Secondary School Teachers' Attitude Towards the Use of Social Media as a Teaching Platform in Nigeria

Faith Shekwagu Jabai

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Information and Communication Technologies in Education

Eastern Mediterranean University
January 2017
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Tümer
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Information and Communication Technologies in Education.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun İşçioğlu
Chair, Computer and Instructional Technology
Teacher Education

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Information and Communication Technologies in Education.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun İşçioğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun İşçioğlu _____

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fahme Dabaj _____

3. Dr. Fatma Tansu Hocann _____

ABSTRACT

Secondary School Teachers' attitude towards the use of social media as a platform for educational purposes in Nigeria. The main aim of the study is to investigate secondary school teachers' attitude towards use of social media as a teaching platform. The study makes use of quantitative methodology. 112 teachers within the country's capital city- Abuja participated as respondents to the distributed questionnaires.

Findings reveal that teachers are familiar with at least two social media platforms namely Facebook and Youtube and frequent users of the aforementioned platforms as well. However, the least frequent and familiar sites are LinkedIn and Slideshare. The general attitude of the teachers are positive towards social media usage. Age and gender had no effect to teachers' general attitude towards social media.

Keywords: Information Communication Technology (ICT), Social Media, Teachers' Attitude.

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, Nigerya – Abuja'da orta öğretim okullarında görev yapmakta olan öğretmenlerinin sosyal medya ortamlarını öğretim amaçlı kullanmalarına yönelik tutumlarını incelemektedir. Çalışma nicel bir çalışma olarak düzenlenmiştir. Araştırmanın çalışma grubu Nijerya Abuja kentinde görev yapmakta olan 112 öğretmenden oluşmuştur.

Çalışma sonucunda öğretmenlerin en az iki sosyal medya ortamına aşina oldukları (Facebook ve YouTube) ve en sık kullandıkları sosyal medya ortamlarının da Facebook ve YouTube olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca çalışma sonucunda öğretmenlerin en az kullandıkları sosyal medya ortamlarının da LinkedIn ve Slideshare olduğu belirlenmiştir. Ek olarak çalışmada, öğretmenlerin sosyal medyaya yönelik olumlu tutumları olduğu ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Ancak öğretmenlerin cinsiyet ve yaşlarının sosyal medyaya yönelik tutumlarının üzerinde etkisinin olmadığı görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler*:* Bilgi ve İletişim Teknolojileri (ICT), Sosyal Medya, Öğretmen Tutumları

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I humbly wish to sincerely appreciate my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ersun Işçioğlu for his patience, guidance, tutoring and relentless encouragement before, during and through the entire thesis. Your exceptional leadership is beyond words. I appreciate all my lecturers who tirelessly tutored and mentored me through the entire Master program. Special gratitude to my entire family, and in-laws and friends. Your support is beyond words. I specially thank Olaoluwapemi Ogunmola, you are family and that is no news. To Sahira, thank you so much for the support. To Elnathan Wang, your timely encouragements are deeply valued. Ultimately, I thank God Almighty, without whom this entire program would have been impossible.

I dedicate this thesis to my priceless parents, who have been with me every step of the way cheering, supporting and loving, Reverend & Mrs. Shekwagu Jabai.

To God be the Glory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the topic and gives the background, motivation, aims, objectives, significance and limitations of the study.

1.1 Background of Study

The 1960's introduced the wave of the internet arrival. Thereafter, it has transcended beyond just an arrival and is today a huge part of human daily living. Previously thought impossible strides in sectors such as communication, entertainment, and information circulation is through the internet made possible and easy at that. However, these activities are possible, effectual and productive all thanks to computer programs and applications called Social Networking Sites (SNS) (Selwyn & Lyndsay, 2009).

It is no news anymore that youths make up the greater number of social media users. These youths predominantly students. However, this platform has created an opening for intercommunication and collaboration. Therefore, arousing educators' interest in channeling its usage into academic relevance. The significant role of these sites play within the academic domain of students which cut across all ages that has evoked interest among instructors (Selwyn & Lyndsay, 2009).

The diverse mediums and opportunities made available through social networks for users over the years is on the increase. It is a truth universally acknowledged that a

larger percentage of social site users are predominantly students, instructors and school faculty.

Hence, it will be wise to think up ideas towards the integration of social media into the educational curriculum and quickly too; as Information Technology (IT) daily unfolds. With the increasing percentage of social network users among students and teachers alike, its relevance especially to the educational circle is greatly understood (Grant, 2008).

Social media sites are on the increase. This increase had made more people inclined as users perhaps for reasons of the special distinctive features that acquaints users to preferred sites hence distinguishing a social media site from another. The effect of this however, is increment in hours used up on social media sites by students. The inspiration and interest in this research is birthed out of a desire to translate the growing time students spend on social media into educational benefit. Generally known, the emergence of technology has exceedingly transformed lives and will continually do (Katherine, 2012).

Technology in education also implies the implementation of Web 2.0 tools alongside its contributions to the academia. Multiplicity of web sites and programs that permits access to individuals to make available information content on an online platform is simply Web 2.0. A significant characteristic of the technology is individual access to generate, distribute or engage in cooperative learning (Eberly, 2016).

To a very large extent, every educational institution is dependent on technology one way or another. Technology plays a cardinal role on educational establishments; students and faculty although with its constant evolving nature, educational sectors have a great responsibility of keeping up with its complexities.

Social media has transformed into a platform that accommodates students regardless the differing cultures and also a unifier for both students and teachers with the creation of an engaging yet relaxed atmosphere that fosters an efficient learning process (Afzal, Safdar & Ambreen 2015).

As educator's find most suitable mediums to occupy students alongside inspire students, social media is gradually evolving and becoming a likely addition and support to the well- known stay in class traditional environment (Ebner, et al. 2010). School facilitators are already considering the likelihood of integrating instructional delivery especially for distance education with social media. It is a new learning and teaching perspective which is capable of blending pedagogy and technology (Brady et al, 2010; Veletsianos & Navarrete, 2012).

The reality of the endless opportunities for education created by social media is exciting. Social media has won students over and universities are left with very little if it is not convincing students on the relevance of social media. Hence, it is only wise to communicate with students through one platform which they spend the largest amount of time on-social media (BBC Active, 2010). As defined by Bryer and Zavatarro (2001), social interaction, potential collaborations and pondering across stakeholders are facilitated through social media technologies. Technologies including

blogs, wikis, audio, visual, video, text media, Facebook, and virtual worlds (Bryer & Zavatarro, 2001). Today, the relevance of social media is globally acknowledged. Dating to July 2011, Facebook had already recorded 750 million users, LinkedIn had over 100 million members, twitter over 177 million tweets per day, and YouTube recorded three billion views per day (Chen & Bryer, 2012).

Proponents strongly believe that present day college students have gotten accustomed to a social media dominated world. Therefore, integrating it into the educational system as a tool will further complement and boost the learning experience with a suitable platform for discussions, group interactions, and exchange of ideas among both students and instructors (Lederer, 2012; Turkle, 2004). As a result of the increasing number social media sites continually record, there is no mistaking the huge role it plays for teachers in areas of skilled improvement or academic relevance (Grant, 2008).

Social media's gained popularity among students and teachers is undoubtedly on the rise however, the academic practice records a low percentage in regards to utilizing social media as a teaching platform. (Guy, 2012).

It is important to state that diverse reasons come to play as influencers to individual's views and perceptions. Sadly, in most cases of analyzing individual views; the uncertainty lies, as to what is truly predominant over others (Simonsen & Dick, 1997).

Judging from related researches above, there is no doubt the relevance of social media or its increasing usage. However, this research differs from others because, it explains

why it will be out of place for the Nigerian government and private school owners to continually put up structures that aid social media integration in secondary schools. It is worth mentioning that, without giving priority into investigating the attitude of the teachers who are required to utilize these media in education, teachers may feel misplaced and unconsidered in the scheme of school structure.

If limitations that play against social media integration have truly been curbed; what answers for the delay in its full usage across schools? Answers are not far- fetched from instructors view and regard towards media and how these views play out in practical domain (Correa et, al 2010).

Although much has been done in the area of research related to the significance of social media in schools, they have not been intentional in proposing it as a teaching platform specifically for Nigerian secondary schools to be precise. That, this study intends to explore.

1.2 Aim of the Study

The major aim of this study is to investigate secondary school teachers' attitudes to the use of social media as a teaching platform in Nigeria.

1.3 Research Questions

In meeting the purpose of this research, the following research questions are relevant:

1. What are the teacher's familiarity and frequency of use of social media?

1.1 What are the teachers' familiarity and frequency according to Gender?

1.2 What are the teachers' familiarity and frequency according to Age?

1.3 What are the teachers' familiarity and frequency according to years of experience?

1.4 What are the teachers' familiarity and frequency according to field of teaching?

2. What is the teacher's attitude towards social media usage in education?

2.1 Is there a difference in teacher's attitude towards social media usage in relation to gender?

2.2 Is there a difference in teacher's attitude towards social media usage in relation to age?

2.3 Is there a difference in teacher's attitude towards social media in relation to years of experience?

2.4 Is there a difference in teachers' attitude towards social media in relation to field of teaching?

1.4 Significance of the Study

This research seeks to provide a platform for the Nigerian view point on teacher's attitudes. Often times, the Nigerian academic community is under examined and not thoroughly investigated especially in relation to technological strides and user competence. This study mirrors social media usage from the angle of the Nigerian educational system with an aim at suggesting that Nigerian secondary schools encourage the use of social media as a teaching platform.

1.5 Limitation of the Study

This study only covers Nigerian Schools located within the capital territory of the country-Abuja, hence the problems of generalizing the result of the findings. More so, the time frame for the completion of this research is a crucial factor. The questionnaire was administered and gathered within a month; July-August 2016.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Communication is not left out of the numerous sectors experiencing the impact of 21st century technology. Both the learning and teaching processes have been drastically influenced with the advent of technology and many educators agree to this (Katherine, 2012). It is left to individual opinion to judge as to whether these technological impacts have been positive or not. Distance and convenient learning have been born with the rise of technology and even global economies have benefited from technology, but ethical issues accompany its strides. Instructors, students and the instruction have not been left without the impact of technology. Before technology made its entrance, instructors majorly took up the role of information dissemination. Today, technology has equipped teachers to not only be knowledge custodians but guides and supervisors (Katherine, 2012). This chapter will cover the related literature.

2.1 Social Media and Its Emergence

Diverse theories have arisen to explain the first history of social media and how it can be traced. Carton (2009) explains that human history has been characterized by technological inventions aimed at breeding better, easier and effective communication with each other. Emile Durkheim is one name that cannot be omitted within social interaction issues and its history as he is referred to as the father of sociology. Emile

and Ferdinand Tonnies in the late 1800s are both highly respected names and considered the pioneers of social networks (Rimskii, 2011, Wren, 2004).

Over the years however, social networks have experienced tremendous changes and evolved into digital media. The evolution of social media is not just the computer. The telephones also served as a social media platform.

The 1960s, introduced the email era (Borders, 2010). Up until 1991 the public gained access into internet usage considering that it was introduced simply as a medium for message exchange (requiring both sender and recipient computers on online mode) today, it is totally different. Emails do more than just send messages. They also store messages and could be readily accessed at any given time. The era was followed by the introduction of the use of self- made devices that promoted unlicensed entries for unpaid telephone calls. Individualistic weirdo's also accessed test lines belonging to telephone companies to achieve uncensored task (Borders, 2010).

Social networking sites sprung up in 1990's. It was not a surprise that the uprising and great increase of social networking sites has been experienced in year 2000. The emergence of social networking sites revolutionized all forms of communication ranging from individual to organizational relations. Gradually, social media became the hub of common interests in movies, music, education and even friendships. So therefore, the question of any benefit of social media development to the academic has arisen. Colleges and campuses could not escape the rapid un-denying presence of social media and its potential in the school curriculum and as an instructional tool (Borders, 2010).

Today, mobile computing devices go beyond making available educational opportunities, mediums and strategies for course content in order to be conveniently and easily dispersed among students, but also provides a platform irrespective of distance barrier for instructors, student and colleagues to communicate (Gikas, & Grant 2013).

Mobile computing devices have proven to be valuable connecting tools for either formal or informal schooling choices (Rodriguez, 2011). More so with social media, learners are free to decide on personal most suiting ways of usage and interaction with course materials with an aim of achieving educational goals through shared and accessed information peculiar to individual need and ability (Sharples et al. 2007).

2.2 Web 2.0 Tools and Academic Integration

The utilization of technology in education also entails Web 2.0 tools and the many benefits which it offers to pedagogy. The aforementioned advantages distinguish this technology as a preferred choice for communication. More so, it plays a vital place in productive communication among students and study partners. Web 2.0 applications comprise of blogs, podcast, and wikis. Popular applications include YouTube, Facebook, discussion boards, MySpace amongst others. Table 1 below clearly explains the roles of authorship and the organization which play in relation to content creation and disperse (Eberly, 2016).

Table 1: Blogs, Wikis and Discussion Boards (Eberly, 2016).

	Authorship	**Content**	**Organization**
Discussion Board	Individual Posts responding to	Originating posts and replies range	Chronological order within threads; is

	Collective Forum or Thread within a Forum	from a sentence to a couple paragraphs, sometimes with attached documents, can include embedded media (e.g. video, images) and external links. Participants can rank threads.	searchable; offers sort, including by highest ranked; offers tagging.
Blog	Individual or Collective (e.g. group blog)	Pages contain text entries; can include embedded media (e.g. video, images) and external links. Can be made open to comments by visitors.	Reverse-chronological order of entries by author; is searchable, provides tagging and categories to support organization and search; can be comprised of multiple pages with defined navigation.
Wiki	Collective	Pages contain text entries; can include embedded media (e.g. video, images) and external	A flat hierarchy of continually modifiable web page(s); is searchable, provides tagging;

		links. Can be made open to comments by visitors.	typically comprised of multiple pages; can include defined navigation.

For years now, contentions have ensued in the educational sector on the dissimilarity between Web 1.0 and Web 2.0. Web 2.0 is comprising of an avenue for inventive technologies to blossom and at the same time, valuing users. Cormode & Krishnamurthy (2008) provide a simple explanation to this. According to them, "Web 2.0" embodies a blend of Web upheaval in recent years. While a definite meaning is difficult and deciphering sites as either "Web 1.0" or "Web 2.0" is a hard task, the simple distinction is identifying the most frequently used and prevalent Web 2.0 sites which includes YouTube and Facebook (Cormode, & Krishnamurthy 2008).

However, the basic dissimilarity with Web 1.0 and Web 2.0 is that Web 2.0 is a result of technological strides and advancement which provides sufficient information to developers and content creators due to its open platform for anyone to create content. In recent times, there has been a notable shift in Internet congestion resulting from the increasing user number of Web 2.0 sites (Cormode, G., & Krishnamurthy, 2008).

A range of social media sites have been integrated into the academic sector and perhaps more will as the years go by. These sites include: Twitter, blog, Facebook, Tumbler, wiki, google+, Instagram among others.

