ED-MEDIA 2010

World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia & Telecommunications

June 29 - July 2, 2010
Toronto, Canada

AACE
Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education

A CONFERENCE OF AACE
www.aace.org

Edited by
Jan Herrington
Bill Hunter

ED-MEDIA COMMITTEES

CHAIRS & CO-CHAIRS

Chair: Craig Montgomerie, Univ. of Alberta, Canada; Chair (2008-2011)
Program Co-Chair: Jan Herrington, Murdoch Univ., Australia
Program Co-Chair: Bill Hunter, Univ. of Ontario Institute of Technology, Canada
Tutorial/Workshop Chair: Martin Ebner, Graz Univ. of Technology, Austria
Tutorial/Workshop Chair: Edgar R. Weippl, Vienna Univ. of Technology, Austria
Poster/Pecha Kucha Chair: Theo Bastiaens, The Open University, The Netherlands & Fernuniversität Hagen, Germany

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Christopher Brook, Curtin Univ. of Technology, Australia (2008-2011)
Martin Ebner, Graz Univ. of Technology, Austria (2008-2011)
Catherine Fulford, Univ. of Hawaii, USA (2009-2012)
Denis Gillet, Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne, Switzerland (2007-2010)
Jan Herrington, Univ. of Wollongong, Australia (2007-2010)
Janette Hill, Univ. of Georgia, USA (2007-2010)
Valerie Irvine, Univ. of Victoria, Canada (2009-2012)
Joseph Luca, Edith Cowan Univ., Australia (2006-2011)
Gary Marks, AACE, USA
Jane Seale, Univ. of Southampton, UK (2007-2010)
George Siemens, Athabasca University, Canada (2007-2010)
Karen Swan, Kent State Univ., USA (2007-2010)
Edgar R. Weippl, Vienna Univ. of Technology, Austria (2008-2011)
Duan van der Westerhuizen, Univ. of Johannesburg, South Africa (2007-2010)

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Tel Amiel, UNICAMP, Brazil
Alan Amory, Univ. of Johannesburg, South Africa
Trish Andrews, Univ. of New England, Australia
Eun-Ok Baek, California State Univ. San Bernardino, USA
Michael Barbour, Wayne State Univ., USA
Philip Barker, Univ. of Teesside, UK
Debra Bauder, USA
Christine Bauer, Vienna Univ. of Economics and Business, Austria
Sue Bennett, Univ. of Wollongong, Australia
Madhumita Bhattacharya, Athabasca Univ., Canada
Laura Blumes, 1-800-GOT-JUNK?, Canada
Paul Bohman, George Mason Univ., USA
Raj Boora, Univ. of Alberta, USA
Johanna Bromberg Craig, Univ. of Virginia, USA
Christopher Brook, Curtin Univ. of Technology, Australia
Mark Brown, Massey Univ., New Zealand
Renee Cambiano, Northeastern State Univ., USA
Leanne Cameron, Macquarie Univ., Australia
Chris Campbell, The Univ. of Notre Dame Australia, Australia
Lorenzo Cantoni, NewMinE Lab - Univ. of Lugano, Switzerland
Patricia Carlson, Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, USA
Maiga Chang, Athabasca Univ., Canada
Yaowen Chang, Teacher College, Columbia Univ., USA
Irene L. Chen, Univ. of Houston Downtown, USA
Musabbir Chowdhury, Assinioboine College, Canada
Elizabeth Anne Christo-Baker, Purdue Univ., USA
Murat Cinar, Norfolk State Univ., USA
Gráinne Conole, The Open Univ., UK
Sarah Cornelius, Univ. of Aberdeen, UK
Ben Daniel, Health Research and Innovation, Canada
Gayle Davidson-Shivers, Univ. of South Alabama, USA
Marc Debiase, West Virginia Univ., USA
Yasemin Demiraslan, Iowa State Univ., USA
Christian Depover, Univ. de Mons-Hainaut, Belgium
Michael Derntl, Univ. of Vienna, Austria
Gail Derrick, Regent Univ., USA
Iain Doherty, The Univ. of Auckland, New Zealand
Erik Duval, Belgium
Martin Ebner, Graz Univ. of Technology, Austria
Jorma Enkenberg, Univ. of Joensuu, Savonlinna, Finland
Yoram Eshet, The Open Univ. of Israel, USA
Margaret Farren, Dublin City Univ., Ireland
Alejandro Fernandez, LIFIA - Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina
Malcolm Field, Future Univ. - Hakodate, Japan
Kathrin Figl, WirtschaftsUniv. Wien, Austria
Ryan Flynn, Univ. of Greenwich, UK
Philippe Fournier-Viger, Univ. of Quebec in Montreal, Canada
Monique Fuchs, Wentworth Institute of Technology, USA
Norman Garrett, Eastern Illinois Univ., USA
Mark Geary, Dakota State Univ., USA
Denis Gillet, Switzerland
Tim Green, California State Univ. Fullerton, USA
Nuno Guimaraes, Univ. of Lisbon, Portugal

