Facebook Usage Of Turkish Football Federation Spor Toto Super League Sports Teams' Supporters

Levent ATALI[1], Dilşad COKNAZ[2]

[1] Dr., Electronic Mail: leventatali@gmail.com
[2] Assist. Prof. Dr., Electronic Mail: dilhak@yahoo.com

[1] Kocaeli Metropolitan Municipality, Karabaş Mah.Salim Dervişoğlu Cad. No:80 41040 İzmit / Kocaeli / TURKEY
[2] Abant İzzet Baysal University, School Of Physical Education and Sport, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Gölköy Kampüsü 14280 Bolu / TURKEY

* Corresponding author: leventatali@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine sports teams' supporters' Facebook usage purposes and also determine their involvement and usage patterns on Facebook and question and examine the differences between them. This is a descriptive research. Relational screening model was used in this study. The sample group of the study consists of 639 supporters who follow official Facebook pages of Turkish Sports Federation Spor Toto Super League sports clubs during the 2011-2012 season. Sports Clubs' Supporters' Facebook Usage Scale was developed by the researcher to collect data. This scale is composed of four sub-dimensions including knowledge, follow and support, communication, sharing and generating income for the club. The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency value of the entire scale was found as (α=0,93). In addition to descriptive statistical methods (mean, standard deviation, frequency, ratio), one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used in between-groups comparison of normally distributed parameters for comparing quantitative data, Tukey test was used for determining the group which caused the difference and t-test (t-test for independent groups) was used for assessments according to two groups when evaluating the research data. As a result, supporters use Facebook applications of sports clubs mostly for the purpose of having knowledge, following up and supporting. Supporters have rather self-defined themselves as viewers while using Facebook. The sub-dimensions of "knowledge, follow and support", "sharing", "communication" and "generating income for the club" have been observed as variables that affect sports clubs' supporters' usage habits of Facebook applications.

Keywords: Sports Clubs, Supporter, Social Media, Facebook

1. Introduction

Computer and internet technologies that leave their marks in era have infiltrated up to the deepest of levels of social life. In recent years, it draws attention that city life technologies and new communication technologies have intertwined and the users of these technologies create significant changes in terms of production and sharing (Akar, 2011). The increase in internet usage parallel to this change in Turkey such as the same with the world and transformation of internet into a part of business life has become inevitable. Significant portion of those in digital media get in contact with the others with the purposes of mutual information exchange and share many operations. This communication style in the nature of information exchange at the beginning of internet usage is now also started to take commercial and promotional operations into its scope. Exchanges and changes in information and experience related to these exchanges have began to emerge along with the leaguing of people who need certain products and services together by increasing in digital media according to their common requirements (Tosun, 2010).

A giant in size and easy-sharing platform that have never happened before on Earth has come into our lives together with the social media phenomenon (Kahraman, 2010). Blossom (2009) defines social media as scalable and accessible communication technologies or techniques which enable each individual to affect other individual groups easily.

Social media that is also known as a digital community is an application that bring people together in a common platform where they can talk, chat, share their opinions and knowledge and make new friends (Marketing Leadership Council, 2008). As in each media, social media needs an environment to exist. The only common point of different technologies and all these tools that use different methods is the fact that they offer high level of sharing opportunity to their users (Kahraman, 2010). New media with the digital capability also provides the ability of interaction to its users at the same time. New communication methods are effective in formation of new social structures by providing re-formation of social structure and relations of production by these new features of its own (Tosun, 2010).

Sports clubs that are one of the sports organizations are distinguished with their intense presence in social networking and large majority of users. Number of sports clubs and supporters that are included in Facebook application which is one of the social networking sites are increasing day by day. The increasing growth of number of supporters who become member of the relevant applications of sports clubs on Facebook makes this area very significant and important. The mutual usage purposes of social networking sites that are used intensively by clubs and supporters continue to gain importance in terms of relations between sports clubs and supporters. The existence of sports clubs and supporter groups on this new environment and media that has attained a great place in today's economy has become inevitable. Social media applications seem to be an opportunity for sports clubs in terms of marketing, public relations, supporter communication and the other management applications that they need to reach supporter groups. The need for examination of social networking sites in the field of sports has emerged along with the fact that

sports began to take place in social networking sites as a field with strong attractiveness and has a great number of viewers.

From the perspective of football, the competition that has been seen on the streets and in the stadiums will be seen to continue in the digital environment, too. The unlimited communication phenomenon provided by the internet may affect supporters and form public opinion by forming pressure groups thanks to the internet environment (Dikici, 2009). It is expected for clubs which make use of this opportunity to step forward. FC Barcelona may be given as an example to these clubs for the reason that they continue to form new distribution channels by creating mobile content under the title of new media (Liaguno, Cusco and Ciurans, 2010). New technologies in social media have increased the number of supporters and have been caused the emergence of a new supporter group. In this regard, new technologies are largely influenced sports (Rein and Kotler, 2006). The effect of Facebook which is one of the social media tools is significant in increasing the number of supporters of sports clubs, today.

