

## A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE USE OF FACEBOOK IN PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS<sup>1</sup>

İsa İPÇİOĞLU\*, Ayşe AKYÜZ\*\*

\* Prof. Dr., Bilecik Şeyh Edebali University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Business Administration, isa.ipcioglu@bilecik.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6912-3290>.

\*\* Corresponding Author, M.B.A., Bilecik Şeyh Edebali University, ayse.kirca@bilecik.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3924-9623>.

### ABSTRACT

*In this study which is based on how Facebook is used by the universities in social media, the appearance of Facebook accounts of universities were tried to be described. Another aim of the study is to analyse which universities use Facebook more actively, what are the shares, and the distribution of the shares regarding the weekdays and weekends using the content analysis method. The population of the study consists of the verified Facebook accounts of 185 universities in Turkey in 2017 while the sample of the study consists of 10 the state university ranked in URAP TR 2016-2017 and 10 the private universities in URAP TR 2016-2017. Facebook accounts of the two groups were analysed using Boomsocial computation and analysis software. As a result of the research, it is possible to say that the universities do not follow a common social media policy as the state and the private university group, that each university's target group is unique, that the expectations of the target group are different, and that they respond differently to different criteria.*

**Keywords:** Public Relations, University, Facebook.

**Jel Codes:** I23, L82, L86.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of public relations has been around since ancient times when people started to live together. It has been used for various purposes since public relations and has used many tools to achieve its goals. Traditional public relations tools come first among these tools. With the development of technology, the Internet has emerged and all countries in the world have become part of an Internet-based virtual world. The development of the Internet and the transition from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 led to the emergence of social media. Eliminating the concepts of time and space, enabling users to express themselves as they wish, and helping people socialize have caused the social media to be used intensely and intensely used in the world in a short time.

Public relations activities have not been insensitive to this development and have included social media as a means to achieve their goals. It has become indispensable in social media universities used in public relations activities of almost all institutions. The main purpose of this research is to reveal to what extent the universities have benefited from the official Facebook accounts they have established

for public relations purposes and to compare the differences between the state universities and the private universities and the attitudes of the state and the private university groups on social media. Hence, in this study, which is based on how Facebook is used by the universities in social media, the appearance of official Facebook accounts of universities were examined. Content analysis method has been used to analyse the official use of Facebook. In the first section traditional and digital public relations activities are compared. In the following sections, public relations activities of universities and use of social media has been described. Then the methodology and the analyses are given in the subsequent sections.

### 2. FROM TRADITIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS TO INTERNET-BASED PUBLIC RELATIONS

Public relations is a management function that is carried out with the aim of influencing opinions and actions between an institution and its target audiences, which have an important role in the success or failure of the institution, to establish and maintain mutual benefit and communication based

<sup>1</sup> This article was produced from a master's thesis entitled "A Comparative Study on the Use of Social Media in Public Relations Activities in Higher Education Institutions" written by Ayşe AKYÜZ under the supervision of İsa İPÇİOĞLU in Bilecik Şeyh Edebali University Institute of Social Sciences.

relationships (Cutlip et al., 1994:6). IPRA (International Public Relations Association) created a new definition of PR fit for the recent times. According to the definition of IPRA (IPRA, 2020), Public relations is a decision-making management practice tasked with building relationships and interests between organisations and their publics based on the delivery of information through trusted and ethical communication methods. With the introduction of the Internet, this organized management task includes the use of all digital

online and offline tools such as computers, mobile phones, photo and video cameras.

The rapidly increasing use of the Internet has caused institutions to shift from traditional public relations tools to Internet-based public relations tools. In Table 1, new media relations, which are the products of developing and changing technology, and traditional media relations are examined (Onat, 2014:10).

