizing Facebook as it is assumed to have a target language friendly interface (Terantino & Graf, 2011). Besides, it has been applied in language learning classroom so far (Blyth, 2010). Facebook as an FL learning environment becomes an effective option due to various reasons. To begin with, Facebook provides authentic knowledge about several topics and a language learner could access this information easily without time or place limitations (Blattner & Fiori, 2009). That is to say, fostering an authentic environment for language learning, Facebook increases communication, interaction, and discussion in the target language. Thus, language learners can accomplish linguistic, grammatical and functional objectives of the target language (Chen, 2012). Moreover, Facebook users also encounter variety of language usage, which is authentic, colloquial and rich (Chen, 2012; Lee & Ranta, 2014) as synchronous or asynchronous relation with native speakers can enhance the language learning process (Blattner & Fiori, 2009; Kabilan et al., 2010; Lee & Ranta, 2014). Second, improving cross-cultural ties with the target language makes Facebook as an effective environment for language learning (Blattner & Fiori, 2009). In that way, language learners create a connection with native speakers and develop a positive relationship with peers who have common likes or same point of views (Belz, 2007; Razak & Saeed, 2015). Third, Facebook can be applied for language instruction to develop socio-pragmatic capacity (Blattener & Fiori, 2009) and linguistic awareness, which creates a suitable environment for utilizing knowledge and provides opportunities for learners' engagement to communicative context (Arnold & Paulus, 2010). Fourth, Facebook enables learners to create the sense of being a community (Blattner & Fiori, 2009; Chen, 2012; Lee & Ranta, 2014; Razak, Saeed & Ahmad, 2013) as Facebook gathers people and ties them as a target language community. Learners' may also utilize Facebook as an environment that provides opportunities for exchanging knowledge in groups (Bani-Hani, Al-Sobh & Abu-Melhim, 2014). In this sense, Facebook may affect learners' motivation and attitude towards language learning because Facebook enables learners to create an environment that is both motivating and entertaining (Kabilan et al., 2010; Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012; Tananuraksakul, 2015). That is, Facebook groups increase motivation and enable learners to approach

language learning process positively (Tananuraksakul, 2015). Moreover, Facebook groups support language learning, multi-dimensional relationships both between a learner and instructor and among learners. Fifth, Facebook encourages learners to improve language learning process and proficiency of the language learner (Mitchell, 2009; Shafie, Yaacob & Singh, 2016) because there have been several opportunities to develop the proficiency and support learners' production in target language (Kabilan et al., 2010; Yunus & Salehi, 2012; Omar et al., 2012; Ru-Chu, 2013; Terantino & Graf, 2011; Wu & Hsu, 2011), which improves language competence (Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012). For instance, Facebook can be utilized to improve learners' reading and writing proficiency (DePew, 2011; Haverback, 2009; Ru-Chu, 2013; Walker, 2010) since it not only simplifies the teaching and learning process but also decreases the level of anxiety and stress (Simpson, 2012; Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012; Tananuraksakul, 2015). Moreover, some Facebook activities create opportunities for discussion among language learners to improve their speaking ability and communication skills (Razak et al., 2013; Shafie et al., 2016; Terantino & Graf, 2011). Moreover, Facebook can improve learners writing skill, as learners can write in the target language and easily publish it and receive feedback from instructor or peers (Razak & Saeed, 2015; Yang & Chen, 2008). In addition, their ability to think and find solutions to problems develop via Facebook (Yunus et al., 2012). Last of all, Facebook can improve multi-dimensional collaboration both among language learners and between learners and instructor (Razak et al., 2013; Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012; Stelter, 2008; Terantino & Graf, 2011) That is to say, language learners receive comments and their reply or comment back develops language skills (Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012). Namely, language learners with low self-esteem and satisfaction can be motivated with applying Facebook as an FL learning environment. To add, Facebook provides opportunities for instructors to announce information, share resources and discuss the issues online (Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012; Wang et al., 2012).

Facebook as an FL learning environment may affect the language learning process adversely due to several reasons. First of all, Facebook may distract learners' attention while learning a foreign language (Yunus et al., 2012); thus, learners may waste their time due to overuse (Fodeman & Monroe, 2009). Second, Facebook as an FL learning environment may affect learners' attitude towards language learning

negatively (Kabilan et al., 2010). For instance, learners may develop resistance to applying Facebook as an FL learning environment since they are in favor of traditional language learning environment (Reinhardt & Zander, 2011) or they are unable to use this technology (Mitchell, 2012). Moreover, learners cannot provide the necessary language and due to this reason, learners avoid using Facebook as an FL learning environment (Mitchell, 2012) or instead of participation, learners just prefer lurking which means just observing the online- ongoing context without contribution (Shafie et al., 2016, p. 2). Third, instructor and learners' control over the quality and the accuracy of the sources (Yunus et al., 2012) and accomplishment of language learners' needs (Lenhart & Madden, 2007) may have negative effects. For instance, if there is no clear outcome, language learners cannot create effective and meaningful links (Kabilan et al., 2010). Fourth, overcorrection may prevent learner from talking freely because that leads pressure over the language learners (Simpson, 2012). Last of all, the familiarity of the instructor affects the application of Facebook because an FL learning environment, teacher's approach to applying Facebook and its applications help to accomplish the activities and determine the effectiveness (Naditz, 2011; Simpson, 2012).

2.1.10. Theoretical Background of the Use of Facebook in FL Learning

2.1.10.1.   Constructivism

The use of Facebook in FL encounters the basic principles of Constructivist Theory. To begin with, Constructivism underlines the importance of interaction among learners (McDonald & Gibson, 1998; Steffe & Gale, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978). Facebook in FL learning supports social interaction and communication opportunities for learners (Aydın 2012). Basically, as knowledge is constructed through the negotiation of meaning, Facebook in FL learning assures language learners to learn and acquire opportunities for constructing required knowledge through social interaction (Chang, 2014). Moreover, the development of language skills is affected positively and constructive outcomes become crucial as learners collaborate (Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012). Facebook also provides required conditions for FL learning because meaningful interaction among learners is constructed and supported naturally (Abrams, 2006; Çoklar, 2012; Kabilan et al., 2010). Second, Constructivist Language Learning accomplishes language learners'

needs such as asking questions, responding and sharing knowledge that enable learners to construct knowledge from hands-on experiences because Facebook enables them to acquire scaffolding from either instructor or peer that enhances language learning process through ZPD (Khan & Ivy, 2014; Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012). Last of all, Facebook in FL learning encourages learners to establish community (Blattner & Fiori, 2008; Kabilan et al., 2010) since Facebook in FL learning enables users to reach a bigger audience who can actively participate in discussions and improve learning process (Dafoulas & Shokri, 2014; Espinosa, 2015).

2.1.10.2.   Collaborative Learning

The use of Facebook in Collaborative FL Learning provides several opportunities for language learning (Dawson, 2008). To begin with, the use of Facebook in FL learning enables language learners to come together to a platform other than the classroom to cooperate and collaborate since Facebook in FL supports the possibility of collaborating with people worldwide (Educause Learning Initiative, 2006). Second, Facebook in FL learning provides learners for exchanging ideas about assignments, examinations or group works (Balçıkanlı, 2015, McBride, 2009; O'Keeffe & Clarke- Pearson, 2011). That is, language learners keep contact with their peers to collaborate on forthcoming events (Mazman & Usluel, 2010). Moreover, Facebook in FL learning supports assistance and learners acquire either mutual or peer feedback through collaboration and interaction (Razak & Saeed, 2015). Third, Facebook in FL fosters the sense of community and enables language learners who share common concerns, multidimensional engagement to tasks (Razak & Saeed, 2014) and helps language learners to participate in collaborative learning activities that improves writing process through peer-revision (Arnold, Ducate & Kost, 2009; Elola & Oskoz, 2010). For instance, online discussion is beneficial to language learning since it supports language learners' participation; develops language output, autonomy, and collaboration (Shafie et al., 2015). Hence, language learners gain the sense of connection and community that improves the language learning process (Irwin et al., 2012; Terantino & Graf, 2011). Fourth, Facebook improves learners' capacity to multidimensional collaboration among people (Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012; Terantino & Graf, 2011). That is, collaboration between an instructor and a learner, among learners or between a

learner and the authentic audience is developed via Facebook (Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012S). What is more, Facebook provides an environment that collaborative language learning takes place and facilitates active participation (Irwin et al., 2012; Mazer, Murphy & Simonds, 2007). In addition, feedback from instructor or peers develops the sense of collaboration (Terantino & Graf, 2011). Last, collaborative activities enhance self-esteem (Lampe et al., 2011) because collaborative learning activities that provide several perspectives of learners and improve critical thinking ability through comparison, evaluation and different perspectives (Liu, 2015).

2.1.10.3. Situated Cognition

Facebook in Situated Cognitive FL Learning fosters several opportunities for language learners and these opportunities simplify the language learning process (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Mills, 2011). First of all, language learning can take place everywhere either formal or informal learning environment in case the effective interaction among learners and instructor to construct knowledge is provided (Kabilan et al., 2010). Thus, Facebook in FL learning provides an informal setting for language learning. To add, there have been three basic elements of situated cognition, namely joint enterprise, mutual engagement, and a shared repertoire that Facebook as an FL learning environment fosters since it positively affects the mutually dependent process (Mills, 2011). Second, the participation in Facebook and activities enables language learners to improve the knowledge of target language and raise the cognition to practice it in socio-cultural context (Chen, 2012) as learners who participate in composing collective knowledge accept it more preferable (Matthew et al., 2009). In this sense, Facebook in FL learning provides for learners a situated platform that is both natural and suitable for socialization (Chen, 2012). Last, authentic materials encourage different levels of literacy, improve meaningful interaction and participation of being a member of the community and improve the common cultural awareness (Mills, 2011).

2.1.10.4. Autonomous Learning

Facebook in Autonomous FL Learning fosters some principles that enable language learners to take the responsibility of their own learning process (Holec,

1981, p. 3) and decisions related to every aspect. A learner becomes autonomous when she can form her own objectives (Nunan, 1996) and Facebook in FL learning provides language learners several opportunities to become autonomous. To start with, Facebook in FL learning enables language learners to form something on their own (Kop, 2011) as it encourages language learners to be in charge of their own learning process and improves the language learning process (Prensky, 2007). Moreover, Facebook in FL learning enables learners to define their own learning objectives and adapt it according to their learning needs (Downes, 2009). Facebook also offers learners Autonomous Learning opportunities which are time and place independent (Blattner & Fiori, 2009). To add, it fosters a common goal that improves the critical awareness of personal autonomy of language learners (Wu & Chao, 2015). Becoming an autonomous learner, Facebook is an assistant that improves autonomy among learners and learning process becomes more motivating and effective (Promnitz-Hayashi, 2011).

2.1.10.5.   Self-determination Theory

The application of Facebook in Self-Determination Theory supports language learners in various ways. To start with, language learning environment that compensates for the relatedness, competence and autonomy of the language learners (Aydın, 2014a) motivates them because motivation is a component that affects the language learning process positively (Aydın, 2014a). That is, learners who are able to express their feelings and thoughts effectively in related context becomes motivated (Nadkami & Hofmann, 2011). Moreover, the competence of language learners is positively affected by Facebook application and improvement of language skills correlatively (Bani-Hani et al., 2014). Facebook in FL learning helps language learners to develop language competency with the help of interaction between language learner and instructor or among other learners (Mason, 2006). Language learners also feel related to a community and Facebook either on-line or off-line creates this relatedness (Ellison et al., 2007) as people need to feel related to others emotionally (Ryan, 1993; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

2.2. Conclusion

Interaction can be defined as a reciprocal action or influence that requires at least two objects, events, and participants. It reflects mutual acceptance and establishment of the roles of the encounters and rules of the defined situation related to the setting. It can be classified into two categories depending on the context; non-verbal and verbal interaction. Interaction has a significant role in the learning process. In this sense, it has five components: activity, cooperation, diversity, expectation, and responsibility. It should be also noted that there are several factors that affect interaction in the learning process such as learners' needs, expectations, personality, age, cognitive abilities, learning styles, learner autonomy, culture, the teaching philosophy, and interdependence. As a second dimension, the environment has effects on the learning process, because learning depends on the environment that has two main effects; motivation and making the process enjoyable, permanent and meaningful. As a third perspective, technology is a component which enhances interaction in the learning environment. That is, interaction is strongly connected with technology tools and its application due to several reasons such as quality of education, becoming a member of a community and forming ideal social environment. There exist some factors which have effects on the use of technology such as practicality, familiarity, age, and learners' attitudes.

Interaction is also important in the FL learning and teaching processes due to several reasons such as personal development, motivation, participation, and improvement of linguistic knowledge. In FL classes, the importance of interaction has become widely known and three types of interaction are categorized in language learning process; conversational interaction, negotiation, and instructional interaction. In this sense, several theories and hypotheses related to interaction and FL learning can be listed respectively. To begin with, Constructivism has established the idea that defines the way that individual construct knowledge from experiences, ideas, and beliefs, whereas cooperative learning is defined as cooperation among learners to reach a target. Furthermore, Autonomous Learning is the capability of taking the responsibility own personal learning process, whereas developmental learning is defined as learners' serious efforts to establish knowledge in a social context. Experiential Learning is defined as a process that underlines the importance of personal efforts and experiences for the learning process, whereas ZPD can be

defined as learners' effort to acquire a language on condition that suitable assistance is provided. In the scope of language learning, Comprehensible Input in language acquisition and learning is every piece of foreign language input which language learners are able to understand. Input hypothesis is defined as the target language input beyond learners' current level of knowledge which is called *i+1*.

With its broad application, social media has several effects that users can be exposed such as rich content, source, and collaboration opportunities. For this reason, application of social media in teaching and learning activities become widespread. In addition, social media has widely used as an educational environment and has the potential of improving learning process due to flexibility, authenticity, and participation. Growing popularity of Web 2.0 and its applications enforce language learners and instructors to apply them in language learning process. Thus, social media contributes to language learning process with improving language skills, creating positive attitudes toward learning and meaningful content. However, application of social media may have negatively impact language learning process due to the inappropriateness of social media, misapprehensions, lack of knowledge and comprehension. Yet, social media directly and closely contributes to users' interaction opportunities due to communicative interaction opportunities, motivation and positive attitudes towards interaction, while there are some adverse effects of interaction via social media such as syntactic versus real world confusion, time management, and distraction.

As a sample of social media, Facebook is an ideal platform for both communication and interaction and one of the popular ways of communication. Users have Facebook accounts for communication with other students and their families, meeting new people, interaction and a participation for an educational environment. On the other hand, Facebook has two main harmful effects: ethical problems such as unsuitable actions/comments, online privacy and cyber-bullying and personal problems such as limited attention span, over sensation and empathy-free behaviors. Facebook as an interaction environment has a positive impact on users due to positive perceptions, social interaction opportunities, collaboration, improvement of satisfaction level and self-respect. Theoretical background of the use of Facebook in interaction depends on Interaction Hypothesis that is directly related to the foreign/second language acquisition processes. For example, Interaction

Hypothesis supports the idea that the proficiency of language learners is highly correlated with interaction and communication. Moreover, comprehensible input and negotiation of meaning enable language learners to modify the conversation. Social Interaction Hypothesis defines social interaction as an action or event that takes place in defined period of time and it is basic, common and strong characteristic of human life. According to Conversational Interaction Hypothesis, language acquisition process is based on the negotiation of meaning between language learners and interlocutors. In that way, conversational interaction provides comprehensible input for language learners. Facebook as an educational environment supports social learning, multi-dimensional interaction, cooperation and the improvement of academic skills. In conclusion, Facebook as an FL learning environment becomes an effective option due to authentic knowledge opportunities, improvement in cross-cultural ties, proficiency and socio-pragmatic reasons. To conclude, based on the theoretical background of the study, several conclusions can be drawn. First, Facebook usage in FL learning encounters the basic principles of Constructivist Theory. Second, Facebook in Collaborative FL Learning provides several opportunities for language learning. Third, Facebook in Situated Cognitive FL learning fosters various opportunities for language learners and simplifies the language learning process. Fourth, Facebook in Autonomous FL Learning fosters some principles that enable language learners to take the responsibility of their own learning process and decisions related to every aspect from defining objectives, needs and expectations of the learner to developing critical awareness. Finally, the application of Facebook in accordance with Self-Determination Theory supports language learners in various ways such as relatedness, competence, and autonomy of the language learner that are positively correlated with the motivation of the language learner. To sum up, conclusions related to the theories listed above highlight the strength of interaction in language learning process from several perspectives and theoretically enforces to search Facebook as an interaction environment which enables language learners to learn a foreign language.

