



The Use of Social Networks as a Communication Tool between Teachers and Students: A Literature Review

Facundo FROMENT

Universidad de Sevilla, SPAIN
facundopfroment@hotmail.es

Alfonso Javier GARCÍA GONZÁLEZ

Universidad de Sevilla, SPAIN
alfonsoj@us.es

M. Rocío BOHÓRQUEZ

Universidad de Sevilla, SPAIN
rociobohorquez@us.es

ABSTRACT

Social networks have drastically changed communication between people, constituting a means of everyday use by which information is created and shared in a simple, instantaneous way with the rest of the world. Although social networks were not initially created for academic purposes, they are gradually being used as a means of communication between teachers and students, making them an extremely important element in the teaching-learning process by offering new possibilities for communication and interaction as well as creating new learning spaces. The purpose of this study is to analyze the use of social networks as a communication tool between teachers and students through a thorough bibliographical review. To do this, a systematic review of scientific documents containing data on teacher-student communication through social networks was carried out, resulting in a total of 96 documents published between 2006 and 2016 indexed in different internationally consulted databases. From the analyzed documents were extracted the educational levels in which research on teacher-student communication in social networks were carried out; the most addressed social networks in the study of teacher-student interaction through social networks; the research areas that have been developed and the main results.

INTRODUCTION

Social networks have changed the way people communicate, the interaction they have and the ability to create and share information with the rest of the world, becoming a daily occurrence (Gómez, Roses, & Farias, 2012). Social networks foster the maintenance, development and creation of interpersonal relationships based on the elaboration of a personal profile in which accessible information is published and shared by all who are present on the social network (Kwon & Yixing, 2010). Social networks have gradually emerged as a new avenue of communication between teachers and students, mainly in higher education, becoming an important communicative tool (Akcaoglu & Bowman, 2016; Albayrak & Yildirim, 2015; Chromey, Duchsherer, Pruett, & Vareberg, 2016), generating diverse questions about teacher-student communication through social networks and their impact on the teaching-learning process (Hershkovitz & Forkosh-Baruch, 2013).

The use of social networks provides the opportunity for teachers and students to be in continuous contact transcending the conventional classroom and creating new teaching and learning spaces (Ean & Lee, 2016; Hamid, Waycott, Kurnia, & Chang, 2015). However, this new reality has generated debates as to whether teachers and students should interact in this way, leading some authorities to restrict or even prohibit such communication (Asterhan & Rosenberg, 2015). Supporters of the teacher-student interaction through social networks present arguments in favor, such as teachers' and students' freedom of expression, the inevitability of the phenomenon and the pedagogical potential of social networks (Greenhow, Robelia, & Hughes, 2009). As the number of teachers with social network profiles increases, the possibilities for teacher-student interaction increase. Therefore, if teachers wish to take advantage of the educational opportunities of social networks, both teachers and students should interact on them (Teelehaïmanot & Hickman, 2011).

The main purpose of the present study is to analyze the use of social networks as a communication tool between teachers and students through a systematic literary review. In particular, this study intends to answer the following questions: (1) What are the educational levels that are being addressed in research related to teacher-

student communication on social networks? (2) Which is the most commonly used social network as a communication tool between teachers and students? (3) What are the research areas that are being developed regarding teacher-student interaction through social networks and the main results of the studies under analysis?

METHODOLOGY

They were analyzed 96 published documents on teacher-student communication through social networks. These documents were found in international scientific databases such as Web of Science, Scopus, PsycINFO and ERIC and come from around the world. As standard criterion, it was established that all scientific documents that provide data on teacher-student communication through social networks would be analyzed, in order for all studies under analysis to be comprised of articles from scientific journals subject to peer review, doctoral theses, dissertations, conference communications and book chapters. The search criterion of the documents consisted of the detection in the title or abstract of the documents of the following keywords, some of them extracted from the ERIC and UNESCO thesaurus: “Teacher-Student Communication and Social Networking”, “Teacher-Student Interaction and Social Networking”, “Teacher-Student Relationship and Social Networking”, “Teacher-Student Communication and Facebook”, “Teacher-Student Interaction and Facebook”, “Teacher-Student Relationship and Twitter”, “Teacher-Student Communication and Twitter”, “Teacher-Student Interaction and Twitter” and “Teacher-Student Relationship and Twitter”. Similarly, new searches were carried out using other keywords such as “Teacher-Student Friending”, “Teacher Credibility”, “Instructor Credibility”, “Teacher Self-Disclosure” and “Student Self-Disclosure” in combination with the above mentioned keywords. From the total of the found documents, it was considered that 96 documents strictly met the criterion, the rest were excluded from the bibliographic review. The documents that were selected for the analysis cover the period between 2006 and 2016, both inclusive, since research focused on teacher-student communication through social networks has been carried out since 2006 and no studies have been found prior to this date.

The selected documents were analyzed using a coding table in which they were categorized by certain features such as the educational levels that were addressed in the study of teacher-student communication on social networks, the most analyzed social networks in teacher-student interaction and the main results obtained by the studies under analysis. In order to create the categories, researchers followed an inductive process based on the exhaustive analysis of the content in the selected documents.

RESULTS

In relation to the educational levels in which research on teacher-student communication on social networks are being developed (see Annex 1); the results show that 77 studies have focused on higher education, 12 in secondary education and 4 in elementary education. There are 3 studies that have not specified the educational level in which the studies were carried out (Table 1).

Table 1: Addressed educational levels in teacher-student communication on social networks

Educational level	Number of studies	Percentage
Higher Education	77	80.2%
Secondary Education	12	12.5%
Elementary Education	4	4.16%
Not specified	3	3.12%

With regard to the most prevalent social networks through research in the analysis of teacher-student interaction (see Annex 2), the results show that 65 studies have focused on Facebook, 8 on Twitter, 1 on Facebook and Twitter, 1 on MySpace and 1 on YouTube. There are 20 studies that have not specified the social network in which the analysis of teacher-student communication was carried out (Table 2).

Table 2: Analyzed social networks in relation to teacher-student communication

Social Networks	Number of studies	Percentage
Facebook	65	67.70%
Twitter	8	8.33%
Facebook & Twitter	1	1.04%
MySpace	1	1.04%
YouTube	1	1.04%
Not specified	20	20.83%

In accordance with the research areas being developed in relation to teacher-student communication on social networks, five categories have been identified through an inductive process: teacher-student interaction through social networks; impact of teacher-student communication through social networks on the teaching-learning process; content published by teachers and students on their online profiles; students’ perceptions of teacher

credibility according to the content of the instructor’s online profile; friendship requests between professors and students and the privacy of teachers’ and students’ online profiles. Furthermore, in the category “teacher-student interaction through social networks”, four sub-categories have been identified: frequency, reasons and opinions about teacher-student communication through social networks as well as most commonly used social networks by teachers and students for interacting with each other. In the category “content published by teachers and students on their profiles” two sub-categories have been identified: exposure to the content of teachers’ and students’ online profiles and inappropriate content of teachers’ and students’ profiles. Table 3 shows the distribution of the documents under analysis in their respective categories. It should be noted that there are several studies that are in more than one category since they have addressed more than one aspect of teacher-student interaction on social networks (see Annex 3).

Table 3: Analyzed studies distributed in the different identified categories

Categories	Sub-categories	Number of studies
Teacher-student interaction through social networks	Frequency of the interaction	13
	Reasons of the interaction	19
	Opinions about the interaction	11
	Most used social networks	6
Impact of teacher-student communication through social networks on the teaching-learning process		51
Content published by teachers and students on their online profiles	Exposure to the content	12
	Inappropriate content	2
Students’ perceptions of teacher credibility according to the content of the instructor’s online profile		8
Friendship requests between teachers and students		21
The privacy of teachers’ and students’ online profiles		8

Below, the main results of the documents under analysis are presented according to their respective categories.

Teacher-student interaction on social networks

Frequency of teacher-student interaction on social networks

Students are willing to use social networks as a means of communication with their teachers (Hamid et al., 2015), using them between 56% and 75% of the cases depending on the study (Ophir, Rosenberg, Asterhan, & Schwarz, 2016; Sendurur, Sendurur, & Yilmaz, 2015). Draskovic, Caic and Kustrak (2013) found that students were motivated by interacting with their teachers through social networks, whereas teachers showed concern and skepticism toward the idea. Saylag (2013) notes that 72% of students agreed to contact their teachers through Facebook to get to know them better. Hurt, Moss, Bradley, Larson and Lovelace (2012) emphasize that students showed no discomfort when interacting with their teachers on Facebook and that teachers created new profiles to interact with their students which lacked personal information, displaying only a profile photo.

