TITLE: TÜKETICILER SOSYAL MEDYAYI NASIL VE NIÇIN KULLANIRLAR?: KULLANICI

TARAFINDAN OLUSTURULMUS IÇERIK VE KULLANIMLAR & DOYUMLAR KURAMLARINA

DAYALI NITEL BIR ÇALISMA

AUTHORS: Eda YASA ÖZELTÜRKAY,Emel YARIMOGLU

PAGES: 142-161

ORIGINAL PDF URL: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/699592

HOW AND WHY CONSUMERS USE SOCIAL MEDIA: A QUALITATIVE STUDY BASED ON USER-GENERATED MEDIA AND USES & GRATIFICATIONS THEORY*

Eda YAŞA ÖZELTÜRKAY[1]
Emel YARIMOĞLU[2]

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to analyze how and why consumers use social media. With the scope of the aim, the user-generated media content and the uses and gratificitions theories were reviewed. The study was designed as a qualitative research with thirty-two social media users with semi-structured interviews. Data gathered and were analyzed with content analysis technique. The findings regarding the user-generated media showed that the participants contribute social media by consuming information, producing content for improving self-actualizations, and participating in social interaction by liking and writing comment. The findings regarding the uses and gratifications showed that six uses and gratifications were identified for customers, and five uses and gratificitations were identified for companies.

Keywords: Social Media, User-Generated Media Content, Uses And Gratifications Theory, Semi-Structured İnterview, Qualitative Study

TÜKETİCİLER SOSYAL MEDYAYI NASIL VE NİÇİN KULLANIRLAR?: KULLANICI TARAFINDAN OLUŞTURULMUŞ İÇERİK VE KULLANIMLAR & DOYUMLAR KURAMLARINA DAYALI NİTEL BİR ÇALIŞMA

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı, tüketicilerin sosyal medyayı nasıl ve niçin kullandıklarını analiz etmektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, çalışmada kullanıcı tarafından oluşturulmuş içerik ve kullanılar ve doyumlar kuramı kullanılmıştır. Çalışma, nitel bir araştırma olarak tasarlanmış olup, otuz iki sosyal medya kullanıcısıyla yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşmelerle tamamlanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler içerik analizi tekniği ile analiz edilmiştir. Kullanıcı tarafından oluşturulmuş içerik ile ilgili bulgular; katılımcıların sosyal medyayı bilgi tüketme, kendini gerçekleştirme amaçlı içerik yaratma ile beğeniler ve yorumlar vasıtasıyla sosyal etkileşime geçme şeklinde kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Kullanım ve doyumlar ile ilgili bulgularda; tüketiciler için altı, işletmeler için beş farklı kullanım ve doyum elde edildiği görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal Medya, Kullanıcı Tarafından Oluşturulmuş İçerik, Kullanımlar Ve Doyumlar Kuramı, Yarı-Yapılandırılmış Görüşme, Nitel Araştırma

Introduction

Today's consumers are no longer merely passive recipients in the marketing exchange process, now they are taking an increasingly active role in co-creating everything from product design to promotional messages (Hanna et al., 2011). People get in touch one with another very easily especially with social media tools. These tools are very active and fast-moving domain. Therefore people or companies who would like to survive should keep their account up to date (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010). People use social media channels to interact with other people, and meet their specific needs. Social media is stated as a communication mechanism that allows users to communicate with thousands, and perhaps billions, of individuals all over the world (Whiting and Williams, 2013). Internet addiction is also discussed in many disciplines, and accepted as a theorized disorder involving people who find themselves spending a lot of time online (Grohol, 1999).

In recent years, social media usage has been rapidly increasing in Turkey and the reasons and the motivations of consumers' using social media have become frequently discussed issues (Aglargoz and Ozata, 2013). The numbers of social media users in Turkey are increasing, and also the importance of addictive behaviors of Turkish people to internet and social media have been becoming more important. Since the rapid development in social media, this study was interested in searching behaviors and perceptions of users in social media.

The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive understanding about how and why Turkish consumers use social media. Therefore; two different research questions were formed within this aim. Based on the purpose of the study, to analyze users' behaviors and perceptions in social media, the user-generated media content (UGM) and the uses and gratifications theory (UGT) were used, and a qualitative study was designed. The study contained two parts. The first part contained the review of the major and current literature on the theory of uses and gratifications & user-generated media content. The second part included the research aim, research methodology, findings, conclusion, managerial implications, and limitations

Literature Summary
Uses& Gratification Theory

Uses and Gratification theory (UGT) is one of the audience-centered approaches. Differently from other media effect theories UGT assumes that individuals have power over their media usage, rather than positioning individuals as passive consumers of media. Regarding to this theory, understanding why and how people actively seek out specific media to satisfy their specific needs as opposed to what media does to people are clarifying (David, 2016). The UGT can also explain why people use social media tools, and the theory also asserts that people utilize media because they are seeking to fulfill a need that necessitates being met (Hicks et al., 2012). According to this theory; media users play an active role in choosing and using the media which means media users can take a part actively in the communication process. The communication process starts with sender and ends with receiver (user/consumer). In this process consumers can passively accept the message. However based on the UGT, users may differiantiate their sources and messages according to their needs. Blumler and Katz (1974) explained that users can search different alternative media sources (choices)