One of the important reasons of conduction of this study is the social media applications which are new for our social life to be expected to add new information to this area in terms of sports clubs and supporters. The purpose of this study is to examine the sports clubs' supporters' usage purposes of Facebook and determine the involvement and usage pattern of them and question the differences between these two aspects.

2. Method

This is a descriptive research. Relational screening model was used in this study. SPSS Windows 2010 software was used for statistical analyses. In addition to descriptive statistical methods (mean, standard deviation, frequency, ratio), one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used in between-groups comparison of normally distributed parameters for comparing quantitative data, Tukey test was used for determining the group which caused the difference and t-test for independent groups was used for assessments according to two groups when evaluating the research data.. Significance level was determined as p<0,05.

2.1 Sample

Target population of the study includes supporters who follow (N=15.403.477) official Facebook page of the Turkish Sports Federation Spor Toto Super League sports clubs during the 2011-2012 season. Sample-size reference table suggested by Yazicioglu and Erdogan (2004) was used for determining sample size in terms of the target population of the study. Although sample size of the study was defined as minimum 384 supporters in a confidence interval of 95% in terms of the suggested sizes, total 639 supporters who follow Facebook pages of the sports clubs were reached by convenience sampling method. Convenience sampling is a method providing the persons whose information and data are easiest to collect to be included in the sample group (Kurtulus, 2006).

2.2. Data Collection

"Sports Clubs' Supporters' Facebook Usage Scale" (SCSFUS) including 29 items was developed for this study. The scale is composed of four sub-dimensions including "knowledge, follow and support", "communication", "sharing" and "generating income for the club". The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency value of the entire scale was found as (α=0,93). Questions about demographic features and Facebook usage were added to the first part of the scale. A message link was sent to the Facebook pages of the Turkish Sports Federation Spor Toto Super League sports clubs and other Facebook pages concerning sports. 639 scale forms completely filled out by the supporters via this link were evaluated.

3.   Findings and Evaluation

Table 1. Mean Scale Score Distribution in terms of Facebook Usage Purposes

Facebook Usage Purposes	Min-Max	Mean ± SD	Arithmetic Mean
Knowledge, Follow and Support	1,09-5,00	3,25±1,08	3,36
Sharing	1,00-5,00	2,81±0,94	2,80
Communication	1,38-4,38	2,68±0,59	2,50
Generating Income for the Club	1,00-5,00	2,32±1,06	2,20

"Knowledge, follow and support" sub-dimension ($\bar{x}$ =3.36) is distinguished among purposes. As is known, the phenomenon of supportership includes the support of persons for their own teams or clubs in any way. It is also a known fact that supporters follow their teams and need to know about them. In the study conducted on football supporters by Tutkun, Tasmektepligil, Canbaz, Acar and Can (2012), it was seen that the supporters used internet mostly for informative purposes. In this context, it can be seen as a probable outcome that the sub-dimension of "knowledge, follow and support" is distinguished among other usage purposes; because obtaining information is one of the most common purposes of using social media. For example, Parlak (2010) determined the purposes of using social media as making friends, communicating and talking with group of friends as well as obtaining information quickly. Similarly, Karaduman and Kurt (2010) determined obtaining information as one the purposes of using social media and defined other purposes as communicating, researching, getting informed, sharing and socializing. Sharing and communication purposes determined in this research are also common in many studies like the purpose of obtaining information (Karaduman and Kurt, 2010; Koksal, 2012; Parlak, 2010). According to another research supporting the results, social media is used for obtaining information, communicating, sharing and contacting (Hazar, 2011). Sener (2009), on the other hand, prioritized the purposes of Facebook usage as communicating, finding friends and sharing in his study concerning

Facebook usage. Besides all these results, people's demand to reach information and the technology satisfying this demand in an easy, quick and cheap way in today's world are also essential (Cetin, 2009). In general terms, Facebook usage purposes determined in all studies are similar to the purposes of sports clubs' supporters; only the sub-dimension of "generating income for the club" pertains to the sports clubs.

Table 2. Facebook usage frequency, duration of following the club's page and percentage and frequency distributions of the tools used for logging to Facebook

Variables		n	%	Total
Facebook Usage Frequency	1 day a week	42	6,6	639
	2-3 days a week	94	14,7	
	4-5 days a week	214	33,5	
	6-7 days a week	289	45,2	
Duration of following the club's page	Less than 1 year	218	34,1	639
	1-2 years	314	49,1	
	3-4 years	107	16,7	
Tools used for logging to Facebook	Computer	300	46,9	639
	Computer + Phone	339	53,1	

According to Table 2, while 6.6% (n=42) of the supporters use Facebook one day a week, 14.7% (n=94) use two or three days a week, 33.5% (n=214) use four or five days a week, and 45.2% (n=289) use six or seven days a week. According to the findings concerning duration of following the club's page, 34.1% (n=218) of the supporters have been following the Facebook page of their club for less than a year, 49.1% (n=314) are for 1-2 years, and 16.7% (n=107) are for 3-4 years. While 46.9% (n=300) of the supporters login to Facebook from computer, 53.1% (n=339) login from computer and phone.