2.3 21st Century Learning

One of the leading 21st century prime concern is the relation of information acquisition and ability in order to entail the development of students to utilize technology and media in a proper way. This purpose ranges from creativity, innovation, communication, research and problem solving keeping in mind that the instructors and printed manuals were the total origin and authority for every desired knowledge. Alternatively in recent times, the instructor's role has been modified into a guide for learning and information attainment. Teachers happen to be huge beneficiaries of technology. Today, information units regardless the capacity could be stored and readily available regardless the format whether it is text, audio or visuals. Individual peculiarity among students is barely an issue with recent technology advancements. Teachers can differentiate instruction and with the assistance of limitless learning aids, students are not totally reliant on classroom teachings alone (Gikas & Grant, 2013).

21st century students utilize technology beyond fun and leisure for meaningful academic responsibilities such as learning, assisting, enquiry, discovery, research and also cooperative learning (Newby et al, 2000).

Technology, especially social media, has succeeded in transforming education beyond the confines of the classroom. The education sector is one sphere immensely experiencing effects of the fast paced technological development especially in information, communication and technologies (ICT). This has been born for creating new communication platforms and for accessing education anywhere and at any time.

Both students and teachers employ the use of ICT to make effective learning in or out of classroom (Sharples et al. 2007).

According to Afzal, Safdar & Ambreen (2015) they stated that with the help of ICT, learning can be achieved at any time and at any place. Both students and teachers utilize its offers to make certain productive acquisition of knowledge that takes place in and out of the class. Gladly, technologies have proven to offer tremendous support to the school system despite its complexities. Evidently, an array of digital material, knowledge and communication tools exist to facilitate both teaching and learning. Over the last 10 years, there has been an adjustment in learning trend to prioritize interaction and understanding against previous learning styles.

2.4 Related Research

The need for knowledge comprehension and interpretation alongside its application is rated more essential in comparison to information gathering while the information delivery in itself does not guarantee productive learning. Technology assistance plays a role in solving problems of excessive importance placed on content.

However some teachers still believe that the use of social media integration into education is tasking and somewhat unsuitable and unprofessional. The use of internet in classroom teaching has made considerable progress over the years. In the academia, the variety technology offers alongside the diverse platforms for integration that has posed a problem not only for management staff, but for teachers as well (Afzal, Safdar, & Ambreen 2015).

Jessica (2015) conducted a study for over 1,000 teachers and the results revealed that 47 percent of all K-12 school teachers stated students' education could be enhanced

with the assistance of social media integration. Further explaining that social media boost cooperative learning among students as they are able to share ideas and thoughts in relation to each other's work, partner in groups, design and share information content and access both the teacher and classmates.

However, a number of schools today utilize sites such as Twitter, as mediums of information transfer among parents, students and even the organization of events by students. With the permission of teachers, students in some cases participate in class quizzes or polls with the aid of cell phones. Social media creates a platform where the students can share their questions about a subject to a subject blog and get possible answers from classmates. Videos could also be put up to explain gray areas to colleagues. Example of courses that could benefit from this include algebra and math (Jessica 2015).

According to usage statistics assembled by Ofcom, U. K. (2013) for communications market report on UK Mobile Phone Usage Statistics, it is recorded that adults totaling a 66% and from ages 16+ most certainly own at least a profile on one or more social network. This age bracket speaks for youths in college or university levels. Today, it is no news that some instructors are utilizing the offers that the social media provides. With faculties attesting that 75% of students agree to spend almost all day on Twitter for diverse reasons, schools are gradually seeing the need for online platforms where students could hold discussions.

However, university alongside and other education providers have responded by increased use of social media marketing to showcase their courses and attract

students, but is the full power of the social media medium to engage and interact with students truly harnessed? Does social media have a place as a teaching tool or is it simply a distraction?

A closer look reveals that teachers are slowly yet steadily recognizing and embracing the potential gains of social media in education with an estimate of 75% of students acknowledging to being of Twitter always according to some school faculties documented in BBC's research (BBC Active, 2010)

More so, the students explain the unending hours spent on social media is used for information dissipation, content sharing, asking and answering questions, debates and most recently, creating hashtags for online discussions or some awareness.

But, can social media play a more central role in university education or education at all levels in general? A cue could be taken considering distance learning models which in some respects are ahead of the game when compared to campus-based counterparts. Distance learning centers are somewhat compelled as a result of the nature of their courses to keep up with technological advancements, keep track of courses and utilize the technological advances to upgrade communication within students and faculty and ultimately achieve learning objectives improving the learning experience.

Information gathered from a number of successful Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) suggest that the participation of students is usually on the rise when social media platforms are incorporated into the school learning program (BBC Active.

2010). This reduces the rate of school drop outs as the convenience of studies and accessibility of course materials via social media helps a great deal. For MOOCs especially, social media has proven to be a positive influence and one that has to be embraced in universities in the long run (BBC Active, 2010).

Almost all Universities have Moodle and Blackboards as part of learning management systems which serve as platforms for information dissemination, course and assignment upload, plagiarism checks and in some cases, a discussion forum for both students and instructor. These platform amongst others have increased the integration of social media into the educational process. In recent times, teachers just easily transfer course content to students through Twitter, Facebook or LinkedIn. With virtually every student owning a smartphone, this communication channel is one that school administrators and teachers cannot afford to overlook anymore. However, the greater challenge will require measures to ensure a balance between frequency and volume of course content shared and order (BBC Active, 2010).

Educators are putting into good use the social media platform as one instructional tool to merge both informal and formal learning environments (Brady, et al., 2010; Deng and Yuen, 2010; George, 2011; Junco, et al., 2010; Manan, et al., 2012; McCarthy, 2009; Velestsianos & Navarrete, 2012).

Moreover, school faculties are not left out. They improve a culture of free participation among students with the aid of social media (Brady, et al., 2010; Junco, et al., 2010; Manan, et al., 2012). Alongside the provision of platform for students to freely express themselves, have moments of individual reflection as well as social

interaction regardless the learning environment whether it is distance or traditional (Deng & Yuen, 2010) (Velestsianos & Navarrete, 2012).

Proponents for and against the integration of social media in education have had ongoing debates. While social media advocates capitalize on the numerous benefits it offers the educational sector, critics on the other hand advocating that the new development be either bridled or entirely excluded from the classroom. However, finding middle ground is posing a challenge.

Lederer (2012) further lists several advantages on the usage of social media in education. She states that social media as a functional medium capable of developing student participation and building communication competence in students within a free and relaxed atmosphere. Lederer (2012) also mentioned that social media has the potential to also bridge communication difficulty among students and instructors. The instructors could also utilize the platform to prepare home works, make announcements, share updates etc.

However, on the other side of the divide, some educators and instructional designers believe that social media technologies are not always neither appropriate nor successful vehicles for teaching and learning activities (Waycott, Bennett, Kennedy, Dalgarno, & Gray, 2010). Lederer (2012) cites the following as reasons leading up to censuring the integration of social media for academic practice as vital. She suggests that social media could be distractive. A common complaint among instructors is that some social media applications i.e. Facebook and Twitter divert students' attention from classroom participation and seen as ultimately disruptive to the learning process.

Although, social media creates an appealing avenue for instructors and students to interact, Lederer (2012) raises up concerns on cyber-bullying. She explains that social media has the tendency to diminish face to face interaction while hiding behind social media to avoid real life communication and could even breed hostile behavior (Lederer, 2012).

Posing another challenge with the integration of social media into the academic curriculum is appropriateness concerns. Content has to be appropriate and suitable for students at all levels and these calls for close supervision from faculty on posted materials in the curriculum (Lester & Perini, 2010).

Debates remain non-stop from proponents against the integration of social media in classroom education. Proponents in support of social media firmly state cooperative learning, interaction and socialization, student to student support, feedback, and information dissemination as pros. However, trust issues in respect to student feedback, cyberbullying, ownership and privacy issues, technological strides and infrastructural setups, information management and even excessive work load are issues that rise time and again as cons.

Despite the contentions and differing views, a middle point is the acknowledgement that there is no denying the impact social media has on 21st century learners (Lederer, 2012; Lester & Perini, 2010; Turkle, 2004). This developing interest in the growing use of social media has compelled educators to critically investigate and explore the possibilities of its integration into the academic process. With educational institutions faced with the need to promote collaborative learning alongside building community

between students, Minocha (2009) suggests that educators utilize social media tools such as Facebook, virtual worlds among others that majorly build and encourage synchronous collaboration.

The examination seeks to unravel the reason some educators view social media integration into education as demanding and way too far from the traditional norms therefore unprofessional. The use of internet in school over the years, has been on the increase.

Fears however arise because expectations on teachers are high. Teachers are expected to be competent and expert users of present day technologies. More so, the application of these strategies in the classroom is an additional expectation. This comes off as an unfair fight as students from very tender ages are already introduced and acclimated to internet. Sadly, the story is so different for some of the classroom teachers. Technology could be a little frightening, posing difficulty; especially in relation to integration into a constantly changing curriculum (Really good stuff, 2012).

Taiwo (2009) a Nigerian researcher, examined teachers' perception of the role of media in classroom teaching in secondary schools. After testing the first hypothesis, it is found that teachers' perceptions of media roles were related to the type of roles teachers thus perceived to be methodologically different (Taiwo, 2009).

Teachers, however, indicated more agreement with media as instructional aids (63%) than with media as substitute for teachers (37%). The finding that conventional/traditional use of media was more preferred to modern use as there are

some teachers' perception of media stepping into the place of teachers. This is consistent with the findings of Acquino (1994), Morris (1962), & Romiszowski, (1998). The findings of their research indicate that teachers generally have a favorable disposition toward the role of media with media as an instructional aid rather than an instructional system.

Regular with results from previous studies (Lumpe & Chambers, 2001); (MacArthur & Malouf, 1991 & Zepp 2005), the findings reveal that teachers had aligned perceptions. Particularly, the percentage of school teachers with aligned preferences was 57%, by judging from the higher percentage of teachers in support of traditional use of media compared to modern use of media. This clearly explains the indifference amongst teachers as to whether social media is incorporated into the school curriculum or not and the inadequate knowledge on social media relevance as opposed to the threats of replacing teacher traditional role.

Similar issues are documented in a study from the results of an extensive survey directed to students, teachers and head teachers on the use of ICT in education (Wastiau et al. 2013). The study gathered feedback from over 24,000 teachers spread across 27 countries, questioned varying issues like the level of teachers' and students' access to ICT at school, ICT centered activities etc. and both operational and social media skills were measured side by side. As suspected, operational skills had an upper hand compared to social media skills across countries. Past the regional differences, the authors urge policy makers at all levels to devote a considerable amount of value, time and money as an investment into the professional development of teachers' as

this will go a long way in bridging the gap between social media skills and operational skills.

Vuorikari and Brecko (2014) express similar views on teacher digital development. They express that this developmental competence and proficiency will better enlighten teachers on the relevance of digital education and enable its proper integration and professional usage.

Veletsianos et, al. (2013) further outline the essence of social media familiarity alongside with technological trends and tools in relation to teachers' delivery level in educational practice. In the same vein, Scott (2013) stresses how gender, age and prior experience may affect teachers taking up e-learning, especially emerging technologies such as social network sites.

Also, Ajjan & Hartshorne (2008) investigated whether university faculty are really in the know of the benefits of using Web 2.0 technologies to aid the traditional classroom instruction delivery possible factors that influence faculty's decision to adopt Web 2.0 technologies as supplement to traditional classroom instruction. Undoubtedly, social network sites are recognized as useful platforms for improving communications between students, teachers, faculty and even course satisfaction and performance level.

Teachers fear that their long-established and customary place and responsibilities could be discarded as a result of social media inclusion in teaching. Other factors

discouraging staff include privacy issues, absence of technical assistance from school management, amongst other risk (Manca & Ranieri, 2015).

As stressed by Veletsianos and Kimmons (2013), are further factors influencing the integration of social media and technologies into the teaching practice? A thin line exists between identifying teacher personal responsibility from professional roles, school administration identity and the core values social media represents. These issues raise fears and resistance. In general, a number of causes, effects and barriers addressed and reviewed to overcome the barriers that discourage school teachers from considering and embracing the adoption and integration of social network tools in present day teaching practices.

A research was taken by Ekici & Kiyici (2012), and findings presented proved that comparing students allowed access to social media and their traditional counterparts with no access, students with social media access were rated as better academically. Their findings tallies with Lederer (2012) in respect to the role social media plays and its ability to make studies exciting and in the long run, produce required results in students.

Ozer, et al. (2014) also undertook a study through comscore with conclusions that 37.3% comprising of people who frequented the internet fall within the ages of 15-24 and 31% these users fall between ages 25-34. The percentages above clearly documents for the age group of youngest in Europe. Furthermore, for Turkey, calculating hours within a month spent by internet users, the country ranked second after England with a 31 hour difference. Ratings show Turkey in 5th place in the world

judging from the 11.2 hours compared to the hours social media users consume on sites. Ofcom did take a study that detailed students as the predominant users of social media.

Kemp (2011) did an extensive examination of the Key 30 economies which accounts for the worlds 70% population and reported that one or more social media sites are frequented by nearly three-quarter of the population on a daily basis. Little wonder the non- stop increase of users.

Ologie (2013) undertook studies on social networks sites and concluded with four tested and proven paragon to answer questions on the use of social networking sites. First, he explains its relevance in the relay and distribution of messages and information in enhancing communal living. Secondly, the thrill in its usage is exciting and can propel passion among users with the array of diverse platforms for information. Thirdly, it is an avenue for creative minds to share thoughts, ideas and innovations. Lastly, it solves a human need. The desire for bonding, community, interaction and connection. In schools most importantly, social media sites motivates users to gain and acquire knowledge with the accessibility to share created profiles with others (Fardoun et al., 2012).

A study by Cheung et, al. (2011) expresses the justifications for the increasing number of social network users. Facebook to be precise. Reasons include the ease and functional connectivity among users and the exciting platform it creates for information dissipation (Cheung et al., 2011). Bostrom et al. (2008) carried out

another study concludes that social network sites encourages collaborative work among students and enables them achieve learning objectives.

Social media has further enabled students with all- time access to course content and ease of information disperse among others. E-learning for example, has created an avenue for school teachers to review personal course content with an all- time access too, and with ease hereby enabling them meet school targets and achieve set objectives (Bates, 2005).

Social media shoulders a key responsibility in making available timely and relevant information to both students and teachers alike. More so, organizations have very little to do with publicizing services. The creation of a websites, covers for it (Klamma et al., 2007). Klamma et al further explains that a key role social networks play is in the creation of a platform that connects experts of different fields together to share ideas and knowledge for a common goal (Klamma et al. 2007).

Among university students, social media usage is an exciting area to explore and research on especially for social scientists and educationists. Hamid, Chang, & Kurnia (2009) are of the opinion that applauds the social media platform for its innovation on collaboration and content creation strategies.

Others justify the use of social media especially in secondary schools as it enhances and motivates students with better study experiences through the online platform (Dabner, 2012). It makes easier student-student communication including students in virtual communities (Mack, Behler, Roberts, & Rimland, 2007).

Reid (2011) conducted an enquiry into the chances and positive roles social sites such as Facebook and Twitter present in specific areas of emotional, academic and social growth. Reid (2011) describes online domain as 'safe places' explaining the free flow of information, built relationships and the attainment of expressive liberty. She concludes that unending opportunities abound for educational networking with Facebook and Twitter hence, supporting the learning process.