which they have already had many in order to satisfy their needs. It means they can easily switch off the channels. UGT is generally defined as an "approach to media study focusing on the uses to which people put media and gratifications they seek from these uses" (Baran and Davis, 2009). The basic definition of the theory can be stated as people use mass media because usage satisfies a need and provides gratification (Tomko, 2007). UGT theory was used in the literature frequently. Therefore, many studies (Park et al, 2009; Hicks,et al. 2012; Urista et al. 2009; Whiting & Williams, 2013; Froget, et al. 2013) related to this theory (UGT) are doing rapidly to analyze and understand user's gratifications. UGT researchers today are exploring stage three as predictive and explanatory possibilities of the theory by connecting media usage with individual factors (Davis, 2006). However, it is accepted that the founder of the approaches are mostly known and stated in the articles as Blumler and Katz, before these scholars the origin theory is built up by Herta Hertzog. She was the first people who coined the word "gratifications" in connection media usage, in 1944 (Tomko, 2007). She sought three different types of gratification as, emotional, wishful thinking, and learning. In further research at the same term, Schramm's (1949) research was first to focus on the social reasons for media consumption. And in his study he stated that people seek reading the newspaper to satisfy the Pleasure Principle or the Reality Principle. Both television and Internet content can be consumed to satisfy the Pleasure Principle or the Reality Principle as well. In 1954 Wilbur Schramm indicated that "the amount of gratification an individual expected to get out of a certain form of media and the amount of effort the individual would have to exert to get it". Some related concepts of Schramms are rewards, reward-driven, proximity (Tomko, 2007; Davis 2006).

All above scholars were acted on theory building's first stage. Further of these scholars, with the dawning of the age of television (1960s), a new arena was opened for the U&G as a second stage and the major contributers were Katz and Foulkes (1962), Mendelsohn (1964), Greenberg and Dominick (1969) and et al, (Davis, 2006). Based upon the effect of narcotization, Katz and Foulkes (1962) stated that watching television is to enter a dream world, which substitutes fantasy for real life (Tomko, 2007). In 1972, Blumler, Brown and McQuail suggested four uses of media as follows, diversion, personal relationships, personal identity, and surveillance (Davis, 2006). In 1984, one of the major contributors of the theory, Rubin classified viewers into instrumental and ritualized viewers and described as follows "ritualized television use appears to be habitual, frequent, and indicate a high regard for television as a medium however, instrumental television viewing appears to be purposeful, selective, and goal-directed, without being frequent or indicating a high regard for the importance of the medium" (Tomko,2007).

Table 1: The origin of Uses & Gratifcation (U&G) Theory and its major contributors

Years	Major Contributors
1940's and 1950's The U & G Theory and origin	Herta Hertzog (1944):Lazarsfeld and Stanton (1944)
	Wilbur Schramm (1954):
The U&G Theory and Television—1960's	Katz and Foulkes (1962),Mendelsohn, (1964)
	Greenberg & Dominick, (1969)
	Blumler & McQuail (1969)
The U&G Theory and Social Development—1970's	Maslow (1970);, lumler, Brown, & McQuail (1972)
	Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1973-1974) ,Blumer, (1979)
The U&G Theory and Audience—1980's	Palmgreen and Rayburn (1982),Bryant and Zillmann, (1984),Windahl (1981),Rubin, (1984),Levy and Windahl (1984)
	Finn (1997), Eighmey & McCord (1998)
	Ruggiero (2000), Papacharissi & Rubin (2000)
	Richardson (2003), LaRosa & Eastin (2004)
The U&G Theory and the Internet—1990's through present	Park et al. (2009), Baran and Davis, 2009)
	Urista et al., (2009), Hicks et al., (2012)
	Froget et al (2013), Ezumah (2013)
	Whiting and Williams, (2013)., Tanta et al., (2014)

Source; Adopted from Tomko, (2007), Davis, (2006) and upto date by authors.

Previous Studies related to U& G theory; especially quantitative studies are prepared. Park et al. (2009) identified basic needs of college students for Facebook gratifications as entertainment, information, socializing and self-status seeking; the other Facebook users' study is initiated by Froget et al (2013) to identify socio demographic factors effects on usage and found significant differences among different income group levels. Regarding to this studies also Ezumah (2013) determined the gratifications of social media users preferences of one social media tool over others as keeping in touch with friends/family, sharing photos and entertainment were significant factors for college students being on social media and Tanta et al. (2014) listed the reasons as socializing, communicating and dates with their friends, discussing school activities. Especially more of the studies indicated above are structured on Facebook users and their preferences. Beside the Facebook studies related to the theory also there are limited studies gathering data with other social media tools. According to the results of Hicks et al., (2012) the similiar gratifications (information seeking, interpersonal utility, entertainment and free time activity) are gathered from the tool of Yelp. Com. Limited

