Social Media Generations' Levels of Acceptance of Diversity[1]

Aylin TUTGUN-ÜNAL
Faculty of Communication, Üsküdar University, İstanbul, Turkey
aylin.tutgununal@uskudar.edu.tr
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2430-6322

ABSTRACT

Social media networks offering the opportunity of communication on a global scale help individual of any age to build their own worlds as part of participatory online culture. The intense use of social media networks and the global affection power on public opinion lead the researchers to investigate the effects of social media networks on Baby Boomer, X, Y, Z generations. So, the levels of acceptance of diversity of these generations are investigated in "Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities" and "Acceptance of Diverse Appearances" and "Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values" dimensions of "Acceptance of Diversity Scale" developed by Deniz and Tutgun - Ünal (2019). The research was carried out in a general survey model and the sample of the research consisted of 516 individuals of different generations. Some of the major results are as follows: (a) The levels of acceptance of diversity of generations are moderate level; (b) Females' levels of acceptance of diversity are found higher than males; (c) Levels of acceptance of diversity of those using social media for a longer time are higher than those using for a shorter time; (d) Those using social media more than four hours daily have a higher level of acceptance of diverse appearances; (e) The generation Y has the highest tolerance level of the acceptance of diverse appearances whereas generation Z has the lowest tolerance level.
Keywords: Social media, Social network, Generations, Acceptance of diversity, Scale

INTRODUCTION

In today's world, where the rapidly growing widespread use of social media prevails, generations and the transfer of values have changed dimensions, causing the networks' influence and reflections to transform every field. People are now able to communicate globally with small-sized devices such as smartphones and watches via an internet connection and live a life as part of the online world separate from the real world.

The unique nature of the online world and its inclusion of different forms of communication have exposed the societies and generations it contains to different effects, making it necessary to re-question the transfer of values and behaviors and the communication of generations. According to Morsümbül (2014), understanding a society requires understanding values since it is the guiding element that forms the basis of the generations and social norms which build the society. Behaviors that occur in line with values change with factors such as socialization experiences, faith, personal characteristics, and family life of each individual. In today's society, the global interaction of social media networks that affect the transfer of value in a way has established various togetherness and revealed cultural diversity.

The dominant culture is the participatory culture today. In this culture, a person cares about what other people think about his/her behavior. In social networks, people are curious about what each other is doing and they produce content on various topics with many purposes to be liked. In this respect, social media networks point to online society as a virtual environment model of participatory culture. Nowadays, participatory culture has changed direction with the online togetherness, and the interaction which is established with various online social forms has led to the differentiation of intergenerational communication and value transfer (Akyazı and Tutgun-Ünal, 2013).

When the generation studies around the world are examined, it is seen that the generations are examined by grouping. These groups are named as Silent Generation (1927-1945), Baby Boomer (1946-1964), Generation X (1965-1979), Generation Y (1980-1999), and Generation Z (2000 and later). However, generations in similar years may appear with different names in other studies. (Berkup, 2014; Census, 2006:2; Dewanti and Indrajit, 2018; Ekşili and Antalyalı, 2017; Johnson and Johnson, 2010:7; Toruntay, 2011; Tutgun-Ünal, 2013; Tutgun-Ünal and Deniz, 2020; Zemke et al., 2013:24).

When the literature is examined, it is seen that different generations show different characteristics in the adaptation to work-life, technology, and even life. Thus, it is important to consider the conditions of the period in the research

---

which focuses on understanding the generations that use social media. As such, it is stated that technology was not common in the period of the Baby Boomer generation who were born between the years of 1946 and 1964, therefore they had to do and produce their own work. People born in this period are respectful to authority, have a high job loyalty, and are conventional. When we consider the relationship of technology and the Generation X who were born between the years of 1965 and 1979, the tools that they have used back then such as the wringer washer, transistor radio, cassette player are now almost disappeared and thought to be nostalgic. Thus, with the widespread use of computer systems, transformations have been experienced in many areas and making them necessary to adapt to changing ways of doing business. It is observed that Baby Boomer Generation and Generation X, who later met with computer systems, are now coming together and socializing with younger generations on social media networks (Tutgun-Ünal, 2013).

Considering Generations Y and Z, it is seen that Generation Y, involving the people born between the years of 1980 and 1999, is the generation in which the differences are felt most clearly (Ekşili and Antalyalı, 2017; Latif and Serbest, 2014; Tutgun-Ünal, 2013). Generation Y, who were introduced to technology at an earlier age compared to other generations, have high self-esteem, are impatient in work life, and insist on their ideas. On the other hand, the most important feature that distinguishes Generation Z, which includes those born in 2000 and after, from other generations is that they were born at a time when information technologies and social media were widely used. According to the Turkey Statistical Institute (TUIK)'s data, the ratio of the youth between the ages of 15-19, who are in Generation Z and born after 2000, to the total population has reached approximately 13%; and the ratio of the generation between the ages of 20-39, who are in the Generation Y and born after 1980, to the total population reached approximately to 32% (TÜİK, 2018). This high rate of Generations Y and Z, reaching 45% in total, has led many researchers to engage in intergenerational studies (Deniz and Tutgun-Ünal, 2019; Borges-Rey, 2015; Boomsocial, 2019; Ekşili and Antalyalı, 2017; Morsümbül, 2014; Tutgun-Ünal and Deniz, 2020).

The researchers aimed to understand and reveal the differences of Generations Y and Z's experiences and expectations in areas such as work, family, and education life due to the intensive social media usage time (Akdemir et al., 2013; Ekşili and Antalyalı, 2017; İnce, 2018; Latif and Serbest, 2014; Mücevher, 2015; Taş, Demirdöğmez and Küçükoğlu, 2017; Tutgun-Ünal, 2013). On the other hand, a wide range of evaluations are also made, including the development characteristics of the country, the impact of gender on work life with industrialization, and education/training conditions when generation characteristics are investigated (Kesgin, 2018; Tutar, 2020a; 2020b; Tutgun-Ünal, 2019). Studies have emphasized that there are intergenerational similarities as well as differences, so generations should be addressed from this aspect as well. (Ekşili and Antalyalı, 2017; Özdemir, 2017; Toruntay, 2011; Tutgun-Ünal, 2013).