Barry Harper, Univ. of Wollongong, Australia
Wu He, Old Dominion Univ., USA
John Hedberg, Macquarie Univ., Australia
Eva Heinrich, Massey Univ., New Zealand
Denis Helic, IICM, TU Graz, Austria
Rachelle Heller, George Washington Univ., USA
Michael Herczeg, Univ. of Luebeck, Germany
Janette R. Hill, Univ. of Georgia, USA
Paula Hodgson, Univ. of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Phil Holifield, Univ. of Central Lancashire, UK
Andri Ioannou, Univ. of Connecticut, USA
Tricia Jones, Univ. of Michigan, USA
Nitya L. Karmakar, Univ. of Western Sydney, Australia
Toshinobu Kasai, Okayama Univ., Japan
Akihiro Kashihara, The Univ. of Electro-Communications, Japan
Sagini Keengwe, Univ. of North Dakota, USA
Robert Kemm, The Univ. of Melbourne, Australia
Mike Keppell, Charles Sturt Univ., Australia
Linda Kieffer, Eastern Washington Univ., USA
Georgios Kouroupetroglou, Univ. of Athens, Greece
Daryl Ku, Univ. of Melbourne, Australia
Poonam Kumar, Saginaw Valley State Univ., USA
Swapna Kumar, Univ. of Florida, Gainesville, USA
Rita Kuo, Mingdao Univ., Taiwan
Luisito Lacatan, Adamson Univ., Philippines
Paul Lam, The Chinese Univ. of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Reneta Lansiquot, New York City College of Technology, USA
Geoffrey Lautenbach, Univ. of Johannesburg, South Africa
Chul-Hwan Lee, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, USA
Insook Lee, Sejong Univ., Korea (South)
Seung-hee Lee, Dong-Ah Institute of Media and Arts, Korea (South)
Geraldine Lefoe, Univ. of Wollongong, Australia
Min Liu, The Univ. of Texas at Austin, USA
Lori Lockyer, Univ. of Wollongong, Australia
Joseph Luca, Edith Cowan Univ., Australia
Brian Mackie, Northern Illinois Univ., USA
Gary Marks, AACE, USA
Florence Martin, Univ. of North Carolina - Wilmington, USA
Constantino Martins, Institute of Engineering of Porto Dept. of Computer Science, USA
Hermann Maurer, Graz Univ. of Technology, Austria
Jeton McClinton, Jackson State Univ., USA
Catherine McLoughlin, Australian Catholic Univ., Australia
Mark McMahon, Edith Cowan Univ., Australia
Carmel McNaught, The Chinese Univ. of Hong Kong, USA
Christina Metaxaki-Kossionides, Univ. of Thrace, Greece
Felix Mödritscher, Vienna Univ. of Economics and Business, Austria
Craig Montgomerie, Univ. of Alberta, Canada
Michael Morgan, Monash Univ., Australia
Nona Muldoon, Central Queensland Univ., Australia
Mai Neo, Multimedia Univ. Malaysia, Malaysia
John O'Donoghue, Univ. of Central Lancashire, UK
Ron Oliver, Australia

Ian Olney, Univ. Of Western Sydney, Australia
Pil-Won On, Purdue Univ., USA
Meg O'Reilly, Teaching and Learning Centre, Australia
Betul Ozkan, The Univ. of Arizona South, USA
Stefanie Panke, Univ. of Bielefeld, Germany
Elaine Pearson, Univ. of Teesside, UK
Jon Preston, Southern Polytechnic State Univ., USA
Celine Quenu-Joiron, Laboratoire de Recherche en Informatique d'Amiens, France
Thomas Reeves, The Univ. of Georgia, USA
Torsten Reiners, Univ. of Hamburg, Germany
Griff Richards, Athabasca Univ., Canada
Ann Riedling, Univ. of South Florida, USA
Malcolm Ryan, Univ. of Greenwich, UK
Steve Ryan, UK
Diane Salter, Univ. of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Demetrios Sampson, Univ. of Piraeus & CERTH, Greece
Jaime Sanchez, Univ. of Chile, Chile
Ieda Santos, Emirates College for Advanced Education, USA
Nick Scherbakov, IICM, TU Graz, Austria
Jane Seale, Univ. of Southampton, UK
George Siemens, Univ. of Manitoba, Canada
Gavin Sim, Univ. of Central Lancashire, UK
Benson Soong, Univ. of Cambridge, UK
Elsebeth Korsgaard Sorensen, Aarhus Univ., Denmark
J. Michael Spector, Univ. of Georgia, USA
Sribhagyam Srinivasan, Lamar State College-Orange, USA
Chih-Yuan Sun, Univ. of Southern California, USA
Daniel Surry, Univ. of South Alabama, USA
Lars Svensson, Univ. West, Sweden
Karen Swan, Univ. of Illinois Springfield, USA
Akira Takeuchi, Kyushu Institute of Technology, Japan
Bonnie Thurber, Northwestern Univ., USA
Leo Valdes, Vision Office, Canada
Mark van 't Hooft, Research Center for Educational Technology, USA
Duan vanderWesthuizen, Univ. of Johannesburg, South Africa
Thanos Vasilakos, Univ. of Western Macedonia, Greece
Katrien Verbert, Katholieke Univ. Leuven, Belgium
Dina Vyortkina, Florida State Univ., USA
Ellen Walker, Hiram College, USA
Greg Walker, Univ. of Hawaii- Leeward Community College, USA
Simon Walker, The Univ. of Greenwich, UK
Hong Wang, Fort Hays State Univ., USA
Edgar R. Weippl, Secure Business Austria, Austria
Dunwei Wen, Athabasca Univ., Canada
Fridolin Wild, The Open Univ., USA
Shahron Williams van Rooij, George Mason Univ., USA
Ruth Wood, Kingston Univ., UK
Junko Yamamoto, Slippery Rock Univ., USA
Fei Jack Yang, St.John's Univ., Taiwan
Melda N. Yildiz, Fulbright Scholar Turkmenistan, USA
Ke Zhang, Wayne State Univ., USA

AACE is not responsible for papers accidentally omitted from the conference proceedings due to late or errant submission by the author or proxy, or technical electronic anomalies during the time of submission.