**Table 1.** Traditional Media Relations and New Media Relations

<b>Media Relations</b>	<b>Traditional Media Relations</b>	<b>New Media Relations</b>
Tools	Press Release	Online Press Release, Press Rooms
	Video Cassette	Links on video sharing sites
	Photos, Translucent	Carrier memory, cd, links given on photo sharing sites
	Press kit	Press kit, online press kit Online press kit
	Press kit gifts, coupons	Gifts, online coupons, online gifts
Events	Press conferences, press cocktails, press tours, press trips	Events, product launches, few scheduled professional, thematic events, excursions, visits
Contact People	News directors, editorial directors, relevant correspondents	Traditional relationships, contacts on news sites, related bloggers, managers of online communities, online opinion leaders
Communication Channels Where Controlled Content is Shared	Shared Corporate website, corporate newsletter corporate, advertising, special programs	Interactive website, corporate blogs, social networks, profile pages, groups, accounts
Communication Channels in which Uncontrollable Content is Shared	Newspaper, magazine, television, radio	Traditional communication channels, news sites, social networks, blogs, video, photo, audio sharing sites

Source: (Onat; 2014:10)

As can be seen from Table 1, it is possible to say that almost all tools are adapted to the internet environment by examining the traditional media relations and the tools of new media relations. Since there are not significant differences in terms of activities, it is possible to say that more people are addressed on the basis of the people contacted. When the communication channels sharing the controllable content are examined, it is observed that the target audience in the traditional public relations is active in the passive new media relations. When it is analyzed in the communication channels where uncontrollable content is shared, it

is seen that today there are social networks, blogs, video, photo and audio sharing sites and applications in addition to the elements in traditional media relations. With the shift of the majority of users from traditional media to digital media, digitalization has recently been observed in public relations activities and this is considered to be very natural given the goals of public relations.

### 3. PUBLIC RELATIONS IN UNIVERSITIES

In the Turkish Higher Education Law (No. 2547) (1981), "University is defined as a higher education institution consisting of faculties, institutes,

colleges and similar institutions and units that provide scientific education, scientific research, publication and consultancy with high level of scientific autonomy and public institutionalism". The universities existing in Turkey operate as public entities according to the "Higher Education Law" and the Higher Education Law regulates the establishment and functioning of the universities. Higher education institutions operating in Turkey and higher institutions related to higher education have to adhere to the rules in various articles of the current constitution.

As with most institutions and businesses, universities also have a public relations unit. The purpose of public relations operating in universities is to strive to be a respected university, to attract the attention of the target audience and to establish a relationship with the public, to develop and maintain these relations. In addition, ensuring the establishment of a good environment between the university and other institutions, and providing goodwill, trust and support among the organization and the people it serves are the main objectives of public relations (Çağlar, 2006: 21).

The developments with advanced technology and changes in higher education in the world and Turkey has made competition differently. Nowadays, universities are willing to involve the best students, regardless of whether they are the private or the state universities, to train the best faculty members and to progress in scientific production (Güven, 2014: 62). Universities carry out a number of public relations activities to achieve their goals. These public relations activities allow the name of the university to be mentioned both inside and outside the institution (Yılmaz, 2015: 34). Universities need to have a professional public relations team to successfully fulfill these requests and create a good image in and out of the institution.

Universities' internal public relations environment; students, academic and administrative staff, while outside public relations environment; media organs, educational institutions at the same or different levels, graduates, student families, surrounding institutions and businesses, the region and the local community where the higher education institution

operates, and public administrators managing the public. The universities should be in close contact with their internal and external environments, and should conduct public relations work that will ensure their dignity and positively affect their image. In order to do this, considering the structure and culture level of the "target group"; public relations tools should be used. The tools that provide this best are also known as "mass media". The media, which can be used by universities, are the university's own media organ, magazines, newspapers or bulletins, annual albums, meetings, ceremonies, contests, concerts, screenings, posters, brochures, etc. Attracting and supporting the people living in the region or region where universities operate, is effective in public conferences, seminars, exhibitions, folklore and dance performances, panels, symposiums, recitals, concerts and various scientific activities (Tikveş, 2005: 85,86,87).