According to the findings, most of the sports clubs' supporters use Facebook applications almost every day. Considering the history of Facebook applications in our country and especially the beginning of sports clubs applications, it's likely to say that sports clubs' supporters have been following the Facebook pages of their clubs since the very first years of the application. Moreover, it can be said that Facebook has become part of daily lives of sports clubs' supporters taking into consideration that they use Facebook every day. In the research of Karaduman and Kurt (2010) conducted on business administration students, it was also mentioned that students used social media intensively every day. According to the findings, nearly half of the sports clubs' supporters login into Facebook both from computer and phone. It shows that supporters are online in Facebook all day long when their usage frequency is also regarded. In the article of Gedizoglu (2011) including the ideas of Avea Corporate Communications Manager Feridun, social media is considered and adopted as a new communication model rather than an environment as it allows establishing a mutual, continuous and dynamic relationship between customers and shareholders rather than a unilateral one. Social media provides great opportunities for brands always standing by their customers. Besides, the most

significant target of social media for corporations is to become a subject of customers' conversation. That's why sports clubs' evaluations concerning such usage of mobile tools are important for Facebook applications aimed at sports clubs' supporters. Because, existence of a supporter group accessible at any time has the potential to allow sports club to communicate with its supporters at any time.

Table 3. Distribution of involvement of supporters in Facebook

Involvement in Facebook	n	%
Content Creator	61	9,5
Commentator	161	25,2
Follower	148	23,2
Contributor	160	25,0
Viewer	317	49,6

According to Table 3, it is seen that 9,5% (n=61) of the supporters are "content creator", 25,2% (n=161) are "commentator", 23,2% are (n=148) "follower", 25% (n=160) are "contributor" and 49,6% (n=317) are "viewer".

According to the content of involvement pattern (Evans, 2010), "content creators" and those who design/set up blogs, Wikis, forums etc. are socially active people. "Content creators" have the minimum rate (9,5%) among sports team supporters according to this study. This ratio of distribution in this involvement pattern is an ordinary and normal situation that when considered that having or learning different knowledge relating to Facebook application and computer areas is required to create content. In other words, a person must have knowledge about content creation at a certain level to create content. This fact may be accepted as an indication that supporters do not have enough knowledge and skills to create content. However, these ratios may likely change depending on usage and knowledge acquisition of supporters in time.

On the contrary, supporters who self-define themselves as "viewers" have the highest ratio (49,6%). According to Evans (2010), viewers are a large group of supporters who like to sit back and view pages, make new friends on media and follow their friends and their current news. According to this definition, it can be argued that Facebook applications provide opportunity of contribution and participation easily without having or learning different information according to the involvement pattern or the other involvement patterns of a viewer. Therefore, it can be considered that Facebook is preferred by supporters because of the reason that it is a new application area and an involvement pattern which does not require so much information and knowledge and easy to involve in. On the other hand, the ratios of involvement patterns of "commentators", "followers" and "contributors" are close to each other. "Commentators" like to evaluate products, services and opinions by taking part in social media by writing their opinions and comment about products and services and responding forums. "Followers" are people who like to find and share things on the internet. Contributive people (contributors) are usually online at places where communities or groups are created and formed and chatted and experiences are shared in certain and specific

topics. In this case, it can be said that three different roles are realized among "supporters" and "commentators" can be said to realize "follower" and "contributor" roles along with their own role at the same time.

Table 4. Analysis of Facebook Usage Purposes by age groups

Usage Purposes		Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean of Squares	F	p
Knowledge, Follow and Support	Between-groups	33,47	4,00	8,37	7,47	*0,001***
	Within-groups	710,48	634,00	1,12		
	Total	743,95	638,00			
Communication	Between-groups	1,52	4,00	0,38	1,09	*0,363*
	Within-groups	221,95	634,00	0,35		
	Total	223,47	638,00			
Sharing	Between-groups	12,33	4,00	3,08	3,50	*0,008***
	Within-groups	558,45	634,00	0,88		
	Total	570,78	638,00			
Generating Income for the Club	Between-groups	15,35	4,00	3,84	3,46	*0,008***
	Within-groups	702,98	634,00	1,11		
	Total	718,32	638,00			

*p<0,05   **p<0,01

When analysis results of the Usage Purposes of Facebook by age groups in Table 4 are examined; a significant difference with respect to the sub-dimensions of "knowledge, follow and support" $[F_{(4;634)}=7,47; p<0,01]$, "sharing" $[F_{(4;634)}=1,09; p<0,05]$ and "generating income for the club" $[F_{(4;634)}=3,46; p<0,05]$ was found but a statistically significant difference with respect to communication $[F_{(4;634)}=3,50; p>0,05]$ was not found.