The publisher is not responsible for the use which might be made of the information contained in this book.

From AACE, the Conference organizer: This is to confirm that all Conference paper submissions are peer-reviewed by at least 2 referees prior to acceptance in the Final Program and prior to publication in the Proceedings book and CD.

Also published in and distributed by EdITLib: Education and Information Technology Digital Library; http://www.EdITLib.org

See AACE Review Policy: http://www.aace.org/reviewpolicy.htm

Preface

Hello and/et Bonjour

On behalf of AACE and the Executive Eommittee for ED-MEDIA 2010, we welcome you to Toronto, Canada, which took the unprecedented step of scheduling the G20 summit as preparation for the ED-MEDIA conference.

Situated on the north shore of Lake Ontario, Toronto is Canada's largest city and an important centre for industry, trade and commerce. It has welcomed immigration for generations and is noted for its rich ethnic and cultural diversity, Toronto's architecture, museums and universities have also made it a centre for learning, especially in communications and culture, a legacy of the work of Marshall McLuhan.

The twenty-second meeting of ED-MEDIA was filled with energy, optimism, and insight. From the opening keynote to the final sessions, we received enthusiastic responses from attendees and we had the distinct impression that, in most sessions, there were informative and rewarding discussions following the stimulus of evocative presentations.

ED-MEDIA 2010 drew 828 attendees from 58 countries representing over 611 institutions. The tradition of bringing together educational media thinkers, scholars, developers, and users from all over the world continued and is clearly reflected in the papers in these proceedings.

Keynotes and invited presentations

The conference was opened each day with a keynote address or debate. The opening keynote was delivered by Carmel McNaught of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, entitled *Enduring Themes and New Horizons for Educational Technology* (see http://www.editlib.org/view/35258). Following her presentation, Carmel was presented with an AACE Fellowship Award by Dr. Gary Marks, only the fifth time this highly prestigious award has been presented.

The second keynote was delivered by Hermann Maurer of Graz University of Technology in Austria – himself a previous recipient of the AACE Fellowship and a founding member of the ED-MEDIA conference. He spoke on *Long Range Forecasting is Necessary but Impossible – Also in Education*.

On the third day, Gráinne Conole of The Open University in UK in her keynote address asked What Would Learning in an Open World Look Like? A Vision for the Future (http://www.editlib.org/view/35260).

Lastly, the conference began the fourth day with a stimulating keynote panel debate featuring Jon Dron (Athabasca University, Canada), and Neil Selwyn (London Knowledge Lab, UK, paper at http://www.scribd.com/doc/33693537/The-educational-significance-of-social-media-a-critical-perspective). At the conclusion of the debate, the moderator, George Siemens, was presented with an AACE Award for Excellence. A further seven specially selected invited presentations were given over the four days of the conference.

Innovations at ED-MEDIA 2010

It is fitting that a conference dedicated to the use of educational media should be constantly engaged in efforts to insure that it is open to change and innovation.

In 2010, ED-MEDIA offered for the first time a dedicated strand for graduate students, supervisors, advisors and others interested in research training. This was a 'conference within a conference' with its own keynote, program and evening reception. No special registration was required – any ED-MEDIA delegate interested in any session could attend. A special launch keynote was delivered by Emeritus Professor Thomas C Reeves, who spoke on the topic of *Socially responsible educational technology research*. This was followed by sessions across six themes that covered a range of phases typically associated with PhD and Masters research (and educational technology research generally), including planning and preparation, theory, research methodologies, analysis, technologies, writing and publication, through to preparing CVs and gaining the most from conferences. These sessions were largely at an introductory level, and were presented by members of the ED-MEDIA executive committee (past and present). Of note was a presentation on *Connectivism* by George Siemens, one of the key proponents and creators of this theory. At a special reception for graduate students, attendees of this strand were asked to provide feedback on how we might strengthen this strand in future years to more fully meet the needs of researchers in educational technology and ICT.

The *pecha kucha* presentations, organized by Theo Bastiaens, were also new this year. In pecha kucha (Japanese for "chit-chat") presenters show 20 slides for 20 seconds each – only 6 minutes 40 seconds to present their work. This was an entertaining event which added another opportunity to share in the exchange of ideas among conference participants. As in previous years, Twitter featured in the conference, with a special monitor in the reception area allowing participants to post and follow tweets about the conference experience.

Review process

There were 381 full papers submitted for review and 247 were accepted for presentation. A further 168 brief papers were submitted and 131 were accepted. This represents an acceptance rate of approximately 69 % of papers submitted to the conference. Each paper was peer-reviewed by at least two members of the Program Committee (over 150 people throughout the world, listed at http://www.aace.org/conf/edmedia/committeepc/). A total of 42 submissions were nominated as outstanding papers to be considered for awards by a subcommittee of the executive. Eight papers were selected as award winning papers.

There were 68 poster sessions, many of which included oral presentations in the *pecha kucha* style. Three posters and one pecha kucha presentation were also award recipients as a result of judging done at the conference poster session.