Considering the young and dynamic structure of the universities, the most effective mass media is thought to be social media due to the internet. The fact that young people follow the technology closely and keep up with technology quickly reveals the necessity to keep up with this change in their universities, who want to establish close relationships with their target audience. The fact that young people are tight followers of the Internet and social media channels compared to traditional public relations tools, and that the internet is faster than the traditional public relations tools, reaches more individuals, is independent of time and place, is less costly, more interesting and popular. It provides a basis for them to benefit more. The public relations units of universities have started to exist in social media and operate in almost all social media platforms by keeping up with this technology. Thus, opening up corporate social media accounts and keeping track of these opened accounts, actively making their presence felt, keeping these accounts up to date and making them interesting are among the duties of public relations units. The reason for this is the desire to reach the audience they want to attract.

#### 4. SOCIAL MEDIA MEASUREMENT AND ANALYSIS METHODS

In last two decades, being in social media is inevitable for institutions. It is very important for institutions to use social media effectively. In order for organizations to use social media effectively, they should clearly determine the reasons for their existence in social media and accordingly, they should make long-term plans. They also need to measure and analyze social media platforms to see how successful those plans are, or if they are unsuccessful, to learn the reasons and make a new plan accordingly (Barutçu and Tomaş, 2013: 20).

While it is possible for institutions that make social media analysis to learn which social media platforms would provide more effective results, it is possible to learn how the users behave differently on different platforms to develop different strategies. In this way, the strategies suitable for their wishes can be followed by displaying behaviors according to the expectations of the target audience. In addition, institutions that conduct social media analysis can learn the thoughts of their followers about the institution and determine how much their posts are liked or disliked by the target audience, and how much interest they attract. Various tools can be used for the mentioned social media measurement and analysis process. Institutions that cannot receive professional support due to their limited budgets can carry out social media measurement and analysis using the freely available online tools, listed below (Kırcova and Enginkaya, 2015; 161). Some of the social media analysis programs that institutions can use within their own means at no cost or by paying a small amount of fees are as follows;

##### 4.1. Boomsocial

Boomsocial is a social media analysis system that allows brands to track, compare and report their presence on social media. Using the Boomsocial infrastructure, Boomsocial was launched in February 2013. With Boomsocial, institutions can analyze their situation on social media and compare them with their competitors. Boomsocial is a free service (Boomsocial, 2020).

With Boomsocial, which enables organizations to measure their performance on social media and the return of their shares, organizations have the opportunity to compare their performances in social networks with seven competitors. The website provides benchmark information such as the number of followers, periodic changes in the page views, etc. with detailed graphics and tables (Özdemir, 2013).

##### 4.2. Google Analytics

Google Analytics is a product of Google. It is a free service that measures traffic to websites. Google Analytics offers organizations the ability to identify which social media platforms are most frequently referred to by website visitors. As a result of this opportunity, institutions can decide which social media platforms they should focus on. At the same time, businesses can learn more about visitors from social platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram (Barutçu ve Tomaş, 2013: 18).

##### 4.3. Socialbakers

It is a platform where different social media channels can be monitored and reported from a single point. It works with the membership system and offers detailed information to anyone who wants to get information about their social media (Kırcova ve Enginkaya, 2015; 161).

In addition to these social media measurement and analysis programs, there are many applications such as Sensekit, Monitera, Somera, Radian6, Brand24, Mention, Trackur, UberVU, Talkwalker, Rival IQ, TrendSpottr, Buzzsumo, NOD3x, Brandwatch, Sysomos, Cision, Attensity, Talkwalker Alerts, Bottlenose, Digimind, Meltwater, Crimson Hexagon, Synthesio, Viralheat, TweetReach etc. (Dijital Ajanslar, 2020).

The presence of social media has also revealed social media measurement and analysis. With the social media measurement tools given above, it is revealed how important the measurement and analysis of social media is. It is possible to make a difference in social media with social media tracking tools that enable brands or institutions to make the most efficient and simple use and strengthen their online presence.

## 5. METHODOLOGY

Social media usage benefits all universities to interactively share up-to-date information to students and other stakeholders and get instant feedback from them. These benefits can be collected under four groups:

- 1) Providing effective communication with graduates and their families,
- 2) Strengthening the institutional identity of the university, increasing the preferred one, creating a good image, building trust,
- 3) Providing academic and pedagogical development, and
- 4) Providing an environment to improve freedom of expression and creating a polyphonic environment in universities (Bingöl and Tahtalıoğlu, 2017).