Table 5. Post- Hoc Analysis of Facebook Usage Purposes by age groups

	Age	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	p
	18-24	3,57±1,02	**0,001****
	25-31	3,05±1,19	
	18-24	3,57±1,02	**0,001****
Knowledge, Follow and Support	32-38	3,12±9,99	
	18-24	3,57±1,02	**0,007****
	39-45	3,09±1,03	
Communication	18-24	3,01±1,01	**0,009****
	25-31	2,68±0,93	
	18-24	3,01±1,01	**0,0041****
Sharing	32-38	2,72±0,84	
	18-24	2,54±1,14	**0,049***
	25-31	2,25±1,05	
Generating Income for the Club	18-24	2,25±1,05	**0,048****
	32-38	2,23±1,00	
	18-24	2,23±1,00	**0,044***
	39-45	2,14±0,94	

*p<0,05   **p<0,01

As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the age group which causes the difference

by age groups according to the scores of "knowledge, follow and support"; a statistically significant difference was found between 18-24 age group ($\bar{x} = 3{,}57\pm1{,}02$), 25-31 age group ($\bar{x} = 3{,}05\pm1{,}19$) (p<0.01), 32-38 age group ($\bar{x} = 3{,}12\pm0{,}99$) (p<0.01) and 39-45 age group ($\bar{x} = 3{,}09\pm1{,}03$) (p<0.01). Considering arithmetic means in order to determine to which group this difference is in favor of; the score of usage purposes of "knowledge, follow and support" of 18-24 age group is seen higher than the scores of 32-38 and 39-45 age groups. As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the age group causing the difference by scores of "sharing" for age groups; a statistically significant difference was found between 18-24 age group ($\bar{x} = 3{,}01\pm1{,}01$) and 25-31 age group ($\bar{x} = 2{,}68\pm0{,}93$), 32-38 age group ($\bar{x} = 2{,}72\pm0{,}84$) (p<0.01). Considering arithmetic means in order to determine to which group this difference is in favor of; the score of usage purposes of "sharing" of 18-24 age group is seen higher than the scores of 25-31 and 32-38 age groups. As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the age group causing the difference by scores of "generating income for the club" for age groups; a statistically significant difference was found between 18-24 age group ($\bar{x} = 2{,}54\pm1{,}14$) (p<0,05) and 25-31 age group ($\bar{x} = 2{,}25\pm1{,}05$) (p<0.01), 32-38 age group ($\bar{x} = 2{,}23\pm1{,}00$) (p<0.01) and 39-45 age group ($\bar{x} = 2{,}14\pm0{,}94$) (p<0,05). Considering arithmetic means in order to determine to which group this difference is in favor of; the score of usage purposes of "generating income for the club" of 18-24 age group is seen higher than the scores of 25-31, 32-38 and 39-45 age groups.

As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the age group causing the difference by the sub-dimension of "knowledge, follow and support", the score of 18-24 age group was found significantly higher. According to the study conducted by Ada et. al. (2013) on university students; it was reported that university students are more willing to use social media applications by dimension of information search. Hazar (2011) has revealed that students use social media mostly to get information according to the result of his study that he conducted on students. The finding that students use internet to get more informed which is a result of another study conducted by Karaduman and Kurt (2010) shows parallelism with findings belonging to 18-24 age group of sports clubs' supporters by the sub-dimension of "knowledge, follow and support" and Facebook usage. As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the age group causing the difference by sub-dimension of "sharing", the score of 18-24 age group was found significantly higher. Hazar (2011) revealed that social media is mostly used for sharing by this age group according to the results of his study and Karaduman and Kurt (2010) reported that students are disposed to use internet in order to share things according to the results of their study. As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the age group causing the difference by sub-dimension of "generating income for the club", the score of 18-24 age group was found significantly higher. Koseoglu (2013) revealed only the variable of age as a significant difference in terms of demographic variables in his study and stated that mostly information is produced for the same age group and areas such as brands and advertisement draw attention on Facebook. It can be argued that this age group of sports clubs' supporters shows interest to sports clubs with the purpose of supporting sports clubs at the dimension of "generating income for the club". The similar results of this study may be interpreted as the way that young people have more willing to be informed and desire to learn and share all these with their friends. It can be argued according to these results that most of sports clubs' supporters'

Facebook users consist of young people and innovations are followed by these young people. Zafarmand (2010) predicts that future will bring more technology-based businesses as a result of intense interest of young people on new media. Parlak (2010) stated that young generation is dominant among people who use social media websites. Articulation of Durmus, Yurtkoru, Ulusu and Kilic (2010) which argues Facebook users are mainly composed of young people shows parallelism with the results of the research.