Generations were compared in terms of the basic values such as "Openness to Change", "Conservatism", "Self-Empowerment" and "Self-Transcendence" in the study of Morsümbül (2014) based on the value approach of Schwartz (1992, 1994). As a result of the research, in which the transformation of intergenerational cultural values between three generations was questioned in the Ankara sample, it was determined that the transformation of values between generations was not fast, but that great changes could occur in the long run. Further, it was emphasized that knowing and acting according to the intergenerational differences could be effective in solving the problems. In this context, considering the speed of information dissemination in social media networks and the power of influence of the networks, the potential to make great changes in a short time has transformed the ways of understanding the value transfer.

Christakis and Fowler (2012) suggested in their study of the influencing power of social networks that online networks have up to three degrees of the power to influence emotions. Accordingly, emotions in social networks affect the people in the network up to three degrees. Mathematical analysis of the social networks they made showed that the likelihood of a person being happy increases 15% when someone from one degree away is happy, 10% when someone from two degrees away (friend of a friend), and %6 when someone from three degrees away (friend of a friend of a friend). If it is four degrees away, the effect diminishes. Thus, as a person's network in social media expands, the power of influence also increases, and it is seen that especially three degrees of influence intensify.

The fact that social networks enabling global communication has paved the way for the formation of mosaic structures around the world by providing an environment for interaction with people of different cultures, beliefs, appearances, and values. Thus, it has been wondered how the online mosaic structures will reflect on the society in real daily life and how they will affect the communication and behavior forms in various areas. In this respect, the degree to which the social media generations accept people with different religious beliefs and cultures, different appearances, and even different opinions becomes very important in understanding social cohesion. Only

with the description of the current situation the direction of expectations, understanding, and communication between generations become clear.

In the global world, changes spread rapidly through social networks, exposing generations to different effects. To İçli (2001), globalization causes an increase in the movement of goods and people around the world and a rapid change in the cultural processes. According to this, while "national" had a privileged position in modernity, it seems to have lost this position in the globalization process, and the social relations that had taken place in the national time and space have now moved to the times and places where differences are emphasized. New communication networks and cultural flows take place rapidly through symbols such as moving and/or still images. The most obvious example of this is the social media networks known for their popularity today, by allowing different cultures to be met and seen side by side.

Today, it is seen that the high-speed social change that occurs with the effect of many factors such as technology, economy, and social events creates an intense interaction between cultures and affects all generations by spreading on a global scale through online networks. In this context, some characteristics that are stated to be evident for generations and the extent to which the differences created by global interaction affect generations at regular intervals are reconsidered, thereby generations will be better understood and social cohesion will be ensured as a natural result of this.

Thus, "levels of social media generations' acceptance of diversity" was determined as the problem statement in this study. Concordantly, it is important to compare the levels of acceptance of diverse religions/ethnicities, diverse appearances and diverse ideas in terms of generations, and to reveal how values and behaviors are transformed by the effect of social media.

The Conceptual Framework of Diversity

The technological changes in the world have recently made the concept of diversity gain importance. Because people with diverse identities coming from different cultures and countries are more intertwined than before and the studies on the subject are increasing as they approach today. When we look at the etymological origin of the concept, we see that it comes from the Arabic root as "frk" and is associated with the words of "separation", "dissociation", "distinction", and "differentiation" (Turkish Etymological Dictionary, 2021).

There must be two or more things in the subject being evaluated for a difference to occur. When the literature is examined, differences are observed even in the conceptual definition and types of differences. Sonnenschein states that differences are defined as "differences between people in terms of race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, age and physical abilities", but the differences have various dimensions such as ethnic origin, national origin, class, religion, education and communication style, place of birth and occupation (Sonnenschein, 1997:3). Supporting the definition, Resources also says that differences mean more than race and gender (Human Resources, 2003; 43). In the field of philosophy, the concept of difference is defined as "the feature that distinguishes every natural, social and conscious event and phenomenon from all others" (http://www.tdk.org.tr). Looking at the differences objectively, we see that people have a series of physical and cultural differences that make up the "range of differences". From a subjective point of view, difference or being different is attributed to other individuals or groups that are different from the individuals themselves or the groups they belong to (Loden and Rosener, 1991,18).

Most people see differences as negativities that should be avoided. However, differences should be considered as the emergence of personal talents and opportunities that help the individual to establish healthy relationships with others. As it is not possible to ignore the differences in terms of businesses, what needs to be done is to think about how differences can be managed (Budak, 2008:398-400). The Society for Human Resource Management in the USA, which has conducted studies towards managing diversity, stated that diversity is often used to express differences based on ethnicity, gender, age, religion, disability, national origin, and sexual orientation according to human resources professionals. Further, it covers an unlimited range of unique features and experiences such as communication styles, speed of learning and understanding, and physical characteristics such as height and weight, (Robbins and Coulter, 2012).

One of the first things that come to mind when talking about the concept of difference is the concept of "identity". It can be seen with various names in the literature. The identity reflects how a person defines and positions himself/herself in the social world, who he/she is, and where he/she stands. The definition of identity, which can be defined as "the whole of the characteristics of an individual or group that differ from other individuals or groups", is always made according to an "other". In other words, definition of identity "passes from the other, through the other" (Bilgin, 2003:199). It should be emphasized that each identity includes an exclusion mechanism.

Each identity has to be defined by its opposite. Making a common identity definition always requires the existence of those who are not included in this identity (Kılıçbay, 2003). The most effective factor in the formation of an identity is family. Family structure, on the other hand, differs with many factors. Parallel to these differences in family structure, there are also differences among individuals who form families. Each family has a certain income status, a cultural structure, the educational status of the members of the family, their living standards, and the types of the profession they have that provide their livelihoods may also differ from each other (KEDV 2006). These diversities directly affect the individual's perspective on differences because the individual starts to get to know the world within his/her family first. Following the family, school life and social environments are effective in the formation of the personality of the individual. This emerging personality directly affects tolerance towards differences or not recognizing differences.