The main purpose of this research is to reveal to what extent the universities have benefited from the official Facebook accounts they have established for public relations purposes and to compare the differences between the state universities and the

private universities and the attitudes of the state and the private university groups on social media. It is aimed to compare which functions their Facebook accounts perform, what do they post in accordance with the purpose of public relations and how it has a functional structure.

The limitations of the research, are as follows:

- While 185 universities of the Higher Education Council operating in 2017 form the universe of research (URAP, 2017), top 10 the state universities and top 10 the private universities for 2016-2017 academic year are the sample of the research.

-Research was limited to the Facebook posts of the universities in March, April and May 2017 periods only.

The sample of the top 10 universities that form the ranking of URAP TR 2016-2017 the state universities (URAP, 2017) and the top 10 universities that form the ranking of URAP TR 2016-2017 the private universities (URAP, 2017) are seen in Table 2, and Table 3, respectively.

**Table 2.** URAP TR 2016-2017 Top 10 State Universities

THE STATE UNIVERSITIES	ESTABLISHED IN	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	TOTAL SCORE
Middle East Technical University	1956	20,468	756.67
Hacettepe University	1957/1967	36,901	720.55
Istanbul University	1453/1933	222,155	702.55
Ankara University	1946		688.08
Gebze Technical University	1992	2,504	46.674
Gazi University	1926	53,305	662.79
Istanbul Technical University	1773/1944	23,474	656.67
Ege University	1955	53,617	655.38
Atatürk University	1954	263,337	617.40
Erciyes University	1978	53,823	605.76

**Table 3.** URAP TR 2016-2017 Top 10 Private Universities

THE PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	ESTABLISHED IN	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	TOTAL SCORE
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University	1984	11,086	671.53
Koç University	1992	6,428	642.79
Sabancı University	1994	3,719	637.66
Başkent Üniversitesi	1994	12,410	535.62
Atılım University	1996	7,881	469.60
Yeditepe University	1996	19,521	458.12
Çankaya University	1997	7,181	454.96
TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji University	2003	5,304	427.29
Acıbadem University	2007	3,434	421.31
Doğuş University	1997	5,930	401.58

## 6. FINDINGS

Although Gebze Technical University is among the 10 the state universities, since there is no data about the university in the Boomsocial system, only the total number of messages could be included in the Table 4 and Table 5. As seen in Table 4, a total of 1,337 messages were posted by the state universities, in total 160,835 likes and 3,300 comments were provided by the followers, and 22,031 fans shared their posts in the profile of the websites. In is also noteworthy that the periodic change in the number of followers was negative on four the state universities Facebook pages.

Interaction ratio is the highest for Ege University and the lowest for Ankara University. The highest positive change in the number of followers happens

for Middle East Technical University, ie. 1490 more followers at the end of the observation period. The highest negative change in the number of followers, however, happens for Gazi University, ie. 1456 followers stopped subscription for the official Facebook account of the university at the end of the research period. Interestingly, while Ankara University posts only 73 messages, which is the lowest number of sharing, number of the followers of the university increases by 255. Hence, it is possible to highlight that the number of posts is not the major reason to change the number of followers. Indeed, interactions with the followers provide more more insights about the efficiency of a Facebook existence.

