AWARENESS OF SOCIAL MEDIA TOOLS AMONG ENGINEERING FACULTIES AND STUDENTS IN PUDUCHERRY – A STUDY

R. Jayakumar

Research Scholar, Department of Library and Information Science
Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu, India

N. Tamilselvan

Research Guide, Department of Library and Information Science
Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu, India

Chief Librarian and Head
RVS College of Engineering and Technology
Coimbatore, Tamilnadu, India
tamilselvanmn@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper highlights the extent of awareness on the social media tools among the engineering faculties and students in Puducherry through a survey conducted with 551 respondents from nine engineering colleges. The findings revealed that more than 90 percent of the respondents were aware of social media tools in general; and particularly, Facebook Live was found to be most familiar among the respondents; 93.15 percent of the faculty respondents were aware of Instagram while 97.49 percent each of the students are most familiarized with Mention and Tweetdeck and 97.26 percent of the faculties opined that Friends request from unfamiliar person was found to be the major security concern while 94.56 percent of the students opined that Junk posting of photos and videos was found to be the major security concern. Overall, it was found that most of the respondents were aware of the social media tools and their applications for various purposes. However, the respondents should be motivated to make use of these tools for academic purposes through which the recognition of the institutions and their stakeholders in a better place with more visibility.

Key words: social media, engineering faculties, engineering students, social networking sites, social media tools, social media platforms

Cite this Article: R. Jayakumar and N. Tamilselvan, Awareness of Social Media Tools Among Engineering Faculties and Students in Puducherry – A Study. *International Journal of Library & Information Science*, 7(3), 2018, pp. 33–44.
<http://iaeme.com/Home/issue/IJLIS?Volume=7&Issue=3>

1. INTRODUCTION

The evolution of the social networking sites can be traced back to the shift of internet technology from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0. Web 2.0 is described as the interactive platform where two or more persons are getting involved virtually engaging in the activities (Kroski, 2007). Social networking sites became one of the most used channels of informal communication and ways to explore and exploit the knowledge resources (Steinfeld et al., 2008; Haque, 2013) and they are the most sought after sharing platforms on the internet (Alexa, 2008). Social networking sites allow their customers to interact with others sophisticatedly and express their personal feelings by sharing with friends and families (Haque, 2013; Governatori & Iannella, 2011; Murray & Waller, 2007). Classroom reading and acquiring of knowledge is becoming real time through the online media which is the fashion of the time (Russo, et al., 2009). Importantly these platforms provide a lot more than an opportunity for collaboration irrespective of the space and time (Minocha, 2009). Thus, social networking is the process where a relationship is created by a group of people with same interest. Social networking sites could be of two types namely Internal Social Networking Sites and External Social Networking Sites (Suraweere, 2010).

It is clear from the literature that social networking sites are popular and widely used by the academic fraternity in India. Though there are large number of academic oriented social networking sites available to use for academic and research purpose, only limited number of social networking sites or tools are being used in the country because of lack of awareness and experience. Imparting proper education and orientation to use social networking sites for academic purpose would result in high scholarly output because of easy access to primary data and swift and instant responses from the target audiences. Therefore, the present study intends to find out the awareness on social media tools among the faculties and students of selected engineering colleges in Puducherry.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are number of studies which appeared from 2000 to till date on social networking sites. A few prominent studies reported very recently related to the current study have been reviewed and presented below:

Asmi and Margam (2018) reported that research scholars were aware of social networking sites. Academic social networking sites such as ResearchGate and Academia.edu were found to be the most used ones by the respondents. The constraints identified while using social media were time-consuming and data security. Yan and Zhang (2018) suggested that social media tools can serve as indicators for evaluating the research activities of research institutions, and such sites can be helpful and credible for acquiring resources, keeping informed about research, and promoting academic influence. Zientek et al., (2018) emphasized that the use of Google Scholar supplements the researchers in reporting their research, improving future research, scholarly networking for collaborations, and marketing their research.

Aleryani, Mofleh and Alariki (2017) found that more than 33% of researchers are not aware of academic social network sites. Ali and Richardson (2017) showed that accruing citations was the main reason for the respondents to upload their publications. The studies by Bardakci, Arslan and U'never (2017), Meishar-Tal and Pieterse (2017), and Mering (2017) proved that the use of social network sites enhanced the research collaboration and information development with researchers across the globe. Jeng et al., (2017) motivated the respondents by stimulating scholarly interactions to reduce the rate of confusion, improving the clarity of questions, and promoting scholarly content management. The use of the social

networking sites creates impact on the research work among the respondents (Kenchakkanavar, Hadagali & Ranadev, 2017; Manca & Ranieri, 2017).

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study was carried out with the following objectives:

- To identify the level of awareness on social media tools among the faculties and students of engineering colleges in Puducherry based on their demographic variables;
- To assess whether the respondents are aware of the social media tools to organize the dashboard; to schedule posts ahead of time; to segment audience for easy following; and to automate and synchronize multiple social media apps in one Social Media tool; and
- To seek the opinion of the respondents on the awareness of the security concerns related to SM tools and platforms.

4. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A questionnaire was used to get the data related to demographic profile of the respondents and the awareness on social networking sites meant for academic related activities. A total of 716 faculty members and 9536 students were spread over the selected nine engineering colleges in Puducherry. The Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling Technique was adopted. 10 percent of Faculties and 5 percent of students were proportionately taken from each college for the study. Table 1 depicts the collection of duly filled in questionnaires.