40% of teachers contact their students on Facebook, 16% used it in the past and 41% had never communicated with their students through Facebook (Asterhan, Rosenberg, Schwarz, & Solomon, 2013). According to Madge, Meek, Wellens, and Hooley (2009), 91% of students have never used Facebook to communicate with their teachers; 68% have not visited their professors’ Facebook profile and 41% indicate that they would not like their teachers to communicate with them via Facebook. Erjavec (2013) noted that most students did not communicate with their teachers on social networks. Hershkovitz and Forkosh-Baruch (2013) found that communication between teachers and students on Facebook was limited. For Hank, Sugimoto, Tsou and Pomerantz (2014), most teachers and students would prefer not to communicate with each other by means of Facebook. Aaen and Dalsgaard (2016) noted that 65% of students have never used social networks to interact with their teachers while only 10% of students have used social networks to communicate with their teachers. Canós-Rius and Guitert-Catases (2014) point out that 100% of teachers and students have never used Twitter to communicate with each other, while 89% of teachers and 92% of students have never used Facebook to interact with each other.

Reasons of teacher-student interaction on social networks

Teachers use Facebook as a tool for contacting their students primarily for issues related to logistics and class organization (Asterhan & Rosenberg, 2015; Asterhan et al., 2013; Fewkes & McCabe, 2012; Gettman & Cortijo, 2015; Sendurur et al., 2015). Furthermore, they point out that through Facebook they seek to strengthen and support those students who need the most assistance, as well as intervene in cases where a psychosocial problem can be detected through the student's profile (Asterhan & Rosenberg, 2015) or to provide emotional support (Ophir et al., 2016). Students communicate with their teachers through social networks to ask them about the content of a subject, as well as schedules or dates of exercises or exams (Abu-Alruz, 2014; Draskovic et al., 2013; Gunnulfsen, 2016).

Thus, there is a consensus that teacher-student communication on social networks should be professional, mainly focused on issues related to the academic field (Ean & Lee, 2016; Chromey et al., 2016; DiVerniero & Hosek, 2011; Draskovic et al., 2013; Erjavec, 2013; Foote, 2011; Hewitt & Forte, 2006; Madge et al., 2009; Nemetz, Aiken, Cooney, & Pascal, 2012).

Opinions about the use of social networks as a communication tool between teachers and students

In relation to the acceptance of social networks as a communication tool between teachers and students, for the majority of students it is appropriate to communicate with their teachers on social networks (Baran, 2010; Fondevila et al., 2015; Sendurur et al., 2015) while a minority finds it inappropriate (Madge et al., 2009; Malesky & Peters, 2011; Miron & Ravid, 2015). In addition, there are, on the one hand, gender differences since male students find teacher-student communication on social networks more appropriate than women (Göktas, 2015; Hewitt & Forte, 2006; Teclhaimanot & Hickman, 2011) and, on the other hand, there are differences according to the academic year in question. For example, third and fourth grade students feel more comfortable and interact more with their teachers through social networks compared to first and second year students (Aydin, 2014; Göktas, 2015).

Most used social networks in teacher-student communication

The most used social networks between teachers and students are Facebook (Aaen & Dalsgaard, 2016; Fondevila et al., 2015) and WhatsApp (Canós-Rius & Guitert-Catases, 2014; Ophir et al., 2016). However, Leafman (2015) and Smith (2016) argue that students prefer e-mails to communicate with their teachers by perceiving them as more professional and formal channels of communication, while social networks are perceived as more casual, informal and more appropriate for interacting with classmates.

Impact of teacher-student communication through social networks on the teaching-learning process

In relation to the impact of teacher-student communication through social networks on the teaching-learning process, the improvement of teacher-student communication and teacher-student relationship stands out (Abella & Delgado, 2015; Albayrak & Yildirim, 2015; Amador & Amador, 2014; Hamid et al., 2015; Irwin, Ball, & Desbrow, 2012; Lee, Lee, & Kim, 2015; Rambe & Nel, 2015; Rezende da Cunha, van Kruistum, & van Oers, 2016; Sanchez, Cortijo, & Javed, 2014; Sánchez-Rodríguez, Ruiz-Palmero, & Sánchez-Rivas, 2015; Sobaih, Moustafa, Ghandforoush, & Khan, 2016; Staines & Lauchs, 2013; Wang, 2013; Yakin & Tinmaz, 2013); a deeper understanding of another individual at a personal level (Cole, Hibbert, & Kehoe, 2013; Erjavec, 2013; Kio, 2016; Schroeder et al., 2010) and the breaking of barriers between teachers and students (DeGroot, Young, & VanSlette, 2015; Rambe & Nel, 2015; Rambe & Ng'ambi, 2014). Similarly, teacher-student communication on social networks correlates positively to increased academic motivation (Aubry, 2013; Imlawi, Gregg, & Karimi, 2015; Saylag, 2013); academic performance (Bowman & Akcaoglu, 2014; Jumaat & Tasir, 2013; Junco, Elavsky, & Heiberger, 2013; Mendez et al., 2009; Sarapin & Morris, 2015); student commitment and involvement (Akcaoglu & Bowman, 2016; Annamalai, Tan, & Abdullah, 2016; Bowman & Akcaoglu, 2014; Junco et al., 2013; Imlawi et al., 2015; Meishar-Tal, Kurtz, & Pieterse, 2012; Rezende da Cunha et al., 2016; Schwarz & Caduri, 2016); a positive class environment (Asterhan & Rosenberg, 2015; Mazer, Murphy, & Simonds, 2007); student satisfaction with the teacher-student relationship (Imlawi et al., 2015); student empowerment (Saylag, 2013) and student resilience (Ophir et al., 2016).

However, Evans (2014) found that the use of Twitter as a communication tool between teachers and students did not improve the teacher-student relationship. Furthermore, the inappropriate and irresponsible use of social networks as a communication tool between teachers and students may be detrimental to the teacher-student relationship (Gettman & Cortijo, 2015; Manasijevic, Zivkovic, Arsic, & Milosevic, 2016); to the teacher's authority and status (Asterhan & Rosenberg, 2015; Draskovic et al., 2013; Foulger, Ewbank, Kay, Osborn, & Lynn, 2009; Kyriacou & Zuin, 2015); to student motivation (Çimen & Yilmaz, 2014) as well as academic performance (Nkhoma et al., 2015).

Content published by teachers and students on their online profiles

Exposure to the content of teachers' and students' online profiles

In relation to the exposure to the content that teachers and students share on their profiles, the expectations of both can be affected by observing particular comments, statuses or photos, judgments being made about the other person (Chromey et al., 2016; DiVerniero & Hosek, 2011; Gettman & Cortijo, 2015; Helvie-Mason, 2011; Sleight, Smith, & Laboe, 2013). Students claim that on their online profiles they display information that they do not want their teachers to see (Cain, Scott, & Akers, 2009; Hank et al., 2014; Hewitt & Forte, 2006) and that they are able to find out information about their teachers' private lives that they would rather not know (DiVerniero & Hosek, 2011; Foote, 2011; Wang, Novak, Scofield-Snow, Traylor, & Zhou, 2015). Likewise, teachers are concerned about accessing a student's online profile and being exposed to information they would rather not have discovered (Asterhan et al., 2013).

Inappropriate content of teachers' and students' online profiles

Teachers consider it to be inappropriate for other teachers to harass or mock students, use unauthorized information, propagate false information, create fictitious profiles, share disruptive information or insult national values on social networks (Deveci & Kolburan, 2015). Thus, teachers understand the need to be as professional as possible to create appropriate learning spaces (Carter, Foulger, & Ewbank, 2008; Forte, Humphreys, & Park, 2012; Mikulec, 2012). Students ranked the following information beginning with the least appropriate all the way to the most appropriate on a teacher's online profile: comments about piercings or tattoos, photos about alcohol consumption, negative comments about other colleagues, comments of a political, racist or religious nature, announcements about class changes, information about exams and positive comments directed to students (Nemetz, 2012).

Students' perceptions of teacher credibility according to the content of the instructor's online profile

Instructors' credibility may be affected by the content of their online profiles when it is inconsistent with the students' previous expectations (DeGroot et al., 2015; Imlawi, Gregg, & Karimi, 2015; Johnson, 2011; Mazer, Murphy, & Simonds, 2009). Thus, a teacher's Facebook profile that discloses a vast amount of information is more credible than an instructor's Facebook profile low in self-disclosure (Mazer et al., 2009) while revealing information about alcohol consumption and emotional problems concerning a personal relationship negatively influences students' perception of teacher credibility (Wang et al., 2015). Johnson (2011) found that instructors who posted social tweets were more credible than teachers who posted scholarly tweets, although DeGroot et al. (2015) suggested that teachers' online profiles with professional content were the most credible.

Furthermore, the mere existence of a teacher's Facebook profile can affect their credibility (Barber & Pearce, 2008; Mazer et al., 2009), although there is no research consensus on the existence or direction of such a correlation (Hutchens & Hayes, 2012). It also seems that frequent use of social networks by students positively affects their perceptions of teachers' credibility (DeGroot et al., 2015; Imlawi, Gregg, & Karimi, 2015; McArthur & Bostedo-Conway, 2012).

Friendship requests between professors and students

According to friendship requests between professors and students on social networks, there is rejection among teachers and students in becoming virtual friends (Bosch, 2009; Bruneel De Wit, Verhoeven, & Elen, 2013; Cain et al., 2009; Gettman & Cortijo, 2015; Gómez et al., 2012; Helvie-Mason, 2011).