2.3. Literature Review

This section reviews the related literature on Facebook and its utilization as an interactional tool. First of all, studies on the role of interaction in FL learning are

listed. Second, studies on Facebook as an educational environment are reviewed. Next, a review of research on Facebook as an FL learning environment is presented. Then, results on Facebook as an interactional environment are examined. Finally, research on teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook is reviewed.

2.3.1. Research on the role of Interaction in FL Learning

Research shows that the role of interaction in FL learning process is crucial and it is considerably affected by several factors such as environment, age, gender, task complexity, proficiency level, and learner's attitudes. To begin with, Heins et al. (2007) investigated the nature and level of interpersonal interaction in both online and the face-to-face language tutorials used at the Open University, UK. The research results revealed that spoken interaction took place in not only face to face but also online language learning environment. Differences with regards to the level of student participation, the use of the target language and the degree of a tutor control and focus. Moreover, Fujii and Mackey (2009) investigated learner- learner interaction in an FL classroom and quantitative research results indicated a relatively low rate of interactional feedback while qualitative analysis of interactions revealed interesting trends in nature of the feedback that was provided. They also highlighted the patterns of interaction that might be shaped by cultural, contextual and interlocutor related factors. McDonough (2004) emphasized that the learners believed that peer interaction through pair and small group activities was useful for practicing oral communication skills but less useful for learning English grammar. That is, learners who had more participation during the pair and small group activities demonstrated improved production of the target forms, even though they did not perceive the activities as useful for learning the language. Oliver (2002) focused on conversational interactions between children aged 8 to 13 years and the findings suggested that in child-child interactions, the nativeness and proficiency of pairings influence the amount of negotiation for meaning that occurred. That is, in terms of negotiation for meaning strategies, nonnative dyads more actively used these strategies than native dyads. Pica et al., (1990) examined the gender factor in interactions of a native and non-native speaker. According to four information exchange tasks results, there existed not a clear-cut role for non-native gender as a discriminating factor in the frequency of negotiated interaction and its associated opportunities for comprehension of input, feedback on production and modification

of output. Braidi (2002) reported on the occurrence and use of recasts in adult native-speaker / nonnative-speaker interactions in a non-classroom setting. At the end of four communication tasks, she concluded that recasts happened in native and non-native interactions and this occurrence was affected to some degree by types of negotiation and by levels of grammaticality. Kim (2009) focused on the impact of task complexity on the occurrence of language-related episodes during task-based interaction in two task types and concluded that the effects of task complexity on the occurrence of learning opportunities differed depending on task types and learner proficiency. Watanabe and Swain (2007) analyzed the effects of L2 proficiency differences in pairs and patterns of interaction on L2 learning and found that the patterns of pair interaction greatly influenced the frequency of language related episodes and post-test performance. That is, when the learners engaged in collaborative patterns of interaction, they were more likely to achieve higher post-test scores regardless of their partner's proficiency level. Last of all, Maftoon and Ziafar (2013) studied the attitudes of EFL Japanese learners and teachers and other factors influenced the classroom interactional patterns. The results demonstrated that there were several factors such as the Japanese EFL learners' attitudes towards the role of English in their society, anxiety, Japanese culture, Japanese English as a different form of English, motivation, and disunity in their learning styles and the idea of 'willingness to communicate.

Research indicates that the role of interaction in FL learning provides opportunities for negotiation, input, output, feedback, and modification. For example, Foster and Ohta (2005) aimed to identify negotiated interaction and the value of language classroom negotiation of meaning from both cognitive and socio-cultural perspectives. A qualitative analysis of the data showed that learners actively assisting each other to transact the task through co-construction and obtaining completely comprehensible input appeared to be of lower priority than maintaining a supportive and friendly discourse. Furthermore, negotiation was one of a range of conversational processes that facilitated SLA as learners' work to understand and express meaning in L2. Smith (2004) observed 24 intermediate level non-native speakers of English and found that previously unknown lexical items that were negotiated were retained significantly better as measured by immediate and delayed recognition and objected labeling post-tests than those items where preemptive input

alone was provided and where target items were not engaged. Smith also stated that results provided evidence of a more direct link between negotiated interaction and acquisition. Moreover, Mayo and Pica (2000) explored whether the interaction between proficient FL learners could address their needs for L2 input and for feedback focused on form in ways that interaction with native speakers and results indicated that overall, interaction between advanced FL learners could provide as much modified input, feedback, and output as when interaction between learners and native speakers took place. According to the results of a case study, Nabei and Swain (2002) found that recasting was a complex verbal behavior influenced by the teaching environment, the interaction context, and the learner's cognitive orientation. Similarly, according to the quasi-experimental study, Sato and Lyster (2012) concluded that teaching corrective feedback to L2 learners was effective especially peer- interaction was an ideal context for suitable exchange process. Mackey (1999) explored the relationship between different types of conversational interaction and SLA. The results supported claims concerning a link between interaction and grammatical development and highlight the importance of active participation in the interaction. Additionally, Pica et al. (1996) analyzed whether L2 learners' interaction with other learners could address three of their supposed needs for L2 learning that were input, feedback and modification. The findings suggested that interaction between L2 learners could address some of their input, feedback, and output needs but that it did not provide as much modified input and feedback as interaction with native speakers did. Last of all, Alegria de la Colina and Garcia Mayo (2009) examined the functions of the L1 in the oral interaction of twelve pairs of undergraduate Spanish EFL learners with low proficiency in the target language while engaged in three collaborative tasks and concluded that language learners described events however the opportunity to use L2 for casual interaction was limited. Thus, it would be desirable for students to be exposed to these types of activities in the L2 so that they could assign sufficient semantic meaning to the expressions used for thinking and self-regulation in the L2, which in turn could facilitate their interaction with native speakers.

2.3.2. Research on Facebook as an Educational Environment

Research shows that the use of Facebook as an educational environment is a controversial issue that severe debates still exist. According to research results,

Facebook as an educational environment enhances the learning process, self-efficiency, interaction, meaningful learning, communication and academic success. To begin with, McCarthy (2010) investigated blending virtual and physical learning environments to enhance the experience of the first year by immersing students into university culture through social and academic interaction between peers. It was found that the online learning environment increased interaction between local and international students. Furthermore, a physical classroom allowed students to interact in a face to face environment, essentially transforming the often impersonal virtual interaction into a meaningful connection. Stanciu et al., (2012) investigated the impact of social networks on educational process in Romanian higher education. Survey results indicated that SNS became very popular among students and might be considered as valuable tools for education. In a quasi-experimental research, Chen (2015) stated that learners whose learning styles were assimilating had better performance than those with accommodating learning styles. Thus, learners had higher self-efficacy and habit strength toward learning in mobile Facebook. Albayrak (2012) also noted that use of Facebook for academic purposes as course management system would continue to improve. So Facebook as an educational environment developed interaction among learners and encourages them to think about subjects and reviewed the learning process. Furthermore, Donmus (2010) concluded that students continuously interacting in Facebook possibly benefited from educational games for their learning. Furthermore, games played through social networks motivated students and helped them to construct their own learning entertainingly. Last, Mayende et al., (2014) stated that learners appreciated the use of Facebook for interactive learning.

Research shows that Facebook also mediates interaction and learning become effective when modeling, contingency management, feedback, instructing and questioning are appropriate. In this perspective, Wang (2013) aimed to identify the nature of student learning engagement associated with Facebook activity and suggested the use of Facebook as an educational communication and interaction tool to enable faculty to assume a more active and participatory role in teaching and learning. To add, Roblyer et al. (2010) studied how likely higher education faculty were to use Facebook for either personal or educational purposes. Results showed that students were much more likely than faculty to use Facebook and were

significantly more open to the possibility of using Facebook and similar technologies to support classroom work

Research indicates that using Facebook as an educational environment affects adversely the learning process due to several reasons such as negative evaluation, the readiness of learners, attitudes, pedagogical factors and previous experiences. For instance, Coklar (2012) found that students evaluated the Facebook positively according to some aspects such as motivation, interaction opportunities or stimulating interest. On the contrary, he emphasized that the students' negative evaluations depended on the control mechanism, informational convergence, and entertainment facilities. Baran (2010) explored what students thought about the incorporation of Facebook in their coursework and stated that not all students were ready to embrace the use of social networking tools such as Facebook in formal teaching, learning, and assessment. Additionally, Alm (2014) examined tertiary language students' experiences of the social networking site Facebook for out-of-class language exposure. Results showed a disconnection between informal and formal learning practices. In a review, Manca and Ranieri (2013) stated that pedagogical affordances of Facebook had only been partially implemented. There were still many obstacles that might prevent a full adoption of Facebook as a learning environment such as implicit institutional, teacher and student pedagogies and cultural issues. Last of all, Boon and Sinclair (2009) found that Facebook had the potential and connectivity to use in an academic setting; however, it was not improved as an educational tool and students' experiences in using these technologies might vary considerably.

Research also indicates some negative results about using Facebook as an educational environment in relation to benefits and challenges, some factors affecting the learning process such as proficiency levels, strength of social ties and possible adaptation requirements, whereas there was a lack of research on using Facebook as an educational environment (Aydın, 2012). As an example, Balçıkanlı (2015) explored whether prospective English language teachers' Facebook adoption processes had an impact on their educational use of Facebook. He stated that there was a significant and positive relationship between Facebook adoption and educational use of Facebook whereas purposes of Facebook usage had a relatively low effect on the educational use of Facebook. Similarly, According to Bateman and

Willems (2012), Facebook provided both benefits and challenges to those adopting it in the context of formal teaching and learning in higher education. They listed the potentials and pitfalls of Facebook in higher education. Alm (2015) also stated that some participants were eager to use Facebook as a tool for learning some were hesitant. That is, the use of the social networking site varied according to proficiency levels of the participants, the strength of social ties with a native speaker. Last of all, Kabilan et al. (2010) examined whether university students considered Facebook as a useful and meaningful learning environment that could support, enhance and/or strengthen their learning of the English language. They concluded that the students believed Facebook could be utilized as an online environment to facilitate the learning of English. However, for them, teachers or language instructors had to integrate Facebook as an educational project with predetermined learning objectives and outcomes for the learning experience to be meaningful.

In a narrower perspective, research demonstrates that better relationship and communication opportunities between instructor and learners or among learners, feeling related, and improvement of academic success, the credibility of the instructor, sharing experiences and factors such as gender, age or the year of study are factors which affect using Facebook as an educational environment. To begin with, Aydın (2014a) examined 121 EFL learners at a Turkish state university and concluded that among Turkish EFL learners, passive behaviors are more common in terms of interaction with their teachers. Moreover, Aydın (2014a) emphasized that some factors such as age, sex or year of study were significantly correlated with some of the items in the scale. Sturgeon and Walker (2009) found that there was an indirect connection between faculty members' use of Facebook and academic performance. Moreover, although some faculty members were hesitant students felt more willing to communicate, the relationships built on Facebook between students and faculty members could make for a more open line of communication. Mazer et al (2007) focused on the effects of teacher self-disclosure via Facebook on anticipated college student motivation, affective learning and classroom climate. They concluded that participants emphasized possible negative associations between teacher use of Facebook and teacher credibility. After inspecting Facebook 'wall' activity of 909 undergraduate students, Selwyn (2009) found that Facebook appeared to provide a ready space where the 'role conflict' that students often experienced in their

relationships with university work, teaching staff, academic conventions and expectations could be worked through in a relatively closed 'backstage' area. Moreover, Akyıldız and Argan (2012) concluded that purpose statements related to social and daily activities had a higher score than educational and school-related purposes' statements. Mendez et al., (2014) investigated student usage of Facebook, its potential impact on faculty interaction and institutional policy. They found that faculty might meet students on their turf to facilitate engagement however the liability was questionable. Teclehaimanot and Hickman (2011) also found that passive behaviors are preferred by students since passive behaviors were more suitable than active behaviors. Moreover, they underlined the point that males perceived student-teacher interactions on Facebook more suitable than females. Whereas, there was no difference between undergraduate and graduate students, age was not a factor to find the interactions more or less appropriate.

2.3.3. Research on Facebook as a FL Learning Environment

Research results obtained from a limited number of studies indicate that Facebook as a FL learning environment develops positive attitudes towards learning and motivation, improves communication, socio-pragmatic and cultural awareness, promotes interaction opportunities and oral participation and improves writing, speaking, reading and grammar. To begin with, Razak et al. (2013) examined the opportunities and challenges of SNSs as learning environment in writing in English. They observed 24 active and regular EFL learners joining the *Only for English Learning Facebook* communities of practice that was a group developed and maintained by a few instructors in English for EFL learners coming from different EFL Arab countries. They concluded that the EFL participants perceived as an interactive learning environment that contributed to enhancing their writing by engaging in learner-learner and learner-instructor interaction, information sharing, communicating and socializing with friends and developing a sense of belonging. Omar et al. (2012) found that the use of Facebook as a platform for the information-sharing task received very positive feedback from the participants. They suggested that it would be a promising virtual tool and environment to promote interaction in English learning and promoting awareness of available online tools and modeling effective use of the tools to enhance learner's online interactions. Furthermore, Vetter and Chanier (2006) explored the effects of multimodality on the results which

obtained, in particular discussing the use of text in the development of spoken interactions. They found that, in an audio-synchronous and multimodal environment, learners, including those who have not spoken in a foreign language for some time, could reach satisfactory rates of oral participation in a relatively short period of time. In addition, Blattner and Fiori (2009) analyzed the group application available on Facebook and concluded that Facebook as an FL learning environment provided some benefits such as authentic language interaction and the development of socio-pragmatic awareness, which is an aspect of language acquisition. As a result, Facebook was found to be a tool to enhance motivation and the sense of belonging to a community. DePew (2011) also stated that multilingual writers were capable of drawing upon their multilingual repertoire to make interesting and deliberate decisions about how they use words and visuals to compose arguments about their respective identities to different audiences. Mitchell (2012) investigated seven ESOL students' motivations for joining Facebook and use of the site and two ESOL students' reasons for not joining it. She reported that they were able to communicate with existing friends, learn English and learn about American culture through Facebook. It is also stated that they were able to accomplish their goals on Facebook with few difficulties. Furthermore, Suthiwartnarueput and Wasanasomsithi (2012) studied the effects of using Facebook as a medium for grammar and writing discussions of low-intermediate EFL students and the results indicated that English grammar was worth promoting for discussions on Facebook as there were correlations between the gain scores in the grammar and writing parts at the significant levels. Moreover, they noted that the students also had positive attitudes towards using Facebook as a means of learning grammar and writing. As an alternative learning tool, Facebook provided them a convenient and attractive means to engage in discussions with the teacher and other users who had better grammatical knowledge. Razak and Saeed (2015) examined peer writing revision among English as foreign language Arab students in a Facebook group. They concluded that the learners' engagement in the online revision activities fostered their sense of online learning community by creating an interactive friendly learning environment, building and nurturing new relationships based on shared interests and developing a sense of belonging. In addition, Bani-Hani et al. (2014) stated that Facebook groups could be effective in teaching EFL writing. In other words, they stated that students could develop their vocabulary by being exposed to fellow group members' posts, in

addition to checking for misspelled words. Last, Tananuraksakul (2015) reported a study on a Facebook group that was used as a learning management system regarding external motivational tool to boost students' intrinsic motivation to learn English for specific purposes. Findings indicated that the Facebook group could give senses of convenience, simplicity, and relaxation and reduce cultural power distance between the instructor and students. In addition, it was found that the Facebook group could be an online tool to facilitate English learning through error corrections.

On the other hand, research indicates that Facebook as an FL learning environment, despite its positive effects, have adverse effects on the learning process due to some factors such as lack of equipment, integration and creating meaningful difference. For example, Yunus et al. (2012) found that factors such as lack of enough equipment as well as access to the internet, and teachers' insufficient time to interact with the students prevented learners from concentrating on the materials. Kabilan et al. (2010) concluded that Facebook could be utilized as an online environment to facilitate the learning of English; however, teachers or language instructors had to integrate Facebook as an educational project with predetermined learning objectives and outcomes for the learning experience. What is more, Alias et al., (2011) found that the students' academic writing performance for both control and experimental groups was more or less the same. In other words, participants in both groups improved in their post-test results, while the improvement demonstrated by the experimental group was not statistically significant. Dixon (2012) examined student engagement with Facebook and described non-native English speakers expectations and experience. Results indicated that the amount of time spent on Facebook per day had no significant relationship to any measures of writing success for a non-native speaker or native speaker. According to findings obtained from survey results of 125 international students at a Canadian university, Lee and Ranta (2014) noted that there existed weak associations between Facebook use and self-assessed language proficiency. Simpson (2012) explored whether Facebook would be an effective and easy teaching tool in ESL classes in South Korean universities. It was found that Facebook was not different from other new teaching tools. Last, Shafie et al. (2016) found that five emerging themes, which were poor online communication skills, lack of confidence, learning by lurking, lack of a sense of belonging and lurking, were the norm of Facebook groups considerably affected the

language learning process. Learners' active participation on Facebook groups would be stimulated if users were sensitive to Netiquette.