Table 1 Status of the Respondents

S. No.	Institution	Abbreviation	Faculty (10% of Total Population)	Students (5% of Total Population)	Total	% of Response
1	Pondicherry Engineering College	PEC	14	123	137	24.86
2	Acharya College of Engineering & Technology	ACET	9	50	59	10.71
3	Alpha College of Engineering & Technology	ALCET	4	33	37	6.72
4	Christ College of Engineering & Technology	CCET	9	65	74	13.43
5	Dr. SJS Paul Memorial College of Engineering & Technology	PMCET	6	30	36	6.53
6	Manakula Vinayagar Institute of Technology	MVIT	10	75	85	15.43
7	RAAK College of Engineering & Technology	RAAKCET	3	8	11	2.00
8	Rajiv Gandhi College of Engineering & Technology	RGCET	15	75	90	16.33
9	Sri Ganesh College of Engineering & Technology	SGCET	3	19	22	3.99
Total			73	478	551	100

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Social media tools are mushrooming and gradually creating a complex situation off late for the users to identify and use reliable SM tools for various purposes. Towards this direction, an attempt was made to assess the level of awareness among the respondents on various SM tools. The options given in the questionnaire on the awareness are multiple in nature. The extent of awareness based on the demographic variables is presented in the following sections:

Gender wise awareness on social media tools

Table 2 provides the data on the Gender wise awareness on social media tools. It was found that 98.68 percent of male respondents were aware of Facebook Live which ranks first in order followed by Facebook Ads (97.68%), Mention (96.69%), Instagram (96.36%), Engage by Twitter (95.70%), Facebook Insights (95.70%), Tweetdeck (95.70%), IFTTT (94.04%), Social Hunt (93.71%), Hubspot (92.38%), Adobe Spark (87.75%), Hootsuite (79.80%), Buffer (77.81%), Everypost (76.49%), Sprout Social (71.19%), Quickmeme (70.86%), Piktochart (66.56%), Canva (64.57%), Feedly (62.58%), Buzz Sumo (62.25%), Panda 5 (60.60%), Sum All (57.28%), Nuzzel (54.64%), Brook (51.66%), and Zapier (49.34%).

With regard to female respondents, it was found that 97.19 percent of the respondents were aware of Facebook Insights which ranks first in order followed by Facebook Ads (96.79%), Mention (96.79%), Engage by Twitter (96.39%), Facebook Live (96.39%), Instagram (96.39%), Tweetdeck (96.39%), Social Hunt (95.58%), IFTTT (94.78%), Adobe Spark (93.98%), Hubspot (93.57%), Feedly (87.15%), Buffer (83.13%), Everypost (81.53%), Sprout Social (78.31%), Brook (77.51%), Hootsuite (76.31%), Piktochart (72.29%), Buzz Sumo (64.26%), Quickmeme (63.05%), Panda 5 (60.64%), Canva (53.82%), Nuzzel (52.61%), Zapier (50.20%), and Sum All (46.99%).

Overall, it was found that Facebook Live was found to be most familiar among the respondents reporting 97.53 percent followed by Facebook Ads (97.23%), Mention (96.74%), Facebook Insights (96.44%), Instagram (96.37%), Engage by Twitter (96.04%), Tweetdeck (96.04%), Social Hunt (94.65%), IFTTT (94.41%), Hubspot (92.98%), Adobe Spark (90.86%), Buffer (80.47%), Everypost (79.01%), Hootsuite (78.05%), Sprout Social (74.75%), Feedly (74.87%), Piktochart (69.42%), Quickmeme (66.96%), Brook (64.58%), Buzz Sumo (63.25%), Panda 5 (60.62%), Canva (59.19%), Nuzzel (53.62%), Sum All (52.14%), and Zapier (49.77%).

Category wise awareness on social media tools

Table 3 highlights the category wise awareness on social media tools. It was observed that out of 73 faculties from nine engineering colleges, 93.15 percent of them were aware of Instagram which ranks first in order followed by Facebook Ads (89.04%), Facebook Live (87.67%), Facebook Insights (84.93%), Hubspot (83.56%), Feedly (80.82%), Engage by Twitter (79.45%), Hootsuite (78.08%), Tweetdeck (78.08%), IFTTT (75.34%), Social Hunt (73.97%), Canva (63.01%), Mention (60.27%), Adobe Spark (58.90%), Sprout Social (58.90%), Everypost (57.53%), Quickmeme (57.53%), Piktochart (56.16%), Panda 5 (53.42%), Zapier (50.68%), Buzz Sumo (49.32%), Nuzzel (47.95%), Brook (46.58%), Buffer (28.77%), and Sum All (28.77%).