Appreciation and gratitude

Any successful conference is the work of many hands and many minds, but every conference depends for its success on the quality of the presentations given. For that, we extend our thanks to the presenters and also to the international reviewers who helped to choose papers for presentation. We are also grateful to the many people who submitted papers that were not selected and we hope that we will be able to help them with their aspirations to share their work at future conferences.

The professional and technical staff of AACE led by Dr Gary Marks do all the organizational work around site arrangements, program schedule, registration, social events, and so on, so that the Executive Committee, reviewers and presenters can all concentrate on what they do well. We are all indebted to AACE for their many services to our community.

We also wish to thank the ED-MEDIA Executive Chair, Tutorial and Poster Chairs and the Executive Committee who work hard throughout the year to plan and organize the conference:

Executive Chair: Craig Montgomerie, Univ. of Alberta, Canada; Chair (2008-2011)
Tutorial/Workshop Chair: Martin Ebner, Graz Univ. of Technology, Austria
Tutorial/Workshop Chair: Edgar R. Weippl, Vienna Univ. of Technology, Austria
Poster/Pecha Kucha Chair: Theo Bastiaens, The Open University, The Netherlands & Fernuniversität Hagen, Germany

Conference Executive Committee
Christopher Brook, Curtin Univ. of Technology, Australia (2008-2011)
Martin Ebner, Graz Univ. of Technology, Austria (2008-2011)
Catherine Fulford, Univ. of Hawaii, USA (2009-2012)
Denis Gillet, Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne, Switzerland (2007-2010)
Janette Hill, Univ. of Georgia, USA (2007-2010)
Valerie Irvine, Univ. of Victoria, Canada (2009-2012)
Joseph Luca, Edith Cowan Univ., Australia (2006-2011)
Gary Marks, AACE, USA
Jane Seale, Univ. of Southampton, UK (2007-2010)
George Siemens, Athabasca University, Canada (2007-2010)
Karen Swan, Kent State Univ., USA (2007-2010)
Edgar R. Weippl, Vienna Univ. of Technology, Austria (2008-2011)
Duan van der Westerhuizen, Univ. of Johannesburg, South Africa (2007-2010)

We look forward to another excellent ED-MEDIA conference in Lisbon in 2011.

Program Co-Chairs: *Jan Herrington, Murdoch University, Australia*
Bill Hunter, The University of Ontario Institute of Technology, Canada

Web 2.0 or Identity 2.0: The Roles of Web 2.0 Tools on the Identity Construction of Turkish Youth

Dr. Uğur BATI
Yeditepe University Faculty of Communication, Istanbul, Turkey
batiugur@gmail.com

Dr. Bünyamin ATICI
Firat University Faculty of Education, Elazig, Turkey
batici@gmail.com

Abstract: The subject area of youth and Web 2.0 tools deal with all research that concerns youth and their use of these media. This research is a special category in the area and examines how are identities constructed and re-constructed in everyday social interactions of Web 2.0 environments. The research consists of a broad range of different perspectives such as qualitative and descriptive studies of what goes on in the Web 2.0 environments. This research employed a survey design and executed among 433 detected participants from random research horizon. The study shows that Web 2.0 tools facilitate interaction, information-sharing and collaboration made possible on young people by the rising of weblogs, social networking sites and wiki's. This also affects the exchange of social interactions among actors and identity construction for these actors becomes possibile. Paticipants in the research think that considering being in the Web 2.0 environments as a lifestyle (84.8%), using a Web 2.0 tools is a tool for identifying themelves (74.2%). Moreover, they do not distinguish between online and offline and do not have another personality online (67.1%). The field is growing in size, shape and complexity and the need for study is urgent. The paper will be a valuable contribution by providing a perspective with Turkey sample and a broad overview.

Introduction

One case is argued widely all around the world: The electronic representation of a real-world entity. The term is usually used to express the online shape of a person that participates in digital interactions on behalf of the person in question. In relation to this, the phenomenon of identity in digital environments is discussed which refers to the specialties of digital technology that is interested in the mediation of people's experience of their own identity and the identity of other people and things. We can imagine that the digital elements would be useful for the process of identity creation especially for the young. As we know that digital environments open the door to new identity experiences.

Identity issue is prominent and it begins with the one crucial question: 'Who am I?' A huge part of being a human being is in fact the ability to ask one's self 'Who am I?' We can answer to this 'basic' question with a name, a profession, a nationality and so on. We can also say that one's identity stems from whom one knows one's associations and connections (Turkle, 1997: 258). It shows the link between the personal and the social. Primarily, it is difficult to forge a formal definition of identity. The initial and unique characteristics of an entity are what identify it. These characteristics might contain the consistent physical attributes of the person, his preferences, or other people's perceptions of the individual's personality. The talents that a person possesses can also become part of one's identity as mentioned. Here perception is important. This means that in practice the definition of one's identity is determined by how it is perceived by others most certainly. Identity is already regarded as individuals' interpersonal qualities, personality traits, self-definition, personal and moral beliefs and the roles and relationships they take on in various interactions (Calvert, 2002). Self-concerns are contingently at the center of individuals' efforts for well-being and for making sense of one's life (Castells, 1999: 37-64). Study on self and identity has a primary importance in the study of human nature. On the other hand, perhaps the most crucial contributions to the study of identity was pioneered by Tajfel and Turner and they delineate identity as 'the individual's knowledge that he/she belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value importance to him/her of the group membership (Abrams and Hogg, 1990: 2). We consider many things at length, but this is a type of process in our minds generally. Identification process is a complex structure which effects at all sometimes. On the other hand, identity represents an enduring philosophical and everyday concern.