Social network sites create avenues for users to extend communicative connections with peers and exchange private information through features peculiar with online communities (Buss & Strauss, 2009). With the opinion of Junco and Loken (2011), social networking sites are simply the simple and unconstrained way to associate and link up especially in a disengaged and disconnected world like ours. Yeomans, and Wheeler (2008) state that SNSs makes available suitable chances for students to exchange ideas, exhibit personal creativity and receive prompt feedback.

Unsurprisingly, with the increasing number of sites; social media has progressed into a fundamental tool for human communication (Brady, Holcomb, & Smith, 2010). Diverse options are available for individuals to connect either through links, videos, photos amongst others, to share information and collaborate (McCann, 2009).

With social media playing a huge role in ensuring that social relationships are built, individuals with communicative difficulties or trouble maintaining social relationships are spared the complications and worry. It motivates interactions and reduces communicative barriers (Ellison, Steinfeld, & Lampe, 2007).

A lot of researchers agree that the utilization and integration of SNSs yields increase interest among students in respect to engagement and collaborative learning (Aghili et al., 2014; Hoffman, 2009). Gathered from a research assembled by New Media Consortium and ELI (2007), social sites goes beyond captivating and engaging users' attention to encouraging user involvement, and building expected educational outcomes. It also provides learners with an avenue to design personal profiles of which they automatically assume learning responsibility (Meishar-Tal, Kurtz, & Pieterse, 2012). More so, SNSs plays a helpful role in aiding student participation, creating and sustaining online communities and room for acceptance (Lee & McLoughlin, 2010; Naveh et al., 2010). More so, SNS has the potential to refine high order thinking efficiency of learners' in sync with exercises chosen by instructors (Callaghan & Bower, 2012; Churchill & Lu, 2012).

The above mentioned reasons clearly explain the relevance of social media and the role it plays particularly in higher education. However, these do not come without reservations from some researchers who submit that it could serve as a distraction to the learning process and the uncontrolled exposure for both students and teachers could be individually unsafe (Petrovic et al., 2014; Meishar-Tal, Kurtz, & Pieterse, 2012).

Evidently, social media usage is on the increase among students. Its promotive relevance in advancing cooperative learning, practical and engaging environment is of immerse importance (Hussain, 2005). The freedom to interact with peers, exchange information and learning experiences, research on projects together and even share job opening opportunities contribute to its preferred use among students. Armstrong

& Franklin (2008) assembled a wide-ranging report in 2008. The report suggested that students' use of social media was majorly for the reasons of learning development.

Social media is viewed to be a communication enabling tool with students desiring that academic institutions embrace its integration into the curriculum to re-inforce classroom teaching (Roblyer, et al. 2010). In view of this, Madge, Meek, Wellens, & Hooley (2009) opined that the use of social media improves educational reach, coverage and relationship. Social networking has a special way of bridging digital natives with digital immigrants. It closes up the learning gap (Bull, et al. 2008).

Conclusively, it has been proven that social media sites make available for use a social environment irrespective distance barrier, for students to communicate more with peers (Higher Education Research Institute, 2007). Distance learning seldom affords enrolled students the opportunity to meet unofficially with course mates and even instructors. The use of social media sites avails them these privileges hence, building a sense of community which in turn gives rise to student zeal, interest, and readiness to collaborate with instructors yielding increased success (Rozac et al., 2012; Holcomb, Brady & Smith, 2010).

In view of the aforementioned, social networking sites present platform for collaborative learning resulting into high student involvement (Lee & McLoughlin, 2010; Naveh et al., 2010), student participation and commitment, (Aghili et al., 2014; Hoffman, 2009), increased student interest and determination, and collaboration (Özmen, & Atıcı, (2014).

Considering both the relevance and impact of social media on education alongside the growing number of users, merging this technology with education only seems rational and objective for the purpose of supporting and improving teaching and learning quality (Özmen, B., & Atıcı, B. 2014).

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This section of the study covers the entire methodology process in detail, which includes data sample, research approach, data collection tools, data sources and variables used in the analysis to obtain the final result.

3.1 Research Approach

In the study of the attitude of teachers' in respect to the utilization of social media in education, various approaches have been applied. However, in this case, quantitative research approach has been adopted.

Quantitative research is used to quantify the problem with the way of generating numerical data in which data can be transformed into useable statistics. It is used to quantify attitudes, opinions, behaviors, and other defined variables – and generalize results from a larger sample population (Wyse, 2011).

Quantitative Research uses measurable data to formulate facts and uncover patterns in research and data collection methods include various forms of surveys. The study focuses on secondary schools within Abuja- Nigeria. Quantitative approach is appropriate for this study as the researcher intends to gather measurable data from secondary school teachers. The questionnaire was obtained from Inayati (2013).

3.1.1 Participants

This study was gathered from the results of 112 teachers who participated as respondents' for this research.

Table 2: Age Distribution of the Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
23-35	45	40.2
35-45	43	38.4
45+	24	21.4
Total	112	100.00

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage between the respondents' across all ages. It shows that all the teachers' fall between three age groups of 23-35, 35-45 and 45+. 40.2% are between ages 23-45, 38.4% are between ages 35-45 and 21.4% are between ages 45+.

Table 3: Years of Experience of the Participants

	Frequency	**Percent**
3-5	32	28.6
5-10	42	37.5
10-15	22	19.6
15	15	13.4
Total	111	99.1
Total	11	100.0

Table 3 explains the frequency percentage of the teachers' based on years of experience. All the teachers fall within 4 groups of years of experience. From Table 3 above, a detailed breakdown is given on the percentages and number of teachers within all the four groups. 28.6% have 3-5 years' work experience, 37.5% have 5-10 years' experience, 19.6% have 10-15 years' experience and 13.4% have 15 years' experience.

Table 4: Gender Distribution of the Participants

		Frequency	Percent
	Male	62	55.4
	Female	49	43.8
	Total	112	100.0

Table 4 shows teachers frequency based on gender with 62 male and 49 female teachers. All 112 respondents' agreed to been computer literate with prior computer background. 55.4% are male teachers while 43.8% are female teachers.

3.2 Data Collection Instruments

A questionnaire based on open and closed ended questions has been designed to collect data from the targeted audience. Questionnaire is a most appropriate and practical tool to collect large amount of information within less time and cost. The collected data can be quantified easily and quickly (Tylor, 2004).

The questionnaire was taken from Inayati (2013) to achieve the research objective**.** The questionnaire comprises of four sections. Firstly, the demographics such as gender, age, field of teaching and years of experience; the second assesses respondents' familiarity with social media with columns for not familiar, familiar, and very familiar. Frequency of usage column entails options for never, seldom, sometimes, often and very often. The last section covers the attitude towards social media usage. Each measured using the five-point Likert scale of agreement: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree and (5) strongly agree.

3.3 Data Analysis

For the analysis of the received data, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences statistics tool (SPSS) 21 version is used. ANOVA is used to calculate the frequency, make descriptive analysis and also t-test. SPSS ranks as the frequently used tool essential in statistical testing over the years (Daniel, 2014).

It is ideal for the social science research, where the measurement of human behavior or attitude is essential. SPSS comes with versatile packages that help in data transformation, forms of output and mainly the adequate results (Daniel, 2014).

In order to drive end results, cumulative analysis has been performed with the help of SPSS software. Cumulative effects are ideal when two or more activities affect an environmental resource, ecosystem, or human community, or when an activity causes effects on two or more occasions.

The cumulative effect is the result of all impact-causing activities that affect a resource while the impacts of the proposed action are occurring or remain in effect (James, 2016). Thus, cumulative analysis was most appropriate for this study to evaluate teachers' attitude in respect to the use of social media in education.

3.4 Validity and Reliability

This explains for the reliability and validity of the research. It is reliable as seen in the Table below because it is above .65 which is acceptable depending on the number of items evaluated. The reliability of the survey is tested and verified using Cronbach alpha. The validity of any research refers to its truthfulness, authenticity, and indicates how ideas match reality Neuman & Kreugar (2003). Furthermore, the validity of any

research study enquires and discourses how the reality that has been measured by the survey matches with the theoretical hypothesis which the researcher has in mind and uses to understand it Neuman & Kreugar (2003).

According to Neuman & Kreugar (2003) the reliability of a research work points to its trustworthiness, dependability and regularity of the work.

Table 5: Reliability Analysis of the Study

Cronbach's Alpha	**No. of Items**
.659	19

Using Cronbach's alpha to establish the reliability, it reflects that: Excellent ($\alpha>0.9$), Good ($0.7<\alpha<0.9$), Acceptable ($0.6<\alpha<0.7$), Poor ($0.5<\alpha<0.6$), Unacceptable ($\alpha<0.5$) (George & Mallery, 2003). Table 5 shows the reliability statistics of the research. As explained above, it shows how reliable the study is judging from Cronbach Alpha criteria.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

This chapter includes research findings of the thesis related with the research questions.

4.1 Teacher's Familiarity and Frequency with the Use of Social Media

Closely after the respondents profile, there were questions on familiarity and frequency of usage of social media. The questionnaire outlined nine common sites to determine frequency and familiarity. The familiarity section had three options of not familiar, familiar and very familiar with the outlined social sites. Table 8 indicates the mean values of the respondents' submission to familiarity and frequency questions.

Table 6: Familiarity and Frequency of Teachers for Social Media Usage

Social Media	**Frequency of use $\bar{x}$**	**Familiarity $\bar{x}$**
Facebook	**2,65**	**4,00**
YouTube	**2,29**	**3,76**
Twitter	2,14	2,85
Wiki	1,74	2,52
Blog	1,84	2,18
Google+	**2,34**	**3,58**
Slide share	1,60	1,99
Podcast	1,43	1,76
LinkedIn	1,88	2,02
MySpace	1,44	1,86

This section had all respondents familiar more than one site especially Facebook, YouTube and Google+. Considerable familiarity from the respondents could be seen in the mean values of Twitter, wikis, and blogs; while the SlideShare, MySpace, LinkedIn and Podcast are reflected as the respondents' least familiar sites. From Table 6, Facebook is the highest with a frequency of 2,65 and a familiarity of 4,00. Google+ comes second in frequency of usage with 2,34 and YouTube follows closely with 2,29. The lowest however is Podcast with 1,43. It equally comes least in familiarity with 1,76. Although the questionnaire administered does not question why the selected media types are most preferred or less preferred, other researchers have carried out findings as to why school teachers take a liking to them.

Munoz, & Towner, (2009) suggest possible reasons as to why Facebook seems to be amongst the top social media platform embraced by teachers and students alike. They explain that Facebook's potential to make available diverse pedagogical benefit to teachers and students. Its connectivity within students places it as an advantage and plays a role in its preference compared to other social media platforms. More so, it builds a larger learning community which is a vital aspect in education (Tess, 2013). Furthermore, it makes available needed the opportunity and formation essential for students to simply help each other in academic courses and in a relaxed atmosphere. Hamann &Wilson (2003) from personal findings drew the conclusions that students who took part in a web-enhanced classes outperformed contemporaries in a traditional lecture format.

This connotes that students are better when actively engaged in Internet based or supported learning compared to the traditional class lecture. According to Hamann

&Wilson (2003), Facebook further creates a better atmosphere for teacher-student and student-student interaction. Through Facebook, instructors conveniently connect with students in respect to assignments, information on events, relevant links, and samples of works at all times including outside of the classroom.

As of July 2011, Facebook recorded 750 million users, Twitter over 177 million tweets per day, and YouTube documented three billion views per day (Chen & Bryer, 2012). Google+ is a cloud-based social networking site suitable for any operating system, user friendly, free, and a tool that can be used globally by any online instructor and any student. Ortiz, et al. (2015) concludes that Google+ was the most suitable chosen social network for a school survey they conducted. Creating a Google+ community as revealed in their survey served as an effective means to share academic material (notes, videos, activity guides, etc.) and the activities were carried out using Google Hangouts. More so, the feedback from the administered survey reflected students' satisfaction with the experience. These could most likely speak for the high familiarity and frequency level of Google+ as depicted in Table 6.

YouTube from the above table is among the top most familiar social media platform among the respondents. Chronicled in Burke et al. (2009) work, a 2006 survey reveals that 100million video clips are daily watched on the YouTube platform with an additional 65,000 new uploads within every 24hours. The site also registers almost 20 million guests every month. Little wonder the result in Table 8.

Yuen, F. Y., & 袁鳳儀. (2015) administered questionnaires to 49 student teachers and 17 teachers. The study indicated YouTube as a common tool among teachers. So

relevant is YouTube that, it seemed to have a generally positive perception amongst teachers who viewed it as a useful tool in education. From the gathered data, YouTube is a familiar tool among teachers and student teachers and even serves as a teaching tool. It ranked the second favorite Interactive Collaborative Learning (ICL) tool in both groups with a 55% teacher rating and a 57% student-teacher rating. As with these research findings, the results confirm the familiarity and frequency of use of YouTube among school teachers.

4.1.1 Teachers' Frequency and Familiarity with Social Media Based on Gender

The Table 7 below shows the relationship between gender and teacher familiarity and frequency with social media.

Table 7: Frequency and Familiarity of Teachers in Relation to Gender

Social Media	Gender	Mean (Frequency)	SD	Mean (Familiarity)	SD
Facebook	Male Female	2.62 2.67	.51 .47	3.98 4.02	1.01 .94
YouTube	Male	2.26 2.35	.65 .63	3.32 4.30	1.15 5.90
Twitter	Female	2.20 2.06	.65 .65	2.93 2.71	1.25 1.40
Wiki	Male	1.66 1.81	.72 .73	4.55 2.43	4.12 1.34
Blog	Female	1.71 2.00	.71 1.77	1.92 2.47	1.22 1.43
Google+	Male	2.32 2.34	.69 .63	3.63 2.48	1.29 1.26
Slide share	Female	1.56 1.65	.64 .69	1.96 2.04	1.31 1. 37
Podcast	Male	.61 .69	.61 .69	1.81 1.71	1.19 1.19
LinkedIn	Female	4.05 .70	4.05 .70	2.03 2.02	1.29 1.36
My Space	Male	.71 .57	.71 .57	1.90 1.86	1.31 1.33

From the Table 7 above, gender plays a role in teachers' familiarity and frequency of social media in the above mentioned sites out of the nine sites mentioned in the questionnaire. However, for four social media platforms, gender plays a role. For YouTube, while Male teachers are familiar with the platform, female teachers are very familiar with the platform. A difference of male-3.32 and females-4.30 is clearly stated. Wiki has the male teachers who are very familiar compared to the female teachers who are not familiar with the site. On familiarity, female respondents' are familiar with Google+ while the male respondents' are seen not familiar with the social media platform. Table 9 shows that, the male respondents' use LinkedIn rarely while the female respondents' never use the LinkedIn. This shows that YouTube, Wiki and Google+ familiarities have a significant difference among gender groups with LinkedIn.

Roberts et, al. (2014) conducted a survey on gender roles in social media usage and concluded that females are inclined to view technologies as communicative devices capable of sustain and developing relationships unlike men who view social media as information and entertainment platforms and sources (Junco et al., 2010). Kuss & Griffiths (2011) undertook an evaluation on Facebook and resulted that females primarily resort to social media for social networking and communicative purposes. More so, various other studies have realized that females express an increased level of bond and fondness with cell phones and social media; some form of dependency compared to males (Geser, 2006) This seems to answer for why female respondents' in this research are more familiar with YouTube compared to the male respondents' who are more familiar with Wiki and Google+ and more frequent on LinkedIn which is primarily an information site.