Table 2 Gender wise awareness on social media tools

Social Media Tool	Male				Female				Total			
	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%
Adobe Spark	265	87.75	37	12.25	234	93.98	15	6.02	499	90.86	52	9.14
Brook	156	51.66	146	48.34	193	77.51	56	22.49	349	64.58	202	35.42
Buffer	235	77.81	67	22.19	207	83.13	42	16.87	442	80.47	109	19.53
Buzz Sumo	188	62.25	114	37.75	160	64.26	89	35.74	348	63.25	203	36.75
Canva	195	64.57	107	35.43	134	53.82	115	46.18	329	59.19	222	40.81
Engage by Twitter	289	95.70	13	4.30	240	96.39	9	3.61	529	96.04	22	3.96
Everypost	231	76.49	71	23.51	203	81.53	46	18.47	434	79.01	117	20.99
Facebook Ads	295	97.68	7	2.32	241	96.79	8	3.21	536	97.23	15	2.77
Facebook Insights	289	95.70	13	4.30	242	97.19	7	2.81	531	96.44	20	3.56
Facebook Live	298	98.68	4	1.32	240	96.39	9	3.61	538	97.53	13	2.47
Feedly	189	62.58	113	37.42	217	87.15	32	12.85	406	74.87	145	25.13
Hootsuite	241	79.80	61	20.20	190	76.31	59	23.69	431	78.05	120	21.95
Hubspot	279	92.38	23	7.62	233	93.57	16	6.43	512	92.98	39	7.02
IFTTT	284	94.04	18	5.96	236	94.78	13	5.22	520	94.41	31	5.59
Instagram	291	96.36	11	3.64	240	96.39	9	3.61	531	96.37	20	3.63
Mention	292	96.69	10	3.31	241	96.79	8	3.21	533	96.74	18	3.26
Nuzzel	165	54.64	137	45.36	131	52.61	118	47.39	296	53.62	255	46.38
Panda 5	183	60.60	119	39.40	151	60.64	98	39.36	334	60.62	217	39.38
Piktochart	201	66.56	101	33.44	180	72.29	69	27.71	381	69.42	170	30.58
Quickmeme	214	70.86	88	29.14	157	63.05	92	36.95	371	66.96	180	33.04
Social Hunt	283	93.71	19	6.29	238	95.58	11	4.42	521	94.65	30	5.35
Sprout Social	215	71.19	87	28.81	195	78.31	54	21.69	410	74.75	141	25.25
Sum All	173	57.28	129	42.72	117	46.99	132	53.01	290	52.14	261	47.86
Tweetdeck	289	95.70	13	4.30	240	96.39	9	3.61	529	96.04	22	3.96
Zapier	149	49.34	153	50.66	125	50.20	124	49.80	274	49.77	277	50.23

As far as the students are concerned, out of 478, 97.49 percent each of the students are most familiarized with Mention and Tweetdeck followed by Engage by Twitter (97.28%), Facebook Live (97.28%), Instagram (97.28%), Facebook Insights (97.07%), Facebook Ads (96.65%), IFTTT (96.23%), Social Hunt (96.23%), Hubspot (95.61%), Adobe Spark (92.68%), Feedly (92.26%), Sprout Social (90.79%), Buffer (89.96%), Everypost (89.75%), Piktochart (88.49%), Canva (86.82%), Brook (86.61%), Hootsuite (86.61%), Quickmeme (86.61%), Buzz Sumo (83.89%), Sum All (80.96%), Panda 5 (78.66%), Zapier (76.78%), and Nuzzel (71.97%).

Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 533 (95.22%) of them were most familiarized with Instagram followed by Facebook Live (92.48%), Facebook Ads (92.85%), Facebook Insights (91.00%), Engage by Twitter (88.37%), Tweetdeck (87.79%), Hubspot (89.58%), IFTTT (85.79%), Social Hunt (85.10%), Mention (78.88%), Feedly (86.54%), Adobe Spark (75.79%), Sprout Social (74.85%), Everypost (73.64%), Hootsuite (82.35%), Piktochart (72.33%), Canva (74.92%), Quickmeme (72.07%), Buffer (59.36%), Brook (66.59%), Buzz Sumo (66.60%), Panda 5 (66.04%), Sum All (54.86%), Zapier (63.73%), and Nuzzel (59.96%).

Awareness on the social media tools to organize the dashboard

Table 4 illustrates the category wise awareness of the respondents on the social media tools to organize the dashboard. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 88.24 percent of them are aware that Facebook Live could be used to organize the dashboard followed by Hubspot (88.52%), Instagram (88.24%), Facebook Ads (86.15%), Facebook Insights (82.26%), Engage by Twitter (81.03%), Feedly (79.66%), Mention (75%), Hootsuite (71.93%), Buffer

(71.43%), Canva (65.22%), IFTTT (58.18%), Panda 5 (51.28%), Adobe Spark (51.16%), Brook (47.06%), Tweetdeck (45.61%), Buzz Sumo (41.67%), Piktochart (41.46%), Nuzzel (40%), Everypost (33.33%), Sprout Social (32.56%), Quickmeme (30.95%), Zapier (29.73%), Social Hunt (29.63%), and Sum All (28.57%).

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 98.27 percent of them were aware that Facebook Ads could be used to organize the dashboard followed by Facebook (98.27%), Facebook Insights (98.06%), Facebook Live (97.63%), Buffer (95.81%), Instagram (95.48%), Tweetdeck (95.06%), Canva (94.94%), Brook (94.20%), Feedly (93.65%), Mention (93.13%), Adobe Spark (92.78%), Everypost (92.31%), Nuzzel (91.86%), Engage by Twitter (91.83%), Hootsuite (91.06%), Piktochart (90.78%), Social Hunt (88.91%), IFTTT (87.61%), Buzz Sumo (86.03%), Zapier (85.56%), Quickmeme (84.30%), Sum All (83.98%), Sprout Social (83.41%), Panda 5 (81.91%), and Hubspot (77.68%).

Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 511 (92.74%) of them were most familiarized with Facebook Live followed by Facebook Ads (92.56%), Facebook Insights (91.83%), Instagram (91.47%), Engage by Twitter (86.03%), Tweetdeck (85.12%), Mention (84.75%), Feedly (83.48%), IFTTT (78.95%), Adobe Spark (78.58%), Buffer (77.50%), Social Hunt (77.13%), Canva (76.95%), Hootsuite (75.86%), Everypost (74.41%), Hubspot (74.23%), Brook (73.68%), Piktochart (72.78%), Sprout Social (68.24%), Quickmeme (65.70%), Buzz Sumo (65.34%), Sum All (60.07%), Nuzzel (59.89%), Panda 5 (59.53%), and Zapier (58.98%).