**Table 4.** Facebook Accounts of the State Universities

+: Yes -: No	OFFICIAL FACEBOOK ACCOUNT									
	Profile Photo	Verified page	Total Messages	Total Likes	Total Comments	Total Sharing	Initial Number of Followers	Final Number of Followers	Change in the Number of	Interaction Ratio
STATE UNIVERSITIES										
Ege University	Corporate Logo	-	35	4,976	82	527	30,472	30,422	-50	0.5245
Middle East Technical University	Corporate Logo	-	99	34,974	324	9,561	116,578	118,068	1,490	0.3837
Hacettepe University	Corporate Logo	-	167	33,379	325	2,739	79,526	79,810	284	0.2734
Gazi University	Corporate Logo	+	159	35,162	1,809	4,702	123,585	122,129	-1,456	0.2146
Istanbul Technical University	Corporate Logo	-	148	16,307	204	1,971	78,036	78,831	795	0.1584
Atatürk University	Corporate Logo	-	131	14,697	191	672	103,684	103,448	-236	0.1145
Erciyes University	Corporate Logo	-	308	7,483	133	388	22,529	22,852	323	0.1137
Istanbul University	Corporate Logo	-	103	11,541	148	1,284	121,189	120,297	-892	0.1047
Ankara University	Corporate Logo	-	73	2,316	84	187	68,240	68,495	255	0.0517
Gebze Technical University	Corporate Logo	-	114	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Having the highest interaction ratio, although Ege University shared the least number of posts, received an average of 142 likes per share. Unlikely, Ankara University has the lowest interaction ratio, with an average of 31 likes per share (See Table 5). Likewise, Ege University receives at least 2 comments on each post while Ankara the same ratio

for Ankara University 1.15, ie. about one comment for each post. It is possible to interpret this finding as most of the posts of Ankara University may have not attracted much attention. As will be given in Table 8, majority of the posts of Ankara University are related to the public announcements about scientific meeting, which does not attract students.

**Table 5.** Proportional View of the State Universities' Facebook Data

+: Yes -: No	Ratios								
	STATE UNIVERSITIES	Likes Per Message (Total Likes / Total Messages)	Comment per message (Total Comments / Total Messages)	Sharing Per Message (Total Sharing / Total Messages)	Average Number of Followers	Likes for Every Thousand Followers (Total Likes/ Average)	Comments for Every Thousand Followers (Total Comments / Average Number or)	Sharing for Every Thousand Followers (Total Sharing/Average)	Interaction Rate
	Ege University	142.171	2.342	15.057	30,447	163	2	17	0.5245
	Middle East Technical University	353.272	3.272	96.575	117,323	298	2	81	0.3837
	Hacettepe University	199.874	1.946	16.401	79,668	418	4	34	0.2734
	Gazi University	221.144	11.377	29.572	122,857	286	14	38	0.2146
	Istanbul Technical University	110.182	1.378	13.317	78,433	207	2	25	0.1584
	Atatürk University	112.190	1.458	5.129	103,566	141	1	6	0.1145
	Erciyes University	24.295	0.431	1.259	22,690	329	5	17	0.1137
	Istanbul University	112.048	1.436	12.466	120,743	95	1	10	0.1047
	Ankara University	31.726	1.150	2.561	68,367	33	1	2	0.0517
	Gebze Technical University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

As seen in Table 6, 935 messages 72,162 likes and 2,772 comments were made to shared messages, and 10.433 followers shared their posts on their

profile at the private universities. Hence, the state universities use Facebook more intensively than the private universities in Turkey.



**Table 6.** Facebook Accounts of the Private Universities

+: Yes -: Hayır	OFFICIAL FACEBOOK ACCOUNT									
	Profile Photo	Verified page	Total Messages	Total Likes	Total Comments	Total Sharing	Initial Number of Followers	Final Number of Followers	Change in the Number of Followers	Interaction Rate
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES										
Sabancı University	Corporate Logo	+	65	21,123	1,983	2,445	62,269	64,413	2,144	0.6102
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University	Corporate Logo	-	54	18,205	140	1,678	68,074	69,011	937	0.5373
Çankaya University	Corporate Logo	-	88	1,781	38	180	5,704	5,782	78	0.3928
Başkent University	Corporate Logo	-	136	4,097	72	988	11,883	12,165	282	0.3117
Koç University	Corporate Logo	+	67	13,315	201	3,881	86,527	88,443	1,916	0.2935
Acıbadem University	Corporate Logo	-	30	925	20	86	15,145	15,314	169	0.2244
TOBB Economics and Technology University	Corporate Logo	-	42	1,293	13	93	29,870	29,425	-445	0.1132
Atılım University	Corporate Logo	-	74	4,288	97	365	76,115	83,117	7,002	0.0772
Doğuş University	Corporate Logo	+	130	1,758	54	109	22,613	22,417	-196	0.0659
Yeditepe University	Corporate Logo	-	249	5,377	154	608	41,095	40,868	-227	0.0603