Teachers prefer to ignore friendship requests from their students by considering them to be inappropriate relationships (Bosch, 2009; Hank et al., 2014; Sturgeon & Walker, 2009); although some studies note teachers' neutrality or even receptiveness in this respect (Deveci & Kolburan, 2015; Grosbeck, Bran, & Tiru, 2011; Sarapin & Morris, 2015). In terms of students, discomfort is generated in relation to teachers' friendship requests (Karl & Peluchette, 2011; Miller & Melton, 2015).

Both teachers and students are often added as virtual friends because they have previously had some kind of contact in real life (Amador & Amador, 2014; Baran, 2010; Hershkovitz & Forkosh-Baruch, 2013). Sheldon (2015) points out that students try to add their teachers as friends on Facebook to get to know them better on a personal level. Accordingly, Hank et al. (2014) indicate that most teachers are inclined to add or accept the friendship requests of those students who have completed their university studies. To identify these causes, Akkoyunlu, Daghan and Erdem (2015) developed an instrument to analyze the reasons why teachers add their students as friends on Facebook. On the contrary, if friendship requests between teachers and students are rejected or ignored, it could negatively affect the teacher-student relationship (Atay, 2009; Dearbone, 2014; Hank et al., 2014; Plew, 2011).

The privacy of teachers' and students' online profiles

Students point out that social networks are platforms for private use and that their use by teachers to communicate with them is intrusive (Al-Dheleai & Tasir, 2015; Fondevila et al., 2015; Kolek & Saunders, 2008; Mazer et al., 2007; Rambe & Ng'ambi, 2014; Roblyer, McDaniel, Webb, Herman, & Witty, 2010). Similarly, different studies found that teachers restricted student access to their Facebook profiles (Erjavec, 2013; Lin, Kang, Liu, & Weiting, 2015).

CONCLUSIONS

The main objective of the present study was to analyze the use of social networks as a communication tool between teachers and students, determining the educational levels in which research on teacher-student communication on social networks are being developed; the most addressed social networks by research for the analysis of teacher-student interaction, the research areas that are being developed and exposing the main results of the studies under analysis.

With regard to the educational levels in which research on teacher-student communication on social networks are being developed, studies have mainly focused on higher education, mostly in universities. As previously mentioned, more and more university professors use social networks in their teaching practice as a means of communication with their students, so this may be the main reason why the scientific community has shown an interest in addressing teacher-student interaction on social networks in the university field.

In terms of the most addressed social networks by the research for the analysis of teacher-student interaction, studies have mainly focused on Facebook. Facebook, apart from being the most popular social network in the world, is the most used social network in the university field by both teachers and students, so it is likely that researchers have focused their interest on analyzing teacher-student communication by means of Facebook.

Considering the five identified categories and the main results of the analyzed studies, in relation to the frequency of teacher-student interaction through social networks, the use of social networks as a communication tool between teachers and students is not generalized. Therefore, the frequency with which they interact through social networks depends on each teacher and student, influenced perhaps by their perceptions of the use of social networks as a communication tool in the academic field. For this reason, teachers can use social networks as an educational platform but should not force students to use them as communication tool with teachers since each student has a certain perception about the use of social networks within the academic field, so that some students may feel uncomfortable or consider it inappropriate to communicate with their teachers through social networks.

In terms of the reasons why teachers and students communicate through social networks, both use them primarily for academic reasons. Thus, teachers should use social networks as communication tools with their students for class-related issues, such as addressing aspects related to class organization, because if teachers interact with their students on issues that are not related to the academic field, students may feel uncomfortable and the teacher-student relationship could be affected. Therefore, teacher-student interaction through social networks should be as professional as possible.

In relation to the most used social networks by teachers and students as a communication tool, they emphasize Facebook, perhaps due to its popularity among the young population and for offering a great variety of interactive tools as well as WhatsApp, for being the most used messaging service these days, being an instant communicative tool and simple to use.

According to teachers' and students' opinions on teacher-student communication through social networks, the acceptance of social networks as a communication tool between them are varied, depending mainly on their perceptions of the subject matter. However, there are clear differences related to gender and academic course according to the opinions of students on teacher-student communication through social networks: male students view teacher-student communication on social networks more appropriate than female students and students in higher courses see teacher-student communication on social networks more appropriate than students in lower courses. This does not mean that teachers should be careful or not interact through social networks with female students or first-year students, but teachers should always explain the reasons or purposes of communicating with their students through social networks in order to reduce the uncertainty or discomfort that some students can have when interacting with their teachers through social networks. If students know from the beginning the intentions of the teacher regarding using social networks as a communication tool, they may feel more comfortable knowing the purpose of the interaction.

With respect to the impact of teacher-student interaction through social networks on the teaching-learning process, the improvement of teacher-student communication and relationship stands out. Likewise, teacher-

student interaction through social networks generates a deeper knowledge of the other person on a personal level; helps break down barriers between teachers and students and positively correlates to increased academic motivation, academic performance, student commitment and involvement, a positive classroom environment, student satisfaction with the teacher-student relationship, student empowerment and student resilience. However, an inappropriate or irresponsible use by both teachers and students of social networks can negatively affect the teacher-student relationship, especially in terms of teacher authority and status as well as student motivation and academic performance. Therefore, in order to improve the teaching-learning processes, teachers should make a responsible use of social networks when interacting with their students and avoiding an inappropriate use of them in order to not damage the teaching-learning processes.

Regarding the exposure to the contents that both teachers and students publish and share on their online profiles, both seem to make judgments about the others according to the content of their respective online profiles. Similarly, teachers' online profile content affects their credibility as education professionals, so teachers should be cautious about the type of information they wish to publish and share with their students because their credibility could be affected and they must always avoid inappropriate content.

In relation to friendship requests between teachers and students, both teachers and students prefer not to become friends. Possible reasons for this rejection include the desire to keep academic and social lives separate and being uncomfortable with the idea that a teacher or student has complete access to the other's online profile. Also, teachers and students indicate that a condition to become friends is that there has to have been contact or that they have established a good relationship in real life. In the same way, teachers and students claim that they have accepted friendship requests to avoid damages in the teacher-student relationship. According to the obtained results, we recommend avoiding friendship requests between teachers and students since although there may be good intentions when adding as friends, some students may see this act as favoritism, affecting the teacher-student relationship. Therefore, we recommend that if a student wants to add a teacher as a friend or vice versa, do so once the course is finished. Likewise, if a teacher rejects a friendship request of a student, the teacher should explain to the student the reasons for rejection so that it does not negatively affect the teacher-student relationship.

Regarding the privacy of teachers' and students' online profiles, students warn that social networks are platforms for private use and that their use by teachers to communicate with students is a violation of privacy. In this sense, teachers must always respect the privacy of their students and avoid behaviors that could violate their privacy when interacting through social networks.

As a limitation of the study, we point out the absence of studies in other languages that we have not been able to access, so it is not possible to assume all possible data on the subject. Moreover, the use of the ERIC and UNESCO thesaurus have been a limitation of the study since many of the used keywords were not included in them, so it is necessary that the thesaurus are updated to facilitate the search of information, especially if it is an expansion topic such as teacher-student interaction through social networks.

Taking into account the identified categories and the main results of the studies under analysis, we propose, as future research, to continue analyzing teacher-student communication on social networks in other educational levels differing from higher education since the majority of studies have focused on universities; to address teacher-student interaction through other social networks other than Facebook since social networks such as Twitter, WhatsApp or YouTube have received little attention; to analyze the frequency of teacher-student interaction through social networks depending on various factors such as age, sex, academic year and areas of study to determine if there are significant differences between them; to identify motives or situations where students wish to communicate with their teachers on issues that are not within the academic field; to determine if the frequent use of social networks in daily life by teachers and students influences their opinions on the acceptance of teacher-student communication on social networks; to establish possible significant differences between students who communicate with their teachers through social networks and students who do not and their impact on the teaching-learning process; to identify what the inappropriate or irresponsible uses of social networks by teachers that can damage the teacher-student relationship are; to clearly expose what types of content in an online profile are those that grant the teacher more or less credibility and to establish the reasons why a teacher or student sends a friendship request to the other. Likewise, we propose that future research should address teacher-student communication on social networks through comparative studies between different educational levels and between public and private educational institutions.