Table 6. Comparison of Facebook Usage Purposes by Facebook Usage Frequency

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	F	p
Knowledge, Follow and Support	Between-groups	4,26	3	1,42	1,22	*0,302*
	Within-groups	739,69	635	1,16		
	Total	743,95	638			
Communication	Between-groups	0,54	3	0,18	0,51	*0,673*
	Within-groups	222,93	635	0,35		
	Total	223,47	638			
Sharing	Between-groups	1,11	3	0,37	0,41	*0,744*
	Within-groups	569,67	635	0,90		
	Total	570,78	638			
Generating Income for the Club	Between-groups	6,58	3	2,19	1,96	*0,119*
	Within-groups	711,74	635	1,12		
	Total	718,32	638			

The scores of sports clubs' supporters in the sub-dimensions of "knowledge, follow and support" [$F_{(3;635)}=1,22$; $p>0,05$], "communication" [$F_{(3;635)}=0,51$; $p>0,05$], "sharing" [$F_{(3;635)}=0,41$; $p>0,05$] and "generating income for the club" [$F_{(3;635)}=1,96$; $p>0,05$] do not differ in a statistically significant way by weekly Facebook usage frequency. The scores of sports clubs' supporters participated in the study in the sub-dimensions of "knowledge, follow and support", "communication", "sharing" and "generating income for the club" do not differ in a statistically significant way by weekly Facebook usage frequency. Therefore, it's likely to say that there is no difference between Facebook usage frequency and Facebook usage purposes of sports clubs' supporters. As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the group causing the difference in all sub-dimensions, certain differences were determined in the group who has been following their club's page for less than a year. It can be said the reason for this group to differ is that they're new in this field and don't know several applications and Facebook usage purposes. In his research concerning Facebook usage, Koseoglu (2013) set forth that the longer the Facebook usage duration is, the more the usage differences are. He also stated that the ones who have been using Facebook for a longer time share more things and give more importance in the dimension of Facebook usage.

Table 7. Analysis of Facebook usage purposes by duration of Facebook usage

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	F	p
Knowledge, Follow and Support	Between-groups	59,40	2	29,70	27,59	**0,001****
	Within-groups	684,55	636	1,08		
	Total	743,95	638			

Communication	Between-groups	4,58	2	2,29	6,65	**0,001****
	Within-groups	218,90	636	0,34		
	Total	223,47	638			
Sharing	Between-groups	23,83	2	11,91	13,85	**0,001****
	Within-groups	546,95	636	0,86		
	Total	570,78	638			
Generating Income for the Club	Between-groups	13,46	2	6,73	6,07	**0,001****
	Within-groups	704,86	636	1,11		
	Total	718,32	638			

**p<0,01

Concerning analysis results of Facebook usage purposes by duration of Facebook usage; a statistically difference was found with respect to sub-dimensions of "knowledge, follow and support" F(2;636)=27,59; p<0,01], "communication" F(2;636)=6,65; p<0,01], "sharing" F(2;636)=13,85; p<0,01] and "generating income for the club" F(2;636)=6,07; p<0,01].

Table 8. Post-Hoc Analysis of Facebook Usage Purposes by the Duration of Facebook Usage

Usage Purposes	Usage Duration	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	P
Knowledge, Follow and Support	< 1 year	2,84±1,14	*0,001***
	1-2 years	3,42±0,95	
	< 1 year	2,84±1,14	*0,001***
	3-4 years	3,60±1,07	
Communication	< 1 year	2,66±0,53	*0,001***
	3-4 years	2,51±0,61	
Sharing	< 1 year	2,55±0,98	*0,001***
	1-2 years	2,94±0,89	
	< 1 year	2,55±0,98	*0,001***
	3-4 years	3,00±0,93	
Generating Income for the Club	< 1 year	2,12±1,07	*0,002***
	1-2 years	2,44±1,03	

**p<0,01

As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the group causing the difference in the scores of "knowledge, follow and support" by the duration of following club's Facebook page, a statistically significant difference was determined between the group who has been following their club's page for less than a year ($\bar{x}$=2,84±1,14), the ones who have been following for 1-2 years ($\bar{x}$=3,42±0,95) (p<0.01) and the ones who have been following for 3-4 years ($\bar{x}$=3,60±1,07) (p<0.01). When arithmetic means are considered, it's seen that the usage purpose of sharing is less often preferred by the ones who have been following their club's page for less than a year compared to the ones who have been following for 1-2 years and the ones who have been following for 3-4 years. As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the group causing the difference in the scores of "communication" by the duration of following club's Facebook page, a statistically significant difference was determined between the group who has been following their club's page for less than a year ($\bar{x}$=2,66±0,53) and the ones who have been following for 3-4 years ($\bar{x}$=2,51±0,61) (p<0,01). And considering arithmetic means, it's seen that the score of the ones who have been following