qualitative studies were carried out based on this approach. Palmgreen and Rayburn (1979) conducted a quantitative research to find uses and gratifications of watching television. It was obtained seven components and eleven gratifications. The research also showed the differences between gratifications-sought and gratifications-obtained. The study which contains both qualitative and quantitative methods searched the reasons of web usage through uses and gratifications theory (Korgaonkar and Wolin, 1999). Social escapism motivation, information motivation, interactive control motivation, socialization motivation, and economic motivation were revealed as the main causes of using internet. There are many quantititive studies (Özer, 2017, Üçer, 2016; Kara, 2016; Çam et al, 2014; Biçer, 2014; Köseoğlu, 2012; Akçay, 2011; Alikılıç vd., 2013; Karakoç ve Gülsünler, 2011; Ayhan & Balcı, 2009; Kücükkurt et al, 2009, Toruk, 2008) are prepared based on Uses & Gratifications theory in Turkey. More of those studies are carried out by survey technique and the data gathered from university students. Toruk (2008) determined that income level and gender have important roles on social media usage of students. Küçükkurt et al., (2009) analyzed the reasons why students follow the media channels (television, internet and newspaper) and stated that students in this study are using social media to satisfy their emotional needs. The results of the study of Ayhan & Balcı (2009) indicated that there are four (interaction, social escape, economic benefit and entertainment) essential factors in internet usage and motivation. Köseoğlu, (2012) identified the kind of factors motivating university students' being online on Facebook, are easy to use, sharing video/photography, follow the agenda, magazine issues, social interactions. Çam et al., (2014) determined the other significant effect on the motivations of students be online and use social media as information-seeking, solving problem, connectivity and content management. The related studies aim is to understand the motivational factors of university students or staffs' using habits of Facebook, the major social media tools. However, Özer, (2017) detailed the theory (UGT) in his study within the concept of the question "Why the students use Twitter?" Then, he stated that the factors for twitter users are aligned as entertainment, following the agenda and reading other's tweets. Besides students related studies, Bicer (2014), identified the motivational factors of academicians who use Facebook as, communication with other academicians and-or followers, visibility in academic area and perform their daily activities. As it seen in the literature part of Turkey, there are many related quantitative studies within the context of motivational factors through social media usage. Moreover these studies, there are a few qualitative based studies (Üçer, 2016; Kara, 2016) with these notion are carried out. Üçer (2016), answered the question of "Why university students use social media tools?" through their focus group study of Facebook, Instagram and Twitter users. The findings of the study revealed that, the popularity of Facebook and Twitter has decreased among students and the major reasons to use these tools to make social interaction, reach news and knowledge, and entertainment. Paralel to Üçer (2016), Kara indicated the Snapchat usage behavior and preferences of the student in the context of the theory of UGT and found out the two main reasons as follows; entertainment and spending free time. Snapchat found very popular among the students based on the reason of rich visualization features of the tool.

2.2. Background of Theory of User -Generated Media

The increased use of the Internet as a new tool in communication has changed the way people to interact to one another (Raacke and Bonds-Raacke, 2008). Therefore, consumers' aims to use the World Wide Web (www) can be differentiated variously such as they can use it to find information, purchase product or service, watch television series and shows, seek mates, search for entertainment, and participate in political spheres (Correa, 2010). Leung (2009) indicated that connection to internet practices has four main motivational factors named with recognition needs, social needs, cognitive needs, and entertainment needs The creation of user-generated media (UGM) was revolutionized the internet by changing the world of communication, entertainment, and information (Shao, 2009; Hicks et al., 2012). Since the motivation is a part of shaping the consumer's choice, benefit perception is recognized as a motivation reflection over the behaviors of the consumers (Kurtulus et al., 2016). UGM is a content which is created by unpaid users rather than paid professionals, and it has been becoming more important since consumers want to create content dramatically (Daugherty et al., 2008). In UGM content, the active internet contributors are called as users and new contents which make contributions to the information on the internet and also social media are created by these users. Recently, the terms which emphasize UGM such as prosumer, produser, and co-creator were used among scholars frequently (Ritzer and Jurgenson, 2010; Bruns, 2009; Schumacher and Feurstein, 2007; Van Dijck, 2009). Users contribute to social media channels. Shao (2009) explained three steps of UGM to contribute to social media channels as follows, consuming (following people to find information or entertainment), participating (enables social interaction among users and it supports liking and approval by others) and the last step is producing (sharing person's own content such as video, audio, photo, and text in order to increase self-actualization level). Daugherty et al. (2008) found out that people support to UGM with the help of the attitudes contributed by ego-defensive and social functional sources. Hence, one person's many sharing in social media can show the levels self-actualization and ego of the person.

Methodology
The purpose and research question of the study
Recently, both Internet usages grows, and information technologies developed slightly, causing to access social media through mobile phones, television and other similar devices has become possible at any place and any time. UGT research into mobile phone usage has found that people seek a number of gratifications from their phones, including affection/sociability, entertainment, and mobility, among others adding to this, when using social media, users can be motivated by factors like a need to vent negative feelings, recognition, and cognitive needs. By the way, researches in identfying uses and gratification is gaining popularity, with new findings emerging (Tomko,2007). Therefore, determining the uses & gratifications in the context of modernity is still important. As it is shown in the literacy part there are limited qualitative studies to identify gratifications. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore how and why consumers use social media with a qualitative perspective. Within the scope of the aim, two research questions were generated: RQ1: How do consumers use social media within the scope of the UGM? and RQ2: Why do consumers use social media within the scope of the UGT?