REFERENCES

- Aaen, J., & Dalsgaard, C. (2016). Student Facebook Groups as a Third Space: between Social Life and Schoolwork. *Learning, Media & Technology*, 41(1), 160-186. doi:10.1080/17439884.2015.1111241
- Abella, V., & Delgado, V. D. (2015). Aprender a usar Twitter y usar Twitter para aprender. *Profesorado, Revista de Currículum y Formación del Profesorado*, 19(1), 364-378. Retrieved from <https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/profesorado/article/view/41046/23330>
- Abu-Alruz, J. (2014). Facebook Use in Education: Experiences of University Science Education Students in Jordan. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 11(3), 291-299. doi:10.2304/elea.2014.11.3.291
- Akcaoglu, M., & Bowman, N. D. (2016). Using Instructor-led Facebook Groups to Enhance Students' Perceptions of Course Content. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 65, 582-590. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.029
- Akkoyunlu, B., Daghan, G., & Erdem, M. (2015). Teacher's Professional Perception as a Predictor of Teacher – Student Friendship in Facebook: A Scale Development Study. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(1), 242-259. doi:10.15345/iojes.2015.01.020
- Al-Dheleai, Y. M., & Tasir, Z. (2015). Facebook and Education: Students' Privacy Concerns. *International Education Studies*, 8(13), 22-26. doi:10.5539/ies.v8n13p2
- Albayrak, D., & Yildirim, Z. (2015). Using Social Networking Sites for Teaching and Learning: Students' Involvement in and Acceptance of Facebook as a Course Management System. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 52(2), 155-179. doi:10.1177/0735633115571299
- Amador, P., & Amador, J. (2014). Academic Advising via Facebook: Examining Student Help Seeking. *Internet and Higher Education*, 21, 9-16. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2013.10.003
- Annamalai, N., Tan, K. E., & Abdullah, A. (2016). Teaching Presence in an Online Collaborative Learning Environment via Facebook. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 24(1), 197-212. Retrieved from [http://www.pertanika.upm.edu.my/Pertanika%20PAPERS/JSSH%20Vol.%2024%20\(1\)%20Mar.%20202016/11%20JSSH-1201-2014.pdf](http://www.pertanika.upm.edu.my/Pertanika%20PAPERS/JSSH%20Vol.%2024%20(1)%20Mar.%20202016/11%20JSSH-1201-2014.pdf)
- Asterhan, C., & Rosenberg, H. (2015). The Promise, Reality and Dilemmas of Secondary School Teacher-Student Interactions in Facebook: The Teacher Perspective. *Computers & Education*, 85, 134-148. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2015.02.003
- Asterhan, C., Rosenberg, H., Schwarz, B., & Solomon, L. (2013). *Secondary School Teacher-Student Communication in Facebook: Potentials and Pitfalls*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Chais Conference on Instructional Technologies Research: Learning in the technological era, Ra'anana: The Open University of Israel. Retrieved from http://innovation.openu.ac.il/chais2013/download/e1_3.pdf
- Atay, A. (2009). Facebooking the Student-Teacher Relationship: How Facebook is Changing Student-Teacher Relationships. *Rocky Mountain Communication Review*, 6(1), 71-74. Retrieved from http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/30735868/organization_951_1251746183.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1493025863&Signature=npe2It%2B%2BFIo4Y4x7%2Blex7ILX88E%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DMaintain_or_develop_new_relationships.pdf#page=71
- Aubry, J. (2013). Facebook-Induced Motivation Shifts in a French Online Course. *TechTrends*, 57(6), 81-87. doi:10.1007/s11528-013-0705-6
- Aydin, S. (2014). Foreign Language Learners' Interactions with their Teachers on Facebook. *System*, 42, 155-163. doi:10.1016/j.system.2013.12.001
- Baran, B. (2010). Facebook as a Formal Instructional Environment. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(6), 146-149. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2010.01115.x
- Barber, L., & Pearce, K. (2008, May). *The Effect of Instructor Facebook Participation on Student Perceptions of Teacher Credibility and Teacher Attractiveness*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Retrieved from http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/3/1/8/9/pages231890/p2318901.php
- Bosch, T. E. (2009). Using Online Social Networking for Teaching and Learning: Facebook Use at the University of Cape Town. *Communicatio: South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research*, 35(2), 185-200. doi:10.1080/02500160903250648
- Bowman, N. D., & Akcaoglu, M. (2014). "I See Smart People!": Using Facebook to Supplement Cognitive and Affective Learning in the University Mass Lecture. *Internet and Higher Education*, 23, 1-8. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2014.05.003
- Bruneel, S., De Wit, K., Verhoeven, J., & Elen, J. (2013). Facebook - When Education Meets Privacy. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects*, 9, 125-148. Retrieved from <http://www.ijello.org/Volume9/IJELLOv9p125-148Bruneel0828.pdf>
- Cain, J., Scott, D. R., & Akers, P. (2009). Pharmacy Students' Facebook Activity and Opinions Regarding

- Accountability and E-Professionalism. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 73(6), 1-6. doi:10.5688/aj7306104
- Canós-Rius, N., & Guitert-Catases, M. (2014). Uso de las TIC en la interacción profesor-alumno: un estudio de caso en una Escuela de Arte y Superior de Diseño. *RELATEC: Revista Latinoamericana de Tecnología Educativa*, 13(1), 63-74. Retrieved from <http://relatec.unex.es/article/view/1249/863>
- Carter, H. L., Foulger, T. S., & Ewbank, A. D. (2008). Have you Googled your Teacher Lately? Teachers' Use of Social Networking Sites. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(9), 681-685. doi:10.1177/003172170808900916
- Chromey, K. J., Duchsherer, A., Pruett, J., & Våreberg, K. (2016). Double-edged Sword: Social Media Use in the Classroom. *Educational Media International*, 53(1), 1-12. doi:10.1080/09523987.2016.1189259
- Çimen, A., & Yılmaz, M. B. (2014). Which Content is Appropriate for Instructional based Social Network? Opinions of K12 Teachers in Turkey. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2338-2343. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.569
- Cole, M. L., Hibbert, D. B., & Kehoe, E. J. (2013). Students' Perceptions of Using Twitter to Interact with the Instructor during Lectures for a Large-Enrollment Chemistry Course. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 90(5), 671-672. doi:10.1021/ed3005825
- DeGroot, J. M., Young, V. J., & VanSlette, S. H. (2015). Twitter Use and its Effects on Student Perception of Instructor Credibility. *Communication Education*, 64(4), 419-437. doi:10.1080/03634523.2015.1014386
- Dearbone, R. (2014). *Relational Development, Self-Disclosure and Invasion of Privacy: College Students and Teachers as Facebook Friends* (Master Theses). Western Kentucky University, Kentucky, US. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2349&context=theses>
- Deveci, A., & Kolburan, A. (2015). Unethical Behaviours Preservice Teachers Encounter on Social Networks. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(14), 1901-1910. doi:10.5897/ERR2015.2163
- DiVerniero, R. A., & Hosek, A. M. (2011). Students' Perceptions and Communicative Management of Instructors' Online Self-Disclosure. *Communication Quarterly*, 59(4), 428-449. doi:10.1080/01463373.2011.597275
- Draskovic, N., Caic, M., & Kustrak, A. (2013). Croatian Perspective(s) on the Lecturer-Student Interaction through Social Media. *International Journal of Management Cases*, 15(4), 331-339. Retrieved from http://www.ijmc.org/ijmc/Vol_15.4_files/15.4.pdf
- Ean, L. C., & Lee, T. P. (2016). Educational Use of Facebook by Undergraduate Students in Malaysia Higher Education: A Case Study of a Private University. *Social Media and Technology*, 1(1), 1-8. doi:10.20897/lectito.201641
- Erjavec, K. (2013). Aprendizaje informal a través de Facebook entre alumnos eslovenos. *Comunicar*, 21(41), 117-126. doi:10.3916/C41-2013-11
- Evans, C. (2014). Twitter for Teaching: Can Social Media be used to Enhance the Process of Learning? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45(5), 902-915. doi:10.1111/bjet.12099
- Fewkes, A. M., & McCabe, M. (2012). Facebook: Learning Tool or Distraction? *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 28(3), 92-98. doi:10.1080/21532974.2012.1078468
- Fondevila, J. F., Mir, P., Crespo, J. L., Santana, E., Rom, J., & Puiggròs, E. (2015). La introducción de Facebook en el aula universitaria en España: la percepción del estudiante. *RELATEC: Revista Latinoamericana de Tecnología Educativa*, 14(3), 63-73. Retrieved from <http://relatec.unex.es/article/view/1811/1403>
- Foote, J. (2011). *To friend or not to friend: Students' Perceptions of Student-Teacher Interaction on Facebook* (Master Theses). Miami University, Florida, US. Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/rws_etd/document/get/miami1314110586/inline
- Forte, A., Humphreys M., & Park, T. (2012). *Grassroots Professional Development: How Teachers Use Twitter*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Sixth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland. Retrieved from http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/22224182/forteicwsm.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1493027146&Signature=YjreyLxyc2LyBDyxqJhsfacbDC0%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DGrassroots_Professional_Development_How.pdf
- Foulger, T. S., Ewbank, A. D., Kay, A., Osborn, S., & Lynn, H. (2009). Moral Spaces in MySpace: Preservice Teachers' Perspectives about Ethical Issues in Social Networking. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(1), 1-28. doi:10.1080/15391523.2009.10782539
- Gettman, H. J., & Cortijo, V. (2015). "Leave Me and My Facebook Alone!" Understanding College Students' Relationship with Facebook and its Use for Academic Purposes. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 9(1), 1-16. doi:10.20429/ijstl.2015.090108
- Göktas, Z. (2015). Physical Education and Sport Students' Interactions with their Teachers on Facebook. *Anthropologist*, 21(1-2), 18-30. Retrieved from <http://krepublishers.com/02-Journals/T-Anth/Anth-21-0-000-15-Web/Anth-21-1-2-000-15-Abst-PDF/T-ANTH-21-1,-2-018-15-1462-Goktas-Z/T-ANTH-21-1,->