In summary, teachers regardless male or female are familiar with social media sites and frequently utilize these sites.

4.1.2 Teachers' Familiarity and Frequency Based on Age

Table 8 shows a breakdown of teachers across all ages and the frequency and familiarity details.

Table 8: Cumulative Table on Teachers' Frequency and Familiarity Depending on Age

		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Frequency of Facebook	Between Groups	,733	2	,367	1,498	,228
	Within Groups	26,686	109	,245		
	Total	27,420	111			
Frequency of YouTube	Between Groups	4,888	2	2,444	6,596	**,002**
	Within Groups	40,389	109	,371		
	Total	45,277	111			
Frequency of Twitter	Between Groups	3,175	2	1,587	3,914	**,023**
	Within Groups	43,798	108	,406		
	Total	46,973	110			
Frequency of Wiki	Between Groups	3,442	2	1,721	3,321	**,040**
	Within Groups	55,981	108	,518		
	Total	59,423	110			
Frequency of Blog	Between Groups	5,456	2	2,728	1,655	,196
	Within Groups	179,651	109	1,648		
	Total	185,107	111			
Frequency of Google+	Between Groups	,498	2	,249	,558	,574
	Within	48,609	109	,446		

	Groups					
	Total	49,107	111			
Frequency of Slide share	Between Groups	1,377	2	,688	1,578	,211
	Within Groups	47,543	109	,436		
	Total	48,920	111			
Frequency of Podcast	Between Groups	2,466	2	1,233	3,447	**,035**
	Within Groups	38,633	108	,358		
	Total	41,099	110			
Frequency of LinkedIn	Between Groups	28,428	2	14,214	1,537	,220
	Within Groups	1007,822	109	9,246		
	Total	1036,250	111			
Frequency of MySpace	Between Groups	1,903	2	,951	2,260	,109
	Within Groups	45,467	108	,421		
	Total	47,369	110			
Familiarity of Facebook Usage	Between Groups	1,612	2	,806	,833	,437
	Within Groups	105,380	109	,967		
	Total	106,991	111			
Familiarity of YouTube usage	Between Groups	25,277	2	12,638	,784	,459
	Within Groups	1757,214	109	16,121		
	Total	1782,491	111			
Familiarity of Twitter usage	Between Groups	12,366	2	6,183	3,743	**,027**
	Within Groups	180,054	109	1,652		
	Total	192,420	111			
Familiarity of Wiki usage	Between Groups	20,834	2	10,417	1,027	,361
	Within Groups	1105,130	109	10,139		

	Total	1125,964	111			
Familiarity of Blog usage	Between Groups	8,499	2	4,249	2,413	,094
	Within Groups	191,930	109	1,761		
	Total	200,429	111			
Familiarity of Google Plus usage	Between Groups	1,896	2	,948	,576	,564
	Within Groups	179,381	109	1,646		
	Total	181,277	111			
Familiarity of Slideshare usage	Between Groups	,013	2	,007	,004	,996
	Within Groups	194,978	109	1,789		
	Total	194,991	111			
Familiarity of Podcast usage	Between Groups	1,562	2	,781	,550	,579
	Within Groups	154,929	109	1,421		
	Total	156,491	111			
Familiarity of LinkedIn usage	Between Groups	9,754	2	4,877	2,917	,058
	Within Groups	182,211	109	1,672		
	Total	191,964	111			
Familiarity of MySpace usage	Between Groups	4,236	2	2,118	1,228	,297
	Within Groups	188,014	109	1,725		
	Total	192,250	111			

Table 8 shows the familiarity and frequency of respondents' between and within groups in relation to age. The cumulative table above shows that frequency levels for YouTube, Twitter, Wiki and Podcast have measurable difference depending on age while Twitter has familiarity difference depending on respondents' age differences. Table 9 below further explains the differences in clear details.

Table 9: Differences Among Age Groups Related to Familiarity and Frequency of Teachers Using Social Media.

Social Media	Ages	Mean Diff. (Frequency)	Sig.	Mean Diff. (Familiarity)	Sig.
YouTube	25-35-45+	.55	.000		
Twitter	25-35- 45+	.44	.007		
Wiki	25-35- 45+	.45	.015		
Podcast	25-35- 35-45	.26	.40		
Podcast	25-35- 45+		.022		
Twitter	25-35- 45+			.84	.010
Blog	45+ - 25-35			.73	.030
LinkedIn	25-35- 45+			.61	.029

More so, it shows that teachers ages (25-35) are more familiar with Twitter compared to teachers ages (45+). Older teachers ages (45+) are more familiar with Blog compared to younger teachers ages (25-35). Teachers ages (25-35) are more familiar with LinkedIn compared to teachers ages (45+).

The above familiarity and frequency Table 9 in relation to age signify that younger aged teachers are more frequent and familiar with the social media sites compared to older teachers except for Blog where the older teachers ages (45+) interestingly are more familiar compared to the younger teachers ages (25-35) and (35-45) respectively. More Tables on Teachers familiarity and frequency based on age could be found in the appendix.

4.1.3 Teachers' Familiarity and Frequency Based on Years of Experience

The Table 10 below indicates how teachers' familiarity and frequency is related to years of experience in teaching.

Table 10: Familiarity and Frequency of Teachers Using social Media Based on Years of Experience

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency of Facebook	3-5	32	2,68	,47
	5-10	42	2,73	,44
	10-15	22	2,59	,50
	15 +	15	2,40	,63
	Total	111	2,64	,49
Frequency of YouTube	3-5	32	2,43	,56
	5-10	42	2,45	,55
	10-15	22	2,00	,61
	15 +	15	1,93	,79
	Total	111	2,28	,63
Frequency of Twitter	3-5	31	2,22	,71
	5-10	42	2,28	,50
	10-15	22	1,86	,63
	15 +	15	1,86	,74
	Total	110	2,12	,65
Frequency of Wiki	3-5	32	1,87	,75
	5-10	42	1,88	,73
	10-15	21	1,38	,58
	15 +	15	1,46	,63
	Total	110	1,72	,72
Frequency of Blog	3-5	32	1,96	,73
	5-10	42	2,14	1,86
	10-15	22	1,45	,67
	15 +	15	1,26	,45
	Total	111	1,83	1,29
Frequency of Google+	3-5	32	2,21	,65
	5-10	42	2,38	,66
	10-15	22	2,27	,76
	15 +	15	2,53	,51
	Total	111	2,33	,66

Frequency of Slide share	3-5	32	1,68	,69
	5-10	42	1,66	,65
	10-15	22	1,45	,67
	15 +	15	1,40	,63
	Total	111	1,59	,66
Frequency of Podcast	3-5	32	1,53	,67
	5-10	41	1,48	,67
	10-15	22	1,27	,45
	15 +	15	1,20	,41
	Total	110	1,41	,61
Frequency of LinkedIn	3-5	32	2,75	5,57
	5-10	42	1,64	,72
	10-15	22	1,36	,58
	15 +	15	1,33	,61
	Total	111	1,86	3,06
Frequency of MySpace	3-5	32	1,50	,67
	5-10	41	1,46	,71
	10-15	22	1,27	,55
	15 +	15	1,46	,63
	Total	110	1,43	,65
Familiarity of Facebook Usage	3-5	32	4,1875	,89
	5-10	42	3,97	,97
	10-15	22	4,00	,92
	15 +	15	3,80	1,26
	Total	111	4,01	,98
Familiarity of YouTube usage	3-5	32	3,65	,93
	5-10	42	3,57	1,06
	10-15	22	5,04	8,79
	15 +	15	2,73	1,43
	Total	111	3,77	4,02
Familiarity of Twitter usage	3-5	32	3,06	1,31
	5-10	42	3,04	1,24
	10-15	22	2,63	1,39
	15 +	15	2,13	1,24
	Total	111	2,84	1,32
Familiarity of Wiki usage	3-5	32	2,46	1,36
	5-10	42	3,23	4,87
	10-15	22	1,81	1,18
	15 +	15	1,66	1,17
	Total	111	2,52	3,19
Familiarity of Blog usage	3-5	32	2,25	1,29

	5-10	42	2,59	1,39
	10-15	22	1,81	1,36
	15 +	15	1,40	,82
	Total	111	2,18	1,34
Familiarity of Google Plus usage	3-5	32	3,31	1,33
	5-10	42	3,64	1,20
	10-15	22	3,72	1,51
	15 +	15	3,80	1,01
	Total	111	3,58	1,28
Familiarity of Slideshare usage	3-5	32	2,00	1,34
	5-10	42	2,00	1,24
	10-15	22	1,95	1,32
	15 +	15	1,93	1,62
	Total	111	1,98	1,32
Familiarity of Podcast usage	3-5	32	1,81	1,22
	5-10	42	1,95	1,20
	10-15	22	1,54	1,14
	15 +	15	1,33	1,04
	Total	111	1,74	1,18
Familiarity of LinkedIn usage	3-5	32	2,37	1,31
	5-10	42	2,07	1,29
	10-15	22	1,63	1,21
	15 +	15	1,60	1,40
	Total	111	2,00	1,31
Familiarity of MySpace usage	3-5	32	2,09	1,46
	5-10	42	1,85	1,20
	10-15	22	1,54	1,22
	15 +	15	1,86	1,45
	Total	111	1,86	1,31

Table 10 shows clearly for each year of experience, the familiarity and frequency of use of social media sites. As seen from the table 10, younger teachers were more familiar and frequented social media sites compared to older teachers. An elaborate table depicting the differences can be seen in the Table 11 below.

Table 11: Differences in Teachers Familiarity and Frequency across Years of Experience

Social Media	Years of Experience		Mean Diff. (Frequency)	Sig.	Mean Diff. (Familiarity)	Sig.
Facebook	3-5	15+	.33	.024		
YouTube	3-5 5-10	10- 15 15+ 10- 15 15+	.43 .50 .45 48	.010 .009 .005 .005		
Twitter	3-5 5-10	5-10 10-15 15+	.36 .45 .41	.042 .013 .030		
Wiki	3-5 5-10	10-15 10-15	.49 .50	.014 .009		
Blog	3-5 5-10 10-15	 .68 .87	 .68 .87	 .042 .024	.85 .77 .12 .91	.039 .025 .003 .0021
Twitter	3-5 5-10				.92 .91	.024 .021
LinkedIn	3-5				.73	.043

Table 11 shows that teachers ages (25-35) frequent YouTube more than older teachers ages (45+). It also reveals that younger teachers ages (25-35) are more frequent with Wiki compared to teachers ages (45+). It further depicts that younger teachers ages (25-35) are more frequent with Podcast compared to other age groups (35-45) and (45+).

4.1.4 Teachers' Frequency and Familiarity of Using Social Media Based on Field of Teaching

This section discusses the relation between teachers' familiarity and frequency of social media between fields of teaching.

Table 12 shows the familiarity and frequency of social media use between every field of study. Basically, only blog stands out between and within groups as the least frequent with a significance below .05.

Table 12: Teachers' Social Media Frequency and Familiarity Between Fields of Teaching

		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Frequency of Facebook	Between Groups	5,401	14	,386	1,699	,068
	Within Groups	22,019	97	,227		
	Total	27,420	111			

Frequency of YouTube	Between Groups	5,191	14	,371	,897	,564
	Within Groups	40,085	97	,413		
	Total	45,277	111			
Frequency of Twitter	Between Groups	3,340	14	,239	,525	,913
	Within Groups	43,633	96	,455		
	Total	46,973	110			
Frequency of Wiki	Between Groups	4,034	14	,288	,499	,928
	Within Groups	55,389	96	,577		
	Total	59,423	110			

Frequency of Blog	Between Groups	40,795	14	2,914	1,959	**,029**
	Within Groups	144,312	97	1,488		
	Total	185,107	111			
Frequency of Google+	Between Groups	7,958	14	,568	1,340	,199
	Within Groups	41,150	97	,424		
	Total	49,107	111			
Frequency of Slide share	Between Groups	3,186	14	,228	,483	,937
	Within Groups	45,734	97	,471		
	Total	48,920	111			

Frequency of Podcast	Between Groups	2,507	14	,179	,446	,955
	Within Groups	38,592	96	,402		
	Total	41,099	110			
Frequency of LinkedIn	Between Groups	102,802	14	7,343	,763	,706
	Within Groups	933,448	97	9,623		
	Total	1036,250	111			
Frequency of MySpace	Between Groups	2,812	14	,201	,433	,960
	Within Groups	44,557	96	,464		
	Total	47,369	110			

Familiarity of Facebook Usage	Between Groups	4,778	14	,341	,324	,990
	Within Groups	102,213	97	1,054		
	Total	106,991	111			
Familiarity of YouTube usage	Between Groups	273,935	14	19,567	1,258	,248
	Within Groups	1508,556	97	15,552		
	Total	1782,491	111			
Familiarity of Twitter usage	Between Groups	11,139	14	,796	,426	,963
	Within Groups	181,281	97	1,869		
	Total	192,420	111			

Familiarity of Wiki usage	Between Groups	230,754	14	16,482	1,786	,051
	Within Groups	895,210	97	9,229		
	Total	1125,964	111			
Familiarity of Blog usage	Between Groups	23,185	14	1,656	,906	,555
	Within Groups	177,244	97	1,827		
	Total	200,429	111			
Familiarity of Google Plus usage	Between Groups	26,748	14	1,911	1,199	,289
	Within Groups	154,529	97	1,593		
	Total	181,277	111			

Familiarity of Slideshare usage	Between Groups	29,414	14	2,101	1,231	,266
	Within Groups	165,577	97	1,707		
	Total	194,991	111			
Familiarity of Podcast usage	Between Groups	20,128	14	1,438	1,023	,438
	Within Groups	136,363	97	1,406		
	Total	156,491	111			
Familiarity of LinkedIn usage	Between Groups	17,690	14	1,264	,703	,766
	Within Groups	174,274	97	1,797		
	Total	191,964	111			

Familiarity of MySpace usage	Between Groups	17,331	14	1,238	,686	,782
	Within Groups	174,919	97	1,803		
	Total	192,250	111			

The Table 12 above shows the cumulative in social media familiarity and frequency of use between and within teachers of different fields of study with frequency in Blog standing out as affected by difference in teachers' field of study. Contained in the appendix is another table showing the familiarity and frequency of teachers based on field of teaching?

4.2 Teacher's Attitude Towards use of Social Media

The section regarding the attitude of respondents' in this study questions the relevance of social media integration for academic goals. There are 24 items in this section of the survey; each measured using the five-point Likert scale of agreement: (1) strongly disagrees, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree and (5) strongly agree. The items were arranged from specific attitudes towards social media usefulness in class. Teachers' attitude have been evaluated based on their age, gender and years of experience. The items are divided into columns of Strongly Disagree (S.D) Disagree (D) Undecided (U) Agree (A) Strongly Agree (A) Mean (M) Frequency (F) Percentage (%).