Measurement development & data gathering
Research and interview questions were structured by one of the major previous study carried by Whiting & Williams (2013) and the study designed as a qualitative study with twenty-three in-depth interviews, and ten uses and gratifications were identified such as social interaction, information seeking, pass time, entertainment, relaxation, communicatory utility, convenience utility, expression of opinion, information sharing, and surveillance/knowledge about others. This exploratory study was conducted to analyze users' contributions to social media within the scope of the UGM concept, which argue that users should use social media actively. They should upload photos, post status, and share information. This qualitative research was applied to social media users via interview technique which is the most popular technique for qualitative data collection (Briggs, 1986). Since the main aim of this study is to gather profound information about users' social media usage characteristics and their insights about social media channels' effects on marketing, semi-structured interviewing was implemented in the study. In semi-structured interviewing standardized and open-ended questions are asked to the interviewees (Britten, 1995). In this research, thirty-two people were interviewed to reach profound and well-designed information about users' social media habits. The data were gathered from the participants in İzmir Province and between the month of January and March 2017. Each interviews lasted approximately 40-45 minutes and totally the research took nearly 1500 minutes of all participants. In the interview sheet there were 16 questions. The initial six questions were related to the demographic data (gender, birth year, marital status, education, income level, and job status), then the following nine questions was related to the first research question of the study and consisted of the questions such as " Which social media channels do you follow?"; "How often do you log in to these social media channels?"; "How often do you share posts in your social media accounts?"; "Do you share your own posts and/or just basically follow your friends?"; " Do you like your friends' posts and how often do you like?"; "Do you comment your friends posts and how often do you comment?"; "Do you communicate via direct messaging with your friends?;" "Do you share the moments in your social media accounts when you attend an event?"; "What are your general insights about that whether social media users upload too much information to their social media channels or not?". The second research question that was analyzed within the tenth question included two perspectives separately such as "Why do people use social media?" and "Why do companies use social media". Since the purposes of the researches are different from each other, qualitative methods generally focus on small samples selected by purposeful sampling which provides "information-rich cases" for in-depth studies whereas quantitative methods focus on larger samples generally selected by random sampling (Patton, 1990, p. 169). The typical sampling method used in qualitative studies is called as purposeful sampling (Palinkas et al., 2015) and was used in this research. Based on this sampling technique, the sample of the research was chosen among the people who are social media users actively and graduated from university at least to gain more profound insights. Content analysis is a method that used in various fields such as marketing, psychology, and communication (Hair et al., 1998) was used to analyze the sentences and thoughts to understand and present the conceptual structures. Qualitative data analysis includes data reduction, data display, and preliminary conclusion (Miles and Huberman, 2002, p.396). In this research, to

148

eliminate the data firstly data were transcribed verbatim, and seventy-two pages of transcriptions were revealed. Then, data were coded to reduce the data. After coding, findings were shown with the help of tables in order to display the data better, frequency and rates in order to clarify the data better and direct quotations in order to reflect the insights of the participants better. The two researchers analyzed the data separately to assure reliability of the data since the prejudices of the researchers should be eliminated from the research (Kirk and Miller, 1986). Besides this, to provide valid data the member checking technique was used. According to this technique, the findings interpreted by the researchers should be sent to the participants to ask whether they confirm them or not (Cho and Trent, 2006). So, the preliminiary findings were sent to the participants via e-mail, and it was asked them to read and verify the insights if the insights are really well understood by the researchers or not. All participants confirmed that the findings represented what they said during the interviews.

4. Findings
The demographics data of the 32 participants were shown in Table 1 below.
Table 1: Demographics of the participants

Participant	Gender	Birth Year	Marital Status	Education	Income Level	Job Status
P1	Male	1975	Married	Master	6501-7800TL	Public sector
P2	Male	1982	Single	Master	6501-7800TL	Public sector
P3	Male	1973	Married	Master	6501-7800TL	Private sector
P4	Female	1977	Married	Master	over 10401TL	Unemployment
P5	Female	1985	Single	Graduate	6501-7800TL	Public sector
P6	Male	1988	Single	Graduate	7801-9100TL	Private sector
P7	Female	1984	Single	Graduate	5201-6500TL	Private sector
P8	Male	1992	Single	Graduate	5201-6500TL	Student
P9	Male	1990	Married	Graduate	3901-5200TL	Self-employment
P10	Male	1986	Single	Graduate	9101-	Private sector

					10400TL	
P11	Male	1991	Single	Graduate	3901-5200TL	Unemployment
P12	Female	1991	Single	Graduate	7801-9100TL	Self-employment
P13	Female	1991	Single	Graduate	over 10401TL	Self-employment
P14	Male	1986	Married	Graduate	6501-7800TL	Private sector
P15	Male	1991	Single	Graduate	1301-2600TL	Private sector
P16	Female	1994	Single	Graduate	2601-3900TL	Student
P17	Male	1984	Married	Graduate	1301-2600TL	Private sector
P18	Male	1986	Single	Master	6501-7800TL	Private sector
P19	Female	1992	Single	Graduate	3901-5200TL	Student
P20	Female	1993	Single	Graduate	5201-6500TL	Private sector
P21	Male	1987	Single	Graduate	3901-5200TL	Private sector
P22	Male	1987	Married	Graduate	5201-6500TL	Private sector
P23	Male	1979	Married	Master	over 10401TL	Private sector
P24	Female	1992	Single	Graduate	7801-9100TL	Student
P25	Female	1993	Single	Master	2601-3900TL	Private sector
P26	Male	1984	Single	Graduate	5201-6500TL	Private sector
P27	Female	1991	Single	Graduate	2601-	Student

					3900TL	
P28	Male	1989	Single	Graduate	2601-3900TL	Unemployment
P29	Female	1989	Single	Graduate	6501-7800TL	Private sector
P30	Male	1977	Married	Graduate	over 10401TL	Self-employment
P31	Male	1980	Single	Graduate	5201-6500TL	Private sector
P32	Female	1980	Single	Graduate	5201-6500TL	Private sector

As it is shown in Table 1, the ages of the participants varied between 23 and 44 years old. More of the participants were male (19), 21 of them are single, 25 of them have a graduate (bachelor) degree and 17 of the participants are working for private sector. After the demographics section the main questions' answers are revealed. In table 2, the social media channels that were used by participants were asked.