As we said that the question 'Who am I?' is crucial content and often express the idea of identity. But we'll also ask one more question about that instead of answering question: How much of the reply comes from within me

and more importantly how much has come from sources outside of me? We can say that so much come from sources outside of me, especially from mass media. Mass media carries weight a grand role in the development of the self in the world of today. We are subject to opinions, people, places, and communities that can induce us to conceal who we really are. Mass media is ok. What about digital media? What about digital or online identity especially by means of Web 2.0 technologies in that case? Here is the key question about our research: What role does a digital medium use in constructing and conversion of this identity, in answering the 'who am I' question? In most sociological literature digital media in general is already analyzed as tools aimed at interaction of social spaces about building digital identity which is a socio-technical construct. When we think of contemporary situation interaction can takes place through digital media, we can assert that what one can be and what can be one is determined in interaction.

The main purpose of this paper is to outline an emerging research area, evolving around young people and contemporary digital arenas like Web 2.0 technologies. The field is growing in sort, title and sophistication. In this manner we primarily try to questionize the matter of identity construction; then we'll examine the relationships between the identity and youth. Hence we'll deal with what factors affect young people's identity development and how do we interpret identity in a Web 2.0 environments like blogs, social networks, wikis and so on. In concern with these explanations, study is to develop a framework for understanding and analyzing the Web 2.0 technologies as an autonomous social space or structure to construct identity digitally for the young within Turkish society.

Web 2.0 Technologies and its Impact on Socialization of Young People

Web 2.0 technologies may be stated by some unique creative principle, make easy contributing, but they take a wide array of modes. Well-known Web 2.0 tools are counted as platforms of Web logs, or blogs, which are websites that are like user based diary or e-journals. Wikis, websites or special platforms are special Web 2.0 tools which are authored by a community of people. They are used for effective information getting. Podcasting is a form of audio blog allowed for the uploading and syndication of audio files. Online social networks are also hearth of Web 2.0. Virtual worlds, including online games, are counted as other forms of online social networks. Web 2.0 means a proper of technologies that have crucially lowered the interaction costs of two-way communication over the World Wide Web, which has socialized the production of information and applications across the internet. With these Web 2.0 tools people did not just communicate more, they began communicating in qualitatively different ways than before. Very huge numbers of new media instruments give an serious opportunity to express themselves, collaborate with others for people and especially for the young people who using these effectively and predominantly. Web 2.0 is really transforming our society in terms of firms' business, politicians' relationships with their voters, teachers' education styles on students, friends' relationships with each other. There are plenty of studies that rely on the impact of Web 2.0 technologies on the socialization effect of them and we have to give some important researches about this subject. Li and Bernoff, 2008; Morato, et. al., 2008: 406-415; Kenderdine and Shaw, 2009: 258-276 can be noticed as studied about this subject. Our research subject which is how individuals and especially youth shape their own identity is another factor influenced by Web 2.0 instruments.

The relationship among the young people, Web 2.0 technologies and identity are crucial to express a new type of socialization process. Here important question comes to mind: How does the proliferation of Web 2.0 features and social networking platforms have affected young people's sense of self and others? As young people define and redefine their identities through addiction with technology, what are the implications for their experiences as citizens, consumers, family members or special community members? Before the emergence of identity studies on the relationships between the youth and Web 2.0, issues about identity have examined within academic disciplines (Mandelbaum, 1996; Weiser, 2001: 723-742; Stutzman, 2006: 10-13; Mokros, 1996, 2003; Shotter & Gergen, 1989; Markus ve Kitayama, 1991; Singelis, 1994). Moreover, some academic studies address the consequences of digital media use for young people's individual and social identities. Buckingham, 2000, 2008; Abbott, 1998: 84–105; Livingstone, 2002; Maczewski, 2002: 111–29; Osgerby, 2004; Boyd, 2007: 119–42; Ito, et al. 2001: 15–21; Watts, Dodds and Newman, 2002: 1302–1305 are few from these subjects. The contributors explore how young people use digital media to share ideas and creativity and to participate in networks that are small and large, local and global, intimate and anonymous. It can be said that this research subject is also somewhat elusive and its content is changing very rapidly as time goes on. In former studies the researchers have focused on various parts of this area, and some following researches bring ideas together to form a joint research base. DiMiccoand Millen, 2007: 383-386; Bennett, W.L. ed., 2007; Lenhart, et.al., 2007; are mentioned as crucial works.

Research Method

It's clear that participating in a Web 2.0 environments, where any personal information is directly shown to others, is a possibility to experiencing different self and thus to show and build new identities. Therefore, there are more possibilities for a greater variety of identities to emerge in cyberspace. There has not been a survey research executed with a relatively large sample of Turkish young people about their identity representations on Web 2.0

environments. Such a survey could supply prominent data in order to understand that Web 2.0's social impact on young's identity constructions. The paper extends debate on the impact of the developing 'digital culture' focusing on young people which is technology-based generation. The aim of the paper is to interrogate the effect of the Web 2.0 technologies on young people and their identity constructions through questionnaire conducted on different young groups. How are identities constructed and re-constructed in everyday social interactions and ritual gatherings? In this frame our research questions are as follows:

Q 1: Which means do the users utilize to portray themselves and each other on Web 2.0 environments?

