USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS BY THE ENGINEERING FACULTIES AND STUDENTS IN PUDUCHERRY – A SURVEY

R. Jayakumar

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

N. Tamilselvan

Research Guide, Chief Librarian and Head,
RVS College of Engineering and Technology,
Coimbatore, India

tamilselvanmn@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper presents the extent of utilization of social media platforms by the engineering faculties and students in Puducherry through a survey conducted with 551 respondents from nine engineering colleges. The study revealed that 91.05 percent of the total respondents made use of Skype; only 12.34 percent of the respondents checked the analytics of social media activities daily; 7.8 of the respondents used SM platforms very frequently, and 22.87 percent frequently. Interestingly, it was found that 90.41 percent of the faculty respondents made use of SM platforms for Academic purposes while 98.12 percent of the students made use of SM platforms for Sharing photos and videos. It was also opined that the use of social media platforms has positively influenced the respondents. However, a good number of respondents have also revealed that there was negative influence on the use of social media platforms.

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, Use of Social Media Platforms by the Engineering Faculties and Students in Puducherry – A Survey. *International Journal of Library & Information Science*, 7(4), 2018, pp. 21–35.
<http://iaeme.com/Home/issue/IJLIS?Volume=7&Issue=4>

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; Governatoria & 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 assess the extent of utilization of social media platforms by 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 conducted based on the following objectives:

- To identify the extent of use of social media platforms by the faculties and students of engineering colleges in Puducherry based on their demographic profile;
- To assess how frequently the respondents make use of social media platforms for checking the analytics of social media activities;
- To examine the purpose of using social media platforms;
- To seek the opinion of the respondents on the Length of using SM platforms, Time spent, Places of using SM platforms, and Devices used for accessing SM platforms; and
- To identify how the respondents have been influenced positively and negatively by using social media 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	Achariya 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

The collected data from 551 respondents which constitute faculties and students of nine engineering colleges in Puducherry were duly analysed and the results are presented below:

Use of Social Media platforms by the category of respondents

Table 2 reports the category wise use of Social Media platforms for various purposes. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 90.74 percent of them made use of WhatsApp followed by Linkedin (88.89%), Twitter (88.46%), Skype (87.50%), Youtube (86.44%), Google Talk (84.48%), Facebook (81.82%), Google + (80%), Instagram (78%), Pinterest (77.08%), Foursquare (75.56%), Tumblr (73.68%), Reddit (71.88%), MySpace (71.74%), Meetme (70.45%), Ibibo (70.21%), Flickr (65.79%), Picasa (65.71%), Meetup (63.64%), Tagged (61.11%), Yahoo!Buzz (60.53%), Xing (59.46%), Metacafe (54.76%), Hike (53.33%), Yahoo!Pulse (52.94%), Vine (50%), Bebo (44.44%), Dailymotion (44%), Hangout (40%), Yammer (37.14%), Snapchat (36.67%), Shtyle (33.33%), Zedge (33.33%), Ask.fm (32.35%), Ning (32.14%), Plaxor (22.22%), Zorpia (17.91%), and Zoomr (17.74%).

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 95.34 percent of them made use of Google Talk followed by Ask.fm (94.83%), Skype (94.59%), Youtube (94.19%), Instagram (94.01%), Tagged (93.68%), Ibibo (93.53%), Dailymotion (93.51%), Hangout (93.21%), Twitter (93.18%), Flickr (93.1%), Meetup (92.91%), MySpace (92.9%), Hike (92.87%), Bebo (92.58%), Zedge (92.28%), Google + (91.69%), Foursquare (91.57%), Picasa (90.73%), Ning (90.19%), Metacafe (90.17%), Xing (89.82%), Meetme (89.8%), Facebook (89.64%), Zoomr (89.47%), Vine (89.31%), Snapchat (88.99%), Tumblr (88.92%), WhatsApp (88.51%), Reddit (88.35%), Pinterest (86.86%), Shtyle (86.77%), Linkedin (85.57%), Plaxor (85.02%), Yahoo!Pulse (81.03%), Yahoo!Buzz (78.8%), Yammer (77.78%), and Zorpia (76.9%).

Overall, it was observed that out of 551 total respondents, 91.05 percent of the respondents made use of Skype followed by Twitter (90.82%), Youtube (90.32%), Google Talk (89.91%), WhatsApp (89.63%), Linkedin (87.23%), Instagram (86%), Google + (85.84%), Facebook (85.73%), Foursquare (83.56%), MySpace (82.32%), Pinterest (81.97%), Ibibo (81.87%), Tumblr (81.3%), Meetme (80.13%), Reddit (80.11%), Flickr (79.45%), Meetup (78.27%), Picasa (78.22%), Tagged (77.4%), Xing (74.64%), Hike (73.10%), Metacafe (72.47%), Vine (69.66%), Yahoo!Buzz (69.66%), Dailymotion (68.76%), Bebo (68.51%), Yahoo!Pulse (66.99%), Hangout (66.6%), Ask.fm (63.59%), Snapchat (62.83%), Zedge (62.81%), Ning (61.17%), Shtyle (60.05%), Yammer (57.46%), Plaxor (53.62%), Zoomr (53.61%), and Zorpia (47.4%).