Table 2: Social media channels used by the participants

Channel	(frequency) Participants
Facebook	**(28)** P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P11, P12, P14, P15, P16, P17, P18, P19, P20, P21, P22, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P31, P32
Instagram	**(27)** P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P9, P10, P12, P13, P14, P17, P18, P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31, P32
Twitter	**(14)** P2, P5, P6, P7, P9, P15, P16, P17, P18, P19, P20, P23, P25, P30
LinkedIn	**(11)** P3, P7, P12, P14, P18, P23, P25, P26, P28, P29, P30
Swarm	**(10)** P2, P3, P6, P7, P17, P19, P27, P28, P29, P31
Foursquare	**(5)** P3, P28, P29, P30, P31
YouTube	**(4)** P3, P28, P29, P30
Snapchat	**(3)** P7, P16, P20
Pinterest	**(1)** P25

The table 2 indicated that most of the participants use Facebook (28) and Instagram (27). Even if Facebook was the mostly used channel, four participants (P10, P13, P23, and P30) did not prefer to use Facebook.

One of them (P23$_{M, 1979}$) said that "I do not use Facebook because it has too much transpency, which bothers me". He meant that sharing every moment in Facebook and interacting with friends do not suit him. He has been using just Instagram, Twitter, and Linkedin that have less interaction and communication activities rather than Facebook. The following questions were asked to learn the answer of the first research question (RQ1) of the study. The participants were asked that how often they log in their social media accounts.

Table 3: The frequency rate of logging in social media channels

Log in Frequency	Participants	Frequency
Several times in a day	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P13, P15, P16, P17, P18, P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P25, P28, P29, P31, P32	23
Once in a day	P9, P10, P12, P14, P24, P26, P27	7
Several times in a week	P11, P30	2
	Total	32

The answers were shown in Table 3 below, 23 of the participants log in their social media accounts several times in a day.
In the next question, the participants were asked that how often they share posts in their social media channels. The answers were shown in Table 4 below. P2 said that he both logs in several times in a day and shares posts. P7 said that she logs in several times in a day but she shares posts once in a day. There were four participants who said that they do not share anything anytime in social media.

Table 4: The frequency rate of sharing posts in social media channels

Sharing Frequency	Participants	Frequency
Several times in a day	P2	1
Once in a day	P7	1
Several times in a week	P1, P14, P17, P18, P29, P22, P27	7
Once in a week	P6, P19, P25	3
Once every two weeks	P11, P12, P16, P20, P28	5
Once in a month	P5, P13, P24, P23, P32	5
Once every three months	P4, P8, P9, P21, P26, P31	6
Never	P3, P10, P15, P30	4
	Total	32

The next question included the ways of interaction among users. Do they share post or they just basically follow their friends? Two of the participants (P11, P17) said that they share their own posts (photos, videos, status) rather than following someone else. Twenty five of 32 participants (P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P8, P9, P10, P12, P13, P15, P16, P18, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P26, P28, P29, P30, P31, P32) said that they generally follow their friends in their lists quietly instead of posting/sharing something related to them. Only five of them (P7, P14, P19, P25, P27) said that they both share something and follow their friends' updatings. The majority of the participants were silent followers.

Next three questions show the contribution degree to the social media actively and the results can be seen from Table 5 below. The first question was related to whether the participant likes their friends' posts or not, and also it was asked that how often they like them. In this question, it was found out that two different conditions were occurred such as Condition 1: I just liked the post which I really find it comic; Condition 2: I just liked the posts which are posted by only my close friends. There are fifteen people, which are nearly the half of the sample, said that they like the posts rarely or they never like posts. It showed that most of them do not contribute to create contents in social media.The second question was related to writing comments on the posts in social media. Whether they comment on their friends' posts or not was asked to the participants. According to the results, only three of them said that they comment on their friends' posts freely. The biggest majority of the people said that they do not comment on their friends' posts. It was seen that two conditions were occurred again. Condition 1: I just comment on the posts which I really love; Condition 2: I just comment on the posts which are posted by only my close friends. Ten people said that they write comment only if they really love the post or they really like the user who shared the post. In this subject, the third question was related to having a direct communication through social media channels with the help of direct messages which are private messages that seen by sender and receiver. They communicate with their friends through social media or not were asked to the participants. P1, P5, P21, P24 emphasized that they use social media to communicate with their friends who live abroad. Besides this, the huge majority of the participants said that they connect with their friends via direct messages.

Table 5: The frequency rate of liking, writing comments, and communicationg via direct messages

	Participants	Frequency
Like		
Yes, usually	P7, P13, P17, P20, P25, P27, P29	7
Sometimes	P4, P11, P18	3
Rarely	P1, P2, P3, P6, P9, P12, P15, P16, P21, P23, P31, P32	12
No, never	P10, P26, P30	3
Condition 1	P8, P14, P19, P22, P24, P28	6
Condition 2	P5	1
	Total	32
Comment		
Yes	P8, P17, P29	3

Rarely	P4, P7, P9, P12, P18, P19, P20, P27, P28	9
No	P2, P3, P10, P15, P16, P21, P24, P26, P30, P31	10
Condition 1	P11, P22,	2
Condition 2	P1, P5, P6, P13, P14, P23, P25, P32	8
	Total	32
Communication via DM		
Yes	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P7, P11, P12, P13, P16, P17, P19, P20, P21, P22, P24, P25, P26, P28, P29, P30	21
Some of them	P6, P8, P9, P14, P18, P23, P27, P31, P32	9
No	P10, P15	2
	Total	32

The eighth question was about what participants do when they attend an event. The probability of sharing the moments in the social media channels during the event was asked to the participants. Twelve participants said that they share the moments in their social media channels whereas twenty participants (said that they do not share anything regarding the event in their social media channels. Besides this, twenty participants (P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P9, P10, P11, P13, P15, P16, P18, P19, P20, P22, P23, P24, P25, P28, and P29) said that sharing every moment in social media was seen as unmannerless behavior. They added that the people who share the moments via photos during a trip wanted to show off to other people and it ended with conspicious consumption. These acts were seen as the efforts for self-actualization (P2), showing that belonging to high social class (P5, P13), making difference and so being considered as important by their friends (P16, P22, P24). They added that the people who are addicted to social media behave ostentatiously. They always want to be liked and followed by other people even if they do not know them personally.