Sabancı University, which has the highest interaction rate in Table 6, has a total of 65 messages, while in Table 7 it received an average of 324 likes per message. However, Yeditepe University, which has the lowest interaction rate, has 249 messages in Table 6 and an average of 21 likes per message in Table 7. Similarly, 30 comments were made on the posts of Sabancı University, while on average, 0.61 on the shares of

Yeditepe University, or at least 1 comment on each share. From this point of view, although the shares of Sabancı University are lower than Yeditepe University, the rates are higher, and it is possible to say that the messages of Sabancı University are more remarkable. As seen in Table 9 Yeditepe University shares the most part of the activity criteria.

**Table 7.** Proportional View of the Private Universities' Facebook Data

+: Yes -: Hayır	PROPORTIONAL VIEW OF CORPORATE FACEBOOK ACCOUNTS							
	LIKES PER MESSAGE (Total Likes / Total Messages)	COMMENT PER MESSAGE (Total Comments / Total Messages)	SHARING PER MESSAGE (Total Sharing / Total Messages)	AVERAGE NUMBER OF FOLLOWERS	LIKES FOR EVERY THOUSAND FOLLOWERS (Total Likes/ Average Number of Followers)	COMMENTS FOR EVERY THOUSAND FOLLOWERS (Total Comments / Average Number of Followers)	SHARING FOR EVERY THOUSAND FOLLOWERS (Total Sharing/Average Number of Followers)	INTERACTION RATE
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES								
Sabancı University	324.969	30.507	37.615	63,341	333	31	38	0.6102
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University	33.425	2.592	31.074	68,542	265	2	24	0.5373
Çankaya University	20.238	0.431	2.045	5,743	310	6	31	0.3928
Başkent University	30.125	0.529	7.264	12,024	340	5	82	0.3117
Koç University	198.731	3	57.925	87,485	152	2	44	0.2935
Acıbadem University	30.833	0.666	2.866	15,229	60	1	5	0.2244
TOBB Economics and Technology University	30.785	0.309	2.214	29,295	44	4	3	0.1132
Atılım University	57.945	1.310	4.932	79,616	53	1	4	0.0772
Doğuş University	13.523	0.415	0.838	22,515	78	2	4	0.0659
Yeditepe University	21.594	0.618	2.441	40,981	131	3	14	0.0603

When Table 8 is analyzed, it is seen that the state universities share the highest efficiency criteria with a rate of 0,202. It is thought that the 3-month period covering the research period coincides with the spring months and has an impact on the efficacy criterion. Scientific meeting criterion is followed by the activity criterion with a share rate of 0.195. Seminars, conferences, panels etc. evaluated within the scope of the scientific meeting criteria within the 3-month period covering the research period of the

state universities. It is possible to say that importance is attached to the activities and sharing of these activities on the Facebook. Following the scientific meeting criteria, the announcement criterion comes with a sharing rate of 0.109. Following the announcement criterion, the most sharing is followed by the promotional criterion with 0.096 messages. When the promotion criterion is analyzed, it is seen that the highest share rate belongs to Hacettepe University with 0,497.