Frequency of checking the analytics of social media activities by the respondents

Table 3 gives the frequency of checking the analytics of social media activities. The institution wise analysis reveals that out of 68 respondents who checked the analytics of social media activities daily, 18(26.47%) respondents were from PEC which ranks first in order followed by RGCET (23.53%), MVIT (16.18%), CCET (11.76%), ACET (8.82%), ALCET (4.41%), PMCET (2.94%), RAAKCET (2.94%), and SGCET (2.94%).

Table 2 Category wise use of Social Media platforms

Social Media platforms	Faculty				Students				Total			
	Use	%	Non-Use	%	Use	%	Non-Use	%	Use	%	Non-Use	%
Ask.fm	11	32.35	23	67.65	385	94.83	21	5.17	396	63.59	44	36.41
Bebo	12	44.44	15	55.56	362	92.58	29	7.42	374	68.51	44	31.49
Dailymotion	11	44.00	14	56.00	346	93.51	24	6.49	357	68.76	38	31.24
Facebook	36	81.82	8	18.18	372	89.64	43	10.36	408	85.73	51	14.27
Flickr	25	65.79	13	34.21	351	93.10	26	6.90	376	79.45	39	20.55
Foursquare	34	75.56	11	24.44	413	91.57	38	8.43	447	83.56	49	16.44
Google +	32	80.00	8	20.00	364	91.69	33	8.31	396	85.84	41	14.16
Google Talk	49	84.48	9	15.52	389	95.34	19	4.66	438	89.91	28	10.09
Hangout	12	40.00	18	60.00	398	93.21	29	6.79	410	66.60	47	33.40
Hike	24	53.33	21	46.67	391	92.87	30	7.13	415	73.10	51	26.90
Ibibo	33	70.21	14	29.79	376	93.53	26	6.47	409	81.87	40	18.13
Instagram	39	78.00	11	22.00	345	94.01	22	5.99	384	86.00	33	14.00
Linkedin	48	88.89	6	11.11	332	85.57	56	14.43	380	87.23	62	12.77
Meetme	31	70.45	13	29.55	361	89.80	41	10.20	392	80.13	54	19.87
Meetup	21	63.64	12	36.36	380	92.91	29	7.09	401	78.27	41	21.73
Metacafe	23	54.76	19	45.24	367	90.17	40	9.83	390	72.47	59	27.53
MySpace	33	71.74	13	28.26	301	92.90	23	7.10	334	82.32	36	17.68
Ning	9	32.14	19	67.86	331	90.19	36	9.81	340	61.17	55	38.83
Picasa	23	65.71	12	34.29	362	90.73	37	9.27	385	78.22	49	21.78
Pinterest	37	77.08	11	22.92	337	86.86	51	13.14	374	81.97	62	18.03
Plaxor	8	22.22	28	77.78	352	85.02	62	14.98	360	53.62	90	46.38
Reddit	23	71.88	9	28.13	311	88.35	41	11.65	334	80.11	50	19.89
Shtyle	9	33.33	18	66.67	282	86.77	43	13.23	291	60.05	61	39.95
Skype	49	87.50	7	12.50	385	94.59	22	5.41	434	91.05	29	8.95
Snapchat	11	36.67	19	63.33	291	88.99	36	11.01	302	62.83	55	37.17
Tagged	22	61.11	14	38.89	267	93.68	18	6.32	289	77.40	32	22.60
Tumblr	28	73.68	10	26.32	289	88.92	36	11.08	317	81.30	46	18.70
Twitter	46	88.46	6	11.54	369	93.18	27	6.82	415	90.82	33	9.18
Vine	21	50.00	21	50.00	234	89.31	28	10.69	255	69.66	49	30.34
WhatsApp	49	90.74	5	9.26	416	88.51	54	11.49	465	89.63	59	10.37
Xing	22	59.46	15	40.54	256	89.82	29	10.18	278	74.64	44	25.36
Yahoo!Buzz	23	60.53	15	39.47	249	78.80	67	21.20	272	69.66	82	30.34
Yahoo!Pulse	18	52.94	16	47.06	235	81.03	55	18.97	253	66.99	71	33.01
Yammer	13	37.14	22	62.86	189	77.78	54	22.22	202	57.46	76	42.54
Youtube	51	86.44	8	13.56	438	94.19	27	5.81	489	90.32	35	9.68
Zedge	23	33.33	46	66.67	311	92.28	26	7.72	334	62.81	72	37.19
Zoomr	11	17.74	51	82.26	323	89.47	38	10.53	334	53.61	89	46.39
Zorpia	12	17.91	55	82.09	213	76.90	64	23.10	225	47.40	119	52.60

Out of 143 respondents who checked the analytics of social media activities few times a week, 28(19.58%) respondents each were from PEC and RGCET respectively followed by MVIT (16.08%), CCET (14.69%), ACET (10.49%), ALCET (8.39%), PMCET (6.29%), SGCET (3.50%), and RAAKCET (1.40%). Out of 210(38.11%) respondents who checked the analytics of social media activities once a week, 50(23.81%) respondents were from PEC followed by PEC (23.81%), MVIT (17.62%), CCET (15.24%), RGCET (14.76%), ACET (10%), PMCET (6.67%), ALCET (5.24%), SGCET (5.24%), and RAAKCET (1.43%).