- 2-018-15-1462-Goktas-Z-Tx[3].pdf
- Gómez, M., Roses, S., & Farias, P. (2012). El uso académico de las redes sociales en universitarios. *Comunicar*, 19(38), 131-138. doi:10.3916/c38-2011-03-04
- Greenhow, C., Robelia, B., & Hughes, J. H. (2009). Web 2.0 and classroom research: what path should we take now? *Educational Researcher*, 38, 246-259. doi:10.3102/0013189x09336671
- Grosbeck, G., Bran, R., & Tiru, L. (2011). Dear Teacher, What Should I Write on my Wall? A Case Study on Academic Uses of Facebook. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 1425-1430. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.306
- Gunnulfsen, A. E. (2016). School Leadership and the Knowledge of Teacher-student Interaction on Facebook: A Study of a Lower Secondary School in Norway. *International Journal of Social Media and Interactive Learning Environments*, 4(2), 169-186. doi:10.1504/ijsmile.2016.077596
- Hamid, S., Waycott, J., Kurnia, S., & Chang, S. (2015). Understanding Students' Perceptions of the Benefits of Online Social Networking Use for Teaching and Learning. *Internet and Higher Education*, 26, 1-9. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.02.004
- Hank, C., Sugimoto, C., Tsou, A., & Pomerantz, J. (2014). Faculty and Student Interactions via Facebook: Policies, Preferences and Practices. *Information Technology*, 56(5), 216-223. doi:10.1515/itit-2014-1061
- Helvie-Mason, L. (2011). Facebook, “Friending” and Faculty-Student Communication. In C. Wankel (Ed.), *Teaching Art and Science with the New Social Media, Cutting-edge Technologies in Higher Education* (Vol. 3, pp. 61-87). Bradford, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. doi:10.1108/s2044-9968(2011)0000003007
- Hershkovitz, A., & Forkosh-Baruch, A. (2013). Student-Teacher Relationship in the Facebook Era: the Student Perspective. *International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Life Long Learning*, 23(1), 33-52. doi:10.1504/ijceell.2013.051765
- Hewitt, A., & Forte, A. (2006, November). *Crossing Boundaries: Identity Management and Student/Faculty Relationships on the Facebook*. Paper presented at the Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing, Banff, Alberta, Canada. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.94.8152&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Hurt, N. E., Moss, G. S., Bradley C. L., Larson, L. R., & Lovelace, M. (2012). The ‘Facebook’ Effect: College Students’ Perceptions of Online Discussions in the Age of Social Networking. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(2), 1-24. doi:10.20429/ijstl.2012.060210
- Hutchens, J. S., & Hayes, T. (2012). In your Facebook: Examining Facebook Usage as Misbehavior on Perceived Teacher Credibility. *Education and Information Technologies*, 19(1), 5-20. doi:10.1007/s10639-012-9201-4
- Imlawi, J., Gregg, D., & Karimi, J. (2015). Student Engagement in Course-based Social Networks: The Impact of Instructor Credibility and Use of Communication. *Computers & Education*, 88, 84-96. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2015.04.015
- Irwin, C., Ball, L., & Desbrow, B. (2012). Students’ Perceptions of Using Facebook as an Interactive Learning Resource at University. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(7), 1221-1232. doi:10.14742/ajet.798
- Johnson, K. A. (2011). The Effect of Twitter Posts on Students’ Perceptions of Instructor Credibility. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 36(1), 21-38. doi:10.1080/17439884.2010.534798
- Jumaat, N. F., & Tasir, Z. (2013). Students’ Types of Online Interaction through Facebook Discussion. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 97, 353-360. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.245
- Junco, R., Elavsky, C. M., & Heiberger, G. (2013). Putting Twitter to the Test: Assessing Outcomes for Student Collaboration, Engagement and Success. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(2), 273-287. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2012.01284.x
- Karl, K. A., & Peluchette, J. V. (2011). “Friending” Professors, Parents and Bosses: A Facebook Connection Conundrum. *Journal of Education for Business*, 86(4), 214-222. doi:10.1080/08832323.2010.507638
- Kio, S. I. (2016). Extending Social Networking into the Secondary Education Sector. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 47(4), 721-733. doi:10.1111/bjet.12259
- Kolek, E. A., & Saunders, D. (2008). Online Disclosure: An Empirical Examination of Undergraduate Facebook Profiles. *NASPA Journal*, 45(1), 1-25. doi:10.2202/0027-6014.1905
- Kwon, O., & Yixing, W. (2010). An Empirical Study of the Factors Affecting Social Network Service Use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(2), 254-263. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.04.011
- Kyriacou, C., & Zuin, A. (2015). Cyberbullying of Teachers by Students on YouTube: Challenging the Image of Teacher Authority in the Digital Age. *Research Papers in Education*, 31(3), 255-273. doi:10.1080/02671522.2015.1037337
- Leafman, J. S. (2015). Online Instructor Perceptions of Social Presence and Educational Use of Social Media. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 2(11), 85-96. doi:10.14738/assrj.211.1637

- Lee, J., Lee, Y., & Kim, M. H. (2015). Perceptions of Teachers and Students towards Educational Application of SNS and its Educational Effects in Middle School Class. *TOJET: Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 14(4), 124-134. Retrieved from <http://www.tojet.net/articles/v14i4/14412.pdf>
- Lin, V., Kang, Y., Liu, G., & Lin, W. (2015). Participants' Experiences and Interactions on Facebook Group in an EFL Course in Taiwan. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 25(1), 99-109. doi:10.1007/s40299-015-0239-0
- Madge, C., Meek, J., Wellens, J., & Hooley, T. (2009). Facebook, Social Integration and Informal Learning at University: 'It is More for Socialising and Talking to Friends about Work Than for Actually Doing Work'. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34, 141-155. doi:10.1080/17439880902923606
- Malesky, L. A., & Peters, C. (2012). Defining Appropriate Professional Behavior for Faculty and University Students on Social Networking Websites. *Higher Education*, 63(1), 135-151. doi:10.1007/s10734-011-9451-x
- Manasijevic, D., Zivkovic, D., Arsic, S., & Milosevic, I. (2016). Exploring Students' Purposes of Usage and Educational Usage of Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 60, 441-450. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2016.02.087
- Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). I'll See You On "Facebook": The Effects of Computer-Mediated Teacher Self-Disclosure on Student Motivation, Affective Learning, and Classroom Climate. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 1-17. doi:10.1080/03634520601009710
- Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E., & Simonds, C. J. (2009). The Effects of Teacher Self-disclosure via Facebook on Teacher Credibility. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34(2), 175-183. doi:10.1080/17439880902923655
- McArthur, J. A., & Bostedo-Conway, K. (2012). Exploring the Relationship between Student Instructor Interaction on Twitter and Student Perceptions of Teacher Behaviors. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 24(3), 286-292. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE1223.pdf>
- Meishar-Tal, H., Kurtz, G., & Pieterse, E. (2012). Facebook Groups as LMS: A Case Study. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 13(4), 33-48. doi:10.19173/irrodl.v13i4.129
- Mendez, J. P., Curry, J., Mwavita, M., Kennedy, K., Weinland, K., & Bainbridge, K. (2009). To Friend or Not to Friend: Academic Interaction on Facebook. *International Journal of Instructional Technology & Distance Learning*, 6(9), 33-47. Retrieved from http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Sep_09/article03.htm
- Mikulec, E. A. (2012). Professional Faces: Pre-service Secondary Teachers' Awareness of Issues of Self-disclosure on Social-networking Sites. *Current Issues in Education*, 15(3), 1-16. Retrieved from <https://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/view/938/375>
- Miller, R., & Melton, J. (2015). College Students and Risk-taking Behaviour on Twitter versus Facebook. *Behavior & Information Technology*, 34(7), 678-684. doi:10.1080/0144929x.2014.1003325
- Miron, E., & Ravid, G. (2015). Facebook Groups as an Academic Teaching Aid: Case Study and Recommendations for Educators. *Educational Technology & Society*, 18(4), 371-384. Retrieved from http://ifets.info/journals/18_4/28.pdf
- Nemetz, P. (2012). Faculty Social Networking Interactions: Using Social Domain Theory to Assess Student Views. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 8, 1-13. Retrieved from <http://jupapadoc.startlogic.com/manuscripts/111030.pdf>
- Nemetz, P., Aiken, K. D., Cooney, V., & Pascal, V. (2012). Should Faculty Use Social Networks to Engage with Students? *Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education*, 20(1), 19-28. Retrieved from <http://www.mmaglobal.org/publications/JAME/JAME-Issues/JAME-2012-Vol20-Issue1/JAME-2012-Vol20-Issue1-Nemetz-Aiken-Cooney-Pascal-pp19-28.pdf>
- Nkhoma, M., Cong, H. P., Au, B., Lam, T., Richardson, J., Smith, R.,...El-Den, J. (2015). Facebook as a Tool For Learning Purposes: Analysis of the Determinants Leading to Improved Students' Learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 16(2), 87-101. doi:10.1177/1469787415574180
- Ophir, Y., Rosenberg, H., Asterhan, C., & Schwarz, B. (2016). In Times of War, Adolescents Do Not Fall Silent: Teacher-Student Social Network Communication in Wartime. *Journal of Adolescence*, 46, 98-106. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.11.005
- Plew, M. S. (2011). *Facebook Friendships between College/University Instructors and Students: Deciding Whether or Not to Allow Students as Friends, Communicating with Students, and the Individual Differences that Influences Instructors' Impression Management on Facebook* (Doctoral dissertation). Georgia State University, Georgia, US. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1026&context=communication_diss
- Rambe, P., & Nel, L. (2015). Technological Utopia, Dystopia and Ambivalence: Teaching with Social Media at a South African University. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 46(3), 629-648. doi:10.1111/bjet.12159
- Rambe, P., & Ng'ambi, D. (2014). Learning with and from Facebook: Uncovering Power Asymmetries in