Table 3 Category wise awareness on social media tools

Social Media Tool	Faculty				Students				Total			
	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%
Adobe Spark	43	58.90	30	41.10	443	92.68	35	7.32	486	75.79	65	24.21
Brook	34	46.58	39	53.42	414	86.61	64	13.39	448	66.59	103	33.41
Buffer	21	28.77	52	71.23	430	89.96	48	10.04	451	59.36	100	40.64
Buzz Sumo	36	49.32	37	50.68	401	83.89	77	16.11	437	66.60	114	33.40
Canva	46	63.01	27	36.99	415	86.82	63	13.18	461	74.92	90	25.08
Engage by Twitter	58	79.45	15	20.55	465	97.28	13	2.72	523	88.37	28	11.63
Everypost	42	57.53	31	42.47	429	89.75	49	10.25	471	73.64	80	26.36
Facebook Ads	65	89.04	8	10.96	462	96.65	16	3.35	527	92.85	24	7.15
Facebook Insights	62	84.93	11	15.07	464	97.07	14	2.93	526	91.00	25	9.00
Facebook Live	64	87.67	9	12.33	465	97.28	13	2.72	529	92.48	22	7.52
Feedly	59	80.82	14	19.18	441	92.26	37	7.74	500	86.54	51	13.46
Hootsuite	57	78.08	16	21.92	414	86.61	64	13.39	471	82.35	80	17.65
Hubspot	61	83.56	12	16.44	457	95.61	21	4.39	518	89.58	33	10.42
IFTTT	55	75.34	18	24.66	460	96.23	18	3.77	515	85.79	36	14.21
Instagram	68	93.15	5	6.85	465	97.28	13	2.72	533	95.22	18	4.78
Mention	44	60.27	29	39.73	466	97.49	12	2.51	510	78.88	41	21.12
Nuzzel	35	47.95	38	52.05	344	71.97	134	28.03	379	59.96	172	40.04
Panda 5	39	53.42	34	46.58	376	78.66	102	21.34	415	66.04	136	33.96
Piktochart	41	56.16	32	43.84	423	88.49	55	11.51	464	72.33	87	27.67
Quickmeme	42	57.53	31	42.47	414	86.61	64	13.39	456	72.07	95	27.93
Social Hunt	54	73.97	19	26.03	460	96.23	18	3.77	514	85.10	37	14.90
Sprout Social	43	58.90	30	41.10	434	90.79	44	9.21	477	74.85	74	25.15
Sum All	21	28.77	52	71.23	387	80.96	91	19.04	408	54.86	143	45.14
Tweetdeck	57	78.08	16	21.92	466	97.49	12	2.51	523	87.79	28	12.21
Zapier	37	50.68	36	49.32	367	76.78	111	23.22	404	63.73	147	36.27

Awareness on the social media tools to schedule posts ahead of time

Table 5 reports the results of category wise awareness of the respondents on the social media tools to schedule posts ahead of time by using any of the tools as mentioned in the Table. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 97.67 percent of them are aware that Hubspot could be used to schedule posts ahead of time followed by Instagram (96.49%), Facebook Ads

(95.92%), Facebook Live (95.92%), Buffer (94.44%), Feedly (91.11%), Engage by Twitter (90.20%), Facebook Insights (90%), Mention (84.85%), Hootsuite (81.40%), Canva (71.79%), Adobe Spark (67.86%), Brook (66.67%), IFTTT (66.67%), Panda 5 (66.67%), Tweetdeck (60%), Buzz Sumo (59.26%), Nuzzel (57.14%), Sprout Social (52%), Sum All (50%), Piktochart (44%), Quickmeme (43.75%), Zapier (42.86%), Social Hunt (36.59%), and Everypost (34.38%).

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 96.59 percent each of them were aware that Facebook Ads and Tweetdeck could be used to schedule posts ahead of time followed by Facebook Insights (95.78%), Piktochart (92.75%), Adobe Spark (92.70%), Hootsuite (92.58%), Canva (92.31%), Facebook Live (92.13%), Feedly (92%), Everypost (91.24%), Instagram (91.10%), Brook (91.03%), Buffer (90.89%), Engage by Twitter (89.74%), Mention (89.68%), Nuzzel (88.66%), Sum All (86.48%), Zapier (85.67%), IFTTT (84.79%), Sprout Social (84.11%), Quickmeme (84.03%), Social Hunt (83.82%), Buzz Sumo (83.65%), Panda 5 (83.63%), and Hubspot (71.94%).

Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 472 (96.25%) of them were most familiarized with Facebook Ads followed by Facebook Live (94.02%), Instagram (93.80%), Facebook Insights (92.89%), Buffer (92.67%), Feedly (91.56%), Engage by Twitter (89.97%), Mention (87.26%), Hootsuite (86.99%), Hubspot (84.81%), Canva (82.05%), Adobe Spark (80.28%), Brook (78.85%), Tweetdeck (78.30%), IFTTT (75.73%), Panda 5 (75.15%), Nuzzel (72.90%), Buzz Sumo (71.45%), Piktochart (68.38%), Sum All (68.24%), Sprout Social (68.06%), Zapier (64.26%), Quickmeme (63.89%), Everypost (62.81%), and Social Hunt (60.20%).