Tarhan (2020a) defines the family as the cornerstone of society and emphasizes the need for families to receive awareness training by experts because only a conscious family will be able to nurse their children emotionally and provide a suitable peaceful growing environment for them. According to Tarhan (2020b), the *5S* model is needed for the development of trust. These are: Love, Respect, Patience, Loyalty and Sincerity *(Sevgi, Saygı, Sabır, Sadakat, Samimiyet)*. The trust-based communication environment provided within the family affects tolerance to differences.

Cultural differences highlight many differences among social situations. In the literature review, various surveys were seen for cultural differences and there are many models for this difference. According to the literature reviews, cultural differences can be classified under the following main headings.

Universalism and Specialism: Culture dominates in universalist culture; rules determine everything. Everyone must obey the rules. It is widely believed that once the rules are not followed, the system will collapse. In a significant part of Eastern societies, specialism is more dominant.

Collectivism and Individualism: Collectivistic culture sees the group as a goal and accepts the development of individuals as a means of achieving this goal. According to the individualistic culture, the goal is the "individual"; developments in the community order are tools that serve the individual. Individualism is generally accepted as a feature of a modernizing society. It took centuries for a person to emerge as an individual from the community that surrounds him/her.

Plain and Emotional: Members of emotionally plain cultures do not reflect their emotions and they carefully control them. This does not mean that they are cold or unfeeling. In these cultures, calmness and self-control is admirable. On the other hand, a member of an emotional culture expresses his/her feelings instantly by laughing, smiling, sulking, and displaying gestures. Transparency and expressing emotions reduce tensions. Warm, lively, and uplifting expressions are admired in these cultures.

Detailed and Specific: Everything is interconnected with each other in detailed cultures. However, indirect and winding ways are used when establishing relationships between people. There is a morality that changes according to the person and the situation. In detailed cultures, people's public living space and private living space are intertwined. Whereas in specific cultures, people's public living space and private living space are separated from each other. Direct and goal-oriented relationships are established. There is a moral understanding based on principles and independent of the person addressed.

Recognition by Gaining Status: In all societies, some members are assigned a higher status than others. However, in some societies, people gain their status based on what they do, their efforts, and achievements. In some societies, status is given to people for reasons such as age, family, gender, education. In acquisitive cultures, a title is earned to the extent of the contribution made to the job or the society in which the people are evaluated according to their knowledge and skills. In recognizing cultures, titles are the indicators of status and are widely used. The respect shown to managers, chiefs, and chairmen is seen as a measure of commitment to the group or organization.

According to Time View: Only human beings have the concept of time in the living world. History, family, ethnic/national origins are of great importance in past-oriented cultures. On the other hand, the activities and tastes of the present moment in time come to the fore in present-oriented cultures. Plans are not challenged, but rarely implemented. Everything is viewed in terms of its current effect. However, opportunities and potentials are emphasized in future-oriented cultures. There is great interest in youth and their future potential. Past and present times are evaluated in terms of future benefits.

Way of Thinking: Cultures also differ in whether people who think simultaneously or in order (consecutively) of all time. In sequential cultures, there is only one activity at a time. Relationships depend on the calendar; the time of the appointments is fixed. The tendency towards following the initial plan is strong. In cultures that think simultaneously, more than one activity is carried out at the same time. Calendars are usually organized by relationships.

According to Environmental View: There is also a difference between the cultures in terms approaching the environment. In some cultures, success is associated with the control over external conditions and they are internally oriented. In other words, they have a strong belief that they can impose their will on nature and their environment. A dominance attitude prevails based on the concept of environmental aggression. Their focus is on their own existence, functions, and organizations. They feel uncomfortable when the environment seems out of control. Whereas in some cultures, there is a strong belief that human beings are a part of the environment and that they should adapt themselves to the laws and forces ofnature. Here, a flexible attitude, compromise, and peace are essential, and harmony, understanding, and sensitivity are valued. The focus is not "me" but the "other". Waves and changes are welcomed to the extent that they are natural (Aksu 2008, from Dicleli and Akkam).

People's need to believe is seen in all historical ages. But in today's societies, differences in religious terms represent social differences in general and one of the differences in society in particular. From a social perspective, religion is a superstructure institution that affects traditional rules and practices of individuals. "Religious Orientation" can be defined as the expression of an individual's evaluation of a religion, to any degree or not. That is, the religious orientation is the psychological orientation of a person regarding religion and his/her world of belief. All kinds of reactions that express an individual's assessment of religion are an indicator of one's religious orientation. When religious orientation is considered together with the understanding of God and the afterdeath in religions, three important factors come to the fore: religious thought and belief, religious behavior-worship, and one's feelings and expectation of future outcome in relation to these two factors (Kuzgun and Sevim, 2004).

Barutçugil (2011:46) stated that the dimensions of diversities can be explained separately at the levels of individual, society, group, and organization. According to Barutçugil, the dimensions of diversities cause the reflection of the differentiating characteristics of each level in people living at all four levels. People who are different individually also have the characteristics of the societies, groups, and organizations they are a member of. As the status, position, and relations of the individual in social structure and communities increase, the dimensions of diversities also differ.

The Purpose of Research
The aim of the study was to examine social media generations' levels of acceptance of diversity in terms of various variables. For this purpose, the following research questions were sought.
1. What is the level of social media generations' acceptance of diversity?
2. Does the social media generations' acceptance of diversity differ?
3. Does the social media generations' acceptance of diversity differ according to gender?
4. Does the social media generations' acceptance of diversity differ according to daily usage of social media usage?
5. Does the social media generations' acceptance of diversity differ based on the onset of social media usage?

METHOD
Since the study aims to analyze the social media generations' levels of acceptance of diversity in terms of various variables, the general screening model was used for revealing the existing situation. According to Karasar (2018), general screening models are used to reveal the existing situation in a universe containing a large number of elements.

Research Group
The sample consisted of 516 participants, 57% of whom were women (n:294) and 43% of men (n:222), who were considered to be in different generations. Thus, the sample was determined through appropriate (accessible) sampling. According to this, 5.8% of the participants were the Baby Boomer Generation (n:30) born between the years of 1946-1964, 6.6% was the Generation X (n:34) born between the years of 1965-1979, 35.5% was the Generation Y (n:183) born between the years of 1980-1999, and 52.1% was the Generation Z (n:269) born between the years of 2000-2020.