- Educational Interactions. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 30(3), 312-325.
doi:10.14742/ajet.116
- Rezende da Cunha, F., van Kruistum, C., & van Oers, B. (2016). Teachers and Facebook: Using Online Groups to Improve Students' Communication and Engagement in Education. *Communication Teacher*, 30(4), 228-241. doi:10.1080/17404622.2016.1219039
- Roblyer, M. D., McDaniel, M., Webb, M., Herman, J., & Witty, J. V. (2010). Findings on Facebook in Higher Education: A Comparison of College Faculty and Student Uses and Perceptions of Social Networking Sites. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13(3), 134-140. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.03.002
- Sanchez, A. R., Cortijo, V., & Javed, U. (2014). Students' Perceptions of Facebook for Academic Purposes. *Computers & Education*, 70, 138-149. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2013.08.012
- Sánchez-Rodríguez, J., Ruiz-Palmero, J., & Sánchez-Rivas, E. (2015). Uso problemático de las redes sociales en estudiantes universitarios. *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 26, 159-174.
doi:10.5209/rev_rced.2015.v26.46360
- Sarapin, S. H., & Morris, P. L. (2015). Faculty and Facebook Friending: Instructor-Student Online Social Communication from the Professor's Perspective. *Internet and Higher Education*, 27, 14-23.
doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.04.001
- Saylag, R. (2013). Facebook as a Tool in Fostering EFL Teachers' Establishment of Interpersonal Relations with Students Through Self-disclosure. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 82, 680-685.
doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.329
- Schroeder, A., Minocha, S., & Schneidert, C. (2010). The Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of Using Social Software in Higher and Further Education Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 26(3), 159-174. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2010.00347.x
- Schwarz, B., & Caduri, G. (2016). Novelties in the Use of Social Networks by Leading Teachers in their Classes. *Computers & Education*, 102, 35-51. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2016.07.002
- Sendurur, P., Sendurur, E., & Yilmaz, R. (2015). Examination of the Social Network Sites Usage Patterns of Pre-service Teachers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 51, 188-194. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.04.052
- Sheldon, P. (2015). Understanding Students' Reasons and Gender Differences in Adding Faculty as Facebook Friends. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 53, 58-62. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.043
- Sleigh, M. J., Smith, A. W., & Laboe, J. (2013). Professors' Facebook Content Affects Students' Perceptions and Expectations. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 16(7), 489-496.
doi:10.1089/cyber.2012.0561
- Smith, E. E. (2016). "A Real Double-edged Sword:" Undergraduate Perceptions of Social Media in their Learning. *Computers & Education*, 103, 44-58. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2016.09.009
- Sobaih, A. E. E., Moustafa, M. A., Ghandforoush, P., & Khan, M. (2016). To Use or Not to Use? Social Media in Higher Education in Developing Countries. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 58, 296-305.
doi:10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.002
- Staines, Z., & Lauchs, M. (2013). Students' Engagement with Facebook in a University Undergraduate Policing Unit. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 29(6), 792-805. doi:10.14742/ajet.270
- Sturgeon, C. M., & Walker, C. (2009). *Faculty on Facebook: Confirm or Deny?* En paper presented at the 14th Annual Instructional Technology Conference, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, US. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED504605.pdf>
- Teclehaimanot, B., & Hickman, T. (2011). Student-Teacher Interaction on Facebook: What Students Find Appropriate. *TechTrends*, 55(3), 19-30. doi:10.1007/s11528-011-0494-8
- Wang, J. (2013). What Higher Educational Professionals Need to Know about Today's Students: Online Social Networks. *TOJET: Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 12(3), 180-193. Retrieved from <http://www.tojet.net/articles/v12i3/12316.pdf>
- Wang, Z., Novak, H., Scofield-Snow, H., Traylor, S., & Zhou, Y. (2015). Am I Disclosing Too Much? Student Perceptions of Teacher Credibility via Facebook. *The Journal of Social Media in Society*, 4(1), 5-37. Retrieved from <http://www.thejsms.org/tsmri/index.php/TSMRI/article/view/22/49>
- Yakin, I., & Tinmaz, H. (2013). Using Twitter as an Instructional Tool: A case Study in Higher Education. *TOJET: Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 12(4), 209-218. Retrieved from <http://www.tojet.net/articles/v12i4/12423.pdf>

Annex 1: Addressed educational levels in teacher-student communication on social networks

Authors	Year	Country	Educational level
Abella & Delgado	2015	Spain	Higher Education
Abu-Alruz	2014	Jordan	Higher Education
Akcaoglu & Bowman	2016	United States	Higher Education
Al-Dheleai & Tasir,	2015	Malaysia	Higher Education
Albayrak & Yildirim	2015	Turkey	Higher Education
Amador & Amador	2014	United States	Higher Education
Atay	2009	United States	Higher Education
Aubry	2013	United States	Higher Education
Aydin	2014	Turkey	Higher Education
Baran	2010	Turkey	Higher Education
Bosch	2009	South Africa	Higher Education
Bowman & Akcaoglu	2014	United States	Higher Education
Bruneel, De Wit, Verhoeven & Elen	2013	Belgium	Higher Education
Cain, Scott & Akers	2009	United States	Higher Education
Canós-Rius & Guitert-Catases	2014	Spain	Higher Education
Chromey, Duchsherer, Pruett & Vareberg	2016	United States	Higher Education
Cole, Hibbert & Kehoe	2013	Australia	Higher Education
DeGroot, Young & VanSlette	2015	United States	Higher Education
Dearbone	2014	United States	Higher Education
Deveci & Kolburan	2015	Turkey	Higher Education
DiVerniero & Hosek	2011	United States	Higher Education
Draskovic, Caic & Kustrak	2013	Croatia	Higher Education
Ean & Lee	2016	Malaysia	Higher Education
Evans	2014	England	Higher Education
Fondevila, Mir, Crespo, Santana, Rom & Puiggròs	2015	Spain	Higher Education
Foote	2011	United States	Higher Education
Foulger, Ewbank, Kay, Osborn & Lynn	2009	United States	Higher Education
Gettman & Cortijo	2015	United States	Higher Education
Göktas	2015	Turkey	Higher Education
Gómez, Roses & Farias	2012	Spain	Higher Education
Grosbeck, Bran & Tiru	2011	Romania	Higher Education
Hamid, Waycott, Kurnia & Chang	2015	Malaysia and Australia	Higher Education
Hank, Sugimoto, Tsou & Pomerantz	2014	United States	Higher Education
Helvie-Mason	2011	United States	Higher Education
Hewitt & Forte	2006	United States	Higher Education
Hurt, Moss, Bradley, Larson & Lovelace	2012	United States	Higher Education
Hutchens & Hayes	2012	United States	Higher Education
Imlawi, Gregg & Karimi	2015	Jordan and United States	Higher Education
Irwin, Ball & Desbrow	2012	Australia	Higher Education
Johnson	2011	United States	Higher Education
Jumaat & Tasir	2013	Malaysia	Higher Education
Junco, Elavsky & Heiberger	2013	United States	Higher Education
Karl & Peluchette	2011	United States and Australia	Higher Education
Kolek & Saunders	2008	United States	Higher Education
Leafman	2015	United States	Higher Education
Lin, Kang, Liu & Lin	2015	Taiwan	Higher Education
Madge, Meek, Wellens & Hooley	2009	England	Higher Education
Malesky & Peters	2012	United States	Higher Education
Manasijevic, Zivkovic, Arsic & Milosevic	2016	Serbia	Higher Education
Mazer, Murphy & Simonds	2007	United States	Higher Education
Mazer, Murphy & Simonds	2009	United States	Higher Education
Meishar-Tal, Kurtz & Pieterse	2012	Israel	Higher Education
McArthur & Bostedo-Conway	2012	United States	Higher Education
Mendez, Curry, Mwavita, Kennedy, Weinland, & Bainbridge	2009	United States	Higher Education
Miller & Melton	2015	United States	Higher Education