On the other hand, out of 87(15.79%) respondents who checked the analytics of social media activities rarely, 28(32.18%) respondents were from PEC followed by ACET (13.79%), RGCET (13.79%), CCET (10.34%), MVIT (10.34%), ALCET (8.05%), PMCET (6.90%), RAAKCET (2.30%), and SGCET (2.30%). Out of 43(7.8%) respondents who never checked the analytics of social media activities, 13(30.23%) respondents were from PEC followed by ACET (11.63%), PMCET (11.63%), MVIT (11.63%), ALCET (9.30%), CCET (9.30%), RGCET (6.98%), RAAKCET (4.65%), and SGCET (4.65%).

The overall result indicates that out of 551 respondents from nine engineering colleges in Puducherry, 68(12.34%) respondents checked the analytics of social media activities daily; 143(25.95%) respondents checked the analytics of social media activities few times a week;

210(38.11%) respondents checked the analytics of social media activities once a week; 87(15.79%) respondents checked the analytics of social media activities rarely; and 43(7.8%) respondents never checked the analytics of social media activities.

Frequency of using Social Media platforms by Institution

Table 4 details the institution wise frequency of using Social Media platforms. The institution wise analysis reveals that out of 43 respondents who used Social media platforms Very Frequently, 14(32.56%) respondents were from PEC which ranks first in order followed by RGCET (20.93%), MVIT (13.95%), CCET (9.30%), ACET (6.98%), ALCET (6.98%), PMCET (6.98%), and RAAKCET (2.33%). It is quite surprising that no respondent from SGCET used very frequently. Out of 126 respondents who used Social media platform Frequently, 32(25.4%) respondents were from PEC which ranks first in order followed by RGCET (18.25%), CCET (15.08%), MVIT (14.29%), ACET (9.52%), ALCET (6.35%), PMCET (5.56%), SGCET (3.97%), and RAAKCET (1.59%). Out of 223 respondents who used Social media platforms sometimes, 49(21.97%) respondents were from PEC which ranks first in order followed by ACET (16.14%), MVIT (16.14%), RGCET (14.8%), CCET (13.9%), ALCET (6.73%), PMCET (4.48%), SGCET (3.59%), and RAAKCET (2.24%).

On the other hand, out of 84(15.25%) respondents who used Social media platforms rarely, 18(21.43%) respondents were from PEC followed by MVIT (20.24%), RGCET (19.05%), PMCET (9.52%), CCET (8.33%), ACET (7.14%), ALCET (5.95%), SGCET (5.95%), and RAAKCET (2.38%). Out of 75(13.61%) respondents who never used Social media platforms, 24(32%) respondents were from PEC followed by CCET (17.33%), RGCET (12%), PMCET (10.67%), MVIT (10.67%), ALCET (8%), SGCET (5.33%), ACET (2.67%), and RAAKCET (1.33%).

Table 3 Frequency of checking the analytics of social media activities

Institution	Daily	%	Few times a week	%	Once a week	%	Rarely	%	Never	%	Total	%
PEC	18	26.47	28	19.58	50	23.81	28	32.18	13	30.23	137	24.86
ACET	6	8.82	15	10.49	21	10.00	12	13.79	5	11.63	59	10.71
ALCET	3	4.41	12	8.39	11	5.24	7	8.05	4	9.30	37	6.72
CCET	8	11.76	21	14.69	32	15.24	9	10.34	4	9.30	74	13.43
PMCET	2	2.94	9	6.29	14	6.67	6	6.90	5	11.63	36	6.53
MVIT	11	16.18	23	16.08	37	17.62	9	10.34	5	11.63	85	15.43
RAAKCET	2	2.94	2	1.40	3	1.43	2	2.30	2	4.65	11	2.00
RGCET	16	23.53	28	19.58	31	14.76	12	13.79	3	6.98	90	16.33
SGCET	2	2.94	5	3.50	11	5.24	2	2.30	2	4.65	22	3.99
Total	68	100	143	100	210	100	87	100	43	100	551	100
%	12.34		25.95		38.11		15.79		7.80		100	