Furthermore, 395 people (76.6%) of the sample are groups who are still students. The proportion of Generation Z participants who are still studying at secondary school is 54.2%. The rate of high school students is 14.4%, 17.7%

of undergraduate students, the rate of graduate students is 9.4%, and the rate of doctoral students is 1.3%. When the last schools that they graduated were questioned, 45.5% of the sample have an undergraduate degree, 16.5% high school diploma, 12.4% graduate degree, 11.6% doctorate degree, 8.3% of them are graduates of college, 4.1% a have secondary school diploma, and 1.7% have primary school diploma.

Data Collection Tools
In the research, data were collected with the "Acceptance of Diversity Scale (ADS)" which is developed by Deniz and Tutgun-Ünal (2019). ADS consists of two three subscales, namely "Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities", "Acceptance of Diverse Appearances" and "Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values". Acceptance of Diversity Scale includes people's acceptance and prejudices towards diverse religious/ethnic structures, diverse appearances, ideas and life values in the work and family environments.

The 1st and 3rd items that are located in the ADS's Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities subscale and all items in the Acceptance of Diverse Appearances and Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values subscales should be scored in reverse. Obtaining high scores from these subscales reveal more accepted diversities (Deniz and Tutgun-Ünal, 2019).

The 1st, 2nd and 3rd items of the ADS which were included in Annex-1 measure "Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities"; 4th, 5th, and 6th items measure "Acceptance of Diverse Appearances"; and 7th, 8th, and 9th items measure "Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values" dimensions. ADS is a 5-point Likert type scale and the participation in the items was organized with the options of "never", "rarely", "sometimes", "often", and "always". The Cronbach α internal consistency coefficient was 0.77 in the total of the scale.

The data of the participants such as birth year, gender, daily social media usage time, and how long they have been using social media were also collected by an information form organized by the researchers in the study.

Data Collection and Analysis
In the research, the data were collected from the generations available in accordance with the principle of volunteering. In order to fill out the questionnaire form, an average of 15 minutes was sufficient. Data collection was carried out in 5 weeks.

Levels of acceptance of diversities are graded as "low", "moderate", and "high" by dividing the range into 3 by obtaining the lowest score and the highest score from each item of the ADS. For the subscales, the related items were also graded in the same way, and "Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities", "Acceptance of Diverse Appearances" and "Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values" values were set (Table 1).

Table 1. Ranges of Acceptance Levels of Diversity Scores

Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities	Acceptance of Diverse Appearances	Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values	Acceptance of Diversity Scale	Level
3-7	3-7	3-7	9-21	Low
8-11	8-11	8-11	22-33	Moderate
12-15	12-15	12-15	34-45	High

To analyze the data SPSS 22 statistics program was used by implementing various techniques such as frequency tests, t-test, and variance analysis.

FINDINGS
In this part of the study, the acceptance levels of diversity of 516 participants consisting of the X, Y, Z, and Baby Boomer generations were statistically examined in the light of the research questions by applying the ADS.

Results regarding the social media generations' acceptance levels of diversity
Firstly, to determine the social media generations' level of acceptance of diversity, analyses were made in line with the scores obtained from the total of ADS and subscales which are given in Table 2. Accordingly, the social media generations' levels of acceptance of diversity were found to be moderate.

Table 2. Generations' Acceptance Levels of Diversity

Sub-scale/Scale	n	$\underline{X}$	sd
Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities	516	11,62	3,06
Acceptance of Diverse Appearances	516	11,11	3,30
Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values	516	9,87	2,30
ADS	516	32,61	6,23

While the lowest score that can be obtained from the ADS is 9, the highest score is 45, and the in-between scores are divided into three values as "low", "moderate", and "high". Accordingly, a score of 32.61 received by social media generations shows that there is a moderate acceptance tolerance for diversity.

When the subscales are considered, it is seen that each subscale consists of three items and the lowest possible score is 3 and the highest score is 15. Thus, when examining the level ranges obtained by dividing the difference between the lowest possible score and the highest score into three, it was found that they showed a moderate level of acceptance tolerance in the subscales of "Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities", "Acceptance of Diverse Appearances" and "Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values".

Results regarding the difference of the social media generations' acceptance levels of diversity
In order to determine whether social media generations' level of acceptance of diversity differs or not, the scores obtained from the ADS and sub-scales were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance and are given in Table 3. According to this, Generation Z showed the lowest tolerance in terms of accepting diverse religions/ethnicities. In other words, the level of acceptance of diverse religions/ethnicities of Generation Z is significantly lower than other generations ($p < 0.00$). When we examine the dimension of acceptance of diverse appearances, the generation with the highest acceptance level was Y, and the acceptance level of the Baby Boomer Generation and Generation Z was found to be significantly lower than Generation Y ($p < 0.00$). There is no significant difference between generations in the dimension of accepting diverse ideas/values.

Table 3. The Difference of Generations' Acceptance Levels of Diversity

Sub-scale/Scale	Generations	n	$\underline{X}$	sd	F	p	Difference
Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities	Baby Boomer	30	12,13	3,07	35,21	,00	Z< B. B. Z< X Z< Y
	X	34	13,26	1,91			
	Y	183	12,98	2,25			
	Z	269	10,42	3,16			
	Total	516	11,62	3,06			
Acceptance of Diverse Appearances	Baby Boomer	30	10,40	3,76	17,53	,00	B. B.<Y Z<Y
	X	34	11,29	3,17			
	Y	183	12,43	2,78			
	Z	269	10,27	3,31			
	Total	516	11,11	3,30			
Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values	Baby Boomer	30	10,03	2,04	1,07	,35	-
	X	34	9,94	1,93			
	Y	183	10,08	2,11			
	Z	269	9,69	2,48			
	Total	516	9,87	2,30			
ADS	Baby Boomer	30	32,56	5,87	29,64	,00	B. B.<Y Z<X Z<Y
	X	34	34,50	5,04			
	Y	183	35,50	5,65			
	Z	269	30,40	5,92			
	Total	516	32,61	6,23			

In the total of the scale, the Generation Z's acceptance level of the diversity was found to be significantly lower in comparison to Generations X and Y ($p < 0.00$). When the average scores obtained from the ADS are examined, the lowest score for all generations belongs to Z. On the other hand, a significant difference was found between the Baby Boomer generation and the Generation Y, where the Generation Y's acceptance level of diversity was found to be high.