Awareness on the social media tools for segmenting audience for easy following

Table 6 shows the results of category wise awareness of the respondents on the social media tools for segmenting audience for easy following by using any of the tools as mentioned in the Table. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 83.78 percent of them are aware that Hubspot could be used for segmenting audience for easy following followed by Facebook Live (80.95%), Feedly (78.79%), Instagram (78%), Facebook Insights (77.50%), Facebook Ads (72.50%), Hootsuite (61.54%), IFTTT (57.14%), Mention (56.25%), Engage by Twitter (55.81%), Brook (41.94%), Buffer (40.91%), Tweetdeck (40%), Social Hunt (38.24%), Nuzzel (34.62%), Canva (33.33%), Quickmeme (33.33%), Buzz Sumo (32.56%), Panda 5 (30.77%), Adobe Spark (29.73%), Sprout Social (27.27%), Sum All (25%), Piktochart (22.22%), Zapier (21.74%), and Everypost (15.38%).

Table 4 Awareness on the social media tools to organize the dashboard by Category

Social Media Tool	Faculty				Students				Total			
	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%
Adobe Spark	22	51.16	21	48.84	411	92.78	32	7.22	433	78.58	53	9.62
Brook	16	47.06	18	52.94	390	94.20	24	5.80	406	73.68	42	7.62
Buffer	15	71.43	6	28.57	412	95.81	18	4.19	427	77.50	24	4.36
Buzz Sumo	15	41.67	21	58.33	345	86.03	56	13.97	360	65.34	77	13.97
Canva	30	65.22	16	34.78	394	94.94	21	5.06	424	76.95	37	6.72
Engage by Twitter	47	81.03	11	18.97	427	91.83	38	8.17	474	86.03	49	8.89
Everypost	14	33.33	28	66.67	396	92.31	33	7.69	410	74.41	61	11.07
Facebook Ads	56	86.15	9	13.85	454	98.27	8	1.73	510	92.56	17	3.09
Facebook Insights	51	82.26	11	17.74	455	98.06	9	1.94	506	91.83	20	3.63
Facebook Live	57	89.06	7	10.94	454	97.63	11	2.37	511	92.74	18	3.27
Feedly	47	79.66	12	20.34	413	93.65	28	6.35	460	83.48	40	7.26
Hootsuite	41	71.93	16	28.07	377	91.06	37	8.94	418	75.86	53	9.62
Hubspot	54	88.52	7	11.48	355	77.68	102	22.32	409	74.23	109	19.78
IFTTT	32	58.18	23	41.82	403	87.61	57	12.39	435	78.95	80	14.52
Instagram	60	88.24	8	11.76	444	95.48	21	4.52	504	91.47	29	5.26

Social Media Tool	Faculty				Students				Total			
	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%
Mention	33	75.00	11	25.00	434	93.13	32	6.87	467	84.75	43	7.80
Nuzzel	14	40.00	21	60.00	316	91.86	28	8.14	330	59.89	49	8.89
Panda 5	20	51.28	19	48.72	308	81.91	68	18.09	328	59.53	87	15.79
Piktochart	17	41.46	24	58.54	384	90.78	39	9.22	401	72.78	63	11.43
Quickmeme	13	30.95	29	69.05	349	84.30	65	15.70	362	65.70	94	17.06
Social Hunt	16	29.63	38	70.37	409	88.91	51	11.09	425	77.13	89	16.15
Sprout Social	14	32.56	29	67.44	362	83.41	72	16.59	376	68.24	101	18.33
Sum All	6	28.57	15	71.43	325	83.98	62	16.02	331	60.07	77	13.97
Tweetdeck	26	45.61	31	54.39	443	95.06	23	4.94	469	85.12	54	9.80
Zapier	11	29.73	26	70.27	314	85.56	53	14.44	325	58.98	79	14.34

Table 5 Awareness on the social media tools to schedule posts ahead of time by the respondents

Social Media Tool	Faculty				Students				Total			
	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%
Adobe Spark	19	67.86	9	32.14	368	92.70	29	7.30	387	80.28	38	19.72
Brook	16	66.67	8	33.33	345	91.03	34	8.97	361	78.85	42	21.15
Buffer	17	94.44	1	5.56	389	90.89	39	9.11	406	92.67	40	7.33
Buzz Sumo	16	59.26	11	40.74	312	83.65	61	16.35	328	71.45	72	28.55
Canva	28	71.79	11	28.21	348	92.31	29	7.69	376	82.05	40	17.95
Engage by Twitter	46	90.20	5	9.80	411	89.74	47	10.26	457	89.97	52	10.03
Everypost	11	34.38	21	65.63	375	91.24	36	8.76	386	62.81	57	37.19
Facebook Ads	47	95.92	2	4.08	425	96.59	15	3.41	472	96.25	17	3.75
Facebook Insights	45	90.00	5	10.00	431	95.78	19	4.22	476	92.89	24	7.11
Facebook Live	47	95.92	2	4.08	398	92.13	34	7.87	445	94.02	36	5.98
Feedly	41	91.11	4	8.89	368	92.00	32	8.00	409	91.56	36	8.44
Hootsuite	35	81.40	8	18.60	312	92.58	25	7.42	347	86.99	33	13.01
Hubspot	42	97.67	1	2.33	341	71.94	133	28.06	383	84.81	134	15.19
IFTTT	24	66.67	12	33.33	379	84.79	68	15.21	403	75.73	80	24.27
Instagram	55	96.49	2	3.51	389	91.10	38	8.90	444	93.80	40	6.20
Mention	28	84.85	5	15.15	391	89.68	45	10.32	419	87.26	50	12.74
Nuzzel	12	57.14	9	42.86	258	88.66	33	11.34	270	72.90	42	27.10
Panda 5	14	66.67	7	33.33	286	83.63	56	16.37	300	75.15	63	24.85
Piktochart	11	44.00	14	56.00	371	92.75	29	7.25	382	68.38	43	31.63
Quickmeme	14	43.75	18	56.25	321	84.03	61	15.97	335	63.89	79	36.11
Social Hunt	15	36.59	26	63.41	373	83.82	72	16.18	388	60.20	98	39.80
Sprout Social	13	52.00	12	48.00	323	84.11	61	15.89	336	68.06	73	31.94
Sum All	7	50.00	7	50.00	275	86.48	43	13.52	282	68.24	50	31.76
Tweetdeck	21	60.00	14	40.00	397	96.59	14	3.41	418	78.30	28	21.70
Zapier	9	42.86	12	57.14	281	85.67	47	14.33	290	64.26	59	35.74