The ninth question was asked to understand the general insights about whether social media users upload too much information to the social media channels or not. Only five of the participants (P2, P3, P6, P26, and P27) said that users uploading post frequencies were normal. On the contrary, the remaining part of the participants said that people share too much unnecessary posts in social media. P7 said that,

> "Some people share ten photos in a day from different perspectives but in the same event with the same dresses. For instance, they share the same photo from a distance perspective, from the right side, and from the left side in a day and this bothers the followers". P12 said that "some people share their every moments in a basic daily life, they pretend as if they are celebrity. They put the photos about their breakfast, lunch and dinner everyday. It seems wrong to me". P5, P14, and P16 agreed with this. P13 said that "I do not understand the people who share the photos of their slippers in Sunday morning".

The last question below was related to the second research question (RQ2). The participants were asked why they use social media. After coding the answers, some keywords were revelaed, and they showed the uses and gratifications for using social media. Six uses and gratificfations were revealed for consumers such as electronic word of mouth (e-wom), providing a new shopping channel, following celebrities, changing decision easily, globalization, and convenience. E-wom was related to online

comments, and customer reviews which can lead other customers. Positive comments may affect other customers positively whereas negative comments affect them negatively. Shopping channel was related to purchasing products and services through social media channels. P16 said that

> "Nowadays, buying through social media is the easisest, fastest, and cheapest way of shopping since consumers have lack of time". P25 emphasized that "Social media channels enable consumers to buy faster and easier".

Celebrity endorsement was related to using celebrities in particularly social media advertising. It affects followers' buyer behaviors. Decision process was related to power of social media in buyer decision process in terms of information search. This can be also related to e-wom. The other side was globalization which means thanks to social media all news, trends, and developments can be followed easily. P14 said that

> "Fashion and trends can be followed easily through social media". P17 said that "Social media, especially Twitter, is useful for following new technologies and also following the world".

The last one, convenience, was related to being accessible easily. Social media provides easy accessibility of time (24/7) and place.

Table 6: Uses and gratifications for customers

Positive sides	Positive insights	Participants
E-wom	Online customer reviews guide other customers.	P7, P11, P12, P18, P20, P31
Providing new shopping channel	The easisest, fastest, and cheapest way of shopping.	P13, P16, P19, P25, P26
Following celebrities	Through social media celebrities' buying behaviors affect their followers.	P3, P4, P9, P15, P23, P30
Changing decision	Social media is an effective tool in consumer decision process.	P1, P2, P28, P32
Globalization	Fashion, trend, new technologies, and the world can be followed easily.	P14, P17, P29
Convenience	Consumers may access social media channels whenever they want and whereever they are.	P16, P17

The tenth question is continued with the uses and gratifications from the perspective of companies. Totally five uses and gratifications were revealed for companies such as communication options, decreasing cost, finding new markets, reaching target market, and positive e-wom. The findings were shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Uses and gratifications for companies

Positive sides	Positive insights	Participants
Communication options	There are too many options to enhance communication with customers	P2, P3, P4, P12, P15, P19, P21, P30, P31
Decreasing cost	Reaching customers with low cost	P9, P11, P16, P18, P28, P29
Finding new markets	It allows companies to reach new large markets	P20, P22, P23, P26, P24, P32
Reaching target market	Reaching customers easier in a shorter time	P1, P6, P13, P14
Positive e-wom	Positive e-wom increase sales	P7, P25, P27

Communication options showed the increasing tools of communication skills through social media. Companies can create different advertising types and communication ways with lower cost. P4 said that

> "Especially in Instagram, with good communication skills the products used by the people who have too many followers have turned into the fashion products". P15 said that "Companies have too many options to organize communication activities in social media, for instance they may use celebrities in their promotional efforts". P30 said that "Companies may use viral advertising in social media freely". Decreasing cost was about having lower advertising cost and lower inventory cost. P18 said that "Social media enables companies to make low cost advertising". P19 said that "Social media provides companies to reach their customers for free". Finding new markets was related to reaching new customers, and also being global so reaching different part of the world. P24 said that "Through social media companies can reach even foreign markets, and start to operate international sales".

Reaching target market meant reaching existing customers easier and quicklier in a shorter time. Positive e-wom showed that online customer reviews and comments increase the sales of the company.

Conclusion

In the paper, it was explored and discussed that how Turkish social media users act in social media within the UGM, and why they use social media within the UGT. The UGT explains many reasons about why consumers use social media (Whiting and Williams, 2013). In this research, from the perspectives of the participants why consumers use social media was determined. Within the UGT, it was analyzed that why both customers and companies use social media. According to the participants' perceptions, the uses and gratifications for customers were gathered under six elements

such as (1) having the power of e-wom (especially the positive ones), (2) having a different shopping channel, (3) having a celebrity endorsement effect, (4) affecting decision process, (5) following global world, and (6) providing convenience like 24/7. Besides this, five uses and gratifications were obtained for companies such as (1) having different communication tools, (2) decreasing costs, (3) finding new markets, (4) reaching target market, and (5) having positive e-wom effects.