Results regarding the difference of the social media generations' acceptance levels of diversity based on gender
In order to determine the difference of the social media generations' acceptance levels of diversity based on gender, the scores obtained from the ADS and subscales were analyzed with the independent group t-test and the obtained data are given in Table 4. To this, significant differences were found in the subscales and the total of the scale where women's acceptance levels of the diversity were higher than those of men. Accordingly, women have higher levels of acceptance of diverse religions/ethnicities, diverse appearances and diverse ideas/values than men.

Table 4. The Difference of Acceptance Levels of Diversity Based on Gender

Sub-scale/Scale	Gender	n	$\underline{X}$	sd	df	t	p
Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities	Female	294	12,14	2,85	514	4,562	,000
	Male	222	10,92	3,19			
Acceptance of Diverse Appearances	Female	294	11,65	3,02	514	4,328	,000
	Male	222	10,40	3,53			
Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values	Female	294	10,32	3,07	514	3,502	,001
	Male	222	9,37	3,06			
ADS	Female	294	34,13	6,90	514	5,324	,000
	Male	222	30,70	7,65			

In the detailed examinations carried out in terms of generations, variations are spotted in the Generation Y and Z (Table 5). Accordingly, women's acceptance levels of diversity were found to be higher than men in the Y and Z generations. However, in Generation Z, there was no gender difference in the acceptance of diverse appearances.

Table 5. The Difference of Generations' Acceptance Levels of Diversity Based on Gender

Generation	Sub-scale/Scale	Gender	n	$\underline{X}$	sd	df	t	p
Y	Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities	Female	111	13,43	1,92	181	3,396	,001
		Male	72	12,30	2,55			
	Acceptance of Diverse Appearances	Female	111	12,82	2,52	181	2,393	,018
		Male	72	11,83	3,06			
	Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values	Female	111	10,57	1,74	181	4,090	,000
		Male	72	9,31	2,41			
	ADS	Female	111	36,83	4,74	181	4,120	,000
		Male	72	33,45	6,32			
Z	Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities	Female	154	11,06	3,09	267	3,927	,000
		Male	115	9,57	3,05			
	Acceptance of Diverse Appearances	Female	154	10,95	3,14	267	3,971	,000
		Male	115	9,37	3,34			
	Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values	Female	154	9,75	2,38	267	,465	-
		Male	115	9,61	2,61			
	ADS	Female	154	31,77	5,46	267	4,559	,000
		Male	115	28,56	6,04			

Results regarding the difference of the social media generations' acceptance levels of diversity based on daily social media usage
In order to determine the difference of the social media generations' acceptance levels of diversity according to daily social media usage, one-way analysis of variance, LSD test, Acceptance of Diversity Scale, and the scores obtained from the sub-scales were used to analyze the differences and the data obtained are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. The Difference of Acceptance Levels of Diversity Based on Daily Usage of Social Media

Sub-scale/Scale	Generations	n	$\underline{X}$	sd	F	p	Difference
Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities	Less than 1 hour	137	11,04	3,01	2,461	,062	-
	1-3 hours	232	11,86	2,91			
	4-6 hours	85	11,91	3,35			
	More than 7 hours	24	11,45	2,90			
	Total	478	11,61	3,04			
	Less than 1 hour	137	10,81	3,27	3,035	,029	Less 1 h. < 4-6 h.

Sub-scale/Scale	Group	n	X̄	sd	F	p	Difference
Acceptance of Diverse Appearances	1-3 hours	232	11,09	3,35			1-3 h. < 4-6 h. 7 h. more < 4-6 h.
	4-6 hours	85	11,91	3,02			
	More than 7 hours	24	10,00	3,21			
	Total	478	11,10	3,29			
Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values	Less than 1 hour	137	9,57	3,17			
	1-3 hours	232	10,16	3,05			
	4-6 hours	85	9,97	3,20	1,209	,306	-
	More than 7 hours	24	9,50	2,71			
	Total	478	9,93	3,10			
ADS	Less than 1 hour	137	31,43	6,91			
	1-3 hours	232	33,13	7,51			Less 1 h. < 1-3 sa.
	4-6 hours	85	33,81	7,76	2,736	,043	Less 1 h. < 4-6 sa.
	More than 7 hours	24	30,95	6,18			
	Total	478	32,65	7,37			

To this, a significant difference was found in the acceptance of diverse appearances. As the duration of daily usage of social media is increased, the tolerance of diverse appearances has also increased. It has been determined that the use of social media for 4 hours or more per day leads to differentiation. Accordingly, it has been found that those who use social media for 4 hours or more a day have higher levels of acceptance of diverse appearance than those who use it less. When the total ADS was examined, it was found that generations with less than 1 hour of social media usage had lower acceptance levels of diversities.

Results regarding the difference of the social media generations' acceptance levels of diversity based on social media usage time
In order to determine the difference of the social media generations' acceptance levels of diversity according to social media usage time, one-way analysis of variance and LSD test were conducted and the obtained results are used to analyze the differences which are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. The Difference of Acceptance Levels of Diversity Based on Social Media Usage Time