Table 4 Institution wise Frequency of using Social Media platforms

Institution	Very Frequently	%	Frequently	%	Sometimes	%	Rarely	%	Never	%	Total	%
PEC	14	32.56	32	25.40	49	21.97	18	21.43	24	32.00	137	24.86
ACET	3	6.98	12	9.52	36	16.14	6	7.14	2	2.67	59	10.71
ALCET	3	6.98	8	6.35	15	6.73	5	5.95	6	8.00	37	6.72
CCET	4	9.30	19	15.08	31	13.90	7	8.33	13	17.33	74	13.43
PMCET	3	6.98	7	5.56	10	4.48	8	9.52	8	10.67	36	6.53
MVIT	6	13.95	18	14.29	36	16.14	17	20.24	8	10.67	85	15.43
RAAKCET	1	2.33	2	1.59	5	2.24	2	2.38	1	1.33	11	2.00
RGCET	9	20.93	23	18.25	33	14.80	16	19.05	9	12.00	90	16.33
SGCET	0	0.00	5	3.97	8	3.59	5	5.95	4	5.33	22	3.99
Total	43	100	126	100	223	100	84	100	75	100	551	100
%	7.80		22.87		40.47		15.25		13.61		100	

The overall result indicates that out of 551 respondents from nine engineering colleges in Puducherry, 43(7.8%) respondents used Social Media platforms very frequently; 126(22.87%)

respondents used Social Media platforms frequently; 223(40.47%) respondents used Social Media platforms sometimes; 84(15.25%) respondents used Social Media platforms rarely; and 75(13.61%) respondents never used Social Media platforms.

Opinion of the respondents on the Length of using SM platforms

Figure 1 indicates the institution wise length of using SM platforms. The institution wise analysis reveals that out of 25 respondents who used social media platforms Less than a Month, 5(20%) respondents each were from MVIT and RGCET followed by PEC (12%), ACET (8%), ALCET (8%), CCET (8%), PMCET (8%), RAAKCET (8%), and SGCET (8%).

With regard to the length of using social media platforms for 1-6 months, out of 66 respondents, 16 (24.24%) are from PEC followed by CCET (16.67%), ACET (12.12%), RGCET (12.12%), MVIT (10.61%), ALCET (7.58%), PMCET (7.58%), RAAKCET (4.55%), and SGCET (4.55%). As far as the length of using social media platforms for 6 months – 1 year are concerned, out of 110 respondents, 23 (20.91%) are from PEC followed by CCET (20%), ACET (19.09%), MVIT (14.55%), ALCET (8.18%), RGCET (8.18%), PMCET (4.55%), SGCET (2.73%), and RAAKCET (1.82%).

In the case of using social media platforms for 1-2 years, out of 187 respondents, 49 (26.2%) are from PEC followed by RGCET (20.86%), MVIT (15.51%), CCET (11.76%), ACET (9.63%), ALCET (5.35%), SGCET (5.35%), PMCET (4.28%), and RAAKCET (1.07%). With regard to the length of using social media platforms for more than 2 years, out of 163 respondents, 46 (28.22%) are from PEC followed by RGCET (17.79%), MVIT (17.18%), CCET (10.43%), PMCET (9.82%), ALCET (6.75%), ACET (6.13%), SGCET (2.45%), and RAAKCET (1.23%).

The overall result indicates that out of 551 respondents from nine engineering colleges in Puducherry, 25 (4.54%) respondents used SM platforms for Less than a Month; 66 (11.98%) respondents used SM platforms for 1-6 months; 110 (19.96%) respondents used SM platforms for 6 months to 1 year; 187 (33.94%) respondents used SM platforms for 1-2 years; and 163 (29.58%) respondents used SM platforms for more than 2 years.

Opinion of the respondents on Time spent on SM platforms

Table 5 represents the institution wise opinion of the respondents on the Time spent on SM platforms in a week. The institution wise analysis reveals that out of 101 respondents who spent time on social media platforms Less than an hour a week, 21 (20.79%) respondents were from PEC followed by ACET (16.83%), CCET (14.85%), MVIT (10.89%), ALCET (8.91%), PMCET (8.91%), RGCET (8.91%), RAAKCET (4.95%), and SGCET (4.95%).

As far as the time spent on using social media platforms for 1-2 hours a week are concerned, out of 162 respondents, 42 (25.93%) are from PEC followed by RGCET (20.99%), MVIT (14.81%), CCET (11.73%), ACET (8.02%), ALCET (6.79%), PMCET (6.17%), SGCET (4.32%), and RAAKCET (1.23%). With regard to the time spent on using social media platforms for 2-4 hours a week, out of 139 respondents, 36 (25.9%) are from PEC followed by RGCET (16.55%), ACET (12.95%), MVIT (12.95%), CCET (12.23%), ALCET (7.91%), PMCET (5.76%), SGCET (4.32%), and RAAKCET (1.44%).

Figure 1 Opinion of the respondents on the Length of using SM platforms

In the case of time spent on using social media platforms for 5-10 hours a week, out of 114 respondents, 29 (25.44%) are from PEC followed by MVIT (23.68%), RGCET (16.67%), CCET (14.04%), ACET (6.14%), PMCET (6.14%), ALCET (4.39%), RAAKCET (1.75%), and SGCET (1.75%).