In the study, it was obtained that the most popular social media channels were Facebook and Instagram. This reflects the social media usage in Turkey. The mostly used social media channels in Turkey are Facebook and Instagram (Chaffey, 2016). They log in social media several times in a day, but they do not share anything. It can be seen that even though participants log in social media several times in a day, they do not share anything during the time that they have spent on social media. This is interesting within the scope of the UGM. As it was read above, the majority of the users have formed by spectators which were also called as "silent followers" in this research. Except sharing posts, when it was talked about just liking a post or writing a comment, it was seen that the users were uncommitted. Nearly half of them do not like anything, and more than half of them do not write any comments. Only around thirty percent of the users contribute to the social media by liking or commenting posts. Another interesting result was related to communicating with friends via direct messages. This is interesting because when it was mentioned to contribute to the social media by sharing posts or writing comments, the users were seen as very uncommitted. However, when it was mentioned to talk with friends via private messages they declared that they use this tool without any doubt. This finding led the researchers to think about the social pressure on social media users. The social pressure may restrain social media users' behaviors. They could not act naturally because they think too much about how this behavior is perceived by others. So, at the end of the day they start to behave like someone else. This makes social media misleading, and it become useless among such a society. When they attend an event, more than half of them do not share the moments from the event on their social media channels since sharing every moments in social media was perceived as unmannerless behavior. The person who shares some moments from an event was perceived as the person who tries to show off. Sharing every moment in a day was seen as a behavior of conspicious consumption, and also it was linked to the efforts for self-actualization. It was also proved in the literature (Shao, 2009). It can be said that the people who share their own contents such as videos and photos want to increase their self-actulization. Such experiences make people believe that they are useful and they create an effect on the other people, and so this increases their self-actualizations. Besides self-actualization efforts, except five users, the remaining parts said that there have been too much unnecessary posts in social media. It can be said that the participation or contribution to social media should include social interaction or community development (Shao, 2009).

In the research, users' producing, participating, and consuming levels were sorted. Mostly the users contribute social media by consuming information and entertainment elements as silent followers. Secondly, they contribute social media by producing content for their self-actualizations. They want to feel themselves as celebritites. Lastly, they contribute social media by participating in social interactions such as liking and writing comment. However there are many papers discussed social

media tools and their effects on people, there have been limited studies that combine the UGM and the UGT. In this study, both two concepts were included, and the questions were asked in order to get answers related to these concepts. This study contributed to social media marketing literature by showing user behavior in social media within UGM, and uses & gratifications of users within UGT. The paper also pointed out deeper understanding since the research managed by qualitative methods. Having a small sample size is a methodological limitation of the study. For further studies, it was advised to conduct qualitative studies with an enhancing sample size. It was also suggested to create a scale to measure uses and gratifications in social media via quantitative methods in future studies.

References

Aglargoz, F. and Ozata, Z., (2013). Uses and gratifications theory as a way of understanding college students' use of social media. *8th International Academic conference*, Naples, Italy, 16-19 September.

Akçay, H. (2011). Kullanımlar ve Doyumlar Yaklaşımı Bağlamında Sosyal Medya Kullanımı: Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *İletişim, Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi.* Güz 2011, Sayı: 33: 137-162.

Alikılıç, Ö. Gülay, G. Binbir, Sevtap. (2013). Kullanımlar ve Doyumlar Kuramı Çerçevesinde Facebook Uygulamalarının İncelenmesi: Yaşar Üniversitesi Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Gazi Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi.* (37): 40-67.

Ayhan, B., and Balcı, Ş. (2009). Kırgızistan'da Üniversite Gençliği Ve İnternet: Bir Kullanımlar Ve Doyumlar Araştırması, *Bilgi Journal of Social Sciences of the Turkish World*, 48: 13-40.

Balcı, Ş., Akar, H. ve Ayhan, B. (2011). Televizyon ve Seçmen İlişkisini Yeniden Düşünmek: 2009 Yerel Seçimleri'nde İzleyici Motivasyonları, *Selçuk İletişim*, 6 (4): 48-63.

Baran, S. and Davis, D. (2009). Mass Communication theory: Foundation, Ferment, and Future, 6th Edition, *Pennsylvania State University College bookstore.*

Biçer, S. (2015). Akademisyenlerin Sosyal Ağlarda Bulunma Motivasyonları: Facebook Örneği, *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (40): 59-80

Blumler, J. G. and Katz, E. (1974). The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research. *Sage Annual Reviews of Communication Research* Vol 3.

Briggs, C. L. (1986). Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research. *Cambridge University Press.*

Britten, N. (1995). Qualitative research: Qualitative interviews in medical research. *British Medical Journal*, 311 (6999): 251-253.

Bruns, A. (2009). From Prosumer to Produser: Understanding User-Led Content Creation. *Transforming Audiences,* 3-4 Sep, 2009, London.

Chaffey, D. (2016). Global social media research summary 2016, ht*tp://www.smartinsights.com/social-media-marketing/social-media-strategy/new-global-social-media-research/* , Access date: 25.01.2017.

Cho, J. and A. Trent (2006). Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative Research*, 6 (3): 319-340.

Correa, T., Hinsley, A. W. and Zuniga, H. G. (2010). Who interacts on the Web?: The intersection of users' personality and social media use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27: 247-253.

Çam, M. S., Çakmak, V., and Aktan, E. (2014). "Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal medya kullanımlarını etkileyen motivasyon faktörleri", *Digital Communication Impact*, 377-388.

Daugherty, T., Eastin, M. S. and Bright, L. (2008). Exploring consumer motivations for creating user-generated content. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8(2), 16-25.

David L, (2016). Uses and Gratification Theory," in Learning Theories, January 26, 2016, *https://www.learning-theories.com/uses-and-gratification-theory.html.*

Ezumah, B. A. (2013). College Students' Use of Social Media: Site Preferences, Uses and Gratifications Theory Revisited. *International Journal of Business and Social Science,* May 2013., 4 (5): 27-34.