Sub-scale/Scale	Generations	n	*X*	sd	F	p	Difference
Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities	Less than a year	40	10,42	3,17			Less 1 y. < 7-9 y.
	1-3 years	124	11,14	3,06			Less 1 y. < 10 y. more
	4-6 years	146	10,99	3,19			1-3 y. < 7-9 y.
	7-9 years	103	12,37	2,87	10,826	,000	1-3 y. < 10 y. more
	More than 10 years	100	12,93	2,25			4-6 y. < 7-9 y.
	Total	513	11,64	3,04			4-6 y. < 10 y. more 7-9 y. < 10 y. more
Acceptance of Diverse Appearances	Less than a year	40	10,20	3,49			Less 1 y. < 7-9 y.
	1-3 years	124	10,72	2,95			Less 1 y. < 10 y. more
	4-6 years	146	10,77	3,61			1-3 y. < 7-9 y.
	7-9 years	103	11,78	3,35	4,243	,002	1-3 y. < 10 y. more
	More than 10 years	100	11,92	2,83			4-6 y. < 7-9 y.
	Total	513	11,14	3,29			4-6 y. < 10 y. more
Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values	Less than a year	40	9,40	3,23			
	1-3 years	124	9,31	3,15			Less 1 y. < 7-9 y.
	4-6 years	146	9,63	2,97			1-3 y. < 7-9 y.
	7-9 years	103	10,80	2,97	4,677	,001	1-3 y. < 10 y. more
	More than 10 years	100	10,43	3,08			4-6 y. < 7-9 y.
	Total	513	9,92	3,10			4-6 y. < 10 y. more
ADS	Less than a year	40	30,02	7,21			Less 1 y. < 7-9 y.
	1-3 years	124	31,18	6,62			Less 1 y. < 10 y. more
	4-6 years	146	31,39	7,65			1-3 y. < 7-9 y.
	7-9 years	103	34,97	7,45	9,849	,000	1-3 y. < 10 y. more
	More than 10 years	100	35,28	6,65			4-6 y. < 7-9 y.
	Total	513	32,71	7,39			4-6 y. < 10 y. more

It appears that there are significant differences in the subscales and the total of the scale. For example, those who have been using social media for a long time showed higher levels of acceptance of diversity.

It can also be said that as the time of social media use increases, the acceptance of diverse religions/ethnicities, acceptance of diverse appearances, and acceptance of diverse ideas/values increases in line with the obtained scores.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the study, which examined the social media generations' levels of acceptance of diversity, some results were obtained in line with the data obtained by applying the Acceptance of Differences Scale (ADS), which includes the dimensions of "Acceptance of Diverse Religions/Ethnicities", "Acceptance of Diverse Appearances" and "Acceptance of Diverse Ideas/Values". The differences between the Baby Boomer, X, Y, and Z generations, which consist of 516 social media users, were found to be moderate. This result obtained from the total ADS was also reflected in the subscales and it was revealed that the generations generally accepted the diversities in all dimensions at a moderate level. In other words, they showed tolerance.

Intergenerational comparisons showed that Generation Z has the lowest tolerance in terms of accepting diverse religions/ethnicities. As a result of this low tolerance by significantly differentiating from all generations when compared to other generations, it was revealed by questioning whether or not agreeing with these statements: "I have friends with different religious beliefs", "I can participate in the same working group with people of different religious beliefs", "I would establish friendships with people from different ethnic groups".

In the examinations made in the dimension of "acceptance of diverse appearances", the generation with the highest acceptance level was Y, and the acceptance level of Baby Boomer and Generation Z was found to be significantly lower than Y. This subscale included items such as: "I would consider someone who wears jewelry (piercing) on their nose, eyebrow or tongue as culturally lost.", "I would feel sorry for someone who has piercings on various parts of their body." and "If I am an employer, I wouldn't prefer someone with tattoos all over their body". Moreover, it has been revealed that Generation Y has a high tolerance to diversity and accepts such situations more than other generations.

When examining generation studies in the literature, it is seen that the Generation Y is the generation in which the differences are felt most clearly (Ekşili and Antalyalı, 2017; Kelgökmen İlic and Yalçın, 2017; Tutgun-Ünal, 2013). When the characteristics of the Generation Y are examined, it is stated that their self-esteem is high and they tend to form unity by nurturing a sense of belonging to people from different segments, views or opinions. Further, if the Generation Y gets support from their families, they show more self-defensive behaviors and their self-confidence increases. In this direction, as a result of the research, the fact that Ys accept people with diverse appearance (wearing jewelry, tattooing, etc.) at a high level has confirmed the studies in the literature.

On the other hand, it can be said that the low tolerance seen in Generation Z is added to the literature as a new result. While it is predicted that the younger generations, especially the Generation Z, who have been familiar with social media from an early age, will differentiate from traditional values by providing more interaction with the modern world, it may be due to the protective attitude of families towards their children from a young age since they have a close attitude to traditional values since it is known that social events affect the value transfer of generations. In this context, after the social events that took place in the world in a certain period when Generation Y had an active role, it can be thought that there may be sensitivity in social structures and this situation can be reflected by families on children.

In the study where investigations were made in the total of the ADS, Generation Z's level of acceptance of diversity was found to be lower than X and Y generations who are older than Generation Z, which was born in 2000 and after. It is noteworthy that the Zs did not differ from the Baby Boomer Generation born between 1946-1964. It can be said that the protective attitude developed after the aforementioned social events formed the ground for the growth of a Generation Z close to the traditional generation.

However, considering that Generation Z is predominantly composed of middle and high school students in the study, it can be said that the situation may change in the following years, students may go to university in different provinces, get married, establish roommates, use of technology may differ, and their values and behaviors may change with environmental factors. Thus, they should be followed. On the other hand, it has been revealed that Y's level of acceptance of the diversity, which is called the generation where the differences are felt most clearly, is higher than other generations in line with the score they received from the scale. This situation can be met as a natural result when considered in line with the generation researches in the literature.

In comparisons made according to gender, women's acceptance levels of diversity were found to be higher than men in Y and Z generations. It has been observed that this differentiation seen in younger generations is not reflected in older generations. Many studies on whether social media use differentiates according to gender are included in the literature and are discussed (Balcı and Gölcü, 2013; Çam and İşbulan, 2012; Özdemir, 2017; Tutgun-Ünal, 2015; Tutgun-Ünal, 2019). Different results are mentioned especially in digital addiction researches such as internet addiction, mobile phone addiction, and social media addiction. In a study on social media addiction, it was found that women depend more on social media for emotional support than men. In the same research, it is stated that men are negatively affected by social media and they have conflicts with people around them because of their use of social media (Tutgun-Ünal, 2015). On the other hand, when other studies are examined, it was emphasized that there is no gender difference in terms of social media addiction and daily social media use in a study conducted with Y generation university students (Tutgun-Ünal, 2019).