**Table 9.** Proportional Distribution of Messages in the Private Universities Facebook Accounts by Subject

TOTAL	65	54	88	136	67	30	42	74	130	249	935
Other	0,030	0,037	0,079	0,036	0,119	-	-	0,040	0,038	0,016	0,038
Condolence-Commemoration	0,046	0,037	0,022	0,014	0,044	0,033	0,071	0,027	0,015	0,004	0,022
Promotion	0,046	0,055	-	0,007	-	0,033	0,071	0,094	0,015	0,008	0,023
Health	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sports	0,015	0,037	0,045	0,051	0,014	0,100	0,095	0,054	0,100	0,032	0,050
Claim-Wish	0,015	0,018	0,011	0,007	0,014	0,033	0,047	0,040	0,061	0,004	0,021
Invitation-Visit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,015	-	0,002
Celebration	0,046	0,074	0,034	0,102	0,194	0,100	0,142	0,054	0,176	0,036	0,087
Ceremony	0,015	-	-	0,036	0,014	-	-	-	-	0,012	0,010
Culture-Art	0,046	0,129	0,227	0,102	0,044	0,066	-	0,040	0,076	0,044	0,078
Activity	0,200	0,333	0,193	0,308	0,179	0,066	0,166	0,283	0,246	0,345	0,267
Service	0,015	-	0,034	-	0,014	-	0,023	-	-	0,020	0,011
Meeting-Interview	-	-	-	-	0,014	-	-	-	-	-	0,001
Scientific Meeting	0,030	0,074	0,181	0,198	0,149	0,433	0,214	0,094	0,184	0,293	0,197
Information	0,353	0,185	0,045	0,08	0,089	0,033	0,071	0,121	0,007	0,060	0,088
Announcement	0,138	0,018	0,125	0,051	0,104	0,100	0,095	0,148	0,061	0,124	0,098
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	Sabancı University	İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University	Çankaya University	Başkent University	Koç University	Acıbadem University	TOBB University of Economics & Technology	Atılım University	Doğuş University	Yeditepe University	TOTAL

When Table 9 is analyzed, it is seen that the private universities share the highest efficiency criteria with the rate of 0,267. Scientific meeting criterion follows the activity criterion with the rate of 0,197.

The announcement criterion is followed by the announcement criterion with 0.098 rate, followed by the informative criterion with 0.088 rate and the 0.087 rate. Although Yeditepe University is the university that shares the most messages among the private Universities (249) and the criteria that it gives intensity are similar to Sabancı University, the lowest interaction rate shows that their sharing is not impressive. In order to increase the interaction rate of Yeditepe University, it is recommended to change its shares, take care of the quality of the shares and follow a path according to the expectations of the target audience.

Comparing the Tables 8 and 9, it is possible to say that the criteria that the state and the private universities share the most are similar. It is seen that the first 5 of the state universities constitute an event, scientific meeting, announcement, promotion and information criterion, while the first 5 of the private universities constitute an event, scientific meeting, announcement, information and celebration criterion. It is seen that the top 3 shared criteria and ranking are the same in the state and the private universities. The different criteria are the promotion criteria, which are in the top five in the state universities, and the celebration criteria, which are in the top five in the private universities.

## 7. CONCLUSION

Universities need to use technology intensively and take full advantages of social media in order to provide better value for the existing and potential students. Because, social networks have become an increasingly popular medium and among young people. Thus, institutions pay attention to take place in social media, which has no time and space limit, is easy to access, and provides fast and close transportation. In addition, Facebook, which has the most common use among social media, is seen as an important communication network for many segments. It is not possible for universities, which are especially rich in young people, to benefit from social media platforms. Universities allow university followers to be aware of the university on any subject they want with the posts they share on Facebook. Universities immediately learn the opinions of the target audience with the feedbacks

they receive and can shape the structure of the university accordingly.

Top 10 public and the private universities that are the subject of this research have official Facebook accounts and are actively used. Universities other than Atatürk University have social media access icons on their corporate web pages and social media icons function without any problems. As the Gebze Technical University, one of the state universities, has not been added to the Boomsocial measurement and analysis program, information about the university could not be included in the Facebook account overview. An important point in the research that is emphasized in the Facebook overview is the interaction rate. The interaction rate shows how effective the social media platforms used by the university as a public relations activity. It is known that the total message, total comment, total share, the number of start fans, the number of end fans and the increase of the seasonal fan are the factors that affect the interaction rate. None of the mentioned criteria can increase the interaction rate alone. Too much sharing does not mean higher interaction rate. It is thought that the important thing is to make an effective sharing and attract the target audience as a comment or liking. When Facebook interaction rates of the state and the private universities are taken into consideration, it is seen that there are universities that have higher interaction rates in the private universities than the state universities. It can be suggested to the state universities to increase their interaction rates by making their sharing more effective and quality.