Table 13: Teacher's General Attitude Towards use of Social Media

No.	Item	S.D		D		U		A		S.A		Mean
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean
1	Social media integration makes teaching and learning more enjoyable	5	4.5	8	7.1	6	5.4	5.4	48.2	39	34.8	4.02
2	Using social media offers real advantages in teaching and learning	5	4.5	7	6.3	7	6.3	59	52.7	34	30.4	3.98
3	Social media is an effective learning tool	3	2.7	8	7.1	7	6.3	67	59.8	28	23.2	3.94
4	Social media improves student-student communication	3	2.7	5	4.5	12	10.7	53	47.3	39	34.8	**4.07**
5	Social media helps me organize my teaching	5	4.5	18	16.1	19	17.0	47	42.0	23	20.5	3.58
6	Social media improves teacher-student communication	4	3.8	14	12.5	14	12.5	54	48.2	24	21.4	**4.18**
7	The technical challenges posed by social media integration in teaching overweigh the benefits	6	5.4	19	17.0	27	24.1	46	14.1	12	10.7	3.63
8	I would like to learn more about using social media in teaching	1	.9	7	6.3	13	11.6	61	54.5	30	26.8	4.00
9	I like using social media in teaching	1	.9	14	12.5	17	15.2	66	58.9	14	12.5	3.69
10	I would suggest my colleagues to use social media in their	2	1.8	13	11.6	13	11.6	62	55.4	22	19.6	3.79

	teaching											
11	Social media allows for effective communication among educators in general	1	.9	5	4.5	14	12.5	67	59.8	25	22.3	3.98
12	Social media is an effective tool for building stronger school community	1	.9	6	5.4	12	10.7	53	47.3	39	34.8	**4.37**
13	Social media allows for effective communication among faculty members and staff	1	.9	4	3.6	13	11.6	62	55.4	32	28.6	**4.07**
14	The school should provide better supporting facilities for social media integration	1	.9	6	5.4	12	10.7	60	53.6	32	28.6	**4.07**
15	The school should provide training for social media integration in teaching	1	.9	6	5.4	13	11.6	62	55.4	31	27.7	4.05
16	The school should better enhance social media integration	1	.9	2	1.8	22	19.6	62	55.4	26	23.2	4.00
17	The school should use social media to attract potential students	2	1.8	2	1.8	20	17.9	57	50.9	31	27.7	4.01
18	The school should use social media to better connect all students	1	.9	9	8.0	21	18.8	57	50.9	24	21.4	3.83
19	Social media creates longer learning	1	.9	7	6.3	17	15.2	67	59.8	20	17.9	3.87

	communities in class											

From the Table 13 above, the highest mean of 4.37 reflects that teachers agree that social media builds a stronger school community. If one should ask how, the next leading numbers answer the question: communication. 4.18 totally supports the role of social media in improving teacher-student communication. A closer analysis of the table reflect that leading mean numbers strongly believe on the relevance of social media in communication. 4.18, 4.7 all reflect the communicative roles social media plays among students', staff and even the school community. However, a top mean of 4.7 and 4.5 reveal the respondents' opinion that schools provide better supporting facilities for the incorporation of social sites into education and staff training.

Comparing with the lowest mean score of 3.5 and 3.65, few respondents' strongly agree while others remain undecided as to whether the technical challenges associated with social media usage pose a problem neither does social media help teachers' organize their teachings respectively. Generally, the attitude of the respondents could be stated as willing to embrace social media use in teaching, informed about its relevance yet not oblivious on its reservations.

Similar to the result of this findings that respondents' view social media in communicative relevance so highly, Gülbahar (2014) also documented the results from his survey that instructors agreed that social media served the following purposes. His result also has the highest respondents' agreeing to its communicative relevance. 10 instructors (the highest number) opted for social media basically for

communication purposes with others opting for fun and playing games, 5 instructors for socialization and 4 instructors for killing time.

Consistent with the findings from earlier studies (Lampe & Chambers, 2001); MacArthur & Malouf, 1991 & Zepp 2005) as chronicled in Taiwo (2009) work, the study indicated that teachers had unified perceptions. Specifically, the proportion of teachers with universal and general preferences was 57%. That the percentage for traditional use of media was higher than the modern use of media explained the seemingly lack of knowledge about modern use of media. Most teachers were indifferent to it because they could not imagine how these media could be used without threatening the traditional role, or at best position of classroom teachers.

The data for this hypothesis revealed the proportions of teachers preferred media as a substitute to media as supplement, whereas, untrained teachers preferred traditional use of media to modern use. It is not surprising that this is so with respect to modern role of media, since those who were exposed to instructional technology while at College should better appreciate all the media, especially modern roles. This could be a reason why teachers from this research strongly agree on school faculty providing adequate supporting infrastructure and staff training.

In line with the results from this findings where all the teachers were familiar with more than two social media, Moran et, al (2011) record in their findings through a questionnaire design by Babson Survey Research Group (BSRG) faculty studies; evidenced that social media integration into course work is on the rise as over 40% of faculty attested to have assigned as part of course assignments, students to either read

or view social media and 20% have asked that students comment on or post to social media sites. Summed up, a total 80% of faculty report using social media for some aspect of their course/s. When questioned on the overall usefulness of social media for teaching asked in the statement "Video, podcasts, blogs, and wikis are valuable tools for teaching" the (70%) majority of faculty agree, with 6% of faculty disagreeing with the statement. (58%) agreed to the statement that social media can be valuable for collaborative learning. (12%) of faculty however disagree with the statement. Simply put, majority of faculty agree that social media is of great academic value and a tool for collaborative learning.

4.2.1 Teachers' Attitude to using Social Media Based on Gender

Table 14 below shows gender in relation to teachers' attitude towards the use of social media.

Table 14: Teachers' Attitude in Relation to Gender

Attitude	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation
Social media integration makes teaching and learning more enjoyable	Male	3,82	1,21
	Female	4,26	,75
Using social media offers real advantages in teaching and learning	Male	3,80	1,17
	Female	4,20	,74
Social media is an effective tool	Male	3,85	1,03
	Female	4,06	,74
Social media improves student-student communication	Male	4,00	1,08
	Female	4,14	,70
Social media helps me organize my teaching	Male	3,41	1,13
	Female	3,77	1,08
Social media improves teacher-student communication	Male	3,75	1,12
	Female	4,75	7,24
The technical challenges posed by social media integration in teaching overweigh the benefits	Male	3,69	4,16
	Female	3,58	1,08
I would like to learn more about using social media in teaching	Male	4,03	,76
	Female	4,00	,91
I like using social media in teaching	Male	3,64	,92

	Female	3,75	,82
I would suggest my colleagues to use social media in their teaching	Male	3,74	,97
	Female	3,85	,93
Social media allows for effective communication among educators in general	Male	3,87	,85
	Female	4,12	,66
Social media is an effective tool for building stronger school community	Male	4,56	3,90
	Female	4,18	,75
Social media allows for effective communication among faculty members and staff	Male	4,01	,83
	Female	4,18	,66
The school should provide better supporting facilities for social media integration	Male	3,96	,79
	Female	4,25	,69
The school should provide training for social media integration in teaching	Male	4,08	,75
	Female	4,06	,77
The school should better enhance social media integration	Male	4,08	,68
	Female	3,87	,72
The school should use social media to attract potential students	Male	4,09	,93
	Female	3,87	,66
The school should use social media to better connect all students	Male	3,80	,920
	Female	3,91	,81
Social media creates longer learning communities in class	Male	3,85	,84
	Female	3,93	,71

From the above table, gender clearly does not have any effect or play a role on the attitude of the respondents' in respect to the use of social media as a teaching platform.

Table 14 clearly shows that the gender of the respondents' does not affect attitude to social media. The respondents were made up of 59 males and 47 females. All of which after the analysis depict that gender is no affective factor. Some other researchers, seem to find different results.

These according to Van Braak, Tondeur & Valcke (2004) also play roles in affecting the supportive computer use variable. In the final model, supportive computer use is

an enormous 53%. Gender seems to play a cardinal role on class use of computers. Male teachers, as opposed to their female colleagues, are reported to integrate computers more often.

However, Sang et, al. (2010) find gender differences as related to teacher beliefs, teacher self-efficacy and teacher attitudes toward computers a huge research hub. The literature on educational computing chronicles diverse conflicting findings about the impact of gender (Teo, 2008). The introduction of computers brought along ICT related activities which have been viewed as a 'male domain' (Brosnan & Davidson, 1996; Panteli, Stack, & Ramsay, 1999). Over 20 years ago, Loyd and Gressard (1986) researched male teachers to be more confident and less anxious toward computers compared to their female counterparts. A questionnaire was administered to a sample of 525 primary school teachers from 68 schools in Flanders (the Dutch-speaking area of Belgium). 81% were female and 19% were male. However, significant effect of 'Gender' was observed with an average difference in favor of males.

The effects of gender were not significant on the perceptions of teachers about the two media options. This was evident after Taiwo's testing of hypothesis two. This corresponds with the finding of Olawepo (1984). Olawepo discovered that gender as a variable did not affect teachers' perceptions of social studies orientation. These findings however, did not support conclusions from cognitive style studies which hold that female teachers are field-dependent and technophobia; while male teachers being field-independent, prefer application of media to instruction (Parker & Rennie, 2002; Haynie, 2003; Weber & Custer, 2005).

4.2.2 Teachers' Attitude towards the Use of Social Media in Relation to Age

This section reflects if there is a relationship or effect of teachers' age to attitude in respect to social media in education.

Table 15: Social Media Attitude of Teachers Based on Age

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Social media integration makes teaching and learning more enjoyable	25-35	45	3,88	1,11
	35-45	43	4,00	1,02
	45+	24	4,29	,95
	Total	112	4,01	1,04
Using social media offers real advantages in teaching and learning	25-35	45	3,91	1,06
	35-45	43	3,95	1,09
	45+	24	4,16	,76
	Total	112	3,98	1,01
Social media is an effective tool	25-35	44	4,00	,91
	35-45	43	3,88	,90
	45+	24	3,95	,95
	Total	111	3,94	,91
Social media improves student-student communication	25-35	45	4,20	,89
	35-45	43	4,00	,95
	45+	24	3,95	,99
	Total	112	4,07	,93
Social media helps me organize my teaching	25-35	45	3,48	1,16
	35-45	43	3,51	1,12
	45+	24	3,87	1,03
	Total	112	3,58	1,12
Social media improves teacher-student communication	25-35	44	3,72	,89
	35-45	43	4,97	7,73
	45+	24	3,58	1,24
	Total	111	4,18	4,88
The technical challenges posed by social media integration in teaching overweigh the benefits	25-35	44	4,09	4,87
	35-45	43	3,46	1,03
	45+	24	3,12	1,19
	Total	111	3,63	3,18
I would like to learn more about using social media in teaching	25-35	45	3,77	,95
	35-45	43	4,23	,68
	45+	24	4,00	,83

	Total	112	4,00	,84
I like using social media in teaching	25-35	45	3,60	,98
	35-45	43	3,81	,82
	45+	24	3,66	,76
	Total	112	3,69	,87
I would suggest my colleagues to use social media in their teaching	25-35	45	3,75	1,04
	35-45	43	3,81	,82
	45+	24	3,83	1,00
	Total	112	3,79	,95
Social media allows for effective communication among educators in general	25-35	45	3,80	,84
	35-45	43	4,11	,69
	45+	24	4,08	,77
	Total	112	3,98	,78
Social media is an effective tool for building stronger school community	25-35	45	4,13	,91949
	35-45	43	4,86	4,61664
	45+	24	3,95	,90
	Total	112	4,37	2,95
Social media allows for effective communication among faculty members and staff	25-35	45	4,11	,85
	35-45	43	4,09	,64
	45+	24	3,95	,90
	Total	112	4,07	,79
The school should provide better supporting facilities for social media integration	25-35	45	3,97	,81
	35-45	42	4,10	,59
	45+	23	4,04	1,02
	Total	110	4,07	,78
The school should provide training for social media integration in teaching	25-35	45	4,00	,85
	35-45	43	4,11	,58
	45+	24	4,04	,95
	Total	112	4,05	,78
The school should better enhance social media integration	25-35	45	4,08	,73
	35-45	43	3,93	,63
	45+	24	3,95	,80
	Total	112	4,00	,71
The school should use social media to attract potential students	25-35	45	3,93	,86
	35-45	43	4,00	,84
	45+	24	4,16	,76
	Total	112	4,00	,83
The school should use social media to better connect all students	25-35	45	3,93	,86
	35-45	43	3,74	,87
	45+	24	3,83	,96
	Total	112	3,83	,88

Social media creates longer learning communities in class	25-35	45	3,93	,83
	35-45	43	3,90	,78
	45+	24	3,70	,80
	Total	112	3,87	,80

Table 15 shows a detailed analysis of respondents' attitude based on every age group. The results from the mean scores show that results are closely linked among all age groups. Therefore, age has no effect on the attitude of teachers.

Table 16: Teachers' Attitude towards Social Media in Relation to Age

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	141,110	2	70,55	,46	,63
Within Groups	15845,095	104	152,35		
Total	15986,206	106			

The Table 16 shows teachers' attitude in relation to age between groups seen in Table 15 and within age groups. Table 15 shows that teachers within ages 35-45 are more interested in knowledge acquisition in respect to social media usage compared to teachers within ages 25-35. As shown, age disparity is no major factor to the attitude of teachers' use of social media as a teaching platform. The respondent's response reveals that age is of no effect. Very slight differences in attitudes can be seen. Table 16 explains that age in relation to social media usage of the respondent's, are not

linked. Social media usage could then be stated on individual preference levels and not directly an age related factor. Hence, not an effect to the attitude of teachers on the use of social media as a teaching platform.

Unlike the findings from this research however, Hermans, et, al. (2008) in their findings record that age and gender accounts for 8% of the variance in supportive computer use. Age is stated as most negatively associated within specific variables. The addition of computer experience variables, the direct influence of age and gender has a significant decrease and is non- existent when attitudes are added. Also, the addition of computer experience variables results to a high increase in explained variance, from 8% to 45%.

While the findings of this research differs from Hermans, et, al. (2008), furthermore; their findings suggest that age is negatively related to computer experience, intensity of computer use and general computer attitudes. When controlled for these variables however, age has no significant effect on supportive computer use. Gender is calculated to also be a key player as males have on average a longer experience with computers, report a more intensive use, and possess more favorable general computer attitudes. The relationship between age and gender is surprising. Judging from the result of this research however, the respondents' attitude in relation to age do not agree with related literatures. Gender and age are insignificant in relation to the attitude of the teachers towards social media.

4.2.3 Relationship between Years of Experience and Use of Social Media

This shows the relationship years of experience plays in teachers' attitude.

Table 17: Teachers' Attitude Based on Years of Experience

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
3-5	29	73,51	12,77
5-10	41	77,70	12,43
10-15	22	73,54	12,055
15+	15	75,06	11.28
Total	107	75,34	12,28

Table 17 shows according to every year of experience, respondents' attitude towards social media. Teachers cut across few and more years of experience share the same positive attitude towards social media except for the study items below.