In the examinations made according to the daily social media usage time, it was revealed that the differences in social media use for 4 hours or more per day affect the level of acceptance of appearances. Accordingly, those who use social media for 4 hours or more a day have a high tolerance of acceptance towards people who wear piercings and tattoos on various parts of their body. When all dimensions were evaluated together in the total scale, it was concluded that the social media generations' acceptance levels of diversities for 1 hour a day were found to be low. It is stated in researches that 4 hours of internet use per day is significant in detecting internet addiction along with other determinants. (Goldberg, 1996; Young, 1996a,b, 2009). In this respect, it can be said that generations who spend 4 hours or more a day at social media have a risk in terms of negativities that may arise from overuse. On the other hand, it is natural for those who use social media for 4 hours or more to be more exposed to the differences in the wide communication network provided on a global scale compared to those who use it for less time and therefore normalize these differences in their lives.

In the study questioning how long generations have been using social media, the acceptance level of diversity among the generations who have used social media for a longer time is found to be higher. In line with the total scores of ADS, it was concluded that as the time of social media use increases, the acceptance of diverse religions/ethnicities, acceptance of diverse appearances and acceptance of diverse ideas/values increase. In this context, it can be said that people who make social media a part of their lives exhibit a more transitive structure in the formation of values and behaviors by establishing a bridge between the online world and the real world.

As a result of the research, it is confirmed once again that developments in the technological, economic, political, and social fields can cause changes in the cultural structures of societies. Accordingly, generations born in different time periods may show different characteristics. Thus, it has been concluded that there is a need for multidimensional analysis of generational studies considering the effects of social media networks that mediate global communication on values and behaviors.

REFERENCES

Akdemir, A., Konakay, G., Demirkaya, H., Noyan, A., Demir, B., Ağ, C., and et.al. (2013). Y kuşağının kariyer algısı, kariyer değişimi ve liderlik tarzı beklentilerinin araştırılması [The investigation of relationship between organizational an investigation of expectations of career perception and change, and leadership style of generation y]. *Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 11–42.

Aksu N. (2008). Örgüt kültürü bağlamında farklılıkların yönetimi ve bir uygulama [Diversity management from organizational culture perspective and a research]. *Doktora Tezi [PhD Thesis]*, Uludağ University, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bursa, Turkey.

Akyazı, E. and Tutgun-Ünal, A. (2013). İletişim fakültesi öğrencilerinin amaç, benimseme, yalnızlık düzeyi ilişkisi bağlamında sosyal ağları kullanımı [Purpose, adoption and level of loneliness relation and the use of social networks: A study on undergraduate communication students]. *Global Media Journal TR*, 3(6), 1–24.

Balcı, Ş. and Gölcü, A. (2013). Facebook addiction among university students in Turkey: "Selçuk University Example". Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 34, 255–278.

Barutçugil, İ. (2011). Kültürlerarası farklılıkların yönetimi, Kariyer Yayıncılık.

Berkup, S. B. (2014). Working with generations X and Y in generation Z period: Management of different generations ın business life. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5(19), 218–229.

Bilgin, N. (2003). Sosyal Psikoloji Sözlüğü, Bağlam Yayıncılık.

Boomsocial (2019). Sosyal Medya Ölçümleme & Analiz. Access: https://www.boomsocial.com/

Borges-Rey, E. (2015) News images on Instagram. *Digital Journalism*, 3(4), 571–593. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2015.1034526

Budak, G. (2008). Yetkinliğe Dayalı İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, Barış Yayınları.

Christakis, N. A. and Fowler, J.H. (2012). Sosyal ağların şaşırtıcı gücü ve yaşantımızı biçimlendiren etkisi, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Çam, E. and İşbulan, O. (2012). A new addiction for teacher candidates: Social networks. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology (TOJET), 11*(3), 14–19.

Deniz, L., and Tutgun Ünal, A. (2019). Sosyal medya çağında kuşakların sosyal medya kullanımı ve değerlerine yönelik bir dizi ölçek geliştirme çalışması [Development of a set of scales toward the use of social media and values of generations in social media age]. *OPUS–Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi [International Journal of Society Researches]*, *11*(18), 1025–1057.

Dewanti, P. and Indrajit, R.E. (2018). The effect of XYZ generation characteristics to e-commerce C-to-C: A review. *Ikraith-Informatika*, *2*(2), 56–60.

Ekşili, N. and Antalyalı, Ö.L. (2017). Türkiye'de Y kuşağı özelliklerini belirlemeye yönelik bir çalışma: Okul yöneticileri üzerine bir araştırma [A study to determine the characteristics of generation y in Turkey: A survey on school administrators]. *Humanities Sciences* (NWSAHS), *12*(3), 90–111.

Goldberg, I. (1996). Goldberg's message. Erişim adresi: http://www-usr.rider.edu/~suler/psycyber/supportgp.html

Human Resources, İnsan Kaynakları ve Yönetim Dergisi (2003). Farklılıkların yönetimi nedir, neden önemlidir, nasıl çalışır? 7(9), July 2003.

İçli, G. (2001). Küreselleşme ve kültür. *C.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *25*(2), 163–172.

İnce, F. (2018). Z kuşağının girişimcilik eğilimi: üniversite öğrencileri üzerinde bir araştırma [Entrepreneurship tendency of z generation: A study on undergraduates]. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 32, 105–113.

Johnson, K. A. (2011). The effect of Twitter posts on students' perceptions of instructor credibility. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *36*(1), 21–38.

Karasar, N. (2018). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, 33th press.

KEDV (2006). Erken çocuklukta farklılıklara saygı eğitimi el kitabı, Derin Yayınları.

Kelgökmen İlic, D. and Yalçın, B. (2017). Y jenerasyonunun farklılaşan iş değerleri ve liderlik algılamaları [Differentiated job values and leadership perceptions of gen y]. *Journal of Yaşar University*, *12*(46), 136–160.

Kesgin, Y. (2018). Türkiye'de ve ABD'de ayrımcılık karşıtlığı bağlamında media politikaları. *Doktora Tezi [PhD Thesis]*, İstanbul University, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, Turkey.

Kılıçbay, M.A. (2003). Kimlikle okyanusu. *Doğu Batı*, issue 23, pp. 155.

Kuzgun Y. and Sevim A. (2004). Kadınların çalışmasına karşı tutum ve dini yönelim arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between attitudes towards women's work roles and religious tendency]. *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences, 37*(1), pp. 18.