Nemetz	2012	United States	Higher Education
Nemetz, Aiken, Cooney & Pascal	2012	United States	Higher Education
Nkhoma et al.	2015	Vietnam and Australia	Higher Education
Plew	2011	United States	Higher Education
Rambe & Nel	2015	South Africa	Higher Education
Rambe & Ng'ambi	2014	South Africa	Higher Education
Roblyer, McDaniel, Webb, Herman & Witty	2010	United States	Higher Education
Sanchez, Cortijo & Javed	2014	Spain, US and Pakistan	Higher Education
Sánchez-Rodríguez, Ruiz-Palmero & Sánchez-Rivas	2015	Spain	Higher Education
Sarapin & Morris	2015	United States	Higher Education
Saylag	2013	Turkey	Higher Education
Schroeder, Minocha & Schneidert	2010	England and Hong Kong	Higher Education
Sheldon	2015	United States	Higher Education
Sleigh, Smith & Laboe	2013	United States	Higher Education
Smith	2016	Canada	Higher Education
Sobaih, Moustafa, Ghandforoush & Khan	2016	Egypt and United States	Higher Education
Staines & Lauchs	2013	Australia	Higher Education
Sturgeon & Walker	2009	United States	Higher Education
Teclehaimanot & Hickman	2011	United States	Higher Education
Wang	2013	Taiwan	Higher Education
Wang, Novak, Scofield-Snow, Traylor & Zhou	2015	United States	Higher Education
Yakin & Tinmaz	2013	Turkey	Higher Education
Aen & Dalsgaard	2016	Denmark	Secondary Edu
Annamalai, Tan & Abdullah	2016	Malaysia	Secondary Edu
Asterhan & Rosenberg	2015	Israel	Secondary Edu
Asterhan, Rosenberg, Schwarz & Solomon	2013	Israel	Secondary Edu
Barber & Pearce	2008	Canada	Secondary Edu
Fewkes & McCabe	2012	Canada	Secondary Edu
Gunnulfsen	2016	Norway	Secondary Edu
Hershkovitz & Forkosh-Baruch	2013	United States and Israel	Secondary Edu
Kio	2016	China	Secondary Edu
Miron & Ravid	2015	Israel	Secondary Edu
Rezende da Cunha, van Kruistum & van Oers	2016	Netherlands	Secondary Edu
Schwarz & Caduri	2016	Israel	Secondary Edu
Çimen & Yilmaz	2014	Turkey	Elementary Edu
Erjavec	2013	Slovenia	Elementary Edu
Lee, Lee & Kim	2015	Korea	Elementary Edu
Sendurur, Sendurur & Yilmaz	2015	Turkey	Elementary Edu
Akkoyunlu, Daghan & Erdem	2015	Turkey	Not specified
Kyriacou & Zuin	2015	England	Not specified
Ophir, Rosenberg, Asterhan & Schwarz	2016	Israel	Not specified

Annex 2: Analyzed social networks in relation to teacher-student communication

Authors	Year	Country	Social Network
Aen & Dalsgaard	2016	Denmark	Facebook
Abu-Alruz	2014	Jordan	Facebook
Akcaoglu & Bowman	2016	United States	Facebook
Akkoyunlu, Daghan & Erdem	2015	Turkey	Facebook
Al-Dheleai & Tasir	2015	Malaysia	Facebook
Albayrak & Yildirim	2015	Turkey	Facebook
Amador & Amador	2014	United States	Facebook
Annamalai, Tan & Abdullah	2016	Malaysia	Facebook
Asterhan & Rosenberg	2015	Israel	Facebook
Asterhan, Rosenberg, Schwarz & Solomon	2013	Israel	Facebook
Atay	2009	United States	Facebook
Aubry	2013	United States	Facebook
Aydin	2014	Turkey	Facebook
Baran	2010	Turkey	Facebook
Barber & Pearce	2008	Canada	Facebook

Bosch	2009	South Africa	Facebook
Bowman & Akcaoglu	2014	United States	Facebook
Bruneel, De Wit, Verhoeven & Elen	2013	Belgium	Facebook
Cain, Scott & Akers	2009	United States	Facebook
Dearbone	2014	United States	Facebook
DiVerniero & Hosek	2011	United States	Facebook
Ean & Lee	2016	Malaysia	Facebook
Erjavec	2013	Slovenia	Facebook
Fewkes & McCabe	2012	Canada	Facebook
Fondevila, Mir, Crespo, Santana, Rom & Puiggròs	2015	Spain	Facebook
Foote	2011	United States	Facebook
Gettman & Cortijo	2015	United States	Facebook
Göktas	2015	Turkey	Facebook
Grosbeck, Bran & Tiru	2011	Romania	Facebook
Gunnulfsen	2016	Norway	Facebook
Hank, Sugimoto, Tsou & Pomerantz	2014	United States	Facebook
Helvie-Mason	2011	United States	Facebook
Hershkovitz & Forkosh-Baruch	2013	United States and Israel	Facebook
Hewitt & Forte	2006	United States	Facebook
Hurt, Moss, Bradley Larson & Lovelace	2012	United States	Facebook
Hutchens & Hayes	2012	United States	Facebook
Imlawi, Gregg & Karimi	2015	Jordan and United States	Facebook
Irwin, Ball & Desbrow	2012	Australia	Facebook
Jumaat & Tasir	2013	Malaysia	Facebook
Karl & Peluchette	2011	United States and Australia	Facebook
Kio	2016	China	Facebook
Kolek & Saunders	2008	United States	Facebook
Lin, Kang, Liu & Lin	2015	Taiwan	Facebook
Madge, Meek, Wellens & Hooley	2009	England	Facebook
Manasijevic, Zivkovic, Arsic & Milosevic	2016	Serbia	Facebook
Mazer, Murphy & Simonds	2007	United States	Facebook
Mazer, Murphy & Simonds	2009	United States	Facebook
Meishar-Tal, Kurtz & Pieterse	2012	Israel	Facebook
Mendez, Curry, Mwavita, Kennedy, Weinland & Bainbridge	2009	United States	Facebook
Miron & Ravid	2015	Israel	Facebook
Nkhoma et al.	2015	Vietnam and Australia	Facebook
Plew	2011	United States	Facebook
Rambe & Ng'ambi	2014	South Africa	Facebook
Rezende da Cunha, van Kruistum & van Oers	2016	Netherlands	Facebook
Roblyer, McDaniel, Webb, Herman & Witty	2010	United States	Facebook
Sanchez, Cortijo & Javed	2014	Spain, United States and Pakistan	Facebook
Sarapin & Morris	2015	United States	Facebook
Saylag	2013	Turkey	Facebook
Sheldon	2015	United States	Facebook
Sleigh, Smith & Laboe	2013	United States	Facebook
Staines & Lauchs	2013	Australia	Facebook
Sturgeon & Walker	2009	United States	Facebook
Teclehaimanot & Hickman	2011	United States	Facebook
Wang	2013	Taiwan	Facebook
Wang, Novak, Scofield-Snow, Traylor & Zhou	2015	United States	Facebook
Abella & Delgado	2015	Spain	Twitter
Cole, Hibbert & Kehoe	2013	Australia	Twitter
DeGroot, Young & VanSlette	2015	United States	Twitter
Evans	2014	England	Twitter
Johnson	2011	United States	Twitter
Junco, Elavsky & Heiberger	2013	United States	Twitter
McArthur & Bostedo-Conway	2012	United States	Twitter
Yakin & Tinmaz	2013	Turkey	Twitter

Miller & Melton	2015	United States	Facebook and Twitter
Foulger, Ewbank, Kay, Osborn & Lynn	2009	United States	MySpace
Kyriacou & Zuin	2015	England	YouTube
Çimen & Yılmaz	2014	Turkey	Not specified
Canós-Rius & Guitert-Catases	2014	Spain	Not specified
Chromey, Duchsherer, Pruett & Vareberg	2016	United states	Not specified
Deveci & Kolburan	2015	Turkey	Not specified
Gómez, Roses & Farias	2012	Spain	Not specified
Draskovic, Caic & Kustrak	2013	Croatia	Not specified
Hamid, Waycott, Kurnia & Chang	2015	Malaysia and Australia	Not specified
Leafman	2015	United States	Not specified
Lee, Lee & Kim	2015	Korea	Not specified
Malesky & Peters	2012	United States	Not specified
Nemetz	2012	United States	Not specified
Nemetz, Aiken, Cooney & Pascal	2012	United States	Not specified
Ophir, Rosenberg, Asterhan & Schwarz	2016	Israel	Not specified
Rambe & Nel	2015	South Africa	Not specified
Sánchez-Rodríguez, Ruiz-Palmero & Sánchez-Rivas	2015	Spain	Not specified
Schroeder, Minocha & Schneidert	2010	England and Hong Kong	Not specified
Schwarz & Caduri	2016	Israel	Not specified
Sendurur, Sendurur, & Yilmaz	2015	Turkey	Not specified
Smith	2016	Canada	Not specified
Sobaih, Moustafa, Ghandforoush & Khan	2016	Egypt and United States	Not specified