Table 18: Teachers' Attitude towards Social Media Based on Years of Experience

Study Item	Between Years of Experience		Mean Square	Sig.
Social media allows for effective communication among educators in general	5-10	3-5	39286	.034
Social media creates longer learning communities in class	3-5	10-15	44034	.050

Table 18 explains the difference in teachers' attitude based on years of experience with close mean figures. Table 18 shows that teachers with 5-10 years of experience agree that social media allows for effective communication among educators in general compared to teachers with 3-5 years of experience. The table above shows that teachers with 3-5 years of experience agree that social media creates longer learning communities in class compared to teachers with 10-15 years of experience.

Table 19: Teachers' Attitude Based on Years of Experience and Use of Social Media

	Sum of squares	**Df**	**Mean square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Between Groups	398,09	3	132,69	0,87	0,45
Within groups	15588,12	103	151,34		
Total	15986,21	106			

This explains comprehensively between variables, the relationship between groups and years of experience. From Table 19 above, the mean differences between the groups are close. Asides the study items specifically discussed in the Table 18, years of experience is not really a factor for this study, as regards teachers' attitude towards the use of social media as a teaching platform. While related researches suggest that years of experience plays a cardinal role in teachers use of social media, the result from this research shows that years of experience has no major effect in teachers' attitude towards the use of social media. This perhaps proves that both young and older educators see the relevance of social media and both embrace its usage. Contained in the appendix is another table showing social media attitude in relation to years of experience.

Similar to the findings of this research, a survey conducted by Moran, et, al. (2011) revealed that faculty with over 20 years of teaching experience are less likely to visit and less likely to post compared to faculty members that are way below 20 years of experience or at the start of their careers. Over 80% of faculty with less than five years teaching experience visited a social media site within the past month for personal use, and over 60% acknowledged to have posted at least on one site during the past month. Compared to faculty with over 20 years' experience, only 70% visited

a social media site for personal use within the past month with only 38% to have posted content. This proves that older and more-experienced faculty members although simply aware of social media sites, they however do not judge the level of usefulness on the same level as the younger and less-experienced faculty. The difference in posting by experience level grades the most-experienced faculty posting only two-thirds as often as the youngest faculty.

Inan, et, al. (2010) had a sample size of 1,382, comprising of all teachers who had complete data for analysis. (40.7%) of the participants had been teaching for over 15 years and (93.7%) of the teachers had a home computer. (38.5%) rated their computer competence as “moderate” with (41.8%) opting for the option “good”. Findings reveal that years of experience could play a role on teachers’ readiness to integrate technology. Simply put, the older teachers’ get, the less interested they are in social media integration into classroom. However, it had no significant effect on teachers’ readiness. Variables in the model explained little variance (17.5%) in teachers’ computer proficiency. As guessed, teacher demographic characteristics as age and years of teaching had significant negative influences on computer proficiency.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to analyze secondary school teachers' attitude in respect to the use of social media within the academic circle. The study took a look at 112 respondents from the capital city of Abuja, Nigeria.

In respect to familiarity and frequency, the questionnaire outlined nine well known social media to ascertain the respondents' familiarity and frequency levels. For the familiarity, the respondents were to choose from three options of not familiar, familiar and very familiar. These social media platforms are: Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Wiki, Blog, Google+, SlideShare, Podcast, LinkedIn, and MySpace.

Facebook was the most familiar and frequently used among all the social media sites. However, all the respondents admitted to been familiar and frequent with at least two out of the ten social media platforms in the questionnaire. Podcast comes as least familiar and frequently used among the respondents.

The ages of the teachers' are grouped into three groups: ages 25-35, 35-45 and 45+. The respondent's feedback show that older teachers are less familiar and less frequent to a number of social media sites compared to younger teachers. Amazingly for Blog, older teachers are indicated as more familiar compared to younger teachers. From all the questionnaire administered, both old and younger teachers admit to the relevance

of social media in education. Teachers' years of experience plays a role in familiarity and frequency of usage.

The general attitude of all the teachers is positive towards social media. It is important to note that gender, age, and years of experience did not play a role in the attitude of the teachers towards the use of social media.

REFERENCES

Afzal, M. T., Safdar, A., & Ambreen, M. (2015). Teachers Perceptions and Needs towards the Use ofE-Learning in Teaching of Physics at Secondary Level. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 3(8), 1045-1051.

Aghili, M., Palaniappan, A. K., Kamali, K., Aghabozorgi, S., & Sardareh, S. A. (2014). Unifying informal and formal learning environments: Educational use of social network sites through implementing community of inquiry framework. *International Journal of e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning*, *4*(3), 191.

Ajjan, H., & Hartshorne, R. (2008). Investigating faculty decisions to adopt Web 2.0 technologies: Theory and empirical tests. *The internet and higher education*, *11*(2), 71-80.

Al-Mukhaini, E. M., Al-Qayoudhi, W. S., & Al-Badi, A. H. (2014). Adoption of social networking in education: A study of the use of social networks by higher education students in Oman. *Journal of International Education Research*, *10*(2), 143.

Armstrong, J. (2008). *A review of current and developing international practice in the use of social networking (Web 2.0) in higher education*. Franklin Consulting (2008).

Aquino, C. C. (1974). Teacher attitudes to media teaching environments. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *5*(1), 72-78.

Babbie, E. R. (1998). *The practice of social research*. International Thomson Publishing Services.

Babbie, E. R. (1989). *The practice of social research*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Ballengee-Morris, C., & Stuhr, P. L. (2001). Multicultural art and visual cultural education in a changing world. *Art Education*, *54*(4), 6-13.

Bates, A. T. (2005). *Technology, e-learning and distance education*. Routledge.

BBC Active (2010) *How social media is changing the world.* Retrieved from: http://www.bbcactive.com/BBCActiveIdeasandResources/Howsocialmediaischangingeducation.aspx

Bostrom, R. P., Gupta, S., & Hill, J. R. (2008). Peer-to-peer technology in collaborative learning networks: *Applications and research issues. International Journal of Knowledge and Learning*, 4(1), 36-57.

Brady, K. P., Holcomb, L. B., & Smith, B. V. (2010). The use of alternative social networking sites in higher educational settings: A case study of the e-learning benefits of Ning in education. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, *9*(2), 151-170.

Brosnan, M. J., & Davidson, M. J. (1996). Psychological gender issues in computing. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *3*(1), 13-25.

Bruns, A. (2008). *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and beyond: From production to produsage* (Vol. 45). Peter Lang.

Bryer, T. A., & Zavattaro, S. M. (2011). Social media and public administration: Theoretical dimensions and introduction to the symposium. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, *33*(3), 325-340.

Bull, G., Thompson, A., Searson, M., Garofalo, J., Park, J., Young, C., & Lee, J. (2008). Connecting informal and formal learning: Experiences in the age of participatory media. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, *8*(2), 100-107.

Burke, S. C., Snyder, S., & Rager, R. C. (2009). An assessment of faculty usage of YouTube as a teaching resource. *Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice*, *7*(1), 8.

Buss, A., & Strauss, N. (2009). *Online communities handbook: Building your business and brand on the Web*. New Riders.

Callaghan, N., & Bower, M. (2012). Learning through social networking sites–the critical role of the teacher. *Educational Media International*, *49*(1), 1-17.

Carton, S. (2009). Defining social media. *Click Z*.

Cheung, C. M., Chiu, P. Y., & Lee, M. K. (2011). Online social networks: Why do students use facebook?. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *27*(4), 1337-1343.

Churchill, D., Lu, J., & Chiu, T. K. (2014). *Integrating mobile technologies, social media and learning design.*

Correa, T., Hinsley, A. W., & De Zuniga, H. G. (2010). Who interacts on the Web?: The intersection of users' personality and social media use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *26*(2), 247-253.

Cormode, G., & Krishnamurthy, B. (2008). Key differences between Web 1.0 and Web 2.0. *First Monday*, *13*(6).

Dabner, N. (2012). 'Breaking Ground'in the use of social media: A case study of a university earthquake response to inform educational design with Facebook. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *15*(1), 69-78.

Daniel, A. (2014). Using SPSS to Understand Research and Data Analysis. Source: http://scholar.valpo.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=psych_oer

Deboer, G. E. (2002). Student-centered teaching in a standards-based world: *Finding a sensible balance. Science & Education*, 11(4), 405-417.

Eberly, 2016. Teaching Excellence & Educational Center. Source: https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/technology/blogs-wikis-discussionboards.html. Accessed on 11th Nov 2016.

Edosomwan, S., Prakasan, S. K., Kouame, D., Watson, J., & Seymour, T. (2011). *The history of social media and its impact on business. Journal of Applied Management and entrepreneurship, 16(3), 79.*

Ekici, M., & Kıyıcı, M. (2012). Using Social Networks in Educational Context. *Uşak University Journal of Social Sciences, 5*(2), 156-167.

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.

Fardoun, H., Alghazzawi, D., López, S., Penichet, V., & Gallud, J. (2012). Online social networks impact in secondary education. *In the proceeding of International Workshop on Evidence-Based Technology Enhanced Learning,* 37-45.

Ferris, S. P. and H. Wilder. (2006). *Uses and potentials of wikis in the classroom*. Innovate 2 (5).

Flinders, D. J. (1997). InterViews: *An introduction to qualitative research interviewing:* Steinar Kvale. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1996.

George, D., & Mallery, M. (2003). Using SPSS for Windows step by step: a simple guide and reference.

Geser, H. (2006). Are girls (even) more addicted? *Some gender patterns of cell phone usage*.

Gikas, J., & Grant, M. M. (2013). Mobile computing devices in higher education: Student perspectives on learning with cellphones, smartphones & social media. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *19*, 18-26.

Gülbahar, Y. (2014). Current State of Usage of Social Media for Education: Case of Turkey. *Journal of Social Media Studies*, *1*(1), 53-69.

Guy, R. (2012). The use of social media for academic practice: A review of literature. *Kentucky Journal of Higher Education Policy and Practice*, *1*(2), 7.

Hamid, S., Chang, S., & Kurnia, S. (2009, December). *Identifying the use of online social networking in higher education.* In *ASCILITE* (pp. 6-9).

Hamann, K., & Wilson, B. M. (2003). Beyond search engines: Enhancing active learning using the internet. *Politics & Policy*, *31*(3), 533-553.

Haynie III, W. J. (2003). *Gender issues in technology education*: A quasi-ethnographic interview approach.

Hermans, R., Tondeur, J., van Braak, J., & Valcke, M. (2008). The impact of primary school teachers' educational beliefs on the classroom use of computers. *Computers & Education*, *51*(4), 1499-1509.

Hoffman, E. S. (2009, April). Evaluating social networking tools for distance learning. In *Proceedings of Technology, Colleges & Community Worldwide Online Conference* (Vol. 1, pp. 92-100).

Hussain, I. (2012). A study to evaluate the social media trends among university students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *64*, 639-645.

Inan, F. A., & Lowther, D. L. (2010). Factors affecting technology integration in K-12 classrooms: A path model. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *58*(2), 137-154.

Inayati, N. (2013). Systemic Analysis of TESOL Practitioners' Use of Social Media In The Higher Education Sector. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching and Research*, *2*(2), 193.

James, F (2016). Burea of ocean energy management. Source: http://www.boem.gov/Environmental-stewardship/Environmentalassessment/NEPA/procedure/analysis/index.aspx

Jessica, B. (2015). *The Education Partners, Transforming Learning: Social Media as an Education Tool.*

Junco, R., Heiberger, G., & Loken, E. (2011). The effect of Twitter on college student engagement and grades. *Journal of computer assisted learning*, *27*(2), 119-132.

Lewis, C., & Fabos, B. (2005). Instant messaging, literacies, and social identities. *Reading research quarterly*, *40*(4), 470-501.

Loyd, B. H., & Gressard, C. P. (1986). Gender and amount of computer experience of teachers in staff development programs: *Effects on computer attitudes and perceptions of the usefulness of computers. AEDS journal*, *19*(4), 302-311.

Lumpe, A. T., & Chambers, E. (2001). Assessing teachers' context beliefs about technology use. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *34*(1), 93-107.

Kalelioglu, F., & Gülbahar, Y. (2014). The Effect of Instructional Techniques on Critical Thinking and Critical Thinking Dispositions in Online Discussion. *Educational technology & society*, *17*(1), 248-258.

Kemp, S. (2016). Digital in 2016. We are social's compendium of global digital, social, and mobile data, trends, and statistics. *We are social*.

Kurtz, G., Meishar-Tal, H., & Pietersee, E. (2014). Implementing Facebook group as a learning environment in a higher education setting: A case study. *Handbook on Design in Educational Computing*.

Kuss, D. J., & Griffiths, M. D. (2011). Online social networking and addiction—a review of the psychological literature. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *8*(9), 3528-3552.

Klamma, R., Chatti, M. A., Duval, E., Hummel, H., Hvannberg, E. T., Kravcik, M., Law, E., Naeve, A., & Scott, P. (2007). *Social software for life-long learning.*

Lederer, K. (2012). Pros and cons of social media in the classroom. *Campus Technology*, *25*(5), 1-2.

Lester, J., & Perini, M. (2010). Potential of social networking sites for distance education student engagement. *New directions for community colleges*, *2010*(150), 67-77.

MacArthur, C. A., & Malouf, D. B. (1991). Teachers' beliefs, plans, and decisions about computer-based instruction. *The journal of special education*, *25*(1), 44-72.

Mack, D., Behler, A., Roberts, B., & Rimland, E. (2007). Reaching students with Facebook: data and best practices. *Electronic journal of academic and special librarianship*, *8*(2), 4.

McCann, K. H. (2009). Virtual communities for educators: An overview of supports and best practices. In *Technology, Colleges, and Community Conference 2009 Proceedings* (pp. 137-142).

McLoughlin, C., & Lee, M. J. (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).

McNabb, D. E. (2002). *Research methods in public administration and nonprofit management*. ME Sharpe.

McKnight, K. (2014). *Top 12 ways technology changed learning.*

Madge, C., Meek, J., Wellens, J., & Hooley, T. (2009). Facebook, social integration and informal learning at university: 'It is more for socialising and talking to friends about work than for actually doing work'. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *34*(2), 141-155.

Manca, S., & Ranieri, M. (2015). Implications of social network sites for teaching and learning. Where we are and where we want to go. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-18.

Manca, S., & Ranieri, M. (2016). Facebook and the others. Potentials and obstacles of Social Media for teaching in higher education. *Computers & Education*, *95*, 216-230.

Marie, O. (2014). Using social media in the classroom; why there's a lot to like. Creating, A., & Time, A. A. Proposal Argument.

Manheim, J. B., Rich, R. C., Willnat, L., & Brians, C. L. (2008). *Empirical political analysis: quantitative and qualitative research methods*. Longman Pub Group.

Meishar-Tal, H., Kurtz, G., & Pieterse, E. (2012). Facebook groups as LMS: A case study. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *13*(4), 33-48.

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

Moran, M., Seaman, J., & Tinti-Kane, H. (2011). Teaching, Learning, and Sharing: How Today's Higher Education Faculty Use Social Media. *Babson Survey Research Group*.

Morris, B. (1962). The function of media in the public schools. *Audiovisual Instruction*, *8*(1), 11.

Munoz, C., & Towner, T. (2009, March). Opening Facebook: How to use Facebook in the college classroom. In *Proceedings of society for information technology & teacher education international conference* (Vol. 2623).

Muijs, D. (2010). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. Sage.