their club's page for less than a year is higher than the ones who have been following for 3-4 years. As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the group causing the difference in the scores of "sharing" by the duration of following club's Facebook page, a statistically significant difference was determined between the group who has been following their club's page for less than a year ($\bar{x}$=2,55±0,98), the ones who have been following for 1-2 years ($\bar{x}$=2,94±0,89) (p<0.01) and the ones who have been following for 3-4 years ($\bar{x}$=3,00±0,93) (p<0.01). When arithmetic means are considered, it's seen that the usage purpose of sharing is less often preferred by the ones who have been following their club's page for less than a year compared to the ones who have been following for 1-2 years and the ones who have been following for 3-4 years. As a result of comparisons made in order to determine the group causing the difference in the scores of "generating income for the club" by the duration of following club's Facebook page, a statistically significant difference was determined between the group who has been following their club's page for less than a year ($\bar{x}$=2,12±1,07)   and the ones who have been following for 1-2 years ($\bar{x}$=2,44±1,03) (p<0,01). And considering arithmetic means, it's seen that the score of the ones who have been following their club's page for less than a year is lower than the ones who have been following for 1-2 years. When sports clubs' supporters are evaluated according to the duration of following their clubs' pages, it's seen that the results are in favor of the ones who have been following their clubs' page for a longer time in parallel with the results in the literature.

Table 9. Analysis of Facebook usage purposes by the user variable of "content creator"

Usage Purposes	Option	N	Mean	SD	t	P
Knowledge, Follow	Yes	61	3,36	1,30	0,692	0,492
and Support	No	578	3,24	1,05		
Communication	Yes	61	2,93	0,61	0,357	0,001**
	No	578	2,65	0,58		
Sharing	Yes	61	3,06	1,14	0,180	0,072
	No	578	2,79	0,92		
Generating Income	Yes	61	2,73	1,33	2,589	0,012*
for the Club	No	578	2,28	1,02		

The score of "communication" [t(0,61)=0,357; p:0,001] of group who self-defines themselves as "content creator" and creates content on Facebook and score of "generating income for the club" [t(1,33)=2,589; p:0,012] were found significantly higher. A significant difference could not be found between the score of "knowledge, follow and support" and score of "sharing" of those who self-define themselves as "content creator" (p>0,05).

The score of "knowledge, follow and support" [t(1,07)=0,703; p:0,482], the score of "communication" [t(0,61)=0,196; p:0,844], the score of "sharing" [t(0,92)=0,059; p:0,953] and the score of "generating income for the club" [t(1,03)=0,854; p:0,394] do not show statistically significant difference for those who self-define themselves as users who comment on Facebook. ("commentators") The score of "knowledge, follow and support" [t(1,08)=0,168; p:0,867], the score of "communication" [t(0,58)=0,955;

p:0,240], the score of "sharing" [t(0,97)=0,193; p:0,850] and the score of "generating income for the club" [t(1,12)=0,827; p:0,408] do not show statistically significant difference for those who self-define themselves as users who follow themselves and the others on Facebook. ("followers") The score of "knowledge, follow and support" [t(0,95)=0,04; p:0,964], the score of "communication" [t(0,61)=1,280; p:0,201], the score of "sharing" [t(0,85)=0,073; p:0,934] and the score of "generating income for the club" [t(1,00)=0,080; p:0,936] do not show statistically significant difference for those who self-define themselves as users who contribute on Facebook ("contributors"). The score of "knowledge, follow and support" [t(1,05)=0,869; p:0,385], the score of "communication" [t(0,55)=0,110; p:0,913], the score of "sharing" [t(0,90)=0,951; p:0,342] and the score of "generating income for the club" [t(1,00)=1,035; p:0,192] do not show statistically significant difference for those who self-define themselves as viewers on Facebook ("viewers").

Table 10. Analysis of Facebook usage purposes by the user variable of "commentator"

Usage Purposes	Option	N	Mean	SD	t	P
Knowledge, Follow and Support	Yes	161	3,20	1,07	0,703	0,482
	No	478	3,27	1,08		
Communication	Yes	161	2,69	0,61	0,196	0,844
	No	478	2,68	0,59		
Sharing	Yes	161	2,81	0,92	0,059	0,953
	No	478	2,81	0,95		
Generating Income for the Club	Yes	161	2,39	1,03	0,854	0,394
	No	478	2,30	1,07		

The score of "knowledge, follow and support" [t(1,07)=0,703; p:0,482], the score of "communication" [t(0,61)=0,196; p:0,844], the score of "sharing" [t(0,92)=0,059; p:0,953] and the score of "generating income for the club" [t(1,03)=0,854; p:0,394] do not show statistically significant difference for those who self-define themselves as commentators on Facebook ("commentators").