2.3.4. Research on Facebook as an Interactional Environment

Research indicates that Facebook is mostly used as an interactional environment for several reasons such as better social relations, improvement in self-esteem and life satisfaction. To begin with, Kujath, (2011) found that interpersonal relationships which Facebook was applied as an extension of face to face interaction enlarged not only connection among users but also strengthened maintaining relations and the main goal of usage enabled to create a better social circle. Viswanath et al., (2009) analyzed the evolution of activity between users in the Facebook social network to capture social links and noted that links in the activity network tended to come and go rapidly over time and the strength of ties exhibited a general decreasing trend of activity as the social network linkages that meant only 30% of Facebook user pairs interacted consistently from one month to the next. Additionally, Pempek et al. (2009) explored why college-aged students invested their time and how they interacted with each other at these sites. They found that college students, who used Facebook approximately 30 minutes during the day as a part of their daily routine, communicated on Facebook using a one-to-many style and spent more time observing content on Facebook than actually posting content. In addition, the results indicated that Facebook was used most often for social interaction. Ellison et al. (2007) focused on the relationship between use of Facebook and the formation and maintenance of social capital and found that there was a strong association between use of Facebook and the three types of social capital that can be listed as bridging, bonding and maintained social capital. Hence, Facebook usage enabled students to interact with measures of psychological well-being, suggesting that it might provide greater benefits for users experiencing low self-esteem and low life satisfaction. Bryant and Marmo (2012) noted that interaction rules provided a useful framework for the study of online SNS. To add, Stutzman et al., (2012) focused on the relationship between Facebook users' privacy concerns, relationship maintenance strategies, and social capital outcomes. They reported that privacy concerns and behaviors predict disclosures on Facebook, but not perceptions of social capital. Moreover, they defined interaction effects between users' network composition and their use of privacy features. Similarly, Antoci et al. (2012) examined computer-

mediated interaction and particularly online networking and concluded that an economy where agents could develop their social interactions through two main modes of participation, one encompassing both online networking and face to face interactions, and the other solely based on physical encounters. Wilsonet al., (2009) focused on user interactions in the Facebook social network. Data obtained from crawls of the Facebook including social and interaction statistics on more than 10 million users showed that studies of social applications had to use real indicators of user interactions in lieu of social graphs. Manago et al. (2012) explored the anatomy friend composition of college students' Facebook networks and its implications for social interactions, life satisfaction, and perceived social support. They concluded that Facebook facilitated expansive social networks that grew disproportionately through distant kinds of relationship. Although it was at slow rates, Facebook also improved the number of close relationships and stronger relationships. As a result, SNS helped youth to satisfy enduring human psychosocial needs for permanent relations in a geographically mobile world—college students with higher proportions of maintained contacts from the past perceived Facebook as a more useful tool for procuring social support. Charlton et al. (2009) focused on the cross-site student software development projects, which was in operation between the two institutions for the past four years. They stated that some of the functionality provided by Facebook and Common Ground enabled learners to reduce the barriers to interaction and community formation. Moreover, by creating a persistent environment that interacted with and leverages the power of existing social networking services, team members appeared to be better able to maintain their interactive cohesiveness, team awareness and project planning potential beyond face-to-face meetings.

Conversely, research focuses on the less effective aspects of Facebook as an interactional environment. These less effective aspects can be listed as passive behaviors, trust and privacy problems, unwillingness to communicate, anxiety and other factors such as different perceptions about its usage. To begin with, Aydın (2014a) examined 121 EFL learners at a Turkish state university and concluded that among Turkish EFL students passive behaviors were more common in terms of interaction with their teachers. Moreover, he emphasized that some factors such as age, sex or year of study were significantly correlated with their behaviors. Second, Dwyer et al. (2007) investigated that trust was not regarded as crucial while developing on-line interactions. That is, users did not reflect the sense of trust and

willingness to share information to new social interaction. Similarly, Acquisti and Gross (2006) searched privacy concerns on members' behavior and stated that an individual's privacy concerns were only a weak predictor of membership. They also noted that some people managed privacy concerns by trusting their ability to control the information provided and the external access to it. Chen and Lee (2013) used a structural equation modeling to define the relationship between Facebook interaction and psychological distress and two underlying mechanisms as communication overload and self-esteem. They found that the relationship between Facebook interaction and psychological well-being tended to be negative. In other words, the frequent Facebook interaction was associated with greater distress directly and indirectly via a two-step pathway that increased communication overload and reduced self-esteem. Furthermore, Teclehaimanot and Hickman (2011) found that passive behaviors were preferred by students. Moreover, they underlined the point that men perceived student-teacher interactions on Facebook more suitable than women, whereas there was no difference between undergraduate and graduate students and age was not a factor to find the interactions more or less appropriate. Burke and Ruppel (2015) investigated whether individuals' social anxiety and interaction success were associated with their Facebook specific self-presentation motives and their social competence. They concluded that people's motives for Facebook self-presentation were associated with their interaction success in different ways, depending on their level of social competence. Moreover, they underlined the value of considering interaction success as an outcome in addition to social anxiety, thereby extending the reach of self-presentation theory. In addition, Lim and Ismail (2010) collected data from users regarding Facebook interactions that included a total number of fans, total interactions, interactions per post, post quality and unique page views. They reported that Facebook had the potential to draw distance learners to engage in meaningful academic conversations but the quantity and quality of posts very much depended on the timing as well as the topics of discussion. According to the results obtained from 14 Facebook brand pages, Cvijikj et al. (2011) found that there was a significant effect of the post type and category on a number of likes and comments as well as on interaction duration. That is, different post characteristics caused a different effect on the level of user interaction on the Facebook page. Additionally, Omar et al., (2012) explored ESL learners' participation in an information-sharing task conducted via Facebook groups and their feedback on the

use of Facebook groups as the platform for the activity. Results showed that the use of Facebook as a platform for the information-sharing task received very positive feedback from the participants. Thus, they suggested that it would be a promising virtual tool and environment to promote interaction in English learning. Results also indicated that promoting awareness of available online tools and modeling effective use of the tools would be an effective virtual tool to enhance learner's online interactions. Nazir et al. (2008) analyzed the usage characteristics and nature of user interactions for three applications that Fighters' Club, Got Love and Hugged. It was found that there existed a small fraction of users account for the majority of activity within the context of Facebook applications and a small number of applications account for the majority of users on Facebook. Furthermore, user response times for Facebook applications were independent of source/destination user locality. Sturgeon and Walker (2009) found that although Faculty members did not put as much weight into the use of Facebook for relationship purposes as students, students wanted to have relationships with their professors and to know them as real people, not as people who were always kept at arms distance for students felt more connected and were more willing to form relationships with others as a result of online communication. Last of all, Lasse Ellefsen (2016) examined current perceptions of using Facebook as a means for interaction between students and lecturers at university level and stated that there was no consensus between learners and lecturers. Namely, students, in particular, found using Facebook for this purpose to be most appealing but lecturers seemed to split in opinion on the matter.

2.3.5. Research on Teachers' interactions with their Students on Facebook

A limited number of studies indicate that teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook can improve the learning process, motivation, and interaction. For example, through qualitatively constructed research methodology, Lasse Ellefsen (2016) asserted that lecturers seemed to split in opinion whether to use Facebook a means for interaction between students and lecturers at the university level, which was in line with previous research on social media use in higher education. Çoklar (2012) also suggested that teachers' interaction with their students on Facebook could provide teacher supervision that was beneficial for the learning process. In addition, both McCharty (2010) and Muñoz and Towner (2009) concluded that

Facebook enhanced teacher-student interaction. Baltacı-Göktalay (2015) found that teacher trainees benefited from Facebook in receiving prompt feedback which encouraged interactions among stakeholders by communicating with their peers, supervisors and cooperative teachers, sharing knowledge, collaborating with their peers and improving their professional performance. Lam (2012) proposed a model to improve student's motivation in learning with four Facebook benefits: interaction, communication, social relationship and participation and suggested that Facebook could be beneficial for learners' motivation whereas there were three factors one of which was teacher-student interaction. Last, Balçıkanlı (2015) investigated prospective English language teachers' experiences on Facebook and found that both teacher educators and student teachers provided direct benefits from this interaction.

On the other hand, some findings reveal that teachers' interaction with their students on Facebook is disadvantageous due to several reasons such as time-management, perception, the level of self-disclosure, credibility and ethical problems. For instance, Yunus et al. (2012) pointed out that teachers' insufficient time to interact with the students were regarded as the main disadvantages of integrating social networking tools into ESL writing classes. Sturgeon and Walker (2009) also found that although faculty saw relationships between themselves and students as an important matter, faculty members did not put as much weight into the use of Facebook for relationship purposes as students. In another study, Mazer et al. (2007) focused on the effects of teacher self-disclosure via Facebook on anticipated college student motivation, affective learning and classroom climate and concluded that teachers might consider Facebook as an important tool for interaction; however, teacher had to be careful and explore forms of self-disclosure that students might deem appropriate or inappropriate via this virtual. Similarly, Mazer et al. (2009) found that teachers' revealing highly personal information affected negatively to their credibility. That is, participants who accessed the Facebook website of a teacher high in self-disclosure reported higher levels of teacher credibility than participants who viewed a low self-disclosure Facebook website. Furthermore, Wang et al. (2015) underlined the point that credibility was highly dependent on the gender. That is, the gender of the teacher influenced students' perception as students evaluated emotional disclose of female teachers more acceptable. Teclehaimanot and Hickman (2009) suggested that teachers had to remain passive rather than active when they interacted with students on Facebook out of class. They underlined that teachers had

to avoid commenting on students' personal photos or sending an invitation on their own initiative. Asterhan and Rosenberg, (2015) found that teachers were not oblivious to using Facebook interaction with their students and they were aware of the handicaps because Facebook was a new area and rules were ubiquitous. Last of all, after profiles were analyzed, Olson et al. (2009) noted that teachers were role model for students and the nature of the inappropriate behavior was cause for concern for teacher educators who were expected to teach and assess dispositions and who had to decide whether or not a prospective teacher was ready for the ethical responsibility of teaching children.

2.3.6. Conclusion

Several conclusions can be drawn from the literature review presented above. To begin with, research shows that the role of interaction in FL learning process is significant and factors such as the environment, age, gender, task complexity, proficiency level and learner's attitudes remarkably affect the role of interaction in FL learning process. Second, research indicates that the role of interaction in FL learning provides opportunities for negotiation, input, output, feedback, and modification. Third, according to the results of prior research, Facebook as an educational environment enhances the learning process, self-efficiency, interaction, meaningful learning, communication and academic success. Additionally, it should be stated that Facebook mediates interaction; thus, learning becomes effective when modeling, contingency management, feedback, instructing and questioning are appropriate. On the other hand, because of several factors such as negative evaluation, the readiness of learners, attitudes, pedagogical factors and previous experiences, the use of Facebook as an educational environment affects adversely the learning process. What is more, there exist some negative results regarding the use of Facebook as an educational environment in relation to benefits and challenges. Some more factors affecting the learning process related to proficiency levels, social ties, and possible adaptation requirements. However, it should be strongly underlined that research still lacks the use of Facebook as an educational environment. Last, it should be added that better relationship and communication opportunities between instructor and learners or among learners, feeling related, and improvement of academic success, credibility of the instructor, sharing experiences and factors such

as gender, age or the year of study are some other variables that have influenced on the use of Facebook as an educational environment.

In the scope of FL learning, the results of a limited number of studies show that Facebook as an FL learning environment develops positive attitudes towards learning and motivation, improves communication, socio-pragmatic and cultural awareness, promotes interaction opportunities and oral participation and improves writing, speaking, reading and grammar. Yet, research also indicates that lack of equipment, integration and creating meaningful difference affect adversely using Facebook as an FL learning environment.

In terms of Facebook as an interactional environment in FL settings is in favored for several reasons such as better social relations, improvement in self-esteem and life satisfaction. On the other hand, research also focuses on the less effective aspects of Facebook as an interactional environment that is listed as passive behaviors, trust and privacy problems, unwillingness to communicate, anxiety. As a final point, it should be strongly emphasized that fairly limited number of studies focused on interactions with FL teachers with their students. Those studies indicate that teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook can improve the learning process, motivation, and interaction. On the other hand, some findings reveal that teachers' interaction with their students on Facebook is disadvantageous owing to several reasons such as time-management, perception, the level of self-disclosure, credibility and ethical problems.

3. METHODOLOGY

This section introduces the methodology of the study. For this purpose, first, the research design and the rationale behind the utilization of descriptive research design in this study are provided. Second, participants in the study are introduced. Then, research tools and procedure are given. Finally, information on the data analysis procedure is presented.

3.1. Research Design

The study uses a descriptive research design, as it is necessary to gain further inside into FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook. Descriptive study can be defined as a type of research design that includes observing and describing aspects of a pattern as it remains (Hungler & Polit, 1999). Additionally, descriptive design copes with a phenomenon that takes place naturally and data related to already existing source could be gathered from first-hand experiences (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). Descriptive research is often quantitative (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989) and quantitative research is defined as "*formal, objective, systematic process in which numerical data are used to obtain information about the world and it is used to describe variables; to examine relationships among variables; to determine cause and- effect interactions between variables*" (Burns & Grove, 2005, p. 25). In the lights of the definitions above; the study mainly focuses on the aspect of FL teachers' interactions with their students and descriptive research design is appropriate to fulfill the objectives of this research. The nature and normative level of interaction between FL teachers and students are the main interest. Thus, among data collecting techniques, the survey was utilized as it best represents the already existing perspectives of participants and without intervention, enables to collect first-hand data. In conclusion, according to descriptive research design, this study presents

a picture of descriptive statistics that were gathered from participants already formed perspectives in a natural context.

3.2. Participants

Sample group in the study consisted of 146 FL teachers working at various schools in the city center of Balıkesir, Turkey. The group consisted of 107 female (%73.3%) and 39 male (26.7%) teachers. It should be noted that gender distribution reflected the overall population of FL teachers in Turkey. The mean age of the participants is 34.5 in the range of 21 and 63. Among participants, 14 (9.6%) teachers were under or 25, 33 (22.6%) were between 26 and 30, 39 (26.7%) were between 31 and 35, 37 (25.3%) were between 36 and 40 and 23 (15.8%) were 41 and over. The mean score for teaching experience of the participants was 11.5 in the range of one and 43. Among them, 32 (21.9%) teachers had less than five years, 38 (26.0%) had six and 10, 44 (30.1%) had 11-15 years and 32 (21.9%) had over 16 years teaching experience. In terms of school types they worked, 15 (10.3%) worked at elementary, 42 (28.8%) worked at secondary and 71 (48.6%) participants worked at high schools and 18 teachers (12.3%) worked at vocational schools. Regarding their graduation degrees, 125 teachers had BA degree (85.6%), whereas 21 participants had MA degree (14.4%). The mean score for having a Facebook account in years were 6.7 in the range of two and 10 years. Among them, 15 teachers stated that they had a Facebook account less than three years (10.3%), whereas 45 participants had an account between four and six years (30.8%). In addition, 70 teachers an account between seven and nine years (47.9%), whereas 16 of them had a Facebook account more than nine years (11.0%). Regarding their frequency of visit, 127 (87.0%) teachers stated that they visited Facebook almost every day, whereas 19 participants (13.0%) did not visit Facebook every day. Among 146 participants, 107 (73.3%) teachers spent on Facebook less than one hour, while 24 teachers (16.4%) spent nearly one hour. Fifteen teachers (10.3%) stated that they spent more than one hour. The mean score for the number of their friends on Facebook was 435.2 in the range of 10 and 2600. In terms of the number of their friends on Facebook, 52 participants (35.6%) had less than 250 friends, whereas 57 participants (39.0%) had between 251 and 500 friends. To add, 17 teachers (11.6%) had between 501 and 750 friends, whereas only 20 participants (13.7%) stated that

they had over 751 friends. Finally, in accordance with their attendance at in-service training course regarding computer use 104 participants (71.2%) stated that they had courses, while 42 teachers (28.8%) did not attend any course.

3.3. Tools

Within the purpose of collecting data, a survey including two sections was utilized. First, a background questionnaire probing participants' gender, age, teaching experience, teaching level, graduation level, Facebook use in years, the frequency of visit, time spent on Facebook, the number of friends, the number of student friends, the device used for Facebook connection and in-service training course regarding computer use was completed. Second, the survey "Student-Teacher Interaction on Facebook" designed by Teclehaimanot and Hickman (2011) was conducted to participants. That survey consisted of two parts; 23 unique behaviors on Facebook with every item written once which presented the FL teacher as the performer and 23 unique behaviors on Facebook with every item written once which presented FL teachers' students as the performer. Each 23 behaviors on Facebook based on the performer were categorized active or passive and answered on a Likert scale ranging from one to five (never=1, rarely=2, sometimes=3, often=4, always=5).