Neuman, W. L., & Kreuger, L. (2003). *Social work research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Allyn and Bacon.

Newby, T., Stepich, D., Lehman, J., & Russell, J. (2000). Instructional technology for teaching and learning: Designing instruction, integrating computers, and using media. *Educational Technology & Society*, *3*(2)

Ofcom, U. K. (2013). Communications market report. *UK Mobile Phone Usage Statistics, London, UK*.

Olawepo, J. A. (1984). Teachers' Perception of social studies orientations at the Primary School Level. *Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of Ibadan*.

Ologie (2013). Making Digital connections in higher education. Retrieved 12/4/2013 from http://ologie.com/

Ozer, I., Karpinski, A. C., & Kirschner, P. A. (2014). A cross-cultural qualitative examination of social-networking sites and academic performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *112*, 873-881.

Özmen, B., & Atıcı, B. (2014). Learners' views regarding the use of social networking sites in distance learning. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *15*(4).

Özmen, B., & Atıcı, B. (2014). The effects of social networking sites in distance learning on learners' academic achievements. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning*, *17*(2), 61-75.

Panteli, A., Stack, J., & Ramsay, H. (1999). Gender and professional ethics in the IT industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *22*(1), 51-61.

Parker, L. H., & Rennie, L. J. (2002). Teachers' implementation of gender-inclusive instructional strategies in single-sex and mixed-sex science classrooms. *International journal of science education*, *24*(9), 881-897.

Petrovic, N., Jeremic, V., Cirovic, M., Radojicic, Z., & Milenkovic, N. (2014). Facebook versus Moodle in practice. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *28*(2), 117-125.

Popper, The Logic of Scientific Discovery (1959), reprinted (2004) by Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

Puig Ortiz, J., Pàmies Vila, R., & Martínez Miralles, J. R. (2015). Google+ as a tool for use in cooperative laboratory activities between universities. *JOTSE: Journal of technology and science education*, *5*(2), 122-129.

Reid, J. (2011). " We don't Twitter, we Facebook": An alternative pedagogical space that enables critical practices in relation to writing. *English Teaching*, *10*(1), 58.

Really Good Stuff (2012). Retrieved from: http://www.reallygoodstuff.com/images/art/ReallyGoodStuff_SocialMediaInClass.pdf

Roberts, J., Yaya, L., & Manolis, C. (2014). The invisible addiction: Cell-phone activities and addiction among male and female college students. *Journal of behavioral addictions*, *3*(4), 254-265.

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.

Ross, J. A., Hogaboam-Gray, A., & Hannay, L. (1999). Predictors of teachers' confidence in their ability to implement computer-based instruction. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *21*(1), 75-97.

Romiszowski, A. J. (1988). *The selection and use of instructional media: for improved classroom teaching and interactive, in dividualized instruction*. Kogan Page.

Sang, G., Valcke, M., van Braak, J., & Tondeur, J. (2010). Student teachers' thinking processes and ICT integration: Predictors of prospective teaching behaviors with educational technology. *Computers & Education*, *54*(1), 103-112.

Scott, K. M. (2013). Does a university teacher need to change e-learning beliefs and practices when using a social networking site? A longitudinal case study. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *44*(4), 571-580.

Selwyn, N., & Grant, L. (2009). Learning and social software-researching the realities. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *34*(2), 79-86.

Simonsen, L. M., & Dick, T. P. (1997). Teachers' perceptions of the impact of graphing calculators in the mathematics classroom. *Journal of computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*, *16*, 239-268.

Smith, J. A. (Ed.). (2015). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*. Sage.

Taiwo, S. (2009). Teachers' Perception of the Role of Media in Classroom Teaching in Secondary Schools. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *8*(1).

Teo, T. (2008). Pre-service teachers' attitudes towards computer use: A Singapore survey. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *24*(4).

Tess, P. A. (2013). The role of social media in higher education classes (real and virtual)–A literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(5), A60-A68.

Trochim, W. M., & Donnelly, J. P. (2001). *Research methods knowledge base*.

Turkle, S. (2004). How computers change the way we think. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *50*(21), B26.

Van Braak, J., Tondeur, J., & Valcke, M. (2004). Explaining different types of computer use among primary school teachers. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *19*(4), 407-422.

Veletsianos, G., & Navarrete, C. (2012). Online social networks as formal learning environments: Learner experiences and activities. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *13*(1), 144-166.

Veletsianos, G., & Kimmons, R. (2013). Scholars and faculty members' lived experiences in online social networks. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *16*, 43-50.

Veletsianos, G., Kimmons, R., & French, K. D. (2013). Instructor experiences with a social networking site in a higher education setting: Expectations, frustrations, appropriation, and compartmentalization. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *61*(2), 255-278.

Vuorikari, R., & Brecko, B. (2014, June). How teachers' professional collaboration in teacher networks could be better studied as part of digital competence. In *World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications* (Vol. 1, pp. 1821-1826).

Wastiau, P., Blamire, R., Kearney, C., Quittre, V., Van de Gaer, E., & Monseur, C. (2013). The use of ICT in education: a survey of schools in Europe. *European Journal of Education*, *48*(1), 11-27.

Watson, G. (2002). Using technology to promote success in PBL courses. The Technology Source, May/June.

Waycott, J., Bennett, S., Kennedy, G., Dalgarno, B., & Gray, K. (2010). Digital divides? Student and staff perceptions of information and communication technologies. *Computers & education*, *54*(4), 1202-1211.

Weber, K., & Custer, R. (2005). Gender-based preferences toward technology education content, activities, and instructional methods. *Journal of technology education*, *16*(2), 55-71.

Wheeler, S., Yeomans, P., & Wheeler, D. (2008). The good, the bad and the wiki: Evaluating student-generated content for collaborative learning. *British journal of educational technology*, *39*(6), 987-995.

Wyse, S. E. (2011). What is the difference between qualitative research and quantitative research. *Message posted to http://www. snapsurveys. Com/blog/what-is-the-difference-between-qualitativeresearch-and-quantitative-research*

Yuen, F. Y., & 袁鳳儀. (2015). Teachers' and students' perceptions towards the use of YouTube videos in an English classroom.

Zepp, R. A. (2005). Teachers' Perceptions on the Roles on Educational Technology. *Educational Technology & Society*, *8*(2), 102-106.

Zikmund, W., & Babin, B. (2006). *Exploring marketing research*. Cengage Learning.

http://copyright.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/1773830/wikisblogsweb2blue.pdf

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Questionnaire

The collected information will only be used for academic/research purpose. Your personal information will remain confidential.

Demographics

School Name:
_____

Name: _____ Age: 25-35 35-45 45 and above

Years of Experience: 3-5 5-10 10-15 15-20 and above

Gender: Male/Female Field of teaching:

Do you have any computing background? Yes/No

Level of computer literacy: Competent/Incompetent

Questionnaire

Table 20. The mean score of the familiarity and frequency of the use of social media.

Social media	Not familiar	Familiar	Very familiar
Facebook			
YouTube			
Twitter			
Wiki			
Blog			
Google +			
SlideShare			
Podcast			
LinkedIn			
MySpace			

Familiarity of use

Social media	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very often
Facebook					
YouTube					
Twitter					

Wiki					
Blog					
Google +					
SlideShare					
Podcast					
LinkedIn					
MySpace					

Table 21. Respondent's attitude towards social media.

Questions	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Social media integration makes teaching and learning more enjoyable					
Using social media offers real advantages in teaching and learning					
Social media is an effective learning tool					
Social media improves student-student communication					
Social media helps me organize my teaching					
Social media improves teacher-student communication					
The technical challenges posed by social media integration in teaching overweigh the benefits					
I would like to learn more about using social media in teaching					
I like using social media in teaching					
I would suggest my colleagues to use social media in their teaching					
Social media allows for effective communication among educators in general					
Social media is an effective tool for building stronger school community					
Social media allows for effective communication among faculty members and staff					

The school should provide better supporting facilities for social media integration					
The school should provide training for social media integration in teaching					
The school should better enhance social media integration					
The school should use social media to attract potential students					
The school should use social media to better connect all students					
Social media creates longer learning communities in class					

Table 22. Familiarity and Frequency based on age

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency of Facebook	25-35	45	2,71	,45
	35-45	43	2,67	,47
	45+	24	2,50	,58
	Total	112	2,65	,49
Frequency of YouTube	25-35	45	2,51	,54
	35-45	43	2,25	,58
	45+	24	1,95	,75
	Total	112	2,29	,63
Frequency of Twitter	25-35	44	2,31	,56
	35-45	43	2,09	,64
	45+	24	1,87	,74
	Total	111	2,13	,65
Frequency of Wiki	25-35	45	1,93	,71
	35-45	43	1,67	,71
	45+	23	1,47	,73
	Total	111	1,73	,73
Frequency of Blog	25-35	45	1,95	,73
	35-45	43	1,95	1,87
	45+	24	1,41	,58
	Total	112	1,83	1,29

Frequency of Google+	25-35	45	2,33	,63
	35-45	43	2,27	,70
	45+	24	2,45	,65
	Total	112	2,33	,66
Frequency of Slide share	25-35	45	1,71	,66
	35-45	43	1,58	,66
	45+	24	1,41	,65
	Total	112	1,59	,66
Frequency of Podcast	25-35	45	1,60	,65
	35-45	42	1,33	,61
	45+	24	1,25	,44
	Total	111	1,42	,61
Frequency of LinkedIn	25-35	45	2,48	4,70
	35-45	43	1,48	,70
	45+	24	1,41	,71
	Total	112	1,87	3,05
Frequency of MySpace	25-35	45	1,60	,68
	35-45	42	1,33	,65
	45+	24	1,33	,56
	Total	111	1,44	,65
Familiarity of Facebook Usage	25-35	45	4,11	,91
	35-45	43	4,02	,96
	45+	24	3,79	1,14
	Total	112	4,00	,98
Familiarity of YouTube usage	25-35	45	3,75	,88
	35-45	43	3,30	1,14
	45+	24	4,58	8,51
	Total	112	3,75	4,00
Familiarity of Twitter usage	25-35	45	3,22	1,18
	35-45	43	2,72	1,31
	45+	24	2,37	1,40
	Total	112	2,84	1,31
Familiarity of Wiki usage	25-35	45	2,64	1,33
	35-45	43	2,83	4,86
	45+	24	1,70	1,19
	Total	112	2,51	3,18
Familiarity of Blog usage	25-35	45	2,44	1,32
	35-45	43	2,16	1,41
	45+	24	1,70	1,16
	Total	112	2,17	1,34
Familiarity of Google Plus	25-35	45	3,42	1,27

usage	35-45	43	3,69	1,28
	45+	24	3,66	1,30
	Total	112	3,58	1,27
Familiarity of Slideshare usage	25-35	45	1,97	1,27
	35-45	43	2,00	1,27
	45+	24	2,00	1,56
	Total	112	1,99	1,32
Familiarity of Podcast usage	25-35	45	1,88	1,19
	35-45	43	1,72	1,18
	45+	24	1,58	1,21
	Total	112	1,75	1,18
Familiarity of LinkedIn usage	25-35	45	2,37	1,28
	35-45	43	1,76	1,21
	45+	24	1,79	1,44
	Total	112	2,01	1,31
Familiarity of MySpace usage	25-35	45	2,11	1,40
	35-45	43	1,69	1,16
	45+	24	1,75	1,39
	Total	112	1,87	1,31

Table 23. Teachers Familiarity and Frequency based on years of experience

		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Frequency of Facebook	Between Groups	5,401	14	,386	1,699	,068
	Within Groups	22,019	97	,227		
	Total	27,420	111			
Frequency of YouTube	Between Groups	5,191	14	,371	,897	,564
	Within Groups	40,085	97	,413		
	Total	45,277	111			
Frequency of Twitter	Between Groups	3,340	14	,239	,525	,913
	Within	43,633	96	,455		

	Groups					
	Total	46,973	110			
Frequency of Wiki	Between Groups	4,034	14	,288	,499	,928
	Within Groups	55,389	96	,577		
	Total	59,423	110			
Frequency of Blog	Between Groups	40,795	14	2,914	1,959	**,029**
	Within Groups	144,312	97	1,488		
	Total	185,107	111			
Frequency of Google+	Between Groups	7,958	14	,568	1,340	,199
	Within Groups	41,150	97	,424		
	Total	49,107	111			
Frequency of Slide share	Between Groups	3,186	14	,228	,483	,937
	Within Groups	45,734	97	,471		
	Total	48,920	111			
Frequency of Podcast	Between Groups	2,507	14	,179	,446	,955
	Within Groups	38,592	96	,402		
	Total	41,099	110			
Frequency of LinkedIn	Between Groups	102,802	14	7,343	,763	,706
	Within Groups	933,448	97	9,623		
	Total	1036,250	111			
Frequency of MySpace	Between Groups	2,812	14	,201	,433	,960
	Within Groups	44,557	96	,464		
	Total	47,369	110			
Familiarity of Facebook Usage	Between Groups	4,778	14	,341	,324	,990
	Within Groups	102,213	97	1,054		
	Total	106,991	111			

Familiarity of YouTube usage	Between Groups	273,935	14	19,567	1,258	,248
	Within Groups	1508,556	97	15,552		
	Total	1782,491	111			
Familiarity of Twitter usage	Between Groups	11,139	14	,796	,426	,963
	Within Groups	181,281	97	1,869		
	Total	192,420	111			
Familiarity of Wiki usage	Between Groups	230,754	14	16,482	1,786	,051
	Within Groups	895,210	97	9,229		
	Total	1125,964	111			
Familiarity of Blog usage	Between Groups	23,185	14	1,656	,906	,555
	Within Groups	177,244	97	1,827		
	Total	200,429	111			
Familiarity of Google Plus usage	Between Groups	26,748	14	1,911	1,199	,289
	Within Groups	154,529	97	1,593		
	Total	181,277	111			
Familiarity of Slideshare usage	Between Groups	29,414	14	2,101	1,231	,266
	Within Groups	165,577	97	1,707		
	Total	194,991	111			
Familiarity of Podcast usage	Between Groups	20,128	14	1,438	1,023	,438
	Within Groups	136,363	97	1,406		
	Total	156,491	111			
Familiarity of LinkedIn usage	Between Groups	17,690	14	1,264	,703	,766
	Within Groups	174,274	97	1,797		
	Total	191,964	111			
Familiarity of MySpace	Between Groups	17,331	14	1,238	,686	,782

usage	Within Groups	174,919	97	1,803		
	Total	192,250	111			

The table above shows the relationship of familiarity and frequency of selected social media sites depending on years of experience.