Table 5 Opinion of the respondents on the Time spent on SM platforms in a week

Institution	< 1 hour	%	1-2 hrs	%	2-4 hrs	%	5-10 hrs	%	> 11 hrs	%	Total	%
PEC	21	20.79	42	25.93	36	25.90	29	25.44	9	25.71	137	24.86
ACET	17	16.83	13	8.02	18	12.95	7	6.14	4	11.43	59	10.71
ALCET	9	8.91	11	6.79	11	7.91	5	4.39	1	2.86	37	6.72
CCET	15	14.85	19	11.73	17	12.23	16	14.04	7	20.00	74	13.43
PMCET	9	8.91	10	6.17	8	5.76	7	6.14	2	5.71	36	6.53
MVIT	11	10.89	24	14.81	18	12.95	27	23.68	5	14.29	85	15.43
RAAKCET	5	4.95	2	1.23	2	1.44	2	1.75	0	0.00	11	2.00
RGCET	9	8.91	34	20.99	23	16.55	19	16.67	5	14.29	90	16.33
SGCET	5	4.95	7	4.32	6	4.32	2	1.75	2	5.71	22	3.99
Total	101	100	162	100	139	100	114	100	35	100	551	100
%	18.33		29.40		25.23		20.69		6.35		100	

With regard to the time spent on using social media platforms for more than 11 hours a week, out of 35 respondents, 9 (25.71%) are from PEC followed by CCET (20%), MVIT (14.29%), RGCET (14.29%), ACET (11.43%), PMCET (5.71%), SGCET (5.71%), and ALCET (2.86%) while none was found from RAAKCET.

The overall result indicates that out of 551 respondents from nine engineering colleges in Puducherry, 101 (18.33%) respondents spent less than one hour a week on SM platforms; 162 (29.4%) respondents spent 1-2 hours a week on SM platforms; 139 (25.23%) respondents spent 2-4 hours a week on SM platforms; 114 (20.69%) respondents spent 5-10 hours a week on SM platforms; and 35 (6.35%) respondents spent more than 11 hours a week on SM platforms.

Opinion of the respondents on the Places of using SM platforms

Table 6 represents the institution wise opinion of the respondents on the Places of using SM platforms. Out of 551 total respondents, 110 (19.96%) of them opined that they used Library for accessing to SM platforms while 169 (30.67%) used Hostels; 200 (36.3%) used Institute Campus; and 72 (13.07%) used Cyber Café.

The institution wise analysis reveals that out of 110 respondents who used Library for accessing to SM platforms, 26 (23.64%) respondents were from PEC followed by MVIT (21.82%), CCET (12.73%), ACET (10.91%), RGCET (10.91%), PMCET (7.27%), ALCET (6.36%), SGCET (3.64%), and RAAKCET (2.73%). With regard to the use of Hostels for accessing to SM platforms, out of 169 respondents, 48(28.4%) are from PEC followed by RGCET (17.16%), MVIT (13.02%), ACET (11.24%), ALCET (9.47%), CCET (8.88%), PMCET (5.92%), RAAKCET (2.96%), and SGCET (2.96%).

As far as the use of Institute Campus for accessing to SM platforms is concerned, out of 200 respondents, 49 (24.5%) are from PEC followed by RGCET (19%), CCET (18%), MVIT (12%), ACET (9.5%), PMCET (6%), SGCET (5.5%), ALCET (4.5%), and RAAKCET (1%).

With regard to the use of Cyber Café for accessing to SM platforms, out of 72 respondents, 15 (20.83%) are from MVIT followed by PEC (19.44%), RGCET (15.28%), ACET (12.5%), CCET (12.5%), PMCET (8.33%), ALCET (6.94%), SGCET (2.78%), and RAAKCET (1.39%).

Opinion of the respondents on the Devices used for SM platforms

Table 7 represents the institution wise opinion of the respondents on the Devices used for SM platforms. Out of 551 total respondents, 64 (11.62%) of them opined that they used Personal Computers for accessing to SM platforms while 175 (31.76%) used Laptop; 249 (45.19%) used Mobile phones; and 63 (11.43%) used Tablets.

The institution wise analysis reveals that out of 64 respondents who used Personal Computers for accessing to SM platforms, 12 (18.75%) respondents were from PEC followed by CCET (14.06%), MVIT (14.06%), RGCET (14.06%), ACET (12.50%), PMCET (9.38%), ALCET (7.81%), SGCET (6.25%), and RAAKCET (3.13%). With regard to the use of Laptops for accessing to SM platforms, out of 175 respondents, 43 (24.57%) are from PEC followed by RGCET (14.86%), MVIT (14.29%), ACET (10.86%), CCET (10.86%), PMCET (9.14%), ALCET (8%), SGCET (4%), and RAAKCET (3.43%). As far as the use of Mobile Phones for accessing to SM platforms is concerned, out of 249 respondents, 65 (26.1%) are from PEC followed by MVIT (18.07%), RGCET (17.67%), CCET (14.86%), ACET (9.24%), ALCET (5.22%), PMCET (4.42%), SGCET (3.61%), and RAAKCET (0.8%).