3.4. Procedure

After granting necessary permissions from the National Education Directorate of Balikesir, Turkey, schools are defined in accordance with the number of teachers working at that school. Then, participants were informed about the purpose, significance, and methodology of the study. Additionally, the rationale behind the subject choice was clarified. Participants were also informed that participation was voluntary. Moreover, participants were also ensured about the anonymity and the confidentiality of their answers and their personal information. They were guaranteed that the information gathered from the survey was going to be used for only scientific purposes. Finally, data collection instrument were distributed and collected after the participant completed them during the spring semester of the 2015 − 2016 academic year.

3.5. Data Analysis

In this study, SPSS was utilized to analyze the collected data. First of all, the frequency and percentage of the survey participants' gender were computed. Then, the mean scores, minimum and maximum values, frequencies and percentages for the participants' age, teaching experience, having a Facebook account, friends on Facebook and student friends on Facebook were calculated. Additionally, the frequency and percentage for participants' school type, graduation level, the frequency of visit, time spent on Facebook, attendance of in-service training course regarding computer use were computed. Then, for each 23 items and the total survey items, the reliability coefficients and percentages of variances were computed. For the first 23 items that presented the FL teacher as the performer, the reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha) is .95 and percentage of variance were 65.18%. For the second 23 items that presented the FL teachers' students as the performer, the reliability coefficient was found to be .96 whereas the percentage of variance was 64.19%. The total reliability coefficients for 46 items indicated a high level of reliability (.96) whereas the total of variance (69.82%) demonstrated that the scale was valid for estimating levels of FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook.

After obtaining the validity and the reliability, frequencies, mean scores, standard deviation and percentage were computed to define the distribution of each 23 items and group homogeneity. Specifically, this calculation was utilized for all the behaviors that are categorized according to the performer (FL teachers or their students). Then, *t*-test was conducted to examine the effects of variables; gender, graduation degree, attendance of in-service training course regarding computer use, the number of student-friends and the frequency of visit on FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook. Finally, ANOVA was utilized to analyze the mean differences between the items in the scale and subject variables such as age, school type, time spent on Facebook, teaching experience and the effects of device used for Facebook connection on FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook.

4. FINDINGS

This section presents the findings of the study that obtained from the survey results in accordance with the research questions. First, the results on the level of FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook are given. Second, the effects of subject variables such as gender, age, teaching experience, teaching level, graduation level, Facebook use in years, the frequency of visit, time spent on Facebook, the number of friends, the number of student friends, the device used for Facebook connection and in-service training course regarding computer use on the level of FL teachers' interactions with their students are given as well.

4.1. FL Teachers' Interactions with Their Students

Values in Table 1 show that Turkish FL teachers presented mostly passive behaviors while interacting with their students. To begin with, Turkish FL teachers stated that they never sent their students "pokes" ($x=1.1$). Similarly, they never posted on their students' wall ($x=1.7$) and sent their students' friend invitation ($x=1.4$). Turkish FL teachers never commented their students' status updates ($x=1.8$), videos their students posted ($x=1.8$) and photos in which their students had been tagged ($x=1.7$). They also never joined the groups their students had joined ($x=1.6$), viewed their students' friend list ($x=1.5$) and read their students' contact information ($x=1.6$). The finding further indicated that FL teachers rarely commented on photos their students posted ($x=2.0$) and started chats with their students ($x=2.0$). Additionally, they rarely sent their students messages ($x=2.0$) and read through the groups their students had joined ($x=2.0$), their students status updates ($x=2.2$), their students' work info ($x=2.2$) and education info ($x=2.4$). They also rarely viewed the photos their students posted ($x=2.4$) and in which their students had been tagged

(x=2.3) and watched videos their students posted (x=2.4). Similarly, Turkish FL teachers rarely read their students' personal info (x=2.0), basic info (x=2.0), and read through the posts on their students' walls (x=2.0). Last of all, they rarely viewed their students' profiles (x=2.2).

Table 1: Frequencies of the level of FL Teachers' Interactions with Their Students on Facebook

Statements		Frequencies							
On Facebook, I		Numbers	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	Sd
Active Behaviors	send my students a "poke".	146	125	14	7	0	0	1.19	.50
		100%	85.6%	9.6%	4.8%	0%	0%		
	comment on photos my students post	146	39	63	39	5	0	2.06	.81
		100%	26.7%	43.2%	26.7%	3.4%	0%		
	post on my students' wall	146	67	50	26	3	0	1.76	.81
		100%	45.9%	34.2	17.8	2.1	0%		
	send my students friend invitations.	146	97	37	9	3	0	1.43	.70
		100%	66.4%	25.3%	6.2%	2.1%	0%		
	comment on my students' status updates.	146	69	43	27	7	0	1.80	.90
		100%	47.3%	29.5%	18.5%	4.8%	0%		
	start chats with my students.	146	47	58	35	6	0	2.00	.85
		100%	32.2%	39.7%	24.0%	4.1%	0%		
	send my students messages.	146	40	64	34	7	1	2.07	.87
		100%	27.4%	43.8%	23.3%	4.8%	.7%		
	comment on videos my students post.	146	62	55	24	5	0	1.80	.83
		100%	42.5%	37.7%	16.4%	3.4%	0%		
	comment on photos in which my students have been tagged.	146	69	54	19	4	0	1.71	.79
		100%	47.3%	37.0%	13.0%	2.7%	0%		
	join the groups my students have joined.	146	78	44	20	4	0	1.65	.81
		100%	53.4%	30.1%	13.7%	2.7%	0%		
Passive Behaviors	read through the groups my students have joined	146	48	52	40	3	3	2.04	.93
		100%	32.9%	35.6%	27.4%	2.1%	2.1%		
	view my students' friend lists.	146	89	36	17	3	1	1.56	.82
		100%	61.0%	24.7%	11.6%	2.1%	.7%		
	view photos my students post	146	25	53	50	16	2	2.43	.94
		100%	17.1%	36.3%	34.2%	11.0%	1.4%		
	read my students' status updates.	146	33	64	36	10	3	2.21	.94
		100%	22.6%	43.8%	24.7%	6.8%	2.1%		
	read through my students' work info.	146	26	66	45	8	1	2.26	.83
		100%	17.8%	45.2%	30.8%	5.5%	.7%		
	read through my student's education info.	146	24	56	48	16	2	2.42	.93
		100%	16.4%	38.4%	32.9%	11.0%	1.4%		
	watch videos my students post.	146	24	58	47	14	3	2.41	.94
		100%	16.4%	39.7%	32.2%	9.6%	2.1%		
	view photos in which my students have been tagged.	146	22	62	50	8	4	2.38	.90
		100%	15.1%	42.5%	34.2%	5.5%	2.7%		
	read my students' personal info (e.g., interests, activities, favorites, etc.).	146	41	62	33	8	2	2.09	.91
		100%	28.1%	42.5%	22.6%	5.5%	1.4%		
	read my students' basic info (e.g., political views, religious view, relationship status, etc.).	146	48	59	30	7	2	2.01	.92
		100%	32.9%	40.4%	20.5%	4.8%	1.4%		
	view my students' profiles.	146	32	64	40	8	2	2.20	.89
		100%	21.9%	43.8%	27.4%	5.5%	1.4%		
	read through the posts on my students' walls.	146	45	65	27	7	2	2.01	.90
		100%	30.8%	44.5%	18.5%	4.8%	1.4%		
	read my students' contact information (e.g., e-mail, phone number, etc.).	146	75	50	20	1	0	1.63	.74
		100%	51.4%	34.2%	13.7%	.7%	0%		

The findings presented in Table 2 also show that from Turkish FL teachers' perspective, their students displayed mainly passive behaviors that showed similarities to their FL teachers. To begin with, Turkish FL teachers stated that their students rarely sent them "pokes" (x=1.6), viewed their teachers' friend list (x=2.3) and joined the groups their teachers had joined (x=2.1). Accordingly, FL teachers' students rarely read their teachers' contact information (x=2.4), the groups their teachers had joined (x=2.3) and posted on their teachers' wall (x=2.3). The findings further indicated that Turkish FL teachers' students sometimes commented on photos their teachers posted (x=2.7), status updates (x=2.5), videos their teachers posted (x=2.6). According to findings, students sometimes started chats with them (x=2.7) and sent them messages (x=2.9). Similarly, FL teachers declared that their students sometimes commented on photos in which their teachers had been tagged (x=2.7), read their status updates (x= 2.8), their teachers' work info (x=3.0) and education info (x=3.0). Their students also sometimes watched videos they posted (x=3.1), viewed the photos in which their teachers had been tagged (x=3.0), read their teachers' basic info (x=2.8) and personal info (x=2.9). They sometimes read through the posts on their teachers' wall (x=2.9). Last of all, these findings showed that Turkish FL teachers' students sometimes sent them friend invitations (x=3.3), viewed photos their teachers posted (x=3.1) and viewed their teachers' profiles (x=3.3).

Table. 2: Frequencies of the level of Students' Interactions with Their Teachers on Facebook

	Statements On Facebook, my students	Number	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	Sd
Active Behaviors	send me a "poke".	146 100%	82 56.2%	44 30.1%	14 9.6%	6 4.1%	0 0%	1.61	.82
	comment on photos I post.	146 100%	10 6.8%	48 32.9%	61 41.8%	24 16.4%	3 2.1%	2.73	.88
	post on my Wall.	146 100%	36 24.7%	45 30.8%	50 34.2%	11 7.5%	4 2.7%	2.32	1.01
	send me a friend invitation.	146 100%	14 9.6%	28 19.2%	30 20.5%	45 30.8%	29 19.9%	3.32	1.25
	comment on my status updates.	146 100%	24 16.4%	50 34.2%	42 28.8%	23 15.8%	7 4.8%	2.58	1.08
	start a chat with me.	146 100%	19 13.0%	40 27.4%	56 38.4%	18 12.3%	13 8.9%	2.76	1.10
	send me a message.	146 100%	12 8.2%	42 28.8%	45 30.8%	29 19.9%	18 12.3%	2.99	1.14
	comment on videos I post.	146 100%	27 18.5%	42 28.8%	41 28.1%	23 15.8%	13 8.9%	2.67	1.20
	comment on photos in which I have been tagged.	146 100%	26 17.8%	41 28.1%	43 29.5%	21 14.4%	15 10.3%	2.71	1.21
	join the groups I have joined.	146 100%	49 33.6%	47 32.2%	38 26.0%	9 6.2%	3 2.1%	2.10	1.01
Passive Behavior0s	can read through the groups I have joined.	146 100%	39 26.7%	39 26.7%	49 33.6%	12 8.2%	7 4.8%	2.37	1.10
	can view my friends list.	146 100%	55 37.7%	32 21.9%	32 21.9%	10 6.8%	17 11.6%	2.32	1.34
	can view photos I post.	146 100%	15 10.3%	29 19.9%	42 28.8%	37 25.3%	23 15.8%	3.16	2.21
	can read my status updates.	146 100%	19 13.0%	38 26.0%	52 35.6%	21 14.4%	16 11.0%	2.84	1.16
	can read through my work info.	146 100%	15 10.3%	35 24.0%	52 35.6%	23 15.8%	21 14.4%	3.00	1.18
	can read through my education info.	146 100%	13 8.9%	33 22.6%	52 35.6%	27 18.5%	21 14.4%	3.06	1.16
	can watch videos I post.	146 100%	17 11.6%	26 17.8%	49 33.6%	28 19.2%	26 17.8%	3.13	1.24
	can view photos in which I have been tagged.	146 100%	16 11.0%	28 19.2%	52 35.6%	26 17.8%	24 16.4%	3.09	1.21
	can read my personal info (e.g., interests, activities, favorites, etc.).	146 100%	18 12.3%	34 23.3%	47 32.2%	25 17.1%	22 15.1%	2.99	1.22
	can read my basic info (e.g., political views, religious view, relationship status, etc.).	146 100%	29 19.9%	33 22.6%	40 27.4%	24 16.4%	20 13.7%	2.81	1.30
	can view my profile.	146 100%	16 11.0%	23 15.8%	35 24.0%	42 28.8%	30 20.5%	3.32	1.27
	can read through the posts on my Wall.	146 100%	20 13.7%	34 23.3%	47 32.2%	24 16.4%	21 14.4	2.94	1.21
	can read my contact information (e.g., e-mail, phone number, etc.).	146 100%	46 31.5%	31 21.2%	35 24.0%	20 13.7%	14 9.6%	2.48	1.31

4.2. Relationship Between FL Teachers' Interaction Levels and Certain Variables

In this subsection, the effects of subject variables on FL teachers' interaction level are presented. For the purpose, findings on the effects of certain variables such as age, gender, teaching experience, teaching level, graduation degree, Facebook use in years, the frequency of visit, time spent on Facebook, the number of friends, the number of student friends, the device used for Facebook connection and in-service training course regarding computer use were analyzed.

The result of the current study indicated that there was no statistically significant difference on FL teachers' interaction levels with their students on Facebook in accordance with certain variables such as age, teaching experience, having a Facebook account, the number of friends and student friends on Facebook, the frequency of visit, the device used for Facebook connection and attendance of in-service training course regarding computer use. On the other hand, according to the results, there exists a statistically significant difference in certain variables such as gender, school type, graduation degree and time spent on Facebook.

Values in Table 3 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between gender groups regarding two items in the scale. For instance, female teachers seemed more interested in viewing photos in which their students had been tagged (p=.039). Second, from teachers' perspectives, male teachers stated that their students seemed more interested in sending pokes than female teachers' students did (p=.042).

Table 3 Gender effects on FL Teachers' Interactions with Their Students (*t*-test)

Statements On Facebook,	Gender	Number	Mean	Sd	F	Sig.
I view photos in which my	Female	107	2.47	.95	6.98	.039
students have been tagged.	Male	39	2.12	.69		
My students send me a	Female	107	1.53	.76	1.35	.042
"poke".	Male	39	1.84	.93		

Values in Table 4 show that there is a statistically significant difference in school types regarding four items in the scale. To begin with, high school teachers appeared more prone to watching videos their students posted than

elementary, secondary and vocational school teachers did (p= .038). Second, high school teachers seemed more interested in commenting on photos which their students had been tagged than elementary, secondary and vocational school teachers (p=.011). Third, secondary school teachers defined more interested in reading their students' contact information than elementary, high and vocational school teachers (p=.012). Last of all, from teachers' perspective, vocational school teachers' students had a tendency to sending their teachers a friend invitation than elementary, secondary and high school teachers' students did. (p=.038).

Table 4 School type effects on FL Teachers' Interactions with Their Students (ANOVA).

Statement	School Type	Number	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
On Facebook, I …						
I watch videos my students' post.	Elementary	15	1.86	.74		
	Secondary	42	2.28	.99		
	High	71	2.59	.94	2.88	.038
	Vocational	18	2.44	.78		
	Total	146	2.41	.94		
I comment on photos in which my students have been tagged.	Elementary	15	1.40	.63		
	Secondary	42	1.50	.63		
	High	71	1.92	.89	3.83	.011
	Vocational	18	1.61	.60		
	Total	146	1.71	.79		
I read my students' contact information (e.g., e-mail, phone number, etc.).	Elementary	15	1.73	.70		
	Secondary	42	2.19	1.01		
	High	71	2.14	.91	3.78	.012
	Vocational	18	2.00	.84		
	Total	146	2.09	.91		
My students send me a friend invitation.	Elementary	15	3.06	1.03		
	Secondary	42	2.92	1.43		
	High	71	3.06	1.20	2.88	.038
	Vocational	18	3.33	.97		
	Total	146	3.32	1.25		

Only one item shows a statistically significant difference in FL teachers' graduation degree as presented in Table 5. That is, from teachers' point of views

students whose teachers had BA degree seemed more tendency to viewing their teachers' friend list than students whose FL teachers had MA degree (p=.037).

Table 5. Graduation degree effects on FL Teachers' Interactions with Their Students (*t*-test)

Statements	Graduation Degree	Number	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
On Facebook,…						
my students' can view my friends' list.	BA	125	2.42	1.36	3.333	.037
	MA	21	1.76	1.09		

According to results presented in Table 6 indicated that there is a statistically significant difference in time spent on Facebook concerning two items in the scale. First, FL teachers who spent nearly one hour on Facebook appeared more prone to sending their students a poke than teachers who spent less than one hour and more than one hour (p=.003). Correspondingly, from teachers perspectives, students whose FL teachers spent nearly one hour on Facebook seemed more interested in commenting on videos their teacher posted than students whose teachers spent less than one hour and more than one hour (p=.034).