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 87.2 percent each of them were aware that Tweetdeck could be used for segmenting audience for easy following followed by Facebook Ads (87%), Quickmeme (86.67%), Engage by Twitter (86.53%), Feedly (85.79%), Facebook Insights (85.54%), Everypost (84.2%), Piktochart (83.98%), Canva (83.17%), Hootsuite (82.82%), Facebook Live (82.06%), Mention (81.73%), Instagram (80.48%), Buzz Sumo (80.11%), Panda 5 (79.14%), Zapier (78.93%), Buffer (77.51%), Brook (77.38%), Sum All (74.49%), Social Hunt (74.45%), IFTTT (74.06%), Sprout Social (73.45%), Nuzzel (72.46%), Adobe Spark (68.45%), and Hubspot (67.97%).

Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 82.29 percent of them were mostly familiarized with Feedly followed by Facebook Insights (81.52%), Facebook Live (81.51%), Facebook Ads (79.75%), Instagram (79.24%), Hubspot (75.88%), Hootsuite (72.18%), Engage by Twitter (71.17%), Mention (68.99%), IFTTT (65.6%), Tweetdeck (63.6%), Quickmeme (60%), Brook (59.66%), Buffer (59.21%), Canva (58.25%), Social Hunt (56.34%), Buzz Sumo (56.33%), Panda 5 (54.95%), Nuzzel (53.54%), Piktochart (53.10%), Sprout Social (50.36%), Zapier (50.33%), Everypost (49.79%), Sum All (49.74%), and Adobe Spark (49.09%).

Awareness on automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one Social Media tool

Table 7 shows the results of category wise awareness of the respondents on automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps by using any one Social Media tool as mentioned in the Table. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 83.64 percent of them are aware that Facebook Live could be used for automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one tool followed by Facebook Ads (82.98%), Hubspot (82.98%), Facebook Insights (82.26%), Instagram (82.14%), Feedly (77.36%), Hootsuite (71.11%), IFTTT (70.83%), Mention (68.57%), Engage by Twitter (66.04%), Brook (63.16%), Adobe Spark (58%), Buffer (57.69%), Nuzzel (57.14%), Canva (54.29%), Panda 5 (51.72%), Quickmeme (50%), Social Hunt (46.67%), Tweetdeck (46.43%), Buzz Sumo (46.15%), Zapier (45.83%), Sum All (42.86%), Piktochart (40.74%), Sprout Social (34.38%), and Everypost (31.82%).

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 89.88 percent of them were aware that Zapier could be used for automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one tool followed by Tweetdeck (88.68%), Quickmeme (88.42%), Facebook Insights (88.26%), Facebook Ads (88.02%), Piktochart (84.24%), Facebook Live (84.10%), Mention (83.70%), Everypost (83.47%), Feedly (83.47%), Hootsuite (83.19%), Engage by Twitter (83.18%), Instagram (80.10%), Buzz Sumo (79.84%), Buffer (78.88%), Panda 5 (78.52%), Canva (78.48%), Social Hunt (78.14%), Brook (77.35%), IFTTT (76.85%), Sum All (75.30%), Sprout Social (74.52%), Nuzzel (72.41%), Hubspot (71.10%), and Adobe Spark (67.63%).

Table 6 Segmenting audience for easy following through social media tools

Social Media Tool	Faculty				Students				Total			
	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%
Adobe Spark	11	29.73	26	70.27	269	68.45	124	31.55	280	49.09	150	50.91
Brook	13	41.94	18	58.06	301	77.38	88	22.62	314	59.66	106	40.34
Buffer	9	40.91	13	59.09	324	77.51	94	22.49	333	59.21	107	40.79
Buzz Sumo	14	32.56	29	67.44	294	80.11	73	19.89	308	56.33	102	43.67
Canva	12	33.33	24	66.67	336	83.17	68	16.83	348	58.25	92	41.75
Engage by Twitter	24	55.81	19	44.19	379	86.53	59	13.47	403	71.17	78	28.83
Everypost	6	15.38	33	84.62	341	84.20	64	15.80	347	49.79	97	50.21
Facebook Ads	29	72.50	11	27.50	368	87.00	55	13.00	397	79.75	66	20.25
Facebook Insights	31	77.50	9	22.50	349	85.54	59	14.46	380	81.52	68	18.48
Facebook Live	34	80.95	8	19.05	334	82.06	73	17.94	368	81.51	81	18.49
Feedly	26	78.79	7	21.21	326	85.79	54	14.21	352	82.29	61	17.71
Hootsuite	24	61.54	15	38.46	294	82.82	61	17.18	318	72.18	76	27.82
Hubspot	31	83.78	6	16.22	331	67.97	156	32.03	362	75.88	162	24.12
IFTTT	12	57.14	9	42.86	354	74.06	124	25.94	366	65.60	133	34.40
Instagram	39	78.00	11	22.00	367	80.48	89	19.52	406	79.24	100	20.76
Mention	18	56.25	14	43.75	349	81.73	78	18.27	367	68.99	92	31.01
Nuzzel	9	34.62	17	65.38	221	72.46	84	27.54	230	53.54	101	46.46
Panda 5	8	30.77	18	69.23	239	79.14	63	20.86	247	54.95	81	45.05
Piktochart	6	22.22	21	77.78	304	83.98	58	16.02	310	53.10	79	46.90
Quickmeme	5	33.33	10	66.67	286	86.67	44	13.33	291	60.00	54	40.00
Social Hunt	13	38.24	21	61.76	341	74.45	117	25.55	354	56.34	138	43.66
Sprout Social	9	27.27	24	72.73	285	73.45	103	26.55	294	50.36	127	49.64
Sum All	6	25.00	18	75.00	254	74.49	87	25.51	260	49.74	105	50.26
Tweetdeck	14	40.00	21	60.00	361	87.20	53	12.80	375	63.60	74	36.40
Zapier	5	21.74	18	78.26	251	78.93	67	21.07	256	50.33	85	49.67

Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 85.5 percent of them were mostly familiarized with Facebook Ads followed by Facebook Insights (85.26%), Facebook Live (83.87%), Instagram (81.12%), Feedly (80.42%), Hootsuite (77.15%), Hubspot (77.04%), Mention (76.14%), Engage by Twitter (74.61%), IFTTT (73.84%), Brook (70.25%), Quickmeme (69.21%), Buffer (68.29%), Zapier (67.86%), Tweetdeck (67.55%), Canva (66.38%), Panda 5 (65.12%), Nuzzel (64.78%), Buzz Sumo (63%), Adobe Spark (62.82%),

Piktochart (62.49%), Social Hunt (62.40%), Sum All (59.08%), Everypost (57.65%), and Sprout Social (54.45%).

Table 7 Automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one Social Media tool

Social Media Tool	Faculty				Students				Total			
	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%	Aware	%	Unaware	%
Adobe Spark	29	58.00	21	42.00	234	67.63	112	32.37	263	62.82	133	37.18
Brook	24	63.16	14	36.84	321	77.35	94	22.65	345	70.25	108	29.75
Buffer	15	57.69	11	42.31	310	78.88	83	21.12	325	68.29	94	31.71
Buzz Sumo	18	46.15	21	53.85	301	79.84	76	20.16	319	63.00	97	37.00
Canva	19	54.29	16	45.71	321	78.48	88	21.52	340	66.38	104	33.62
Engage by Twitter	35	66.04	18	33.96	351	83.18	71	16.82	386	74.61	89	25.39
Everypost	14	31.82	30	68.18	298	83.47	59	16.53	312	57.65	89	42.35
Facebook Ads	39	82.98	8	17.02	338	88.02	46	11.98	377	85.50	54	14.50
Facebook Insights	51	82.26	11	17.74	361	88.26	48	11.74	412	85.26	59	14.74
Facebook Live	46	83.64	9	16.36	349	84.10	66	15.90	395	83.87	75	16.13
Feedly	41	77.36	12	22.64	298	83.47	59	16.53	339	80.42	71	19.58
Hootsuite	32	71.11	13	28.89	287	83.19	58	16.81	319	77.15	71	22.85
Hubspot	39	82.98	8	17.02	305	71.10	124	28.90	344	77.04	132	22.96
IFTTT	17	70.83	7	29.17	312	76.85	94	23.15	329	73.84	101	26.16
Instagram	46	82.14	10	17.86	326	80.10	81	19.90	372	81.12	91	18.88
Mention	24	68.57	11	31.43	339	83.70	66	16.30	363	76.14	77	23.86
Nuzzel	16	57.14	12	42.86	189	72.41	72	27.59	205	64.78	84	35.22
Panda 5	15	51.72	14	48.28	223	78.52	61	21.48	238	65.12	75	34.88
Piktochart	11	40.74	16	59.26	294	84.24	55	15.76	305	62.49	71	37.51
Quickmeme	8	50.00	8	50.00	275	88.42	36	11.58	283	69.21	44	30.79
Social Hunt	14	46.67	16	53.33	311	78.14	87	21.86	325	62.40	103	37.60
Sprout Social	11	34.38	21	65.63	269	74.52	92	25.48	280	54.45	113	45.55
Sum All	9	42.86	12	57.14	247	75.30	81	24.70	256	59.08	93	40.92
Tweetdeck	13	46.43	15	53.57	329	88.68	42	11.32	342	67.55	57	32.45
Zapier	11	45.83	13	54.17	231	89.88	26	10.12	242	67.86	39	32.14

Opinion of the respondents on the awareness of the security concerns related to SM tools and platforms

Table 8 reports the opinions of the respondents on the awareness of the security concerns related to SM tools and platforms. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 97.26 percent of them opined that Friends request from unfamiliar person was found to be the major security concern followed by Junk posting of photos and videos (94.52%), Virus detection (93.15%), and Fake accounts (80.82%).

Table 8 Opinion of the respondents on the Barriers in using SM tools and platforms

S. No.	Barriers	Faculty (N=73)	%	Students (N=478)	%
1	Lack of appeal	36	49.32	369	77.20
2	Fear of addiction	54	73.97	245	51.26
3	Cyber bullying	43	58.90	368	76.99
4	Concern with privacy	65	89.04	268	56.07
5	Very intrusive nature	56	76.71	398	83.26
6	Data security	67	91.78	402	84.10
7	Lack of IT skills	48	65.75	125	26.15
8	Lack of awareness about various SMs	36	49.32	213	44.56
9	Ethical reason	58	79.45	238	49.79

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 94.56 percent of them opined that Junk posting of photos and videos was found to be the major security concern followed by Fake accounts (90.38%), Virus detection (88.08%), and Friends request from unfamiliar person (52.93%).

6. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The outcomes of the study on the awareness of social media tools among the faculties and students of engineering colleges in Puducherry led to the significant findings such as more than 90 percent of the respondents were aware of social media tools in general; and particularly, Facebook Live was found to be most familiar among the respondents; 93.15 percent of the faculty respondents were aware of Instagram while 97.49 percent each of the students are most familiarized with Mention and Tweetdeck; 88.24 percent of the faculties were aware that Facebook Live could be used to organize the dashboard while 98.27 percent of the students were aware that Facebook Ads could be used to organize the dashboard; 97.67 percent of the faculties were aware that Hubspot could be used to schedule posts ahead of time while 96.59 percent each of the students were aware that Facebook Ads and Tweetdeck could be used to schedule posts ahead of time; 83.78 percent of the faculties were aware that Hubspot could be used for segmenting audience for easy following while 87.2 percent each of the students were aware that Tweetdeck could be used for segmenting audience for easy following; 83.64 percent of the faculties were aware that Facebook Live could be used for automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one tool while 89.88 percent of the students were aware that Zapier could be used for automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one tool; and 97.26 percent of the faculties opined that Friends request from unfamiliar person was found to be the major security concern while 94.56 percent of the students opined that Junk posting of photos and videos was found to be the major security concern. Overall, it was found that most of the respondents were aware of the social media tools and their applications for various purposes. However, the respondents should be motivated to make use of these tools for academic purposes through which the recognition of the institutions and their stakeholders in a better place with more visibility.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aleryani, A.Y., Mofleh, H., & Alariki, S. (2017). The Usage of Academic Social Network Sites by Researchers in Developing Countries: Opportunities and Challenges, *Saba Journal of Information Technology and Networking (SJITN)*, 5(2), 49-59.
- [2] Alexa (2008). Facebook overtakes MySpace. Retrieved from <http://blog.alex.com/2008/05/Alexa>.
- [3] Ali, M.Y., & Richardson, Joanna. (2017) Usage of academic social networking sites by Karachi social science faculty: Implications for academic libraries, *International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions*, XX (X), 1-12.
- [4] Asmi, N.A., & Margam, Madhusudhan. (2018) "Academic social networking sites for researchers in Central Universities of Delhi: A study of ResearchGate and Academia", *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 67 (1), pp.91-108.
- [5] Governatoria, G., & Iannella, R. (2011). A modelling and reasoning framework for social networks policies. *Enterprise Information Systems*, 5(1), 145–167. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/17517575.2010.513014>
- [6] Haque, A., Sarwar, A., & Yasmin, F. (2013). Malaysian Users' Perception towards Facebook as a Social Networking Site. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 119–130. Retrieved from <http://www.hrmar.com/admin/pics/1415.pdf>

- [7] Jeng, W., Des Autels, S., He, DQ., & Li, L. (2017) Information Exchange on an Academic Social Networking Site: A Multidiscipline Comparison on ResearchGate Q&A, *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(3), 638-652.
- [8] Kenchakkanavar, A.Y., Hadagali, G.S., & Ranadev, S. (2017). Use of Academic Social Networking Sites by the Research Scholars in the Universities of Dharwad city: A study. *Journal of Advances in Library and Information Science*, 6(3), 274-278.
- [9] Kroski, E. (2007). The social tools of Web 2.0: Opportunities for academic libraries. *Choice*, 44(12), 2011-21.
- [10] Manca, Stefania & Ranieri, Maria (2017) Networked scholarship and motivations for social media use in scholarly communication, *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning* 18(2), 123-138.
- [11] Meishar-Tal, H., & Pieterse, E. (2017) Why Do Academics Use Academic Social Networking Sites?, *International Review of Research In Open And Distributed Learning*, 18(1), 1-22.
- [12] Mering, M. (2017). Correctly Linking Researchers to Their Journal Articles: An Overview of Unique Author Identifiers. *Serials Review*, 43(3-4), 265-267.
- [13] Minocha, S. (2009). Role of social software tools in education: a literature review. *Education Plus Training*, 51(5/6), 353-369.
- [14] Murray, K. E., & Waller, R. (2007). Social networking goes abroad. *International Educator*, 16(3), 56.
- [15] Russo, A., Watkins, J., Kelly, L., & Chan, S. (2008). Participatory communication with social media. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 51(1), 21-31.
- [16] Steinfield, C., Ellison, N. B., & Lampe, C. (2008). Social capital, self-esteem, and use of online social network sites: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 29(6), 434-445.
- [17] Suraweera, N. S., Razali, N., Chouhan, L. B., Tamang, N., Hubilla, A. M. K. U., Ratnayake, A. M., & Mahesar, S. N. (2010, August). Value of social networking in libraries and information organizations in Asia and Oceania. In *Gothenburg, Sweden: World Library and Information Congress: 76th IFLA General Conference And Assembly*. Retrieved from <http://conference.ifla.org/past/2010/145-suraweera-en.pdf>.
- [18] Yan, W., & Zhang, Y. (2018) Research universities on the ResearchGate social networking site: An examination of institutional differences, research activity level, and social networks formed, *Journal of Informetrics*, 12, 385-400.
- [19] Zientek, L.R., Werner, J.M., Campuzano, M.V., & Nimmon, K. (2018). The Use of Google Scholar for Research and Research Dissemination, *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 30(1), 39-46.