Table 6 Opinion of the respondents on the Places of using SM platforms

Institution	Library	%	Hostel	%	Institute Campus	%	Cyber Café	%	Total	%
PEC	26	23.64	48	28.40	49	24.50	14	19.44	137	24.86
ACET	12	10.91	19	11.24	19	9.50	9	12.50	59	10.71
ALCET	7	6.36	16	9.47	9	4.50	5	6.94	37	6.72
CCET	14	12.73	15	8.88	36	18.00	9	12.50	74	13.43
PMCET	8	7.27	10	5.92	12	6.00	6	8.33	36	6.53
MVIT	24	21.82	22	13.02	24	12.00	15	20.83	85	15.43
RAAKCET	3	2.73	5	2.96	2	1.00	1	1.39	11	2.00
RGCET	12	10.91	29	17.16	38	19.00	11	15.28	90	16.33
SGCET	4	3.64	5	2.96	11	5.50	2	2.78	22	3.99
Total	110	100	169	100	200	100	72	100	551	100
%	19.96		30.67		36.30		13.07		100	

Table 7 Opinion of the respondents on the Devices used for SM platforms

Institution	PC	%	Laptop	%	Mobile	%	Tablet	%	Total	%
PEC	12	18.75	43	24.57	65	26.10	17	26.98	137	24.86
ACET	8	12.50	19	10.86	23	9.24	9	14.29	59	10.71
ALCET	5	7.81	14	8.00	13	5.22	5	7.94	37	6.72
CCET	9	14.06	19	10.86	37	14.86	9	14.29	74	13.43
PMCET	6	9.38	16	9.14	11	4.42	3	4.76	36	6.53
MVIT	9	14.06	25	14.29	45	18.07	6	9.52	85	15.43
RAAKCET	2	3.13	6	3.43	2	0.80	1	1.59	11	2.00
RGCET	9	14.06	26	14.86	44	17.67	11	17.46	90	16.33
SGCET	4	6.25	7	4.00	9	3.61	2	3.17	22	3.99
Total	64	100	175	100	249	100	63	100	551	100
%	11.62		31.76		45.19		11.43		100	

With regard to the use of Tablets for accessing to SM platforms, out of 63 respondents, 17 (26.98%) were from PEC followed by RGCET (17.46%), ACET (14.29%), CCET (14.29%), MVIT (9.52%), ALCET (7.94%), PMCET (4.76%), SGCET (3.17%), and RAAKCT (1.59%).

Opinion of the respondents on the purpose of using SM platforms

An attempt was made to analyse various purposes of using SM platforms to identify the significant difference among the respondents. As indicated in Table8, out of 73 faculty respondents, 90.41 percent of them made use of SM platforms for Academic purpose followed by Promoting own research/publication (89.04%), Sharing experiences (80.82%), Finding information about conference/seminars, etc. (76.71%), Online discussion (65.75%), Meeting new people (57.53%), Sharing photos and videos (57.53%), Interacting with friends & families (53.42%), Chatting (28.77%), Entertainment (26.03%), Games (15.07%), Job searching (12.33%), and Lurking – watching posts passively (8.22%).

On the other hand, out 478 student respondents, 98.12 percent of them made use of SM platforms for Sharing photos and videos followed by Job searching (97.91%), Entertainment (97.7%), Meeting new people (96.65%), Online discussion (96.44%), Interacting with friends & families (95.82%), Chatting (94.56%), Games (94.35%), Sharing experiences (62.34%), Lurking (50.42%), Academic (34.31%), Finding information about conference/seminars, etc. (30.54%), and Promoting own research/publication (25.31%).

Table 8 Opinion of the respondents on the Purpose of using SM platforms

S. No.	Purpose	Faculty (N=73)	%	Students (N=478)	%
1.	Chatting	21	28.77	452	94.56
2.	Entertainment	19	26.03	467	97.70
3.	Academic	66	90.41	164	34.31
4.	Sharing experiences	59	80.82	298	62.34
5.	Online discussion	48	65.75	461	96.44
6.	Games	11	15.07	451	94.35
7.	Meeting new people	42	57.53	462	96.65
8.	Job searching	9	12.33	468	97.91
9.	Sharing photos and videos	42	57.53	469	98.12
10.	Lurking (watching posts passively)	6	8.22	241	50.42
11.	Interacting with friends & families	39	53.42	458	95.82
12.	Promoting own research/publication	65	89.04	121	25.31
13.	Finding information about conference/seminars, etc.	56	76.71	146	30.54

Opinion of the respondents on the statement “Using social media tools makes it easy to organize and access various social activities”

An opinion was sought from the respondents based on the statement whether “Using social media tools makes it easy to organize and access various social activities”. Table 9 indicates that out of 551 respondents, 71 (12.89%) of them strongly agreed with the statement while 125 (22.69%) respondents somewhat agreed; 197 (35.75%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed; 100 (18.15%) respondents somewhat disagreed; and 60 (10.89%) respondents strongly disagreed.