Annex 3: Analyzed studies distributed in the different identified categories

Authors	Year	Country	Category
Aaen & Dalsgaard	2016	Denmark	Frequency of interaction
Asterhan, Rosenberg, Schwarz & Solomon	2013	Israel	Frequency of interaction
Canós-Rius & Guitert-Catases	2014	Spain	Frequency of interaction
Draskovic, Caic & Kustrak	2013	Croatia	Frequency of interaction
Erjavec	2013	Slovenia	Frequency of interaction
Hamid, Waycott, Kurnia & Chang	2015	Malaysia and Australia	Frequency of interaction
Hank, Sugimoto, Tsou & Pomerantz	2014	United States	Frequency of interaction
Hershkovitz & Forkosh-Baruch	2013	United States and Israel	Frequency of interaction
Hurt, Moss, Bradley, Larson & Lovelace	2012	United States	Frequency of interaction
Madge, Meek, Wellens & Hooley	2009	England	Frequency of interaction
Ophir, Rosenberg, Asterhan & Schwarz	2016	Israel	Frequency of interaction
Saylag	2013	Turkey	Frequency of interaction
Sendurur, Sendurur & Yilmaz	2015	Turkey	Frequency of interaction
Abu-Alruz	2014	Jordan	Reasons of interaction
Asterhan, Rosenberg, Schwarz & Solomon	2013	Israel	Reasons of interaction
Asterhan & Rosenberg	2015	Israel	Reasons of interaction
Chromey, Duchsherer, Pruett & Vareberg	2016	United States	Reasons of interaction
DiVerniero & Hosek	2011	United States	Reasons if interaction
Draskovic, Caic & Kustrak	2013	Croatia	Reasons of interaction
Ean & Lee	2016	Malaysia	Reasons of interaction
Erjavec	2013	Slovenia	Reasons of interaction
Fewkes & McCabe	2012	Canada	Reasons of interaction
Foote	2011	United States	Reasons of interaction
Gettman & Cortijo	2015	United States	Reasons of interaction
Gunnulfson	2016	Norway	Reasons of interaction
Hewitt & Forte	2006	United States	Reasons of interaction
Madge, Meek, Wellens & Hooley	2009	England	Reasons of interaction
Nemetz, Aiken, Cooney & Pascal	2012	United States	Reasons of interaction
Ophir, Rosenberg, Asterhan & Schwarz	2016	Israel	Reasons of interaction
Sendurur, Sendurur & Yilmaz	2015	Turkey	Reasons of interaction
Aydin	2014	Turkey	Opinions about the interaction

Baran	2010	Turkey	Opinions about the interaction
Fondevila, Mir, Crespo, Santana, Rom & Puiggròs	2015	Spain	Opinions about the interaction
Göktas	2015	Turkey	Opinions about the interaction
Hewitt & Forte	2006	United States	Opinions about the interaction
Madge, Meek, Wellens & Hooley	2009	England	Opinions about the interaction
Malesky & Peters	2011	United States	Opinions about the interaction
Miron & Ravid	2015	Israel	Opinions about the interaction
Sendurur, Sendurur & Yilmaz	2015	Turkey	Opinions about the interaction
Teclehaimanot & Hickman	2011	United States	Opinions about the interaction
Aaen & Dalsgaard	2016	Denmark	Most used social network
Canós-Rius & Guitert-Catases	2014	Spain	Most used social network
Fondevila, Mir, Crespo, Santana, Rom, & Puiggròs	2015	Spain	Most used social network
Leafman	2015	United States	Most used social network
Ophir, Rosenberg, Asterhan & Schwarz	2016	Israel	Most used social network
Smith	2016	Canada	Most used social network
Abella & Delgado	2015	Spain	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Akcaoglu & Bowman	2016	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Albayrak & Yildirim	2015	Turkey	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Amador & Amador	2014	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Annamalai, Tan, & Abdullah	2016	Malaysia	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Asterhan & Rosenberg	2015	Israel	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Aubry	2013	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Bowman & Akcaoglu	2014	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Çimen & Yilmaz	2014	Turkey	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Cole, Hibbert & Kehoe	2013	Australia	Impact of teacher-student interaction
DeGroot, Young & VanSlette	2015	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Draskovic, Caic & Kustrak	2013	Croatia	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Erjavec	2013	Slovenia	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Evans	2014	England	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Foulger, Ewbank, Kay, Osborn & Lynn	2009	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Gettman & Cortijo	2015	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Hamid, Waycott, Kurnia & Chang	2015	Malaysia and Australia	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Imlawi, Gregg & Karimi	2015	Jordan and United	Impact of teacher-student

Irwin, Ball & Desbrow	2012	States Australia	interaction Impact of teacher-student interaction
Jumaat & Tasir	2013	Malaysia	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Junco, Elavsky & Heiberger	2013	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Kio	2016	China	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Kyriacou & Zuin	2015	England	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Lee, Lee & Kim	2015	Korea	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Manasijevic, Zivkovic, Arsic & Milosevic	2016	Serbia	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Mazer, Murphy & Simonds	2007	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Meishar-Tal, Kurtz & Pieterse	2012	Israel	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Mendez, Curry, Mwavita, Kennedy, Weinland & Bainbridge	2009	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Nkhoma et al.	2015	Vietnam and Australia	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Ophir, Rosenberg, Asterhan & Schwarz	2016	Israel	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Rambe & Nel	2015	South Africa	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Rambe & Ng'ambi	2014	South Africa	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Rezende da Cunha, van Kruistum & van Oers	2016	Netherlands	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Sanchez, Cortijo & Javed	2014	Spain, United States and Pakistan	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Sánchez-Rodríguez, Ruiz-Palmero & Sánchez-Rivas	2015	Spain	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Sarapin & Morris	2015	United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Saylag	2013	Turkey	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Schroeder, A., Minocha & Schneidert	2010	England and Hong Kong	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Schwarz & Caduri	2016	Israel	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Sobaih, Moustafa, Ghandforoush & Khan	2016	Egypt and United States	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Staines & Lauchs	2013	Australia	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Wang	2013	Taiwan	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Yakin & Tinmaz	2013	Turkey	Impact of teacher-student interaction
Asterhan, Rosenberg, Schwarz & Solomon	2013	Israel	Exposure to the content
Cain, Scott & Akers	2009	United States	Exposure to the content
Chromey, Duchsherer, Pruett & Vareberg	2016	United States	Exposure to the content
DiVerniero & Hosek	2011	United States	Exposure to the content
Foote	2011	United States	Exposure to the content
Gettman & Cortijo	2015	United States	Exposure to the content
Hank, Sugimoto, Tsou & Pomerantz	2014	United States	Exposure to the content
Helvie-Mason	2011	United States	Exposure to the content
Hewitt & Forte	2006	United States	Exposure to the content

Sleigh, Smith & Laboe	2013	United States	Exposure to the content
Wang, Novak, Scofield-Snow, Traylor & Zhou	2015	United States	Exposure to the content
Deveci & Kolburan	2015	Turkey	Inappropriate content
Nemetz	2012	United States	Innapropriate content
Barber & Pearce	2008	Canada	Students' perceptions of teacher credibility
DeGroot, Young & VanSlette	2015	United States	Students' perceptions of teacher credibility
Hutchens & Hayes	2012	United States	Students' perceptions of teacher credibility
Imlawi, Gregg & Karimi	2015	Jordan and United States	Students' perceptions of teacher credibility
Johnson	2011	United States	Students' perceptions of teacher credibility
Mazer, Murphy & Simonds	2009	United States	Students' perceptions of teacher credibility
McArthur & Bostedo-Conway	2012	United States	Students' perceptions of teacher credibility
Wang, Novak, Scofield-Snow, Traylor & Zhou	2015	United States	Students' perceptions of teacher credibility
Akkoyunlu, Daghan & Erdem	2015	Turkey	Friendship requests
Amador & Amador	2014	United States	Friendship requests
Atay	2009	United States	Friendship requests
Baran	2010	Turkey	Friendship requests
Bosch	2009	South Africa	Friendship requests
Bruneel De Wit, Verhoeven & Elen	2013	Belgium	Friendship requests
Cain, Scott & Akers	2009	United States	Friendship requests
Dearbone	2014	United States	Friendship requests
Deveci & Kolburan	2015	Turkey	Friendship requests
Gettman & Cortijo	2015	United States	Friendship requests
Gómez, Roses & Farias	2012	Spain	Friendship requests
Grossek, Bran & Tiru	2011	Romania	Friendship requests
Hank, Sugimoto, Tsou & Pomerantz	2014	United States	Friendship requests
Helvie-Mason	2011	United States	Friendship requests
Hershkovitz & Forkosh-Baruch	2013	United States and Israel	Friendship requests
Karl & Peluchette	2011	United States and Australia	Friendship requests
Miller & Melton	2015	United States	Friendship requests
Plew	2011	United States	Friendship requests
Sarapin & Morris	2015	United States	Friendship requests
Sheldon	2015	United States	Friendship requests
Sturgeon & Walker	2009	United States	Friendship requests
Al-Dheleai & Tasir	2015	Malaysia	Privacy of profiles
Erjavec	2013	Slovenia	Privacy of profiles
Fondevila, Mir, Crespo, Santana, Rom & Puiggròs	2015	Spain	Privacy of profiles
Kolek & Saunders	2008	United States	Privacy of profiles
Lin, Kang, Liu & Weiting	2015		Privacy of profiles
Mazer, Murphy & Simonds	2007	United States	Privacy of profiles
Rambe & Ng'ambi	2014	South Africa	Privacy of profiles
Roblyer, McDaniel, Webb, Herman & Witty	2010	United States	Privacy of profiles