Q 2: What kinds of relationships are sought after on the Web 2.0 environments?

Q 3: What role do interactions play in the young people's construction of identity?

Q 4: What does the site mean to them and how can it be seen as a continuation of their

offline lives

At first glance it would appear that digital environment has brought about greater opportunities to communicate, to share views and represent their identity for the young people which previously could not be widely realize with traditional communication environments. When we look at the procedure and sample in the research, we have focused on the university students between the ages of 18-24 educated in different cities of Turkey. This research employed a survey design. Some survey items were measured using a 5- point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). The others are yes and no items were measured by frequency. The study was conducted in Istanbul, Izmir and Elazığ which are located in the three different-regions in Turkey. Questionnaires were distributed among 433 detected participants from random research horizon. Random selections of young people were asked to complete a survey about their use of Web 2.0 environments, and their feelings about disclosure of identity information. The first part of the survey was completely quantitative; students indicated which, if any, Web 2.0 tools they participated in. In the second part of the survey, young people were asked to respond to a number of statements about identity information statement, stating their level of agreement with the disclosure. The explanations handle how young people feel about their Web 2.0 tools profiles being accessed in general. A total of 414 usable questionnaires were returned, indicating a response rate of 97 percent.

Results

Table 1 show that a large majority of the participants (72.3%) stated that they have been using internet for more than 6 years. The data concerning from where the participants have access to internet are also indicated in the study. According to this, 68.7 percent of the participants have access to internet from home, 11,9 percent from school, 9.4 percent from internet cafes.

Table 1. Usage Time of Internet

	f	%
1-6 Months	0	0.0
7-11 Months	0	0.0
1-2 Years	51	12.3
3-5 Years	64	15.4
More than 6 Years	299	72.3
Total	414	100.0

The information concerning the gender of the participants is provided in the study. 37.6 percent of the participants are female and 62.4 percent are male. The data concerning their own computer and internet accesses of the participants are also indicated in the study. 87.4 percent of the participants have their own computers, and 92.3 percent have personal internet accesses. The periods of connecting to internet in hour at the weekly basis are provided in the study. According to the findings, 23.2 of the participants connect internet for more than 40 hours, 21.2 percent for 21-40 hours and 20.6 percent for 10-12 hours. The most frequent purposes of using internet by the participants are also indicated in the study. The data concerning how the participants identify themselves as the internet users are provided in the study. The participants use internet most frequently for the purposes of communicating with the other individuals (42.1%), entertainment (19.6%), shopping (16,3%), education and get information (11.0%).

Table 2. Usage Aims of the Participants

	f	%
Education	45	11,0
Shopping	66	16.3
Entertainment	85	19.6
Communcation to Others	173	42.1

Get Information	45	11,0
Total	414	100.0

It is seen that a large majority of the participants (92.1%) identify themselves as the regular internet users. The results concerning how the participants evaluate the place of internet in their lives are also provided in the study. According to the findings, 94.5 percent of the participants responded at the important and very important levels for the place of internet in their lives. The statuses of using the Web 2.0 environments in which the participants are members are provided in the study. According to this, 51.4 percent of the participants use the social network sites for 214-40 hours, 24.1 percent for longer than 40 hours and 12.3 percent for 10-12 hours and 12,2 percent for 7-9 hours. When we look at the way of usage of Web 2.0 tools, 32% have created their own online journal or blog. 24% of the participants maintain their own personal webpage. 33% of online participants share their own artistic creations online, such as artwork, photos, stories, or videos. 18% create or work on webpages or blogs for others, including those for groups they belong to, friends, or school assignments.

Researches also have shown that 82.4 percent of all participants use at least one of the Web 2.0 tools. The most popular Web 2.0 tool in terms of social network sites was The Facebook, with 81.2 percent of participants. Twitter, Friendster and MySpace were the other shared social network sites stated by respondents. Table 3 shows the proportion of social network sites users by specific site. Facebook is the well-known Web 2.0 tool among participants, with almost seven in ten using it, all knows it. Twitter is also well-known (100%) by the respondents. MySpace is used by more than half of the sample, although it is popular tool among participant. The other three sites (Friendster, Xanga, and Orkut, in that order of popularity) are significantly less popular Web 2.0 tools which are used less than 5 % of the sample. *Table 3* indicated the percentage of respondents who use the site 'often' and 'sometimes.'

Table 3.Familiarity and experience with social network sites among participants (percentages)

	Manages it	Has known of it	Has never managed it	Tried it but no more
Facebook	81.2	100	12.1	6.1
Twitter	62.5	100	23.5	8.2
MySpace	42.6	86.2	57.4	14.8
Friendster	4.3	38.9	71.5	5.4
Xanga	1.1	6.2	86.2	1.9
Orkut	0.9	7.1	81.3	3.2

We can see that from the study teens say social networking sites help them manage their friendships. 87 % of participants state they use the sites to stay in touch with friends they see constantly, while 79% use the sites to stay in touch with friends they rarely see in person. 68 % of all participants manage the sites to arrange social acitivities with their friends; moreover we see that 46 % use the sites to make new friends. Almost 3 in five (61%) young people who use social networking sites also mean they write blog. Young people in Web 2.0 environments also interact wit each other especially with others' blogs. Approximately eight in ten (79%) young people noticed that reading the blogs of others. On the other hand, just 14% of all participants mean they use the sites for flirting. 54 % of young people utter that they watch videos on video sharing sites such as video.google.com, Metacafe, YouTube. From the comperative analysis we see that men participants are more likely to report watching videos on video sharing sites when compared with women participants. In addition to this, online men participants are twice as likely as girls to post video files (21% vs. 12%). Receiving comments for the videos is another category and we behold that nearly three-quarters (68 %) of video posters report that they get comments for these. 44% of participants comment that people sometimes comment on their video postings. 21% says that people comment on their online videos 'most of the time.' Furthermore 26 % mean that they never get comments on posted videos.
The opinions concerning what memberships the participants will not leave are provided in the Table 4.