When the subject contents of the public Facebook accounts of the state universities are analyzed, it is determined by the examination that the state universities are shared with the most activity, scientific meeting and announcement criteria in the private universities. It is also possible to say that universities do not pursue a common social media policy, each university's target audience is unique, their target audience has different expectations, and they react differently to different criteria.

Nowadays, given the usage rates of Facebook, universities' effective use of this social media, it enables them to experience many positive public

relations activities such as reputation, image, promotion, follow-up, liking, sharing, and being preferred. In the further studies, it is advised to increase the number of universities and the observation period for better understanding.

## REFERENCES

1. BARUTÇU, S. & TOMAŞ, M. (2013). “Sürdürülebilir Sosyal Medya Pazarlaması ve Sosyal Medya Pazarlaması Etkinliğinin Ölçümü”, *İnternet Uygulamaları ve Yönetimi Dergisi*, C:4, S.1, pp. 5-24.
2. BINGÖL, S. & TAHTALIOĞLU, H. (2017). “Türkiye’de Üniversitelerin Sosyal Medya Kullanımı: Gazi Üniversitesi Örneği”, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, C:22, pp. 2405-2423.
3. CUTLIP, S. M., CENTER, A. H. & BROOM, G. L. (1994). *Effective Public Relations*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
4. ÇAĞLAR, N. G. (2006). “Üniversite Kütüphanelerinde Halkla İlişkiler ve Başkent Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi”, *Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Bilgi ve Belge Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı*, Ankara.
5. GÜVEN, B. (2014). “Yüksek Öğretim Kurumlarında Halkla İlişkiler Faaliyetleri: Atatürk ve Muş Alparslan Üniversiteleri Örneğinde”, *Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Halkla İlişkiler ve Tanıtım Anabilim Dalı*, Erzurum.
6. IPRA, <https://www.ipra.org/member-services/pr-definition/>.
7. KIRCOVA, İ. & ENGINKAYA, E. (2015). *Sosyal Medya Pazarlama*, 1. Baskı, Beta Basım A.Ş., İstanbul.
8. ONAT, F. (2014). *Dijital Çağda Halkla İlişkiler Yazarlığı*, Nobel, Ankara.
9. ÖZDEMİR, F. (2013). *Boom Social Beta Yayına Girdi*, Retrieved from <http://1sosyalmedya.com/boom-social-beta-yayina-girdi.html>, 01.03.2018.
10. TIKVEŞ, Ö. (2005). *Halkla İlişkiler ve Reklamcılık*, 2. Bası, Beta Basım A.Ş., İstanbul.
11. Turkish Higher Education Law (No. 2547), (1981). T.C. Resmi Gazete, 17506.
12. University Ranking by Academic Performance, Retrieved from [tr.urapcenter.org](http://tr.urapcenter.org), 01.08.2017.
13. University Ranking by Academic Performance, 2016-2017 Devlet Üniversiteleri Genel Sıralaması, Retrieved from [http://tr.urapcenter.org/2016/2016\\_t5.php](http://tr.urapcenter.org/2016/2016_t5.php), 01.08.2017.
14. University Ranking by Academic Performance, 2016-2017 Vakıf Üniversiteleri Genel Sıralaması, Retrieved from [http://tr.urapcenter.org/2016/2016\\_t6.php](http://tr.urapcenter.org/2016/2016_t6.php), 01.08.2017.
15. YILMAZ, M. (2015). “Üniversitelerde Halkla İlişkiler: Kurumsal Web Sayfaları ve Sosyal Medya Uygulamaları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”, *Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Halkla İlişkiler ve Tanıtım Ana Bilim Dalı Halkla İlişkiler ve Tanıtım Bilim Dalı*, Konya.
16. Boomsocial (2018). Retrieved from [www.boomsocial.com/Social-Medya-ve-Biz](http://www.boomsocial.com/Social-Medya-ve-Biz).
17. Dijital Ajanslar (2018). Retrieved from [www.dijitalajanslar.com/social-medya-takip-aracлари/](http://www.dijitalajanslar.com/social-medya-takip-aracлари/).