Table 6. Time spent on Facebook effects on FL Teachers' Interactions with Their Students (ANOVA)

Statement	Time spent on Facebook	Number	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
On Facebook, …						
I send my students a poke.	Less than one hour	107	1.14	.42		
	Nearly one hour	24	1.50	.78	5.91	.003
	More than one hour	15	1.06	.25		
	Total	146	1.19	.50		
My students comment on videos I post.	Less than one hour	107	2.61	1.19		
	Nearly one hour	24	3.20	1.02	3.46	.034
	More than one hour	15	2.26	1.33		
	Total	146	2.67	1.20		

5. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section consists of four sub-sections that present the findings of the study in accordance with the research questions. First, conclusions reached in the study are presented. Second, the results of the study obtained from the research are compared with the ones reached in prior research. Third, practical recommendations for learners, teachers, educators, and material or curriculum developers are presented. Last of all, recommendations for further research is provided.

5.1. Conclusions

According to findings of the study that aims to explore FL teachers' interaction levels with their students on Facebook, seven conclusions were reached as listed below:

1. The first conclusion is that Turkish FL teachers mainly prefer passive behaviors while interacting with their students on Facebook. These passive behaviors consist of reading through the groups students have joined, the posts on student's wall, status updates and basic, personal, work, education and contact information, viewing profiles, friend list, and photos and watching videos students have posted. In other words, they feel less comfortable while performing active behaviors such as sending a poke, messages and friend invitation, posting on the wall, joining the groups, starting chats or commenting on photos, status updates, videos, and photos.

2. The second conclusion is that FL teachers perceive that their students mostly prefer passive behaviors. These passive behaviors consist of reading through the groups their teachers have joined, the posts on teachers' wall, status updates and work, education, personal, basic and contact information, viewing profiles, friend list and photos, watch videos their teachers have posted.

3. The third conclusion is that the gender is a considerable variable regarding FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook. Female teachers feel more acceptable when they viewed the photos in which their students had

been tagged. When FL teachers' perceptions were considered, it can be stated that male teachers' students feel more appropriate to send them a poke.

4. The fourth conclusion is that the graduation degree is a considerable variable regarding FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook. In other words, FL teachers who have BA have a more positive perception on viewing their friends' list by their students.

5. The fifth conclusion is that time spent by FL teachers on Facebook is a considerable variable regarding FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook. That is, FL teachers who spent nearly one hour on Facebook felt more comfortable sending their student pokes. Moreover, FL teachers who spent nearly one hour on Facebook perceive that their students find more appropriate to comment on videos which their teachers posted.

6. The sixth conclusion is that school type is a considerable variable regarding FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook. That is, high school FL teachers find appropriate to watch videos which their students have posted. Furthermore, high school FL teachers felt more suitable to comment on photos in which their students had been tagged. Secondary school FL teachers also find more convenient to read their students' contact information. On the other hand, FL teachers perceive that vocational school FL teachers' students felt more comfortable to send them a friend invitation.

7. The last conclusion is that variables such as age, teaching experience, having a Facebook account, the number of friends and student friends on Facebook, the frequency of visit, the device used for Facebook connection and attendance of in-service training course regarding computer usage are not considerable variables that show the difference in terms of the level of FL teachers' interactions with their students on Facebook.

5.2. Implications

According to the findings obtained from the current study, several pedagogical implications can be drawn. First of all, this study provides evince for interaction between FL teachers and their students on Facebook. That is, Facebook provides interaction opportunities for FL teachers and their students. These results are parallel to the findings of similar studies which indicate the opportunities for

interaction on Facebook (Aydın 2012; 2014a, Berg et al., 2007; Sturgeon & Walker, 2009; Teclehaimanot & Hickman, 2011) and its strength to maintain relations (Kujath, 2011). On the other hand, this conclusion contradicts the findings of Lasse Ellefsen (2016) that asserted that lecturers seemed to split in opinion whether to use Facebook as a means for interaction between students and lecturers. Second, FL teachers mainly prefer passive behaviors such as reading through the groups which students have joined, the posts on student's wall, status updates and basic, personal, work, education and contact information, viewing profiles, friend list, and photos and watching videos students have posted and they avoid active behaviors. FL teachers perceive that their students also prefer passive behaviors. Similar findings are obtained by Teclehaimanot and Hickman (2011) whose study concluded that students find passive behaviors more appropriate than active behaviors while interacting with their teachers on Facebook. Additionally, in Turkish FL context, Aydın (2014a) also states that Turkish FL students prefer passive behaviors while interacting with their teachers on Facebook. That is, passive behaviors such as reading their teachers' status updates and basic, personal, work and education information, reading through the groups their teachers joined, the posts on their teachers' walls, viewing their teachers' profiles and photos and watching videos posted by teachers are more acceptable. The findings also match the findings obtained by Pempek et al. (2009) whose study also suggested that students prefer observing the content instead of posting any content on Facebook. Moreover, the findings by Mazer et al. (2007) point the negative association between the teachers' interaction with their students on Facebook and their credibility. That is, students' perception of their teachers about being consistent encourages them to interact on Facebook and the passive behaviors such as accessing teachers' page encourages them to interact.

According to results, regarding gender difference between male and female FL teachers and their perception of students, it can be stated that the study has contradictory results. To begin with, some studies concluded that male students find student–teacher interactions on Facebook more appropriate than females (Hewitt & Forte, 2006; Mazman & Usluel, 2011; Teclehaimanot & Hickman, 2011). In terms of gender difference, the findings of this study indicate that male FL teachers have the perception that their students feel more comfortable to send them a poke which is an active behavior. To add, Wang et al. (2015) conclude that the credibility of the

teacher is highly related to gender and emotional disclose of female teachers are more acceptable. Moreover, the conclusion reached by Aydın (2014a) which shows that female learners feel more comfortable about reading their teachers' status updates, viewing their teachers' profiles, and joining the groups their teachers joined is similar to this study because according to the findings, female teachers feel more acceptable when they view the photos in which their students are tagged.

The results of the present study suggest that school type, graduation degree and time spent on Facebook constitute significant variables and match the findings of prior research. For instance; Teclehaimanot and Hickman (2011), Roblyer et al. (2010) and Aydın (2014a) noted that higher education students have positive perceptions of interaction on Facebook. In this study, findings indicate that high school FL teachers find it appropriate for watching videos which their students have posted, commenting on photos in which their students had been tagged. That is, these findings are parallel to these studies in terms of school type. On the other hand, secondary school FL teachers have a more positive perception on reading their students' contact information. Moreover, FL teachers working at vocational school have the perception that their students felt more comfortable to send them a friend invitation. It can also be noted that FL teachers who have BA have more positive perceptions on viewing their friends' list by their students. This result contradicts the result of Teclehaimanot & Hickman' s (2011) findings that suggest no difference between graduate and undergraduate and the result of Aydın 's (2014a) findings which suggests juniors and seniors feel more comfortable sending messages to their teachers and reading their teachers' contact information. Additionally, FL teachers who spent nearly one hour on Facebook felt more comfortable sending their students a poke and FL teachers who spent nearly one hour on Facebook have the perception that their students find more appropriate to comment on videos which their teachers posted. As it is found by Pempek et al., and Ellison et al. (2007) members use Facebook approximately 30 minutes per day as a daily routine however they feel more comfortable while observing or maintaining bridges. In terms of the time spent on Facebook, the results of Pempek et al. (2009) and Ellison et al. (2007) show differences with this current study. On the other hand, the results of this current study show similarities to the findings of Debatin et al. (2009) which suggest that they spend up to an hour a day.

In conclusion, Facebook as an interaction environment for FL teachers and their students can be used an alternative environment for interaction for Facebook, which is open for innovations. Facebook is also interesting and a useful tool for interaction. However, there have been several factors affecting Facebook interaction and using it as a means of environment for interaction has some superiority to the traditional face to face interaction when increasing interest of people in using technology and SNS tools, especially Facebook, are considered. In other words, FL teachers could utilize interaction on Facebook in addition to traditional methods and enhance the language learning process. The contradiction between findings of this research and the results of other studies can be interpreted in connection with some factors such as culture, age, gender etc. Finally, this study has contributions to the related literature in terms of FL teachers' interaction with their students on Facebook and effects of certain variables such as gender, age, teaching experience, teaching level, graduation level, Facebook use in years, the frequency of visit, time spent on Facebook, the number of friends, the number of student friends, the device used for Facebook connection and in-service training course regarding computer use. Moreover, it also contributes to the related literature in Turkish FL context because the number of research on the interaction level of FL teachers with their students and the effects of certain variables is insufficient.

5.3. Practical Recommendations

In the lights of findings of the present study, some practical recommendations are presented below. First of all, FL teachers should be aware of creating positive interaction opportunities with their students on Facebook. For instance, FL teachers who utilize only a traditional face to face interaction need revising this. In other words, real life interaction between teachers and students are of course crucial; however, teachers should be aware of the recent innovations and ways to attract learners' attention. Additionally, traditional teachers' role can be transferred from controller to participant. In that way, FL teachers' interaction with their students and their perception of students may change. Second, interaction on Facebook expands the time spent with students so teachers share extra time with their students while interacting on Facebook that may improve the language acquisition process and the relationship between the teachers and their students. On the other hand, adopting

dominant behaviors as expected from teachers in Turkish culture may prevent effective teacher-learner interaction as general expectations of passive student behaviors become a hindrance as well. Moreover, FL teachers can encourage their students to become a part of interaction on Facebook instead of avoiding these opportunities because Facebook is just one of the effective platforms for interaction. In that way, interaction between teachers and students can increase and better understanding opportunities become quite possible. Third, interaction on Facebook provides both teachers and students to improve their living and learning experiences and creates opportunities for both making necessary modifications and improvements. Moreover, effective interaction between teachers and students may improve classroom environment and enhances involvement and academic success. To contribute students' learning process, interaction on Facebook supports social and cultural learning in a constructivist environment.

Additional recommendations to other factors in the educational process are listed as well. First, with recent changes in curricula, technological improvements take parts in language learning process, so some adaptations to use Facebook effectively can be organized. Furthermore, course designers and curriculum developers should enhance the importance of teacher-student interaction on Facebook and support this interaction with the relevant content. Other teaching materials such as course and text books can be adapted to improve the online teacher-student interaction.

To sum up, given FL teachers' passive behaviors while interacting with their students and their perception of their students, FL teachers should increase their interaction with their students. That is, teachers need to spend more time to interact with their students since this teacher-student interaction enhances both personal improvement and academic achievement. Additionally, interaction on Facebook enhances both learners and teachers awareness to use Facebook as a language learning environment. With the help of relevant content, materials and curriculum, interaction on Facebook improves teacher-student interaction.

5.4. Recommendations for Further Research

In the lights of current findings, further research should focus on the level of interaction of other stakeholders of the learning process on Facebook. In other words,

these results reflect the FL teachers' perspective about interaction on Facebook and their perception about their students. Hence, more research is necessary to define the perceptions of other stakeholders because different perspectives would be worth to search. These different perspectives may include other actors of educational process such as families, managers or curriculum developers. Moreover, the effects of different variables such as cultural, social and economical differences should be focused since participants' perspectives about interaction on Facebook may relate to these factors. That is, the effects of cultural differences such as ethnicity, religion, social norms and economical background on interaction on Facebook should be carried out.

REFERENCES

Abrami, P. C., Chambers, B., Poulsen, C., De Simone, C., d'Apollonia, S. & Howden, J. (1995). *Classroom connections: Understanding and using cooperative learning.* Toronto: Harcourt-Brace.

Abrami, P. C., Bernard, R. M., Bures, E.M. Borokhovski, E. & Tamim, R. M. (2011). Interaction in distance education and online learning: using evidence and theory to improve practice. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 23*(2-3), 82-105.

Abrams, Z. I. (2006). From theory to practice: Intracultural CMC in the L2 classroom. In L. Ducate, & N. Arnold (Eds.), *Calling on CALL: From theory and research to new directions in foreign language teaching* (pp. 181−210). San Marcos, TX: CALICO Press.

Acquisti, A. & Gross, R. (2006). Imagined communities: Awareness, information sharing, and privacy on the Facebook. In *International workshop on privacy enhancing Technologies* (pp. 36-58). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Agichtein, E., Castillo, C., Donato, D., Gionis, A. & Mishne, G. (2008). Finding high-quality content in social media. *Proceedings of the 2008 international conference on web search and data mining* (pp. 183-194). ACM.

Akyıldız, M., Argan, M. (2012). Using online social networking: Students' purposes of Facebook usage at the university of Turkey. *Journal of Technology Research*, *3*(1), 1-11.

Alagözlü, N. (2007). Critical thinking and voice in EFL writing. *Asian EFL Journal, 9*(3), 118-136.

Albayrak, D. (2012). Social networking sites utilization for teaching and learning. Doctoral Dissertation, METU, Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved on December 10, 2015 from http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12614122/index.pdf

Alegria de la Colina, A. & M. de P. Garcia Mayo (2009). Oral interaction in task-based EFL learning: The use of the L1 as a cognitive tool. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *47*(3), 325–345.

Alexander, B. (2006). Web 2.0: A new wave of innovation for teaching and learning. *Educause Review, 41*(2), 33–44.

Alias, A. A., Ab Manan, N. A., Yusof, J. & Pandian, A. (2012). The use of Facebook as language learning strategy (LLS) training tool on college students' LLS use and academic writing performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *67*(2012), 36-48.

Allwright, R. L. (1990). What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal 36*(1), 5-18.

Alm, A. (2015). Facebook for informal language learning: Perspectives from tertiary language students. *The EUROCALL Review, 23*(2), 3-19.

Alptekin, C. (1993). Target-language culture in EFL materials. *ELT Journal*, *47*(2), 136-143.

Anderson, J. R. (1982). Acquisition of cognitive skill. *Psychological Review*, *89*(4), 369-406.

Anderson, T. (2003). Getting the mix right again: An updated and theoretical rationale for interaction. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *4*(2). Retrieved on March 22, 2015 from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/viewArticle/149/230

Anderson, T. (2004). Toward a theory of online learning. In T. Anderson & F. Elloumi (Eds.), *Theory and Practice of Online Learning* (pp. 33-60) Canada: Athabasca University.

Anderson, T. & Elloumi, F. (2004). *Theory and practice of online learning.* Athabasca: Athabasca University.

Antoci, A., Sabatini, F. & Sodini, M. (2012). See you on Facebook! A framework for analyzing the role of computer-mediated interaction in the evolution of social capital. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, *41*(2012), 541–547.

Archilla, Y. M. R. (2014). Interaction in a blended environment for English language learning. *GIST Education and Learning Research. 9(2),* 142-156.

Arnold, J. (1999). *Affect in Language Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arnold, N. & Paulus, T. (2010). Using a social networking site for experiential learning: Appropriating, lurking, modeling and community building. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *13*(4), 188-196.

Arnold, N., Ducate, L. & Kost, C. (2009). Collaborative writing in wikis: Insights from culture projects in intermediate German classes. *Internet and Higher Education, 13*(4) 188–196.

Asur, S. & Huberman, B. A. (2010). Predicting the future with social media. *The Proceedings of the Web Intelligence and Intelligent Agent Technology Conference* (pp. 492-499). IEEE.

Asterhan, C. S. C. & Rosenberg, H. (2015). The promise, reality and dilemmas of secondary school teacher-student interactions in Facebook: The teacher perspective. *Computers and Education*, *85*(2015), 134–148.

Aydın, S. (2007). Attitudes of EFL learners towards the Internet. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *6*(3), 18-26.

Aydın, S. (2009). Test anxiety among foreign language learners: A review of literature. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *5*(1), 127-135.

Aydın, S. (2011). Internet anxiety among foreign language learners. *TechTrends*, *55*(2), 46-54.

Aydın, S. (2012). A review of research on Facebook as an educational environment. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *60*(6), 1093–1106.

Aydın, S. (2013). Second Life as a Foreign Language Learning Environment: A Review of Research. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *14*(1), 53-63.

Aydın, S. (2014a). Foreign language learners' interactions with their teachers on Facebook. *System, 42*, 155.

Aydın, S. (2014b). EFL Writers' attitudes and perceptions toward F-portfolio use. *TechTrends*, *58*(2), 59-77.

Baird, D. E. & Fischer, M. (2005). Neomillennial user experience design strategies: Utilizing social networking media to support "always on" learning styles. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *34*(1), 5-32.

Balçıkanlı, C. (2015). Prospective English language teachers' experiences in Facebook: Adoption, use and educational use in Turkish context. *IJEDICT, 11*(3), 82-99.