Table 4. What elements memberships the participants will not leave

	f	%
Blogs	117	28.3
Facebook	129	31.2
Twitter	48	11.7
Myspace	34	8.3
Video sites	90	20.5
Total	414	100.0

The answers of the identity-based questions are provided in the Table 5.

Table 5.The identity-based information concerning the young people in which the participants

Using a Web 2.0 tools is a tool for identifying myself	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	307	74.2	107	25.8	414	100.0
Communicating with the other members is real like in daily life	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	341	82.4	73	17.6	414	100.0
Communicating with the other members of the social networks is indispensable for me	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	308	74.6	106	25.4	414	100.0
Web 2.0 tools are a great tool to stay in touch with friends	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	335	81.1	79	18.9	414	100.0
I write my detailed text profile text to show I am real.	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	288	65.6	126	34.4	414	100.0
You can find my personality totally in Web 2.0 environments	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	296	71.7	118	28.3	414	100.0
I have a special groups like me in Web 2.0 environments	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	340	82.3	74	17.7	414	100.0
There is a freedom of saying in Web 2.0 environments	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	363	87.8	51	12.2	414	100.0
I talk about only non-virtual things such as boyfriends or girlfriends, school, parents in the Web 2.0 environments	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	357	86.4	57	13.6	414	100.0
I do not distinguish between online and offline and do not have another personality online	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	277	67.1	137	32.9	414	100.0
I present my special object in Web 2.0 environments	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	267	64.5	147	35.5	414	100.0
Considering being in the Web 2.0 environments as a lifestyle	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	351	84.8	63	15.2	414	100.0
Having some political, ethnical and religious subjects objected on the subject of Web 2.0 environments	Yes		No		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	242	58.6	172	41.4	414	100.0

According to the Table 5, the following results are obtained based on the opinions of the participants:

- Using a Web 2.0 tools is a tool for identifying myself (74.2%); Communicating with the other members is real like in daily life (82.45); Communicating with the other members of the social networks is indispensable for me (74.6%); Web 2.0 tools are a great tool to stay in touch with friends (81.1%),
- I write my detailed text profile text to show I am real (65.6%); You can find my personality totally in Web 2.0 environments (71.7%); I have special groups like me in Web 2.0 environments (82.3%); There is a freedom of saying in Web 2.0 environments (87.8%); I talk about only non-virtual things such as boyfriends or girlfriends, school, parents in the Web 2.0 environments (86.4%); I do not distinguish between online and offline and do not have another personality online (67.1%); I present my special object

in Web 2.0 environments (64.5%); Considering being in the Web 2.0 environments as a lifestyle (84.8%); Having some political, ethnical and religious subjects objected on the subject of Web 2.0 environments (58.6%).

As it could be seen also in the table, the average attitude point of the participants (n=414) is 55.32. Being 56 of the median and its closeness to the arithmetic average indicate that the participants are close to the normal distribution. When the average attitude point 55.32 is evaluated out of 4, it makes 3.72 points. It could be said that the attitudes of the participants towards to the usage of Web 2.0 environments are positive

Table 6. Participants towards to the usage of Web 2.0 environments

	f	Ranj	Min	Max	$\overline{X}$	Median	S
Scale	414	22	43	68	55.32	58	4.42

In addition to this, the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the participants concerning the attitude points are provided in the study. According to this, the articles on which the participants show attitude at high level could be stated as follows.

- Communicating with the other members of the social networks is indispensable for me ($\overline{X}$=4.42); Web 2.0 tools are a great tool to stay in touch with friends ($\overline{X}$=4.07); I write my detailed text profile text to show I am real ($\overline{X}$=3.74); You can find my personality totally in Web 2.0 environments ($\overline{X}$=4.01); I have special groups like me in Web 2.0 environments ($\overline{X}$=3.91); There is a freedom of saying in Web 2.0 environments ($\overline{X}$=4.55); I talk about only non-virtual things such as boyfriends or girlfriends, school, parents in the Web 2.0 environments ($\overline{X}$=3.63); I do not distinguish between online and offline and do not have another personality online ($\overline{X}$=3.84); Considering being in the Web 2.0 environments as a lifestyle ($\overline{X}$=4.31).