Institution wise analysis of the opinion on the above statement revealed that out of 71 respondents who strongly agreed, 18 (25.35%) are from PEC that ranks first followed by CCET (16.9%), RGCET (16.9%), ACET (12.68%), MVIT (12.68%), PMCET (7.04%), ALCET (5.63%), RAAKCET (1.41%), and SGCET (1.41%). Out of 125 (22.69%) respondents who somewhat agreed, 28 (22.4%) are from PEC that ranks first in order followed by RGCET (19.2%), MVIT (16.8%), CCET (12.8%), ACET (11.2%), ALCET (7.2%), PMCET (5.6%), RAAKCET (2.4%), and SGCET (2.4%). Out of 197 (35.75%) respondents who neither agreed nor disagreed, 48 (24.37%) are from PEC that ranks first in order followed by MVIT (18.27%), RGCET (16.75%), CCET (13.71%), ACET (11.68%), PMCET (5.58%), SGCET (4.57%), ALCET (3.55%), and RAAKCET (1.52%).

On the other hand, out of 100 (18.15%) respondents who somewhat disagreed, 31 (31%) are from PEC that ranks first in order followed by MVIT (12%), ALCET (11%), RGCET (11%), CCET (10%), ACET (9%), PMCET (8%), SGCET (5%), and RAAKCET (3%). Out of 60 (10.89%) respondents who strongly disagreed, 12 (20%) are from PEC that ranks first in order followed by RGCET (16.67%), CCET (15%), MVIT (11.67%), ACET (10%), ALCET (10%), PMCET (8.33%), SGCET (6.67%), and RAAKCET (1.67%).

Table 9 Opinion of the respondents on “Using social media tools makes it easy to organize and access various social activities”

Institution	Strongly agree	%	Somewhat agree	%	Neither agree nor disagree	%	Somewhat disagree	%	Strongly disagree	%	Total	%
PEC	18	25.35	28	22.40	48	24.37	31	31.00	12	20.00	137	24.86
ACET	9	12.68	14	11.20	23	11.68	9	9.00	6	10.00	59	10.71
ALCET	4	5.63	9	7.20	7	3.55	11	11.00	6	10.00	37	6.72
CCET	12	16.90	16	12.80	27	13.71	10	10.00	9	15.00	74	13.43
PMCET	5	7.04	7	5.60	11	5.58	8	8.00	5	8.33	36	6.53
MVIT	9	12.68	21	16.80	36	18.27	12	12.00	7	11.67	85	15.43
RAAKCET	1	1.41	3	2.40	3	1.52	3	3.00	1	1.67	11	2.00
RGCET	12	16.90	24	19.20	33	16.75	11	11.00	10	16.67	90	16.33
SGCET	1	1.41	3	2.40	9	4.57	5	5.00	4	6.67	22	3.99
Total	71	100	125	100	197	100	100	100	60	100	551	100
%	12.89		22.69		35.75		18.15		10.89		100	

Opinion of the respondents on the statement “Using social media tools provide a significant advantage in teaching and learning process”

Table 10 indicates based on the statement “Using social media tools provide a significant advantage in teaching and learning process” that out of 551 respondents, 47 (8.53%) of them strongly agreed with the statement while 138 (25.05%) respondents somewhat agreed; 222 (40.29%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed; 80 (14.52%) respondents somewhat disagreed; and 64 (11.62%) respondents strongly disagreed.

Institution wise analysis of the opinion on the above statement revealed that out of 47 respondents who strongly agreed, 11 (23.4%) are from RGCET that ranks first followed by PEC (19.15%), MVIT (19.15%), ACET (10.64%), CCET (10.64%), RAAKCET (6.38%), ALCET (4.26%), PMCET (4.26%), and SGCET (2.13%). Out of 138 (25.05%) respondents who somewhat agreed, 26 (18.84%) are from RGCET that ranks first in order followed by CCET (16.67%), PEC (15.22%), MVIT (15.22%), ACET (13.77%), PMCET (7.97%), ALCET (7.25%), SGCET (2.9%), and RAAKCET (2.17%). Out of 222 (40.29%) respondents who neither agreed nor disagreed, 61 (27.48%) are from PEC that ranks first in order followed by MVIT (17.57%), RGCET (16.22%), CCET (13.06%), ACET (9.91%), ALCET (5.86%), PMCET (5.41%), SGCET (3.6%), and RAAKCET (0.9%).

On the other hand, out of 80 (14.52%) respondents who somewhat disagreed, RGCET (13.75%), CCET (12.5%), MVIT (12.5%), ACET (7.5%), ALCET (7.5%), PMCET (6.25%), SGCET (6.25%), and RAAKCET (1.25%). Out of 64 (11.62%) respondents who strongly disagreed, 20 (31.25%) are from PEC that ranks first in order followed by ACET (10.94%), CCET (10.94%), ALCET (9.38%), PMCET (9.38%), MVIT (9.38%), RGCET (9.38%), SGCET (6.25%), and RAAKCET (3.13%).