Baltacı- Goktalay, S. (2015). The impact of Facebook in teaching practicum: Teacher trainees perspectives. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *10*(17), 2489-2500.

Bani-Hani, N. A., Al-Sobh, M. A. & Abu-Melhim, A. R. H. (2014). Utilizing Facebook groups in teaching writing: Jordanian EFL students' perceptions and attitudes. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *4*(5), 27-34.

Baran, B. (2010). Facebook as a formal instructional environment. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *41(*6), 146-149.

Barsky, E. (2006). Introducing Web 2.0: Rss trends for health librarians. *JCHLA. 27*(1), 7–8.

Barsky, E & Purdon, M. (2006). Introducing Web 2.0: Social networking and social bookmarking for health librarians. *JCHLA, 27*(3), 65–67.

Basaran, B. Ç. (2013). Attitudes of EFL teachers and learners towards CALL in Turkey. *Proceeding of ICT for language learning* (pp. 143-149). Libreriauniversitaria. it Edizioni.

Bateman, D. & Willems, J. (2012). *Facing off: Facebook and higher education, in Misbehavior online in higher education*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Beck, C. M. (1974). *Educational philosophy and theory: An introduction*. Boston: Little Brown.

Bell, P. & Davis, E..A. (2000). Designing Mildred: Scaffolding Students' Reflection and Argumentation Using a Cognitive Software Guide. In B. Fishman & S. O'Connor-Divelbiss (Eds.), *Fourth International Conference of the Learning Sciences* (pp. 142-149). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bennett, S., Bishop, A., Dalgarno, B., Waycott, J. & Kennedy, G. (2012). Implementing Web 2.0 technologies in higher education: A collective case study. *Computers & Education*, *59*(2), 524-534.

Belz, J. A. (2007). The role of computer mediation in the instruction and development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *27*(2007), 45-75.

Bisno, H. (1952*). The philosophy of social work.* Washington DC: Public Affairs Press.

Blattner, G. & Fiori, M. (2009). Facebook in the language classroom: Promises and possibilities. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, *6*(1), 17-28.

Bloom, P. & Keil, F. C. (2001). Thinking through language. *Mind & Language*, *16*(4), 351-367.

Blyth, C. (2010). Instrumental motivation. Retrieved on January 5, 2016 from http://coerll.utexas.edu/methods/modules/learners/02/instrumental.php

Boon, S & Sinclair, C (2009). A world that I don't inhabit: Disquiet and identity in second life and Facebook. *Educational Media International, 46*(2), 99-110.

Borau, K., Ullrich, C., Feng, J. & Shen, R. (2009). Microblogging for language learning: Using twitter to train communicative and cultural competence. *International Conference on Web-based Learning* (pp. 78-87). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Boulos, M. N. K. & Wheeler, S. (2007). The emerging web 2.0 social software: An enabling suite of sociable technologies in health and health care education. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, *24*(1), 2-23.

Boulos, M., Maramba, I. & Wheeler, S. (2006). Wikis, blogs and podcasts: A new generation of web-based tools for virtual collaborative clinical practice and education. *BMC Medical Education*, *6*(1), 41. Retrieved on December 12, 2015 from http://bmcmededuc.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6920-6-41.

Boyd, D. M & Ellison, N. B (2008). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 13*(38), 210-230.

Braidi, S. (2002). Reexamining the role of recasts in native-speaker / nonnative-speaker interactions. *Language Learning*, *52*(1), 1–42.

Brown, H. (1994). *Teaching by principles.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brown, H. (2008). Role models for language identity: A video project. The *Proceedings of JALT* (pp. 577-586). Tokyo:JALT

Bruner, J. S. (1983). *Children's talk: Learning to use language.* New York: Norton.

Bruning, K. (2005). The role of critical thinking in the online learning environment. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, *2*(5), 21-31.

Bryant, E. M. & Marmo, J. (2012). The rules of Facebook friendship: A two-stage examination of interaction rules in close, casual, and acquaintance friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *29*(8), 1013-1035.

Burhanna, K. J., Seeholzer, J. & Salem, J. (2009). No natives here: A focus group study of student perceptions of Web 2.0 and the academic library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 35*(6), 523-532.

Burke, T. J & Ruppel, E. K. (2015). Facebook self-presentational motives: Daily effects on social anxiety and interaction success. *Communication Studies*, *66*(2), 204-217.

Burnett, K., Bonnici, L. J., Miksa, S. D. & Kim, J. (2007). Frequency, intensity and topicality in online learning: An exploration of the interaction dimensions that contribute to student satisfaction in online learning. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, *21*(35), 71-82.

Burns, N. & Grove, S. K. (2005). *Pflegeforschung verstehen und anwenden.* Elsevier, Urban & FischerVerlag.

Butler, K. (2010). Tweeting your own horn. *District Administration*, *46*(2), 41–44.

Buus, L. (2012). Scaffolding teachers integrate social media into a problem-based learning approach. *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 10*(1), 13-22.

Buyukkantarcioglu, N. (2004). A sociolinguistic analysis of the present dimensions of English as a foreign language in Turkey. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *165*, 33-58.

Carrol, J. B. (1993). *Human cognitive abilities: a survey of factor –analytic studies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cassidy, J. (2006). Me media: How hanging out on the Internet became big business. *The New Yorker*, *82*(13), 50.

Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (1953). *Group dynamics: Research and theory*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Celik, S. (2011). Characteristics and competencies for teacher educators: Addressing the need for improved professional standards in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*(4), 72-87.

Celik, S. & Kasapoğlu, H. (2014). Implementing the recent curricular changes to English language instruction in Turkey: opinions and concerns of elementary school administrators. *South African Journal of Education*, *34*(2), 01-14.

Celik, S. & Toptaş, V. (2010). Vocabulary learning strategy use of Turkish EFL learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *3*, 62-71.

Celik, S., Arikan, A. & Caner, M. (2013). In the eyes of Turkish EFL learners: What makes an effective foreign language teacher? *Porta Linguarum: Revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*, 20, 287-297.

Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory and practice in cultural context* (pp. 39-64). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chang, W. J. (2014). Group Communication and Interaction in Project-based Learning: The Use of Facebook in a Taiwanese EFL Context. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *1*(1), 108-130.

Chapelle, C. A. (2003). *English Language Learning and Technology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Charlton, T., Devlin, M. & Drummond, S. (2009). Using Facebook to improve communication in undergraduate software development teams. *Computer science Education. 19* (4), 273-292.

Chartrand, T. L. & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: The perception–behavior link and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*(6), 893.

Chen, H. (2012). Social networking, socialization, and second language writers: The development of new identities and literacies. Doctoral Dissertation, Arizona: The University of Arizona. Retrieved on June 17, 2016 from http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/232494

Chen, Y. C. (2015). Linking learning styles and learning on mobile Facebook. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *16*(2). 94-114.

Chen W & Lee K. H. (2013). Sharing, liking, commenting, and distressed? The pathway between Facebook interaction and psychological distress. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, & Social Networking, 16* (10), 728–734.

Chickering, A. W. & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, *39*(7), 3–6.

Churcher, K., Downs, E. & Tewksbury, D. (2014). Friending" Vygotsky: A Social Constructivist Pedagogy of Knowledge Building through Classroom Social Media Use. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, *14*(1), 33-50.

Coklar, A. N. (2012). Evaluations of students on Facebook as an educational environment. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 3*(2), 42-53.

Collis, B. & Remmers, E. (1997). The World Wide Web in education: Issues related to cross-cultural communication and interaction, in: B. H. KHAN (Ed.*) Web-Based Instruction* (pp. 85-92). Englewood Cliffs: NJ, Educational Technology

Cook-Sather, A. (2010). Students as learners and teachers: Taking responsibility, transforming education, and redefining accountability. *Curriculum Inquiry, 40*(4)*,* 555-575.

Crandall, J. (1999). Cooperative language learning and affective factors. In Arnold, J (Eds.), *Affect in Language Learning* (pp. 226-245). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummuins, J. (1997). Cultural and linguistic diversity in education: A mainstream issue? *Educational Review, 49(2),* 105-114.

Cvijikj, I. P., Spiegler, E. D. & Michahelles, F. (2011). The effect of post type, category and posting day on user interaction level on Facebook. *The proceedings of Third International Conference on Social Computing* (pp. 810-813). IEEE.

Dabbagh, N. & Kitsantas, A. (2011). Personal learning environments, social media, and self-regulated learning: A natural formula for connecting formal and informal learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *15*(1), 3-8.

Dafoulas, G. A. & Shokri, A. (2014). Delivery of E-Learning through social learning networks. International Association for Development of the Information Society. *Proceedings of the International Conference e-Learning* (pp. 222-229). Lisbon: Portugal.

Dam, L. (1995). *Learner Autonomy 3: From Theory to Classroom Practice*. Dublin: Authentik.

Daniel, J. & Marquis, C. (1988). Interaction and independence: Getting the mix right. D. Sewart, D. Keegan, & B.Holmberg (Eds.), *Distance education: International perspectives* (pp. 339–359). London: Routledge.

Davydov, V. (1995). The influence of L. S. Vygotsky on education theory, research, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 24*(1), 12–21.

Dawson, S. (2008). A study of the relationship between student social networks and sense of community. *Educational Technology & Society, 11(3)*, 224-238.

Debatin, B., Lovejoy, J. P., Horn, A. K & Hughes, B. N. (2009). Facebook and online privacy: Attitudes, behaviors, and unintended consequences. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *15*(1), 83–108.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The" what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227-268.

Dede, C. (1996). Emerging technologies and distributed learning. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 10(2),* 4-36.

DePew, K. E. (2011). Social media at academia's periphery: Studying multilingual developmental writers' Facebook composing strategies. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, *11*(1), 54-75.

Dewey, J. & Bentley, A. F. (1946). Interaction and transaction. *The Journal of philosophy. 43(19),* 505-517.

Dixon, G. A. (2011). *Facebook, writing and language learner variables at a large metropolitan community College.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas, Kansas, the USA.

Dogancay-Aktuna, S. & Kızıltepe, Z. (2005). English in Turkey. *World Englishes*, *24*(2), 263-265.

Dohn, N. B. (2009). Web 2.0: Inherent tensions and evident challenges for education. *Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, *4*(3), 343–363.

Donmuş, V. (2010). The use of social networks in educational computer-game based foreign language learning. *Proceedings of Ninth Social and Behavioral Sciences* (pp 1497–1503). Cairo; Egypt.

Downes, S. (2007). Places to go: Facebook. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education.* *4*(1), 1-7.

Driscoll, M. P. (2005). *Psychology of learning for instruction.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Ducata, L. & Lomicka, L. (2008). Adventures in the blogosphere: From blog readers to blog writers. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 21*(1), 9–28.

Duffy, T. M & Jonassen, D. H. (1992). *Constructivism and the Technology of Instruction: A Conversation.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dweyer, C., Hiltz, S. R. & Passerini K. (2007). Trust and privacy concern within social networking sites: A comparison of Facebook and MySpace. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Americas Conference on Information Systems* (pp. 339-350). Keystone: Colorado.

Ebner, M., Lienhardt, C., Rohs, M. & Meyer, I. (2010). Microblogs in higher education A change to facilitate informal and process-oriented learning? *Computers in Education, 55*(1), 92–100.

Ellis, R. (1991). The interaction hypothesis: A critical evaluation. In E. Sadtono (Eds.), *Language acquisition in the second/foreign language classroom* (Anthology Series 28, pp. 179–211). Singapore: SEMEO, Regional Language Centre.

Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning a second language through interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Elola, I. & Oskoz, A. (2010). Collaborative writing: Fostering foreign language and writing conventions development. *Language Learning & Technology*, *14*(3), 51-71.

Ellison, N. B. (2008). Introduction: Reshaping campus communication and community through social network sites. In G. Salaway, J. B. Caruso, & M. R. Nelson (Eds*.), The ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology* (pp. 19-32). Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research.

Ellison, N. B, Steinfield, C. & Lampe, C. (2007). The Benefits of Facebook ''Friends'' social capital and college students' use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 12* (4), 1143–1168.

Engeström, Y., Miettinen, R. & Punamaki, R. L. (1999). *Perspectives on Activity Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erel, S. & Bulut, D. (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: A comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *22*(1), 397-415.

Eroğlu, Y. (2016). Interrelationship between attachment styles and Facebook addiction. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4*(1), 150-160.

Espinosa, L. F. (2015). The Use of Facebook for educational purposes in EFL classrooms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(11), 2206-2211.

Finkel, E. L., Campbell, W. K., Brunell, A. B., Dalton, A. N., Scarbeck, S. J., & Chartrand, T. L. (2006). High-maintanence interaction: Inefficient social coordination impairs self regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*(3), 456-475.

Fischer, E. & Reuber, A. R. (2011). Social interaction via new social media: (How) can interactions on Twitter affect effectual thinking and behavior? *Journal of Business Venturing, 26*(1), 1–18.

Foster, P. & Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics, 26(3),* 402–430.

Fodeman, D. & Monroe, M. (2009). The impact of Facebook on our students. *Teacher Librarian*, *36*(5), 36.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: SEABURY Press.

Friedlander, W. A. (1958). *Concept and methods of social work.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Fujii, A. & A. Mackey (2009). Interactional feedback in learner–learner interactions in a task based EFL classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*(3), 267– 301.

Furman, N., Goldberg, D. & Lusin, N. (2006). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education*. NY: Modern Language Association .

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning, 43*(2), 157–194.

Gass, S. & Mackey, A. (2002). Frequency effects and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24(2),* 249–260.

Gass, S. & Varonis, E.M (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *16*(3), 283-302.

Geser, G. (2007). Open Educational Practices and Resources. *OLCOS Roadmap, 4(*1), 1-9

Gibbons, P. (2003). Meditating language learning: Teacher interactions with ESL students in a content-based classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(2), 247-273.

Glud, L. N., Buus, L., Ryberg, T., Georgsen, M. & Davidsen, J. (2010). Contributing to a learning methodology for Web 2.0 learning – Identifying central tensions in educational use of web 2.0 technologies. In L. Dirckinck-Holmfeld, V. Hodgson, C. Jones, M. de Laat, D. McConnell, & T. Ryberg (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Networked Learning* (pp. 934-942). Denmark: Aalborg.

Gockov, G., Stojanović, A. & Gojkov-Rajić, A. (2014). Meta- components of intellectual autonomy as higher education teaching quality indicators. *Interdisciplinary Management Research*, *10* (2014), 657-669.

Godwin-Jones, R. (2008). Web-writing 2.0: Enabling, documenting, and assessing writing online. *Language Learning & Technology, 12*(2), 7–13.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face interaction*. NY: Garden City.

Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order: American sociological association. *American Sociological Review, 48(1).*1-17.

Greenhow, C. (2009). Tapping the wealth of social networks for professional development. *Learning & Leading with Technology*, *36*(8), 10-11.

Greenwell, S, & Kraemer, B. (2006). Internet reviews: Social networking software: Facebook and MySpace. *Kentucky Libraries, 70*(4), 12-16.

Grobstein, P. (1989). Diversity and deviance: A biological perspective. Retrieved on October 24, 2015 from http://serendip.brynmawr.edu/gen_beh/diversity.html

Grosseck, G. (2009). To use or not to use web 2.0 in higher education? *Proceedings of the Seventh International Symposium on English Teaching Social and Behavioral Sciences* (pp.478-482). Timisoara: Romania

Gunawardena, C. N. (1995). Social presence theory and implications for interaction and collaborative learning in computer conferences. *International Jl. Of Educational Telecommunications, 1*(2/3), 147-166.

Gungor, F. & Yayli, D. (2012). Self-efficacy and anxiety perceptions of pre-service EFL teachers. *Approaches and Methods in Second and Foreign Language Teaching (pp. 227-236). Sarajevo: IBU Publications.*

Haberman, M. (1996). The pedagogy of poverty versus good teaching. In W. Ayers & P.Ford (eds.), *City kids, city teachers: Reports from the front row* (pp. 118-130). New York: The New Press.

Halpern, D. F. (2013). *Sex differences in cognitive abilities.* New York, USA: Psychology Press.

Harris, A. & Rea, A. (2009). Web 2.0 and virtual world technologies: A growing impact on IS education. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 20*(2), 137-144.

Hatch, E. (1978). Acquisition of syntax in a second language. In J. Richards (Ed.), *Understanding second and foreign language learning* (pp. 34-70). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Haverback, H. R. (2009). Facebook: Uncharted territory in a reading education classroom. *Reading Today*, *27*(2), 34-44.

Heath, S. B. (1986). *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students.* California: California State Department of Education.