Froget, J R L., Baghestan A . G., and Asfaranjan, Y.S. (2013). A Uses and Gratification Perspective on Social Media Usage and Online Marketing *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15 (1): 134-145.

Grohol, J. (1999). Too Much Time Online: Internet Addiction or Healthy Social Interactions? *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 2(5):395-401.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). Multivariate data analysis. New York: *Prentice Hall*.

Hanna, R., Rohm, A. and Crittenden, V. L. (2011). We're all connected: The power of the social media ecosystem. *Business Horizons*, 881: 1-9.

Hicks, A., Comp, S., Horovitz, J., Hovarter, M., Miki, M. and Bevan, J. L. (2012). Why people use Yelp.com: An exploration of uses and gratifications. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28: 2274-2279.

Kaplan, A. M. and Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons*, 53: 59-68.

Kara, T. (2016). Gençler Neden Snapchat Kullanıyor Kullanımlar ve Doyumlar Yaklasımı Üzerınden Bır Arastırma. *International Journal Of Intermedia,* 3(5):262-277.

Karakoç, E. ve Gülsünler, M.E. (2012). Kullanımlar ve Doyumlar Yaklaşımı Bağlamında Facebook: Konya Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Akdeniz Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Aralık 2012, 18: 42-57

Kirk, J. and Miller, M. L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. *Sage Publications.*

Korgaonkar, P. K. and Wolin, L. D. (1999). A multivariate analysis of web usage. Journal of advertising research, 39: 53-68.

Köseoğlu, Ö. (2012). Sosyal Ağ Sitesi Kullanıcılarının Motivasyonları: Facebook Üzerine Bir Araştırma", *Selçuk Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Akademik Dergisi,* 7(2):58-81.

Kurtulus, K., Kurtulus, S. and Bulut, D. (2016). Benefit Segmentation of Internet Users and Their Addictitive Behavior, *Yıldız Social Science Review*: 1:.21-30.

Küçükkurt, M., Hazar, Ç. M., Çetin, M., and Topbaş, H. (2009). Kullanımlar ve Doyumlar Yaklaşımı Perspektifinden Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Medyaya Bakışı, *Selçuk Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Akademik Dergisi,* 6(1):37-50.

Leung, L. (2009). User-generated content on the Internet. An examination of gratifications, civic engagement and psychological empowerment. *New Media & Society*, 11: 1327–1347.

Miles, M. B. and A. M. Huberman, A. M. (2002). The Qualitative Researcher's Companion. London: Sage.

Özer, Ö. (2017). "Kullanımlar Ve Doyumlar Kuramı Çerçevesinde Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İi Bf Öğrencilerinin Twitter Kullanımı Üzerine Bir Analiz", *Intermedia International Peer-Reviewed E-Journal Of Communication Sciences*, 4(6):40-58.

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N. and Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5): 533-544.

Palmgreen, P., & Rayburn, J. D. (1979). Uses and gratifications and exposure to public television: A discrepancy approach. *Communication Research*, 6(2): 155-179.

Park, N., K.F. Kee and S. Valenzuela, 2009. Being immersed in social networking environment: Facebook groups, uses and gratifications, and social outcomes. *Cyber Psychology and Behavior*, 12(6): 729-733.

Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (pp. 169-186). Beverly Hills, CA: *Sage publication.*

Raacke, J. and Bonds-Raacke, J. (2008). MySpace and Facebook: Applying the uses and gratifications theory to exploring friend-networking sites. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior,* 11(2): 169-174.

Ritzer, G. and Jurgenson, N. (2010). Production, Consumption, Prosumption The nature of capitalism in the age of the digital 'prosumer'. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 10(1), 13-36.

Schumacher, J. and Feurstein, K. (2007). Living Labs-the user as co-creator. In Technology Management Conference (ICE), 2007 June *IEEE International Conference* : 1-6.

Shao, G. (2009). Understanding the appeal of user-generated media: a uses and gratification perspective. *Internet Research*, 19(1): 7-25.

Song, I., Larose, R., Eastin, M. E. and Lin, C. A. (2004). Internet Gratifications and Internet Addiction: On the Uses and Abuses of New Media. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*. 7(4): 384-394.

Tanta, I, Mihovilović, M., Sablić, z. (2014) Uses and Gratification Theory – Why Adolescents Use Facebook? *Medij. İstraž:* 85-110.

Urista, M. A., Dong, Q., and Day, K. D. (2009). Explaining Why Young Adults Use Myspace And Facebook Through Uses And Gratifications Theory, *Human Communication*, 12 (2): 215-229.

Üçer, N. (2016). Kullanımlar Ve Doyumlar Yaklaşımı Bağlamında Gençlerin Sosyal Media Kullanımına Yönelik Niteliksel Bir Araştırma, *Global Media Journal Turkish Edition*, 6(12):1-26

Tomko, C, (2007). Growing Up Internet: A Qualitative Case Study Of A Long-Term Relationship Of A Teenage Girl Mentored By A Middle-Agaed Woman In The On-Line World. Unpublished thesis, *The University of Akron In Master of Fine and Applied Arts* December, 2007.

Toruk, İ. (2008). "Üniversite Gençliğinin Medya Kullanma Alışkanlıkları Üzerine Bir Analiz. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi",* (19):475-488.

Van Dijck, J. (2009). Users like you? Theorizing agency in user-generated content. *Media, culture & society,* 31(1): 41-58.

Whiting, A., Williams, D. (2013). Why people use social media: a uses and gratifications approach. *Qualitative Market Research*, 16(4): 362-369.