Table 10 Opinion of the respondents on “Using social media tools provide a significant advantage in teaching and learning process”

Institution	Strongly agree	%	Somewhat agree	%	Neither agree nor disagree	%	Somewhat disagree	%	Strongly disagree	%	Total	%
PEC	9	19.15	21	15.22	61	27.48	26	32.50	20	31.25	137	24.86
ACET	5	10.64	19	13.77	22	9.91	6	7.50	7	10.94	59	10.71
ALCET	2	4.26	10	7.25	13	5.86	6	7.50	6	9.38	37	6.72
CCET	5	10.64	23	16.67	29	13.06	10	12.50	7	10.94	74	13.43
PMCET	2	4.26	11	7.97	12	5.41	5	6.25	6	9.38	36	6.53
MVIT	9	19.15	21	15.22	39	17.57	10	12.50	6	9.38	85	15.43
RAAKCET	3	6.38	3	2.17	2	0.90	1	1.25	2	3.13	11	2.00
RGCET	11	23.40	26	18.84	36	16.22	11	13.75	6	9.38	90	16.33
SGCET	1	2.13	4	2.90	8	3.60	5	6.25	4	6.25	22	3.99
Total	47	100	138	100	222	100	80	100	64	100	551	100
%	8.53		25.05		40.29		14.52		11.62		100	

Opinion of the respondents on the positive influence of using SM tools and platforms

Table 11 provides the opinions of the respondents on the positive influence of using SM tools and platforms. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 94.52 percent of them opined that use of SM tools and platforms positively influences the Dissemination of research results followed by Collaborative & peer learning (93.15%), Keep updated in the field (82.19%),

Better relations with peer experts (80.82%), Involvement in social & cultural activities (79.45%), Collaborative working opportunity (78.08%), Help save time & money (67.12%), Collation of resources (67.12%), and Developing e-portfolio for future employment (31.51%).

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 93.72 percent of them opined that use of SM tools and platforms positively influences the Developing e-portfolio for future employment followed by Keep updated in the field (91.63%), Involvement in social & cultural activities (91.21%), Help save time & money (76.15%), Collaborative & peer learning (72.38%), Collation of resources (65.27%), Collaborative working opportunity (51.26%), Better relations with peer experts (49.16%), and Dissemination of research results (44.14%).

Opinion of the respondents on the Negative influence of using SM tools and platforms

Table 12 provides the opinions of the respondents on the negative influence of using SM tools and platforms. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 84.93 percent of them opined that use of SM tools and platforms negatively influences the Neglecting social activities followed by Unable to concentrate on family/social life (83.56%), Affecting academic performance (80.82%), Lose effective learning time (73.97%), Stay up late at night and sleep disorder (64.38%), and Addiction to social media (49.32%).

Table 12 Opinion of the respondents on the positive influence of using SM tools and platforms

S. No.	Influencing Factor	Faculty (N=73)	%	Students (N=478)	%
1.	Better relations with peer experts	59	80.82	235	49.16
2.	Collaborative & peer learning	68	93.15	346	72.38
3.	Developing e-portfolio for future employment	23	31.51	448	93.72
4.	Dissemination of research results	69	94.52	211	44.14
5.	Help save time & money	49	67.12	364	76.15
6.	Involvement in social & cultural activities	58	79.45	436	91.21
7.	Collation of resources	49	67.12	312	65.27
8.	Collaborative working opportunity	57	78.08	245	51.26
9.	Keep updated in the field	60	82.19	438	91.63

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 92.68 percent of them opined that use of SM tools and platforms negatively influences such as Stay up late at night and sleep disorder followed by Lose effective learning time (90.38%), Unable to concentrate on family/social life (88.49%), Addiction to social media (88.08%), Neglecting social activities (75.1%), and Affecting academic performance (67.15%). (Table 13)

Table 13 Opinion of the respondents on the Negative influence of using SM tools and platforms

S. No.	Influencing Factor	Faculty (N=73)	%	Students (N=478)	%
1.	Addiction to social media	36	49.32	421	88.08
2.	Stay up late at night and sleep disorder	47	64.38	443	92.68
3.	Lose effective learning time	54	73.97	432	90.38
4.	Affecting academic performance	59	80.82	321	67.15
5.	Neglecting social activities	62	84.93	359	75.10
6.	Unable to concentrate on family/social life	61	83.56	423	88.49

6. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The outcomes of the study on the use of social media platforms by the faculties and students of engineering colleges in Puducherry led to the following significant findings such as 91.05 percent of the total respondents made use of Skype; only 12.34 percent of the respondents

checked the analytics of social media activities daily; 7.8 of the respondents used SM platforms very frequently, and 22.87 percent frequently. 4.54 percent of the respondents used SM platforms for Less than a Month while 18.33 percent of them spent less than one hour a week on SM platforms; 19.96 percent of the respondents opined that they used Library for accessing to SM platforms while 169 (30.67%) used Hostels, 200 (36.3%) used Institute Campus; and 72 (13.07%) used Cyber Café. Interestingly, it was found that 90.41 percent of the faculty respondents made use of SM platforms for Academic purposes while 98.12 percent of the students made use of SM platforms for Sharing photos and videos. It was also opined that the use of social media platforms has positively influenced the respondents. However, a good number of respondents have also revealed that there was negative influence on the use of social media platforms.

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.alexa.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.hrmars.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., & Nimon, 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.