Conclusion

In this paper we would argue that Web 2.0 tools have opened an alternative space for young people's identity construction. We can see that from the research young people's construction of identity is relational and interactive in Web 2.0 environments. Their construction of identity depend on not only theri description of their own personalty also other's descriptions of them in their own profile pages. It can be seen that they let others describe who they are in these environments. In relation to this, analyis shows that participants write their detailed text profile text to show they are real (65.6%). Research shows that 32% of respondents have created their own online journal or blog. We see that almost 3 in five (61%) young who use social networking sites also mean they write blog. And, in keeping with the conversational nature of Web 2.0 environments, young people are also interacting with others' blogs. 24% of the participants maintain their own personal webpage. 33% of online participants share their own artistic creations online, such as artwork, photos, stories, or videos. 18% create or work on webpages or blogs for others, including those for groups they belong to, friends, or school assignments. Seven in ten (70%) social networking teens report reading the blogs of others, and three in four social networking teens (76%) have posted comments to a friend's blog on a social networking site. We can understand from this that in a way the users are actually in control of other's construction of them to the degree that they can be almost. Researches also have shown that 82.4 percent of all participants use at least one of the Web 2.0 tools. These are important data to show us the prevalence of the Web 2.0 tools on young people.

As a conclusion, it can be said that the social and contact enabling features of Web 2.0 tools like guest book, the chat section, the debate forum, the clubs etc or the personal and branding related features like profile, the picture gallery, the blog, the notice board, the profiling messages on the front page etc are widely used by young people who are technology-based generation. It's clear that young people use Web 2.0 tools for entertainment like games, videos, jokes, articles or for supporting and getting practical information. But most importantly, they are used for identifying themselves (74.2%). From the research we can see that participants think that others can find their personality totally in Web 2.0 environments (71.7%). They are also in special groups or community which alike them in Web 2.0 environments (82.3%). Study shows that young people do and talk about online is very close to their non-virtual lives and friends for which reason the boundary between online and offline is blurred today. In the research we see that participants do not distinguish between online and offline and do not have another personality online (67.1%). Thus, the users are permanently creating and co-creating their identity online not only by using the Web 2.0 tools and their functionalities, but also by using their interaction and communication as mediational means.

Bibliography

Bennett, W.L. ed. (2007) *Civic life online: Learning how digital media can engage youth*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Lenhart, A., Madden, M., Macgill, A.R. and Smith, A. (2007) *Teens and social media*. Washington, D.C, Pew Internet and American Life Project

Watts DJ, Dodds PS, Newman ME.(2002). *Identity and search in social networks*. *Science*. 296:1302–1305.

Jorge Morato, Anabel Fraga, Yorgos Andreadakis, Sonia Sánchez-Cuadrado (2008). Semantic Web or Web 2.0? Socialization of the Semantic Web. *WSKS* (2): 406-415

Li, C. and Bernoff, J. (2008) *Groundswell: Winning in a world transformed by social technologies*. Boston, MA., Harvard Business Press.

Castells, Manuel (1999). *Flows, Networks, and Identities: A Critical Theory of the Informational Society*. In Manuel Castells, Ramón Flecha, Paulo Freire, Henry A. Giroux, Donaldo Macedo & Paul Willis, *Critical Education in the New Information Age*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 37-64

Buckingham, David (2000). *After the Death of Childhood: Growing up in the Age of Electronic Media*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Abbott, Chris (1998). "Making Connections: Young People and the Internet." Pp. 84–105 in *Digital Diversions: Youth Culture in the Age of Multimedia*, edited by J. Sefton-Green. London: UCL Press.

Buckingham, David, (ed.) (2008). *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media.* John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cotterell, John (1996). *Social Networks and Social Influences in Adolescence*. London, UK, and New York: Routledge.

Drucker, Peter F. (1994). "The Age of Social Transformation." *The Atlantic Monthly* 274(5):53–80.

Epstein, Jonathon S., ed. 1998. *Youth Culture: Identity in a Postmodern World*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Press

Livingstone, Sonia (2002). *Young People and New Media*. London, UK, and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Maczewski, Mechthild (2002). "Exploring Identities through the Internet: Youth Experiences Online." *Child & Youth Care Forum* 31(2):111–29.

Osgerby, Bill (2004). *Youth Media*. London, UK, and New York: Routledge

Boyd, Danah (2007). "Why Youth (Heart) Social Network Sites: The Role of Networked Publics in Teenage Social Life. " Pp. 119–42 in *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media,* edited by D. Buckingham. John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ito, Mizuko, Vicki O'Day, Annette Adler, Charlotte Linde, and Elizabeth Mynatt (2001). "Making a Place for Seniors on the Net: SeniorNet, Senior Identity, and the Digital Divide." *Computers and Society* 31(3):15–21.

DiMicco, J.M. and Millen, D.R. (2007). Identity management: Multiple presentations of self in Facebook. *GROUP '07: Proceedings of the 2007 International ACM Conference on Supporting Group Work,* Sanibel Island, Florida, USA. Pp.383-386.

Sarah Kenderdine and Jeffrey Shaw (2009). New media in situ: the re-socialisation of public space Volume 2, Number 4 / *International Journal of Arts and Technology*, 258 - 276

Boyd D. (2007). "Why Youth (Heart) Social Network Sites: The Role of Networked Publics in Teenage Social Life." In: Buckingham D, editor. *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media*. Cambridge, USA: MIT Press; p. 119–42.

Stutzman F.(2006). An Evaluation of Identity-Sharing Behavior in Social Network Communities. International Digital and Media Arts Journal 3(1):10–3.

Weiser, E. (2001). The functions of Internet use and their social and psychological consequences, *Cyberpsychology & Behavior,* 4, 723-742.

Lenhart, A., & Madden, M. (2007). Social networking websites and teens: An overview. Pew Internet & American Life Project. Retrieved from the Internet on March 23, 2007 at http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/ PIP_SNS_Data _Memo_Jan_2007.pdf