Hegelheimer, V. & Chapelle, C. (2000). Methodological issues in research on learner-computer interactions in CALL. *Language Learning & Technology, 4*(1), 41-59. Retrieved on January 10, 2016, from http://llt.msu.edu/vol4num1/hegchap/

Heiberger, G. & Harper, R. (2008). Have you Facebooked astin lately? Using technology to increase student involvement. In R. Junco & D. M. Timm (Eds.), *Using emerging technologies to enhance student engagement*. New directions for student services, issue 124 (pp. 19–35). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Heins, B., Duensing, A. , Stickler, U. & Batstone, C. (2007). Spoken interaction in online and face-to-face language tutorials, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *20*(3), 279-295.

Helliwell, J. F. & Putnam, R. D. (2004). The social context of well-being. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, *359*(1449), 1435–1446.

Herron, C., Dubreil, S., Cole, S. P. & Corrie, C. (2000). Using instructional video to teach culture to beginning foreign language students. *CALICO Journal*, *17*(3), 395-429.

Higgs, T. V (1985). The input hypothesis: An inside look. *Foreign Language Annals*, *18*(3), 197-203

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Pergamon.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B. & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 70* (2), 125–132

Huang, H. M. (2002). Toward constructivism for adult learners in online learning environment. *British Journal of Educational technology, 33(1), 27-37.*

Huang, J. J., Yang, S. J., Huang, Y. M. & Hsiao, I. Y. (2010). Social learning networks: Build mobile learning networks based on collaborative services. *Educational Technology & Society*, *13*(3), 78-92.

Hungler, B.P. & Polit D.F. (1999). *Nursing Research Principles and Method.* New York: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Irwin, C., Ball, L., Desbrow, B. & Leveritt, M. (2012). Students' perceptions of using Facebook as an interactive learning resource at university. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *28*(7), 1221-1232.

Jiang-Yuan, Z. & Wei, G. (2012). Who is controlling the interaction? The effect of the nonverbal mirroring on teacher student rapport. *US-China Education Review, 7(*2012), 662-669.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. & Holubec, E. J. (1986). *Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom.* Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Roger T. J. & Karl A. S. (1991). Cooperative learning increasing college faculty instructional productivity. *ERIC, ED* 343465.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. & Smith, K. (1998). Cooperative learning returns to college: What evidence is there that it works? *Change*, *30*(4), 27-35.

Joinson, A.N. (2008). Looking at, looking up or keeping up with people? Motives and uses of Facebook. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1027-1036). ACM.

Jonassen, D. (1991). Evaluating constructivistic learning. *Educational Technology, 31*(10), 28-33.

Kabilan, M. K., Ahmad, N. & Abidin, M. J. Z. (2010). Facebook: An online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education? *The Internet and Higher Education, 13*(4), 179–187.

Kearsley, G. (1995). The nature and value of interaction in distance learning. (ACSDE Research Monograph No. 12). State College, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University, American Center for the Study of Distance Education.

Kearsley, G. (2000). Online education: Learning and teaching in cyberspace. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Keegan, D. (1996). *Foundations of Distance Education*. London: Routledge.

Kern, R. G. (1995). Restructuring classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects on quantity and characteristics of language production. *The Modern Language Journal,* 79(4), 457-476.

Khan, R. K. & Ivy, T. I. (2014). Using Facebook for large writing classrooms: A possibility for Bangladesh. *International Journal of Multifaceted and Multilingual Studies*, *1*(1), 1-19.

Kim, Y. (2009). The effects of task complexity on learner–learner interaction. *System*, *37*(2), 254-268.

Kinik, B. (2014). Teachers' perceptions towards technology use and integration to teach English. *Proceedings of ICT for Language Learning* (pp. 456-460), Padova: Italy.

Kirkgoz, Y. (2007). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations. *RELC journal*, *38*(2), 216-228.

Kizildag, A. (2009). Teaching English in Turkey: Dialogues with teachers about the challenges in public primary schools. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *1*(3), 188-201.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *Modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy.* Prentice Hall Regents, Englewood Cliffs.

Kohonen, V. (1992). Experiential language learning: Second language learning as cooperative learner education. In D. Nunan (ed.) *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 14–39). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kolb, D. A., Boyatzis, R. E. & Mainemelis, C. (2000). Experiential learning theory: Previous research and new directions. In R.J. Sternberg & L.F. Zhang (Eds), *Perspectives on cognitive, learning and thinking styles* (pp. 227–247). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Komarraju, M., Karau, S.J., Schemeck, R.R. & Avdic, A. (2011). The big five personality traits, learning styles, and academic achievement. *Personality and Individual Differences 51* (2011) 472–477.

Kop, R. (2011). The challenges to connectivist learning on open online networks: Learning experiences during a massive open online course. *The International Review of Research In Open And Distributed Learning*, *12*(3), 19-38.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. USA: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press

Krashen, S (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.

Krashen, S. D. (2013). *Second Language Acquisition: Theory, Application, and Some Conjectures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krause, K. (2005). The changing student experience: Who's driving it and where is it going. *Proceedings of Good Practice in Practice* (pp. 5-7). Wagga Wagga: Australia.

Kreijns, K., Kirschner, P. A. & Jochems, W. (2003). Identifying the pitfalls for social interaction in computer-supported collaborative learning environments: A review of the research. *Computers in Human Behavior, 19*(2013), 335-353.

Kujath, C. L. (2011). Facebook and MySpace: Complement or substitute for face-to face interaction? *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *14*(2011), 75–78.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The post method condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(1), 27-48.

Kushner, D.(2006). Face to Face. *Rolling Stone,* 4, 30-34.

Kwan, G. C. E. & Skoric, M. M. (2013). Facebook bullying: An extension of battles in school. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(1), 16– 25.

Labinowicz, E. (1980). *The Piaget primer: Thinking, learning, teaching*. California: Addison Wesley.

Lam, L. (2012). An innovative research on the usage of Facebook in the higher education context of Hong Kong. *The Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, *10*(4), 377-386.

Lampe, C., Ellison, N. & Steinfield, C. A. (2006). Face (book) in the crowd: Social searching vs. social browsing. *Proceedings of ACM Special Interest Group on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work* (pp. 167 – 170). ACM.

Lasse Ellefsen, M. A. (2016). An investigation into perceptions of Facebook-use in higher education. *International Journal of Higher Education, 5*(1), 160-172.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, N., Mikesell, L., Joaquin, A. D. L., Mates, A. W. & Schumann, J. H. (2009). *The interactional instinct: The evolution and acquisition of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lee, K. & Ranta, L. (2014). Facebook: Facilitating social access and language acquisition for international students? *TESL Canada Journal*, *31*(2), 22-51.

Lenhart, A. & Madden, M. (2007). *Teens, privacy & online social networks: How teens manage their online identities and personal information in the age of MySpace*. Pew Internet & American Life Project.

Lieberman, G. & Hoody L. (1998). *Closing the achievement gap: Using the environment as an integrated context for learning.* Poway, CA: Science Wizards

Lim T. & Ismail J. T. (2010). The use of Facebook for online discussions among distance learners. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 11*(4), 72-81.

Linell, P. (1982). *The written language bias in Linguistics.* Linköbing: Sweeden.

Little, D. (1991*). Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems.* Dublin: Authentik.

Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: the dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *SYSTEM, 23*(2), 175-181.

Littlewood, W. (1997) 'Self-access: why do we want it and what can it do?' In P. Benson & P. Voller (eds.) *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning* (pp. 79-92)*.* London: Longman.

Liu, S. H. (2015). The perceptions of participation in a mobile collaborative learning among pre-service teachers. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *5*(1), 87-94.

Lizzio, A., Wilson, K. & Simmons, R. (2002). University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: implications for theory and practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 27(1), 27-52.*

Locke, L. (2007). The Future of Facebook. *Time Magazine,* July 17, 2007. Retrieved on January20, 2016 from http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,1644040,00.html

Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In B. Winitz (ed.), Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition. *Annals of New Academy of Sciences, 379* (1), 259-278.

Long, M.H. (1983a). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5*(2); 177-193.

Long, M. H. (1983b). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 126–141.

Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377–393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M. H. (1990). Task, group, and task-group interactions. *Language Teaching Methodology for the Nineties. Anthology Series, 24*, 31-53.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.

Long, M. H & .Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19(2), 207-228.*

Lopes, P. N., Brackett, M. A. Nezlek, J. B., Schütz, A., Sellin, I. & Salovey, P. (2004). Emotional intelligence and social interaction. *Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 30*(8), 1018-1034.

Lou, Y., Bernard, R. M. & Abrami, P. C. (2006). Media and pedagogy in undergraduate distance education: A theory-based meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Educational Technology Research & Development, 54*(2), 141-176.

MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Language anxiety: Its relation to other anxieties and to processing in native and second languages. *Language Learning, 41* (4), 513–534.

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction and second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*(4), 557-587.

Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied linguistics*, *27*(3), 405-430.

Maftoon, P. & Ziafar, M. (2013). Effective factors in interactions within Japanese EFL classrooms. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *86*(2), 74-79.

Manago, A. M., Taylor, T. & Greenfield, P. M. (2012). Me and my 400 friends: The anatomy of college students' Facebook network, their communication patterns and well-being. *Developmental Psychology*. *48*(2), 369-380.

Manca, S. & Ranieri, M. (2013). Is it a tool suitable for learning? A critical review of the literature on Facebook as a technology-enhanced learning environment. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *29*(6), 487-504.

Mason, R. (2006). Learning technologies for adult continuing education. *Studies in Continuing Education, 28*(2), 121-133.

Mathias, A. (2011). The fakebook generation. In Kirszner, and Mandell (Eds). *The Blair Reader* (pp. 239-24). Boston: Prentice Hall.

Matthew, K. I., Felvegi, E. & Callaway, R. A. (2009). Wiki as a collaborative learning tool in a language arts methods class. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 42*(1), 51.

Mayende, G., Muyinda, P. B., Isabwe, G. M. N., Walimbwa, M. & Siminyu, S. N. (2014). Facebook mediated interaction and learning in distance learning at Makerere University. *The Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on e-Learning* (pp 333-338). Lisbon: Portugal.

Mayer, R. E. & Massa, L. J. (2003). Three facets of visual and verbal learners: Cognitive ability, cognitive style, and learning preference. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(4), 833-846.

Mayo, M. P. G. & Pica, T. (2000). Interaction among proficient learners: Are input, feedback and output needs addressed in a foreign language context. *Studia Linguistica 54*(2), 272-279.

Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E. & Simonds, C. J. (2007). I'll see you on Facebook: the effects of computer-mediated teacher self-disclosure on student motivation, affective learning, and classroom climate. *Communication* Education, *56*(1), 1–17.

Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E. & Simonds, C. J. (2009). The effects of teacher self-disclosure via Facebook on teacher credibility. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *34*(2), 175–183.

Mazman, S. G. & Usluel, Y. K. (2010). Modeling educational usage of Facebook. *Computers & Education*, *55*(2), 444–453.

McBride, K. (2009). Social-networking sites in foreign language classes: Opportunities for re-creation. In L. Lomicka & G. Lord (Eds.), *The next generation: Social networking and online collaboration in foreign language learning* (pp. 35-58). San Marcos, Texas: CALICO.

McCharty, J. (2010). Blended learning environments: Using social networking sites to enhance the first year experience *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 26*(6), 729-740.

McDonald J & Gibson C. C. (1998). Interpersonal dynamics and group development in computer conferencing. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 12*(1) 6–24.

McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *Elsevier System 32* (2004), 207-224.

McGinnis, S. (1994). Cultures of instruction: Identifying and resolving conflicts. *Theory into Practice*, *33*(1), 16-22.

McGuire, M. T. & Raleigh, M. J. (1986). Behavioral and physiological correlates of ostracism. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *7(3-4)*, 187-200.

McInnerney, J. M., & Roberts, T. S. (2004). Online learning: Social interaction and the creation of a sense of community. *Educational Technology & Society, 7*(3), 73–81.

McLoughlin, C. & Lee, M. J. (2007). Social software and participatory learning: Pedagogical choices with technology affordances in the Web 2.0 era. *ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning. Proceedings of Ascilite* (pp. 664-675). Singapore

McLoughlin, C. & Lee, M. J. W. (2010). Personalised and self regulated learning in the web 2.0 era: International exemplars of innovative pedagogy using social software. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 26*(1), 28–43.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meeuwisse, M., Severiens, S. E. & Born, M. (2010). Learning environment, interaction, sense of belonging and study success in ethnically diverse study groups. *Research in Higher Education, 51*(6), *528- 545.*

Mejias, U. (2006). Teaching social software with social software. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, *2*(5), 2.

Mendez, J. P, Ky Le & Jose De La Cruz. (2014). Integrating Facebook in the classroom: Pedagogical dilemmas. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies* 13(1), 1-8.

Mills, N. (2011). Situated learning through social networking communities: The development of joint enterprise, mutual engagement, and a shared repertoire. *Calico Journal, 28(*2), 345-368.

Minocha, S. (2009). A study of the effective use of social software to support student learning and engagement. *JISC*, University of Bristol.

Mitchell, K. (2012). A social tool: Why and how ESOL students use Facebook. *Calico Journal*, *29*(3), 471-493.

Moore, M. G. & Kearsley, G. (1996). *Distance education: A systems view*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Morton, H. & Jack, M. A. (2005). Scenario-based spoken interaction with virtual agents. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *18*(3), 171-191.

Muñoz, C. L. & Towner, T. L. (2009). Opening Facebook: How to use Facebook in the college classroom. *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education conference*. Charleston: South Carolina. Retrieved on June, 2016 from http://www46.homepage.villanova.edu/john.immerwahr/TP101/Facebook.pdf

Nabei, T. & Swain, M. (2002). Learner awareness of recasts in classroom interaction: A case study of an adult EFL student's second language learning. *Language Awareness, 11*(1), 43–63.

Naditz, N. (2011). Friend or foe: Facebook in a high school language class. *The Language Educator*, *6*(6), 46-47.

Nazir, A., Raza, S. & Chuah, C. (2008). Unveiling Facebook: Measurement study of social network based applications. *Proceedings of the 8th ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Internet Measurement* (pp. 43–56). New York, NY: ACM.

Neves, A. H. (1983). The effect of various input on the second language acquisition of Mexican-American children in nine elementary classrooms. Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University. Retrieved on November 30, 2015 from: http://home.capecod.net/~tpanitz/tedsarticles/coopbenefits.html.

Newman, D., Griffin, P. & Cole, M. (1989). The construction zone: Working for cognitive change in school. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nezlek, W. (2001). Casual relationships between perceived social skills and day to day social interaction: Extending the sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18*(3), *386-403.*

Nunan, D. (1996). Towards autonomous learning: Some theoretical, empirical and practical issues. *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning*, *1326.*

Ohta, A. S. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner–learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 93–121.

Okan, Z. (2003). Edutainment: Is learning at risk? *British Journal of Educational Technology, 34(3)*, 255–264.

O'Keeffe, G. S. & Clarke-Pearson, K. (2011). The impact of social media on children, adolescents, and families. *Pediatrics*, *127*(4), 800-804.

Oliver, R. (2002). The patterns of negotiation for meaning in child interactions. *Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 97-111.

Olson, J., Clough, M. & Penning, K. (2009). Prospective elementary teachers gone wild? An analysis of Facebook self-portrayals and expected dispositions of pre-service elementary teachers. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, *9*(4), 443-475.

Omar, H., Embi, M. A. & Yunus, M. M. (2012). ESL learners' interaction in an online discussion via Facebook. *Asian Social Science, 8*(11), 67-74.

O'Reilly, T. (2005). What is web 2.0?: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. Retrieved on January28, 2016 from http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/a/oreilly/tim/news/2005/09/30/what-is-web-20.html.

O'Reilly (2007). What is Web 2.0:Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. *Communication & Strategies*, *65*(1), 16-37.

Orey, M. (2010). *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching and technology*. CreateSpace.

Ormrod, J. E. (2004). *Human learning* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/ Prentice Hall.

Oxendine, C., Robinson, J. & Willson, G. (2004). Experiential learning. In M. Orey (Ed.), *Emerging perspectives on learning teaching, and technology* (pp. 259-266).

Paige, R. M; Jorstad, H.; Siaya, L.; Klein, F. & Colby, J. (2000). Culture learning in language education: A review of the literature. St. Paul, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, the University of Minnesota.

Papacharissi, Z. & Mendelsohn, A. (2011). Toward a new(er) sociability: Uses, gratifications and social capital on Facebook. In S. Papathanassopoulos (Ed.), Communication and society. Media perspectives for the 21st century. Concepts, topics and issues (pp. 212–230). New York: Routledge.

Parker, A. & Parker, S. (2013). Interaction: The vital conversation in online instruction. *ERIC, ED541876.*

Pavlov I (1927): *Conditioned Reflexes.* London: Oxford University Press.