Latif, H. and Serbest, S. (2014). Türkiye'de 2000 kuşağı ve 2000 kuşağının iş ve çalışma anlayışı [Generation 2000 in Turkey and generation 2000's business and working concept]. *Gençlik Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2*(4), 132–163.

Loden, M. and Rosener, J. B. (1991). Workforce America! Managing employee diversity as a vital resource. Irwin Professional Publishing.

Morsümbül, Ş. (2014). Kültürel değerlerin üç kuşak arasındaki değişimi üzerine bir inceleme: Ankara örneği [A study on the cultural value change across three generations: Ankara sample]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi [University Journal of Turkish Studies/HÜTAD]*, 21, 137–160.

Mücevher, M.H. (2015). X ve Y kuşağının birbirlerine karşı özellik ve etkileşim algıları: SDÜ örneği [Characteristics and interaction perceptions of x and y generations against each other: SDU sample]. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi [Unpublished Master Thesis]*, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Isparta, Turkey.

Özdemir, Ş. (2017). Kuşaklar teorisine göre Türkiye'deki gençlerin medya kullanım alışkanlıkları ve İstanbul örneği [Media usage habits of youths based on theory of generations: İstanbul sample]. *Yüksek Lisans Tezi [Master Thesis]*, Marmara University, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, Turkey.

Robbins, S. P. and Coulter, M. (2012). Management. New Jersey: Pearson. Robbins, S. P. & Judge, T. A. (2013). Örgütsel Davranış. İ. Erdem (Çev.), Nobel.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. (M. Zanna, Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology in (pp. 1-65). New York: Academic Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are the universal aspects in the structure and content of human values. *Journal for Social Issues*, *50*(4), 19–45.

Sonnenschein, W. (1997). "The diversity toolkit: How you can build and benefit from a diverse workforce", Mcgraw-Hill.

Tarhan, N. (2020a). "Güçlü bir toplum için aile güçlendirilmeli". Access: https://www.nevzattarhan.com/prof-dr-nevzat-tarhan-guclu-bir-toplum-icin-aile-guclendirilmeli.html

Tarhan, N. (2020b). "Haz, mutluluk ve huzur ayrı kavramlar". Access: https://www.nevzattarhan.com/prof-dr-nevzat-tarhan-haz-mutluluk-ve-huzur-ayri-kavramlar.html

Taş, H.Y., Demirdöğmez, M., and Küçükoğlu, M. (2017). Geleceğin mimarları Z kuşağının iş hayatına muhtemel etkileri [Possible effects of future architects' z generation on business life]. OPUS-*Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi [International Journal of Society Researches], 7*(13), 1031–1048.

Toruntay, H. (2011). Takım rolleri çalışması: X ve Y kuşağı üzerinde karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi [Unpublished Master Thesis]*, İstanbul University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Tutar, C. (2020a). Postmodern kentsel mekanda kültürel belleğin inşa süreci: Televizyon dizilerinde öne çıkan nostaljik eğilimler [Construction process of cultural memory in postmodern urban space: Prominent nostalgic trends in television series]. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi [The Journal of Akdeniz University's Faculty of Communication]*, 34, 102–121.

Tutar, C. (2020b). Gastronomi kültürünün inşası ve dönüşümünde televizyon: Masterchef Türkiye ve the Taste Türkiye programları örneği [Television in the construction and transformation of gastronomic culture: The cases of MasterChef Turkey and The Taste Türkiye programs" *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi [İstanbul University Journal of Sociology]*, "Yemek ve Toplum" special issue, *40*(1), 339–364.

Tutgun-Ünal, A. (2013). Nesiller ayrılıyor: X, Y ve Z nesilleri [XYZ Generations]. Açıkbilim, Access: http://www.acikbilim.com/2013/09/ dosyalar /nesiller-ayriliyor-x-y-ve-z-nesilleri.html

Tutgun-Ünal, A. (2015). Sosyal medya bağımlılığı: Üniversite öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma [Social media addiction: a research on university students]. *Doktora Tezi [PhD Thesis]*. Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Tutgun-Ünal A. (2019). A study on Z generation's social media usage, preference and educational usage in Turkey. *Azerbaijan Journal of Educational Studies*, *689*(4), 65–82. ISSN: 0134-3289

Tutgun-Ünal, A. and Deniz, L. (2020). Sosyal medya kuşaklarının sosyal medya kullanım seviyeleri ve tercihleri. *OPUS-Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi [International Journal of Society Researches]*, *15*(22), 125–144. DOI: 10.26466/opus.626283

TÜİK (2018). *Temel istatistikler/ Nüfus ve demografi/ Nüfus projeksiyonları/ Yaş grubu ve cinsiyete göre nüfus*. Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, Access: http://www.tuik.gov.tr/UstMenu.do?metod=temelist

Türk Dil Kurumu (2021). Türk Dil Kurumu Büyük Elektronik Sözlüğü, Access: http://www.tdk.gov.tr

Türkçe Etimolojik Sözlük (2021). Türkçe Etimolojik Sözlük. Access: http://www.etimolojiturkce.com/kelime/fark

Young, K. S. (1996a). Psychology of computer use: Addictive use of the internet, a case that breaks the stereotype. *Psychological Reports*, 79, 899–902.

Young, K.S. (1996b). Internet addiction: The emergence of a new clinical disorder. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, *1*(3), 237–244.

Young, K. S. (2009). Internet addiction: Diagnosis and treatment consideration. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 39, 241–246.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., and Filipczak, B. (2013). Generations at work: Managing the clash of boomers, gen Xers, and gen Yers in the workplace (2nd Ed. b.). USA: Amacom.

Annex-1. Acceptance of Diversity Scale (ADS)

Item No. / Items	NEVEr	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1 It bothers me to have friends of different religious beliefs.					
2 I can participate in the same working group with people of different religious beliefs.					
3 I do not make friends with people from different ethnic groups.					
4 I would consider someone who wears jewelry (piercing) on their nose, eyebrow or tongue as culturally lost.					
5 I would feel sorry for someone who has piercings on various parts of their body.					
6 If I am an employer, I wouldn't prefer someone with tattoos all over their body.					
7 I would disconnect from those who have contrary views on social media.					
8 I would not like to see people with outlier preferences in my family circle.					
9 It bothers me to befriend someone who has a contrary lifestyle.					