Table 24: Familiarity and Frequency based of field of Teaching

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency of Facebook	Language	8	2,75	,46
	Economics	8	2,37	,51
	Geography	9	2,55	,72
	Biology	6	2,33	,51
	English	9	2,88	,33
	Physics	5	2,40	,54
	Home economics	6	2,66	,51
	Agricultural science	5	2,80	,44
	Mathematics	13	2,61	,50
	Science	10	2,60	,51
	Computer	8	2,87	,35
	Fine art	5	2,20	,44
	Music	6	3,00	,00
	Chemistry	7	3,00	,00
	History	7	2,57	,53
	Total	112	2,65	,49
Frequency of YouTube	Language	8	2,00	,75
	Economics	8	2,00	,75
	Geography	9	2,11	,78
	Biology	6	2,16	,75
	English	9	2,55	,52
	Physics	5	2,20	,44
	Home economics	6	2,50	,54
	Agricultural science	5	2,40	,89
	Mathematics	13	2,07	,64
	Science	10	2,40	,51
	Computer	8	2,62	,51

	Fine art	5	2,20	,44
	Music	6	2,50	,83
	Chemistry	7	2,57	,53
	History	7	2,28	,48
	Total	112	2,29	,63
Frequency of Twitter	Language	8	1,87	,64
	Economics	8	2,12	,35
	Geography	9	1,88	,78
	Biology	6	2,16	,40
	English	9	2,22	,83
	Physics	5	2,20	,44
	Home economics	6	2,33	,51
	Agricultural science	5	2,40	,89
	Mathematics	13	2,00	,57
	Science	10	2,00	,66
	Computer	8	2,25	,70
	Fine art	5	2,00	,70
	Music	5	2,40	,89
	Chemistry	7	2,42	,53
	History	7	2,14	,89
	Total	111	2,13	,65
Frequency of Wiki	Language	8	1,50	,53
	Economics	8	1,62	,74
	Geography	9	1,77	,83
	Biology	6	2,16	,75
	English	9	1,66	,70
	Physics	5	1,80	,83
	Home economics	6	1,66	,81
	Agricultural science	5	2,00	1,00
	Mathematics	13	1,69	,75
	Science	10	1,80	,63
	Computer	8	1,87	,83
	Fine art	5	1,40	,54
	Music	6	2,00	,89
	Chemistry	6	1,83	,98
	History	7	1,42	,53
	Total	111	1,73	,73
Frequency of Blog	Language	8	1,25	,46
	Economics	8	1,60	,744
	Geography	9	1,89	,78
	Biology	6	4,16	4,40

	English	9	1,77	,66
	Physics	5	1,60	,54
	Home economics	6	1,50	,54
	Agricultural science	5	2,40	,89
	Mathematics	13	1,53	,66
	Science	10	1,60	,69
	Computer	8	1,75	,70
	Fine art	5	1,60	,54
	Music	6	2,00	,89
	Chemistry	7	1,71	,95
	History	7	2,00	,81
	Total	112	1,83	1,29
Frequency of Google+	Language	8	2,37	,74
	Economics	8	2,25	,88
	Geography	9	2,33	,70
	Biology	6	2,16	,40
	English	9	2,44	,72
	Physics	5	2,60	,54
	Home economics	6	2,66	,51
	Agricultural science	5	2,60	,54
	Mathematics	13	2,00	,70
	Science	10	2,40	,51
	Computer	8	2,75	,46
	Fine art	5	1,80	,44
	Music	6	2,00	,89
	Chemistry	7	2,71	,48
	History	7	2,14	,69
	Total	112	2,33	,66
Frequency of Slide share	Language	8	1,62	,74
	Economics	8	1,37	,52
	Geography	9	1,55	,72
	Biology	6	1,50	,83
	English	9	1,77	,83
	Physics	5	1,80	,83
	Home economics	6	1,83	,40
	Agricultural science	5	1,60	,54
	Mathematics	13	1,69	,63
	Science	10	1,50	,70
	Computer	8	1,87	,64
	Fine art	5	1,20	,44
	Music	6	1,50	,83

	Chemistry	7	1,42	,78
	History	7	1,57	,53
	Total	112	1,59	,66
Frequency of Podcast	Language	8	1,25	,46
	Economics	8	1,37	,51
	Geography	9	1,22	,44
	Biology	5	1,40	,89
	English	9	1,55	,72
	Physics	5	1,80	,83
	Home economics	6	1,50	,54
	Agricultural science	5	1,40	,54
	Mathematics	13	1,38	,65
	Science	10	1,30	,48
	Computer	8	1,50	,75
	Fine art	5	1,20	,44
	Music	6	1,66	,81
	Chemistry	7	1,42	,53
	History	7	1,57	,78
	Total	111	1,42	,611
Frequency of LinkedIn	Language	8	1,37	,51
	Economics	8	5,25	11,22
	Geography	9	2,00	1,00
	Biology	6	1,66	,81
	English	9	1,66	,70
	Physics	5	1,80	,83
	Home economics	6	1,66	,81
	Agricultural science	5	1,80	,83
	Mathematics	13	1,30	,63
	Science	10	1,70	,67
	Computer	8	1,62	,91
	Fine art	5	1,20	,44
	Music	6	1,83	,75
	Chemistry	7	1,57	,78
	History	7	1,57	,78
	Total	112	1,87	3,05
Frequency of MySpace	Language	8	1,37	,51
	Economics	8	1,25	,46
	Geography	9	1,66	,86
	Biology	5	1,40	,89
	English	9	1,55	,72
	Physics	5	1,80	,83

	Home economics	6	1,50	,54
	Agricultural science	5	1,40	,54
	Mathematics	13	1,30	,63
	Science	10	1,50	,70
	Computer	8	1,50	,75
	Fine art	5	1,20	,44
	Music	6	1,66	,81
	Chemistry	7	1,28	,75
	History	7	1,28	,48
	Total	111	1,44	,65
Familiarity of Facebook Usage	Language	8	4,12	,99
	Economics	8	3,87	,83
	Geography	9	3,77	1,48
	Biology	6	3,66	1,36
	English	9	4,11	,92
	Physics	5	4,40	,89
	Home economics	6	3,83	,75
	Agricultural science	5	4,00	1,00
	Mathematics	13	3,92	1,18
	Science	10	4,00	,66
	Computer	8	4,00	1,06
	Fine art	5	3,80	,83
	Music	6	4,50	,83
	Chemistry	7	4,00	1,00
	History	7	4,28	,95
	Total	112	4,00	,98
Familiarity of YouTube usage	Language	8	2,50	1,06
	Economics	8	3,50	1,06
	Geography	9	3,22	1,20
	Biology	6	3,66	1,21
	English	9	3,44	,88
	Physics	5	3,60	1,34
	Home economics	6	10,16	16,60
	Agricultural science	5	3,40	1,51
	Mathematics	13	3,15	1,46
	Science	10	3,90	,87
	Computer	8	3,50	,92
	Fine art	5	3,00	1,22
	Music	6	3,66	1,50
	Chemistry	7	3,85	,89
	History	7	3,28	1,38

	Total	112	3,75	4,00
Familiarity of Twitter usage	Language	8	2,75	1,16
	Economics	8	3,12	1,24
	Geography	9	2,66	1,41
	Biology	6	2,16	1,60
	English	9	2,55	1,42
	Physics	5	3,00	1,58
	Home economics	6	2,66	1,03
	Agricultural science	5	3,20	1,48
	Mathematics	13	3,07	1,32
	Science	10	2,70	1,05
	Computer	8	2,62	1,40
	Fine art	5	2,40	1,34
	Music	6	3,33	1,50
	Chemistry	7	3,28	1,70
	History	7	3,14	1,34
	Total	112	2,84	1,31
Familiarity of Wiki usage	Language	8	2,00	1,19
	Economics	8	2,37	1,30
	Geography	9	2,44	1,50
	Biology	6	2,66	1,63
	English	9	2,00	1,22
	Physics	5	2,40	1,67
	Home economics	6	1,50	,54
	Agricultural science	5	9,00	13,49
	Mathematics	13	2,00	1,52
	Science	10	2,30	1,25
	Computer	8	2,62	1,40
	Fine art	5	1,60	,89
	Music	6	2,33	1,50
	Chemistry	7	2,57	1,27
	History	7	2,14	1,21
	Total	112	2,51	3,18
Familiarity of Blog usage	Language	8	1,87	1,24
	Economics	8	2,25	,88
	Geography	9	2,22	1,48
	Biology	6	2,66	1,96
	English	9	1,88	1,36
	Physics	5	2,20	1,30
	Home economics	6	1,66	,81
	Agricultural science	5	3,20	1,48

	Mathematics	13	1,84	1,21
	Science	10	2,30	1,25
	Computer	8	2,37	1,50
	Fine art	5	1,20	,44
	Music	6	2,16	1,47
	Chemistry	7	2,00	1,52
	History	7	3,14	1,67
	Total	112	2,17	1,34
Familiarity of Google Plus usage	Language	8	3,87	1,12
	Economics	8	3,37	1,40
	Geography	9	3,11	1,53
	Biology	6	3,50	1,37
	English	9	3,55	1,01
	Physics	5	4,20	1,09
	Home economics	6	3,66	1,03
	Agricultural science	5	3,40	,54
	Mathematics	13	3,30	1,65
	Science	10	4,00	,81
	Computer	8	4,12	1,12
	Fine art	5	2,00	1,00
	Music	6	3,33	1,63
	Chemistry	7	3,71	1,60
	History	7	4,28	,75
	Total	112	3,58	1,27
Familiarity of Slideshare usage	Language	8	1,62	1,18
	Economics	8	1,75	1,16
	Geography	9	1,88	1,36
	Biology	6	3,66	1,21
	English	9	1,88	1,16
	Physics	5	2,20	1,30
	Home economics	6	2,33	1,50
	Agricultural science	5	1,80	1,09
	Mathematics	13	1,84	1,21
	Science	10	1,80	1,13
	Computer	8	1,62	1,40
	Fine art	5	1,20	,44
	Music	6	2,33	1,75
	Chemistry	7	1,71	1,25
	History	7	2,71	1,88
	Total	112	1,99	1,32
Familiarity of Podcast	Language	8	1,25	,70

usage	Economics	8	1,87	1,12
	Geography	9	1,33	,70
	Biology	6	3,00	1,67
	English	9	1,66	1,41
	Physics	5	2,20	1,30
	Home economics	6	1,50	,83
	Agricultural science	5	2,20	1,09
	Mathematics	13	1,53	1,19
	Science	10	1,50	,97
	Computer	8	1,75	1,38
	Fine art	5	1,20	,44
	Music	6	2,00	1,26
	Chemistry	7	2,00	1,29
	History	7	2,14	1,67
	Total	112	1,75	1,18
Familiarity of LinkedIn usage	Language	8	1,75	1,38
	Economics	8	2,00	1,30
	Geography	9	2,22	1,39
	Biology	6	2,66	1,96
	English	9	1,88	1,16
	Physics	5	2,40	1,34
	Home economics	6	1,50	,83
	Agricultural science	5	2,80	1,09
	Mathematics	13	1,53	1,19
	Science	10	2,40	1,34
	Computer	8	1,87	1,45
	Fine art	5	1,20	,44
	Music	6	2,33	1,50
	Chemistry	7	2,00	1,29
	History	7	2,14	1,67
	Total	112	2,01	1,31
Familiarity of MySpace usage	Language	8	1,62	1,18
	Economics	8	1,87	1,35
	Geography	9	2,22	1,71
	Biology	6	3,00	1,78
	English	9	1,44	,88
	Physics	5	2,00	1,00
	Home economics	6	1,50	,83
	Agricultural science	5	2,20	1,09
	Mathematics	13	1,53	1,19
	Science	10	2,10	1,44

	Computer	8	1,87	1,64
	Fine art	5	1,20	,44
	Music	6	2,00	1,26
	Chemistry	7	1,71	1,49
	History	7	2,14	1,67
	Total	112	1,87	1,31

Table 25: Social media attitude and years of experience

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Social media integration makes teaching and learning more enjoyable	3-5	32	3,90	,96
	5-10	42	3,95	1,12
	10-15	22	4,13	,99
	15 +	15	4,20	1,14
	Total	111	4,00	1,04
Using social media offers real advantages in teaching and learning	3-5	32	3,84	1,01
	5-10	42	4,07	1,04
	10-15	22	3,90	1,06
	15 +	15	4,13	,91
	Total	111	3,98	1,01
Social media is an effective tool	3-5	31	3,83	1,00
	5-10	42	4,02	,84
	10-15	22	3,90	,92
	15 +	15	4,00	1,00
	Total	110	3,94	,91
Social media improves student-student communication	3-5	32	4,00	1,01
	5-10	42	4,28	,86
	10-15	22	3,95	,84
	15 +	15	3,80	1,08
	Total	111	4,07	,94
Social media helps me organize my teaching	3-5	32	3,50	1,19
	5-10	42	3,57	1,10
	10-15	22	3,59	1,05
	15 +	15	3,66	1,17
	Total	111	3,56	1,11
Social media improves teacher-student communication	3-5	31	3,74	,99
	5-10	42	5,00	7,79
	10-15	22	3,54	1,22
	15 +	15	3,66	1,29
	Total	110	4,17	4,90

The technical challenges posed by social media integration in teaching overweigh the benefits	3-5	32	3,59	,91
	5-10	41	4,04	5,06
	10-15	22	3,45	1,10
	15 +	15	3,06	1,16
	Total	110	3,66	3,18
I would like to learn more about using social media in teaching	3-5	32	3,78	,90
	5-10	42	4,07	,86
	10-15	22	4,18	,79
	15 +	15	3,93	,70
	Total	111	3,99	,84
I like using social media in teaching	3-5	32	3,53	,84
	5-10	42	3,78	,95
	10-15	22	3,77	,86
	15 +	15	3,66	,81
	Total	111	3,69	,88
I would suggest my colleagues to use social media in their teaching	3-5	32	3,75	1,04
	5-10	42	3,88	,83
	10-15	22	3,63	1,04
	15 +	15	3,80	,94
	Total	111	3,78	,94
Social media allows for effective communication among educators in general	3-5	32	3,7500	,84
	5-10	42	4,14	,64
	10-15	22	3,95	,84
	15 +	15	4,06	,88
	Total	111	3,98	,78
Social media is an effective tool for building stronger school community	3-5	32	4,00	,95
	5-10	42	4,38	,66
	10-15	22	5,00	6,55
	15 +	15	4,26	,70
	Total	111	4,37	2,96
Social media allows for effective communication among faculty members and staff	3-5	32	4,00	,95
	5-10	42	4,19	,70
	10-15	22	3,81	,73
	15 +	15	4,26	,70
	Total	111	4,07	,79
The school should provide better supporting facilities for social media integration	3-5	31	4,03	,91
	5-10	42	4,04	,66
	10-15	22	4,00	,87
	15 +	15	4,33	,72
	Total	110	4,07	,78
The school should provide	3-5	32	4,09	,77

training for social media integration in teaching	5-10	42	4,00	,73
	10-15	22	3,86	,88
	15 +	15	4,33	,72
	Total	111	4,04	,77
The school should better enhance social media integration	3-5	32	4,06	,66
	5-10	42	4,02	,74
	10-15	22	3,77	,75
	15 +	15	4,13	,63
	Total	111	4,00	,71
The school should use social media to attract potential students	3-5	32	3,93	,91
	5-10	42	4,07	,63
	10-15	22	3,86	1,03
	15 +	15	4,13	,83
	Total	111	4,00	,83
The school should use social media to better connect all students	3-5	32	3,84	,91
	5-10	42	4,00	,73
	10-15	22	3,59	1,05
	15 +	15	3,73	,96
	Total	111	3,83	,88
Social media creates longer learning communities in class	3-5	32	4,03	,82
	5-10	42	3,92	,67
	10-15	22	3,59	,95
	15 +	15	3,86	,83
	Total	111	3,88	,80