Table 11. Analysis of Facebook usage purposes by the user variable of "follower"

Usage Purposes	Option	N	Mean	SD	t	P
Knowledge, Follow and Support	Yes	148	3,26	1,08	0,168	0,867
	No	491	3,25	1,08		
Communication	Yes	148	2,64	0,58	0,955	0,340
	No	491	2,69	0,60		
Sharing	Yes	148	2,83	0,97	0,193	0,850
	No	491	2,81	0,94		
Generating Income for the Club	Yes	148	2,39	1,12	0,827	0,408
	No	491	2,31	1,04		

The score of "knowledge, follow and support" [t(1,08)=0,168; p:0,867], the score of "communication" [t(0,58)=0,955; p:0,240], the score of "sharing" [t(0,97)=0,193; p:0,850] and the score of "generating income for the club" [t(1,12)=0,827; p:0,408] do not show statistically significant difference for those who self-define themselves as followers on Facebook ("followers").

Table 12. Analysis of Facebook usage purposes by the user variable of "contributor"

Usage Purposes	Option	N	Mean	SD	t	P
Knowledge, Follow and Support	Yes	160	3,25	0,95	0,04	0,964
	No	479	3,25	1,12		
Communication	Yes	160	2,63	0,61	1,280	0,201
	No	479	2,70	0,58		
Sharing	Yes	160	2,81	0,85	0,073	0,934
	No	479	2,81	0,98		
Generating Income for the Club	Yes	160	2,32	1,00	0,080	0,936
	No	479	2,33	1,08		

The score of "knowledge, follow and support" [t(0,95)=0,04; p:0,964], the score of "communication" [t(0,61)=1,280; p:0,201], the score of "sharing" [t(0,85)=0,073; p:0,934] and the score of "generating income for the club" [t(1,00)=0,080; p:0,936] do not show statistically significant difference for those who self-define themselves as contributors on Facebook ("contributors").

Table 13. Analysis of Facebook usage purposes by the user variable of "viewer"

Usage Purposes	Option	N	Mean	SD	t	P
Knowledge, Follow and Support	Yes	317	3,29	1,05	0,869	0,385
	No	322	3,21	1,11		
Communication	Yes	317	2,68	0,55	0,110	0,913
	No	322	2,68	0,63		
Sharing	Yes	317	2,78	0,90	0,951	0,342
	No	322	2,85	0,99		
Generating Income for the Club	Yes	317	2,27	1,00	1,035	0,192
	No	322	2,38	1,11		

The score of "knowledge, follow and support" [t(1,05)=0,869; p:0,385], the score of "communication" [t(0,55)=0,110; p:0,913], the score of "sharing" [t(0,90)=0,951; p:0,342] and the score of "generating income for the club" [t(1,00)=1,035; p:0,192] do not show statistically significant difference for those who self-define themselves as viewers on Facebook ("viewers").

Content creators consist of people who are at the top of Forrester's Technographics Ladder and create a special and private page and share what they created and formed. In this sense, content creators seem to have the highest level of knowledge and information about social media applications. In this regard, it can be argued that this group which self-define themselves as content creators may show differences when compared to other groups because of the fact that they have knowledge about advanced level of usage and the other usage dimensions. The sports clubs' supporters who self-define themselves as content creator on Facebook may be argued to use Facebook to communicate and generate income for the club when compared to the other user groups.

4. Conclusion

In general terms, Facebook usage purposes revealed in all studies are similar to the purposes of sports clubs' supporters; only the sub-dimension of "generating income for the club" pertains to the sports clubs.

Considering the sports clubs' supporters use of their clubs' Facebook applications, there are certain variables affecting their usage in the sub-dimensions of "knowledge, follow and support", "communication", "sharing" and "generating income for the club" that are considered as the Facebook usage purposes. It was determined that sports clubs' supporters were using Facebook applications of their club primarily for "knowledge, follow and support." Besides, the supporters self-defined themselves mostly as viewer on Facebook. These results show that there are special Facebook usages for supporters in consideration of the supporter-sports club relationship.

The role of content creation considered as one of the ways of appearing in Facebook in this study is the less often preferred role by the supporters. One of the underlying reasons for supporters not to engage in so many activities concerning content creation can be regarded as one must have a certain level of knowledge to create content in Facebook. On the other hand, this condition is likely to change in time depending on the usage and knowledge acquisition. Moreover, there have been certain supporters who play these three different roles at the same time. In other words, there are supporters who are commentator, follower and contributor at the same time.

When sports clubs' supporters are evaluated according to the duration of following their clubs' pages, it's seen that the results are in favor of the ones who have been following their clubs' page for a longer time in parallel with the results in the literature.

In conclusion, this study is limited with the sports clubs' supporters who use Facebook that is a social media application and the sports clubs that are mostly involved in football. It can be suggested that similar studies to be conducted for different sectors of sports industry to determine how social media is regarded in the industry based on Facebook.

4. Reference

Ada, S., Çiçek, B. ve Kaynakyeşil, G. (2013). *Çevrimiçi sosyal ağ sitesi kullanımını etkileyen motive edici faktörler üzerine bir araştırma.* XIV. Akademik Bilişim Konferansında sunulan bildiri (23-25 Ocak, Antalya), Antalya: www. ab.org.tr/ab13/206.html.