Pempek, T. A, Yermoyeleva, Y. A &Calvert, S. A. (2009). College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 30*(3), 227-238.

Peterson, C. & McCabe, A. (1994). A social interactionist account of developing decontextualized narrative skill. *Developmental Psychology*, *30*(6), 937-948.

Philp, J. & Tognini, R. (2009). Language acquisition in foreign language contexts and the differential benefits of interaction. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *47*(3-4), 245-266.

Piaget, J. (1959). The language and thought of the child (3rd ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on Negotiation: What Does It Reveal About Second-Language Learning Conditions, Processes, and Outcomes? *Language learning*, *44*(3), 493-527.

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D. & Linnel, J. (1996). Language learners 'interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 30(1)*, 60-85.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., Berducci, D. & Newman, J. (1990). Language learning through interaction: What role does gender play? *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 6*(1), 52-83.

Pica, T., Young, R. & Doughty, C. (1986). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly, 21(4),* 130-151.

Poyatos, F. (1992). *Advances in nonverbal communication.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pratte, R. (1979). *Pluralism in Education: Conflict, clarity and commitment*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon, 9*(5), 1-6.

Prensky, M. (2007). *Digital game-based learning.* New York: Paragon House.

Promnitz-Hayashi, L. (2011). A learning success story using Facebook. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 2(*4), 309-316.

Puntambekar, S. & Hübscher, R. (2005). Tools for scaffolding students in a complex learning environment: What have we gained and what have we missed? *Educational Psychologist, 40(1),* 1-12.

Razak, N. A., Saeed, M. A. & Ahmad, Z. (2013). Adopting social networking sites (SNSs) as interactive communities among English foreign language (EFL) learners in writing: Opportunities and challenges. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(11), 187-198.

Razak, N. A. & Saeed, M. A. (2014). Collaborative writing revision process among learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) in an online community of practice (CoP). *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *30*(5), 580-599.

Razak, N. A., Saeed, M. A. (2015). EFL Arab learners' peer revision of writing in a Facebook group: Contributions to written texts and sense of online community. *English Language Teaching*, *8*(12), 11-26.

Reinhardt, J. & Zander, V. (2011). Social networking in an intensive English program classroom: A language socialization perspective. *Calico Journal*, *28*(2), 326-344.

Reis, H. T. & Collins, W. A. (2004). Relationship, human behavior and psychological science. *American Psychological, 13*(6), 233-237.

Roazzi, A. & Bryant, P. (1998). The effects of symmetrical and asymmetrical social interaction on children's logical inferences. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 16(2), 175-181.

Roblyer, M. D., McDaniel, M., Webb, M., Herman, J. & Witty, J. V. (2010). Findings on Facebook in higher education: A comparison of college faculty and student uses and perceptions of social networking sites. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *13*(3), 134–140.

Rogers, C. (1975). The interpersonal relationship in the facilitation of learning. In D. Read and S. Simon (eds.), *Humanistic Education Sourcebook*. N. J : Prentice-Hall- Englewood Cliffs.

Ross, C., Orr, E. S., Sisic, M., Arseneault, J. M., Simmering, M. G. & Orr, R. R. (2009). Personality and motivations associated with Facebook use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *25*(2), 578–586.

Ru-Chu, S. (2013). Effect of using Facebook to assist English for business communication course instruction. *TOJET, 12*(1), 52-59.

Ryan, R. M. (1993). Agency and organization: Intrinsic motivation, autonomy and the self in psychological development. In J. Jacobs (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Developmental perspectives on motivation* (Vol. 40, pp. 1–56). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Ryan, S. D., Magro, M. J. & Sharp, J. H. (2011). Exploring educational and cultural adaptation through social networking sites. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, *10*(1), 1-16.

Salehi, E., Hedjazi, M. H. & Ebrahimi, M.S. (2015). The effects of personality types on the learning styles of agricultural students' case study in Iran. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education, 4(2),* 126-135.

Sarac-Suzer, S.H. (2007). *Examining methodological issues through pedagogical and practical knowledge of experienced teachers: A case study.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Sato, K. & Kleinsasser, R. C. (2004). Beliefs, practices, and interactions of teachers in a Japanese high school English department. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*(8), 797-816.

Sato, M. & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development: Monitoring, practice, and proceduralization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 34*(4), 591–626.

Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1994). Computer support for knowledge-building communities. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *3*(3), 265–283.

Segovia, L & Hardison, D. M. (2009). Implementing education reform: EFL teachers' perspective. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 154-162.

Seliger, H. W. & Shohamy, E. G. (1989). *Second language research methods*. Oxford University Press.

Selwyn, N. (2009). Faceworking: Exploring students' education related use of Facebook. *Learning Media and* Technology*, 34*(2), 157-174.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher, 27*(2), 4-13.

Shafie, L. A., Yaacob, A. & Singh, P. K. K. (2016). Lurking and L2 learners on a Facebook group: The Voices of the invisibles. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(2), 1-12.

Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, *29*(7), 4-14.

Simpson, M. N. (2012). ESL@ FACEBOOK: A teacher's diary on using Facebook. *Teaching English with Technology*, *12*(3), 36-48.

Sinha, J. B. P. & Verma, J. (1994). Social support as a moderator of the relationship between allocentrism and psychological wellbeing. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism*: *Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 267-275). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, B. (2004). Computer-mediated negotiated interaction and lexical acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26* (3), 365-398.

Solak, E. & Bayar, A. (2015). Current Challenges in English Language Learning in Turkish EFL Context. *Online Submission*, *2*(1), 106-115.

Soo, K. S. & Bonk, C. J. (1998). Interaction: What does it mean in online distance education? *Proceedings of the 10th World Conference on Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia & World Conference on Educational Telecommunications* (pp. 20-25). Germany: Freiburg.

Soyer, E. & Hogart, R. M. (2015). Learning from experience in nonlinear environments: Evidence from a competition scenario. *Cognitive Psychology, 81(*2015), 48-75.

Stanciu A, Mihai F & Aleca, O. (2012). Social networking, as an alternative environment for education. *Accounting and Management Information Systems*, *11*(1), 56–75.

Steffe, L. & Gale, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Constructivism in education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Stelter, B. (2008). Online Games by the Hundreds, With Tie-Ins. New York Times. Retrieved on February 01, 2016 from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/18/business/media/18adco.html

Stern, H. H. (2003). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (1979). The nature of mental abilities. *American Psychologist*, *34*(3), 214.

Streeck, J. & Knapp, M. L. (1992). The interaction of visual and verbal features in human communication. In F. Poyatos (Ed.), *Advances in nonverbal communication* (pp. 3–23). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sturgeon, C. M. & Walker, C. (2009). Faculty on Facebook: Confirm or deny? *The Proceedings of Annual Instructional Technology Conference of Lee University*. Cleveland: USA.

Stutzman, F. (2006). Student life on the Facebook. Retrieved on January 02, 2016 from http://chimprawk.blogspot.com/2005/10/freshman-facebook-zeitgeist.html.

Stutzman, F, Vitak, J., Ellison, N. B., Gray, R. & Lampe, C. (2012) Privacy in interaction: Exploring disclosure and social capital in Facebook. *Proceedings of international conference on weblogs and social media* (pp. 330-337) Ireland: Dublin.

Subasi, G. (2010). What are the Main Sources of Turkish EFL Students' Anxiety in Oral Practice? *Online Submission*, *1*(2), 29-49.

Suthiwartnarueput, T. & Wasanasomsithi, P. (2012). Effects of using Facebook as a medium for discussions of English grammar and writing of low-intermediate EFL students. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *9*(2), 194-214.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235 – 253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Press.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G.Widdowson* (pp. 125 – 144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 320–337.

Sykes, J. M., Oskoz, A. & Thorne, S. L. (2008). Web 2.0, synthetic immersive environments, and mobile resources for language education. *Calico Journal*, *25*(3), 528-546.

Tananuraksakul, N. (2015). An investigation into the impact of Facebook group usage on students' affect in language learning in a Thai context. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *27*(2), 235-246.

Tappan, M. B. (1997). Language, culture and moral development: A Vygotskian perspective. *Developmental Review 17*(1)*, 78-100.

Teclehaimanot, B. & Hickman, T. (2011). Student-teacher interaction on Facebook: What students find appropriate. *TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning*, *55*(3), 19–30.

Terantino, J. & Graf, K. (2011). Using Facebook in the language classroom as part of the net generation. Curriculum. *Language*, *11(*1), 44- 45.

Tercanlıoglu, L. (2005). Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign language learning and how they relate to gender. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology,* 5(3*),* 145-162.

Thurmond, V. & Wambach, K. (2004). Understanding interactions in distance education: A review of the literature. *International journal of instructional technology and distance learning*, *1*(1), 147-166.

Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 41-133). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Tok, H. (2009). EFL learners' communication obstacles. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, *8*(29), 84-100.

Umbach, P. & Wawrzynski, M. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, *46(2),* 153-184.

Van Lier, L. (2014). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. London: Routledge.

Verma, R. B. S. (2010). Principles, skills and models of group work practice. (Ed.) Thomas Gracious Social Work Intervention with Individuals and Groups (pp. 212-241). Maidan Garhi: New Delhi

Vetter, A. & Chanier, T. (2006). Supporting oral production for professional purposes in synchronous communication with heterogeneous learners. *ReCALL*, *18*(01), 5-23.

Virkus, S. (2008). Use of Web 2.0 technologies in LIS education: Experiences at Tallinn University, Estonia. *Electronic Library and Information Systems*, *42* (3), 262-274.

Viswanath, B., Mislove, A., Cha, M., & Gummadi, K. P. (2009). On the evolution of user interaction in Facebook. *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Workshop on Online Social Networks* (pp. 37–42). New York, NY: ACM.

Vygotsky, L.S (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Wagner, E.D. (1994). In support of a functional definition of interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *8*(2), 6 -26.

Wagner, E. D. (1997).Interactivity: From agents to outcomes. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 71*(1997), 19-27.

Wang, J. (2013). What higher educational professionals need to know about today's students: Online social networks. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *12*(3), 180–193.

Wang, Q., Woo, H. L., Quek, C. L., Yang, Y. & Liu, M. (2012). Using the Facebook group as a learning management system: An exploratory study. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 43*(3), 428–438.

Wang, Z., Novak, H., Scofield-Snow, H & Traylor, S. (2015). Am I disclosing too much? Student perceptions of teacher credibility via Facebook introduction. *The journal of Social Media in Society, 4*(1), 5-37.

Watanabe, Y. & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: Collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners *Language Teaching Research, 11*(2), 121–142

Weinstein, C. E. & Mayer, R. E. (1983). The teaching of learning strategies. *Innovation Abstracts, 5*(32), 1-4.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of the mind.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action.* Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.

Wheeler, L. & Nezlek, J. (1977). Sex differences in social participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35(*10), 742-754.

Wheeler, L. & Nezlek, J. (1983). Loneliness, social interaction and sex roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*(4), *943-953.*

Wilson, C., Boe, B., Sala, A., Puttaswamy, K. P. &. Zhao, B.Y. (2009). User interactions in social networks and their implications. *Proceedings of the 4th ACM European conference on Computer systems* (pp. 205–218). ACM

Wlodkowski, R. (2004). Creating motivating learning environments. M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods* (pp. 141–164). Malabar, FL: Krieger

Woods, R. H. & Baker, J. D. (2004). Interaction and immediacy in online learning. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *5*(2), Retrieved December 24, 2015 from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/186/268.

Wu, G. C.-H. & Chao, Y.-C. J. (2015). Learners' agency in a Facebook-mediated community. In F. Helm, L. Bradley, M. Guarda, & S. Thouësny (Eds), *Critical CALL – Proceedings of the 2015 EUROCALL Conference* (pp. 558-563) Italy: Padova.

Wu, W.-C. V., Yen, L. L., & Marek, M. (2011). Using online EFL interaction to increase confidence, motivation, and ability. *Educational Technology & Society, 14* (3), 118–129.

Wu, P.& Hsu, L. H. (2011). EFL learning on social networking site? An action research on Facebook. *Proceedings of Teaching & Learning with Vision Conference*. Queensland, Australia.

Yadav, S. (2006). FB—the complete biography. *Mashable Social Networking News*, August 25. Retrieved on January 15, 2016 from http://mashable.com/2006/08/25/FB-profile/.

Yang, S. J. & Chen, I. Y. (2008). A social network-based system for supporting interactive collaboration in knowledge sharing over peer-to-peer network. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, *66*(1), 36-50.

Yashima, T., Nishide, L. Z. & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 54*(1), 119-152.

Ybarra, J. O., Bumstein, E., Winkielman, P., Keller, M. C., Manis, M., Chan, E. &Rodrigez, J. (2007).Mental exercising through simple socializing: Social interaction promotes general cognitive functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology, 34*(2), 248–259.

Yunus, M. M. & Salehi, H. (2012). The effectiveness of Facebook groups on teaching and improving writing: Students' perceptions. *Journal of Education and Information Technologies*, *1*(6), 87-96.

Yunus, M. M., Salehi, H. & Chenzi, C. (2012). Integrating social networking tools into ESL writing classroom: Strengths and weaknesses. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(8), 42-48.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *81*(3), 329-339.

Zhang, Y. (2010). Cooperative language learning and foreign language learning and teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(1), 81-83.

Zuckerman, G. (2003). The developmental path toward reflection. *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*, 177.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Legal Permission Form

Appendix 2. Background and *Student-Teacher Interaction on Facebook* questionnaire

Dear participant,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on your interactions with your students on Facebook in the scope of a scientific research. Information gathered from the questionnaire is going to be preserved and used solely to provide further insight into the EFL teachers' interaction with their students on Facebook. Please read the following statements and questions, circle the answer that best represents your response and fill in the blanks when appropriate.

Rabia BÖREKCİ, MA Student
rabia_borekci@hotmail.com

About you ...

1. What is your gender?   (1) Female   (2) Male

2. What is your age?   ....

3. How long have you been teaching?   ....

4. Which school have you been working?

    (1) Elementary   (2) Secondary   (3) High   (4) Vocational

5. What grade did you graduate last?

    (1) BA   (2) BA   (3) Ph.D.

6. How long do you have a Facebook account? ....   ,

7. How often do you visit Facebook?

    (1) Once or twice a year   (2) Once or twice a month

    (3) Once or twice a week   (4) Almost every day

8. How much time do you spend on Facebook when you enter Facebook?

    (1) Less than one hour   (2) Nearly one hour   (3) Nearly two hours

    (4) Nearly three hours   (5) Nearly four hours   (4) More than five hours

9. How many friends do you have on Facebook?   ....

10. How many of your friends are your students on Facebook?   ....

11. Which one do you prefer using for Facebook?

    (1) Desktop PC   (2) Notebook   (3) Tablet

    (4) Mobile Phone   (5) Other (Please specify) ....

12. Have ever joined an education related to computer usage?

    (1) Yes   (2) No

	On Facebook, my students ...	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Oftentimes	Always
1.	send me a "poke".	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
2.	comment on photos I post.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3.	post on my Wall.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
4.	can read through the groups I have joined.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5.	can view my friends list.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6.	send me a friend invitation.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7.	comment on my status updates.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8.	can view photos I posts.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
9.	start a chat with me.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10.	join the groups I have joined.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
11.	can read my status updates.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
12.	send me a message.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
13.	can read through my work info.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
14.	can read through my education info.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
15.	can watch videos I post.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
16.	can view photos in which I have been tagged.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
17.	can read my personal info (e.g., interests, activities, favorites, etc.).	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
18.	can read my basic info (e.g., political views, religious view, relationship status, etc.).	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
19.	can view my profile.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
20.	comment on videos I post.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
21.	can read through the posts on my Wall.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
22.	comment on photos in which I have been tagged.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
23.	can read my contact information (e.g., e-mail, phone number, etc.).	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

On Facebook, I ...	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1. send my students a "poke".	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
2. comment on photos my students post.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3. post on my students' wall.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
4. read through the groups my students have joined.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5. view my students' friend lists.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6. send my students friend invitations.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7. comment on my students' status updates.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8. view photos my students post.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
9. start chats with my students.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10. join the groups my students have joined.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
11. read my students' status updates.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
12. send my students messages.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
13. read through my students' work info.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
14. read through my teacher's education info.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
15. watch videos my students post.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
16. view photos in which my students have been tagged.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
17. read my students' personal info (e.g., interests, activities, favorites, etc.).	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
18. read my students' basic info (e.g., political views, religious view, relationship status, etc.).	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
19. view my students' profiles.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
20. comment on videos my students post.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
21. read through the posts on my students' walls.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
22. comment on photos in which my students have been tagged.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
23. read my students' contact information (e.g., e-mail, phone number, etc.).	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)