Akar, E. (2011). *Sosyal medya pazarlaması, sosyal web'de pazarlama stratejisi.* Ankara: Efil Yayınları.

Blossom, J. Content Nation. Surviving And Thriving As Social Media Changes Our Work, Our Lives, and Our Future, http://www.contentnation.com. Erişim Tarihi: 20.05 2010.

Çetin, E. (2009) *Sosyal iletişim ağları ve gençlik: Facebook örneği.* Uluslararası Davroz Kongresi'nde

sunulan bildiri (24-27 Eylül, Isparta, 1094-1105), Isparta

Dikici, S. (2009). *Bir başka taraftarlık.* Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Durmuş, B., Yurtkoru, S. ve Ulusu, Y., Kılıç, B. (2010). *Sosyal paylaşım ağlarının bireylere ve işletmelere yönelik incelenmesi: Facebook üzerine bir araştırma.* İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık.

Evans, L. (2010). *Social media marketing*. USA: Pearson Tech Group.

Forrester Research (2008) The social technographics ladder. http://forrester.typepad.com/.a/6a00d8341c50bf53ef0120a932b364970b-500wi. 02 Mayıs 2013'te erişildi.

Gedizlioğlu, D. (2011). Sosyal medyanın en samimi markaları. *MediaCat Pazarlama İletişimi Dergisi,* 197, 90-94.

Hacıefendioğlu, Ş. (2010). Sosyal paylaşım sitelerinde üye bağlılığı üzerine. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 2(10), 56-71.

Hazar, M. (2011). Sosyal medya bağımlılığı. *Gazi Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi,* 32, 151-175

Horzum, B. (2010). Öğretmenlerin web 2.0 araçlarından haberdarlığı, kullanım sıklıkları ve amaçlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi,* 7(1), 603-634.

İşlek, S. (2012). Sosyal medyanın tüketici davranışlarına etkileri: Türkiye'deki sosyal medya kullanıcıları üzerine bir araştırma. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karaman: Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Kahraman, M. (2010). *Sosyal medya, pazarlamacılar için sosyal medyaya giriş.* İstanbul: Mediacat Yayınları.

Karaduman, M. ve Kurt, H. (2010) *İletişim fakültesi öğrencilerinin sosyal medya kullanım düzeyleri*, XV. Türkiye'de internet Konferansında sunulan bildiri (02-04 Aralık, İstanbul), İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi.

Köksal, Y. (2012). Sosyal medya uygulamalarının pazarlama faaliyet alanı içerisinde kullanım şekilleri üzerine bir inceleme. *KSÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9 (1), 75-85.

Köseoğlu, Ö. (2013). Bir pazarlama iletişimi ortamı olarak Facebook: reklam ve elektronik ağızdan ağıza mesajların karşılaştırılmasına yönelik bir analiz. *Yeditepe Üniversitesi Global Media Journal,* 3(6), 74-101.

Kurtuluş, K. (2006). *Pazarlama araştırmaları.* İstanbul: Literatür Yayınları.

Leo, M. (2012). Der club der millionare, *Social Media & Sport Magazin,* 17 Ausgabe 2012, 32-33.

Liaguno, E., Cuscó, R. ve Ciurans, A. (2010). Futbol club Barcelona business economics II Professor: David Rodríguez. www.iese.edu/research/pdfs/OP-06-12.pdf 02 Mayıs 2013'te erişildi.

Marketing Leadership Council, 2008, www.mlc.executiveboard.com. Erişim Tarihi: 17.05.2010

Parlak, F. (2010). Sosyal medya ve tüketici satın alma karar sürecine etkileri: nitel bir uygulama, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kütahya: Dumlupınar Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Sağır, A. (2012). *Facebook gruplarında şampiyonluk algısı üzerinden bir taraftarlık kimliği çözümlemesi.*

12. Spor Bilimleri Kongresinde sunulan bildiri (12-14 Kasım, Denizli, ss. 375-376), Denizli.

Şener, G. (2009). *Türkiye'de Facebook kullanımı araştırması,* XIV. Türkiye'de internet Konferansında sunulan bildiri (12-13 Aralık, İstanbul), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Tosun, B N. (2010). *İletişim temelli marka yönetimi.* İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

Tutkun, E., Taşmektepligil, Y. ve Canbaz, S., Acar, H., Can, M. (2012). Samsunspor taraftarlarının sosyo-ekonomik özellikleri ve şiddete eğilimleri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi,* 14(1), 56-63.

Yazıcıoğlu, Y. ve Erdoğan, S. (2004). *SPSS uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Zafarmand, N. (2010). Halkla ilişkiler alanında yeni mecra ve uygulamaların yeri ve önemi: sosyal medya ve PR2.0. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara