The current issue and full text archive of this journal is available at
www.emeraldinsight.com/0737-8831.htm

Who is following us? Data mining a library's Twitter followers

Robin R. Sewell
Medical Sciences Library, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

Received March 2012
Revised July 2012
Accepted August 2012

Abstract

Purpose – Twitter is an increasingly popular social networking tool for libraries to use to reach out to their patrons, but very little research has been done to determine who is following library tweets. The aim of the paper is to use the existing Twitter follower information for the Sterling Evans Library at Texas A&M as a test bed to determine the composition of Evans Twitter followers. The Medical Sciences Library's primary user groups are made up largely of graduate and professional students, making the difference in the number of graduate and undergraduate followers of particular interest.

Design/methodology/approach – Follower data were gathered from the Evans Twitter page and each user was identified and categorized. Additional data were collected on the number of tweets, and the state of the account, active or inactive.

Findings – A total of 432 follower accounts were examined. A total of 54.37 percent were identified as affiliated with Texas A&M University. The largest group of followers were students (23.61 percent), made up primarily of undergraduates (81.05 percent). Faculty/staff (7.64 percent) showed very little participation. Unaffiliated followers included corporations (19.68 percent), alumni (11.57 percent), and other libraries or librarians (7.64 percent).

Originality/value – Very little can be found in the library literature on Twitter follower analysis. This is the first large and detailed analysis of library Twitter followers.

Keywords Twitter, Social networking, Data mining, Social media, Undergraduate, Graduate, Libraries

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Twitter has become an important feature on the social media landscape. It offers the ability to compose quick, short messages of 140 characters or less to highlight important developments or events, or to just let followers know your current state, physical, mental or emotional. Celebrities use tweets, twitter microblog messages, to stay connected to their fan base, and news organizations cloud source tweets for trends and report their findings as they relate to current events. Twitter and other social media sites like Facebook played a vital role in 2011 world events including the protests during the "Arab Spring," the aftermath of the Tōhoku earthquake and tsunami (Acar and Muraki, 2011), and the "Occupy" movement in the US. It is not surprising that many libraries have embraced Twitter as another tool in their social media tool box, along with Facebook and YouTube, to reach out to patrons virtually.

The Medical Sciences Library (MSL) at Texas A&M University did not participate in Twitter and wanted to discover who was following library tweets before committing to an ongoing invested of staff time and effort to maintain an MSL Twitter presence. This project was undertaken to identify and categorize library tweet followers and determine if library tweets are reaching the intended audience; in the case of an academic library, the intended audience would be followers affiliated with the parent

Library Hi Tech
Vol. 31 No. 1, 2013
pp. 160-170
© Emerald Group Publishing Limited
0737-8831
DOI 10.1108/07378831311303994

institution. As the primary library for the graduate and professional students in the Colleges of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences and the Texas A&M Health Sciences Center College of Medicine, College of Nursing, College of Pharmacy, and School of Rural Public Health, MSL has a particular interest in the differences in the following habits of undergraduate and graduate/professional students. Given the intensive nature of graduate and professional programs, it was hypothesized that the majority of library tweet followers would be undergraduates.

Literature review

Twitter can be used in two ways: to push information out to followers, and to gather intelligence about account holders by monitoring their tweets. Forrestal and French both provide excellent examples of using twitter as an intelligence gathering tool. Forrestal provides detailed instruction on setting and saving Twitter keyword searches, including geographic limits to keep results relevant, and indicate availability of new information by setting an alarm, e-mail alert, or RSS feed (Forrestal, 2011). French describes a listening model employing applications such as Gist and HootSuite to manage Twitter and assist in gathering competitive style intelligence information on contacts (patrons), competitors, and experts (French, 2010).

The majority of the literature on Twitter implementation focuses on its information delivery aspects. There have been several innovative applications of Twitter including using it to provide reference services (Ekart, 2011; Fields, 2010; Mathews, 2008), distribute new titles lists (Rodzvilla, 2010), and serve as an access point for an embedded classroom librarian (Filgo, 2011); however, Stuart found that most library tweets focus on library news and information or highlight particular library resources. Libraries often neglect the social aspects of Twitter and do not use it as an opportunity to connect to their followers. Stuart cautioned against dabbling in Twitter because it could easily damage a libraries social media credibility with users, especially since there is an expectation of new and fresh content with Web 2.0 technologies (Stuart, 2010).

The library literatures focus has been primarily on getting started with Twitter and on how and why Twitter could and should be implemented, but very little attention has been paid to who is following library tweets. Anecdotal comments about the lack of local users and the trend for other librarians and unaffiliated patrons to follow library tweets has been offered (Stephens, 2007), but only Cuddy *et al.* (2010) provide concrete data on their early experience using Twitter at New York University Health Sciences Library (NYUHSL). The data demonstrated that only 27 (40.91 percent) of the 66 NYUHSL tweet followers were affiliated patrons. The others followers were librarians or libraries, businesses, and unaffiliated individuals.

No literature was identified which compared the use of Twitter by undergraduate students and graduate/professional students; however two articles were found that examined academic year and use of other social media sites. Park demonstrated differences in attitudes and use patterns of undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty of Cyworld, a popular social networking site in South Korea. Undergraduates were more avid users, especially of the profile service, while graduate students tended to use the site to help with academic pursuits and many had lost interest in the profile aspect as they transitioned from undergraduate to graduate status (Park, 2010). In their analysis of Facebook use by medical students and residents

at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Thompson *et al.* found the number of medical students with accounts, 63 percent overall, was higher that the number of medical residents with Facebook accounts, only 12.8 percent, and that Facebook use for both medical students and medical residents decreased as they approached graduation (Thompson *et al.*, 2008).

Methodology

Since MSL had no Twitter account of its own to analyze, this project took advantage of the Sterling C. Evans Library's (Evans) early adoption of Twitter by data mining the list of followers for the last week in July 2011. Of the five physical libraries on the Texas A&M College Station campus two, Evans and the West Campus Library, are active Twitter users. Evans was selected because it has had a Twitter presence since May 2009 and had a large number of followers, 436, in July 2011. The Evans Library serves a broad section of the university including a large number of science disciplines and both graduate and undergraduate populations. While the TAMU West Campus Library is also an active Twitter participant with a large number of followers, its primary patron population, the University's Mays School of Business, does not provide the breadth of discipline coverage of the Evans Library patron pool.

Evans' Twitter follower data were gathered by copying and pasting the information from the Evans Twitter account into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. This preserved the descriptive information entered by the account holder and whether the account had protected its tweets (restricted viewing set by the account holder), and preserved the hyperlink to access the Twitter account online. Each follower was classified into one of the following types: student, faculty/staff, university department/organization, library faculty/staff, Texas A&M University alumni, corporation, organization, other library/librarian, other university, outside individual, unknown. Faculty and staff results were pooled together; however, separate data were collected for library faculty and staff to differentiate them from the general faculty and staff population.

Every attempt was made to identify faculty, staff, and students and to differentiate them from unaffiliated followers. Information used to determine affiliation was sourced from the account holders self-descriptions, campus directory, campus web sites, Facebook, Twitter, MySpace, LinkedIn, Google Profiles, and blogs. In some cases it was possible to determine from postings on Facebook or tweets that a follower was a student at Texas A&M, but there was insufficient information to determine their year or program. Those followers who could not be accurately identified as being affiliated were classified as outside individuals. If there was insufficient information to make a determination of status, which was the case for accounts with protected tweets and no descriptive information, the follower was classified as unknown.

In addition, the author attempted to identify the academic program (college) and year for students, the college for faculty/staff, and the year of graduation and college for alumni. Year of graduation for alumni was of particular importance since an alumnus may have been a follower as a student and continued to follow after graduation. All alumni who graduated from 2009 to 2011 were classified as recent graduates who could have begun following Evans' tweets prior to graduation.

Followers were further identified as affiliated and not affiliated. To be considered affiliated a follower had to be a faculty, staff, student, or an academic department, administrative unit, or university organization. Alumni, parents of students, football

related fan sites, and organizations that had a web presence outside the tamu.edu domain were not considered affiliates.

As data were gathered it became apparent that additional classifications were needed for corporations. All corporations were identified as local or not local and additional information on the type of business was included. As the analysis progressed, the subcategories of Aggie fan-base (followers of Texas A&M sports), library vendor, student focus, and restaurants emerged. There were also several corporations which did not fit into any of these sub-classifications and were considered as miscellaneous.

Follower posting data were used to determine the amount of activity generated by the account and whether the account continued to be active. The total number of tweets was recorded for each follower with an unprotected account. No differentiation was made between a tweet created by the follower and a retweet, (the reposting of a tweet someone had found interesting). The date of the last tweet posted was also collected in an effort to differentiate those followers that had an ongoing interest in Twitter from those followers whose accounts had been abandoned. A binary designation of account activity was used to identify accounts as active or inactive. Because the data were gathered in July, some student followers may have had lower levels of Twitter activity, especially those who had just graduated and were relocating, or those who were busy with summer jobs. The author decided that a follower must have posted tweets in May to be considered active. This meant that an account with a large number of tweets that stopped in April would be considered inactive despite the number of past tweets logged from that account. No data on tweets or last posting were available for protected accounts.

Results

Information for 436 followers was collected from the Evans Twitter page. Four of the accounts which had been removed from Twitter between the time the data were collected and when the analysis was completed a few weeks later were dropped from the analysis leaving a total of 432 followers.

The data were used to compare the Texas A&M University affiliated followers, the followers the library is most interested in reaching, with the unaffiliated followers. The analysis showed 196 (45.37 percent) followers had an affiliation with Texas A&M University, while 236 (54.63 percent) were not affiliated and 38 (8.80 percent) were classified as unknown. Table I provides summary data for all types and a more detailed description of the analysis of the categories is given in the following.

Students

Student data were used to compare undergraduate students to graduate/professional students, and to examine college affiliations, Twitter activity, and number of tweets. Student data by academic year is provided in Table II. Master's, PhD. and professional students are grouped together under the heading of graduate students. There was insufficient information to determine program year for seven of the students, so those followers were excluded from the follower percentage analysis.

All Texas A&M University colleges were represented by student followers. Table III shows total student followers by college. Additional data from the Texas A&M University Enrollment Profile Spring 2011 (Office of Institutional Studies and

Type	Followers No.	(%)	Active No.	(%)	Inactive No.	(%)	Protected No.	(%)	Tweets Av.	Median
Affiliated										
Student	102	23.61	52	86.67	8	13.33	42	41.18	1,379.10	190.00
Faculty/staff	23	5.32	9	56.25	7	43.75	7	30.43	804.56	96.50
Lib. faculty/staff	33	7.64	8	28.57	20	71.43	5	15.15	98.18	2.50
University[a]	38	8.80	29	76.32	9	23.68	0	0.00	425.13	132.00
Unaffiliated										
Alumni	50	11.57	24	63.16	14	36.84	12	24.00	1,369.24	303.50
Corporation	85	19.68	59	72.84	22	27.16	4	4.71	672.30	185.00
Organization	7	1.62	5	71.43	2	28.57	0	0.00	758.75	191.00
Other lib.[b]	33	7.64	26	83.87	5	16.13	2	6.06	677.40	218
Other university	4	0.93	2	50.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	244.25	229.50
Outside individual	19	4.40	13	72.22	5	27.78	1	5.26	741.17	433.50
Unknown[c]	38	8.8	14	53.9	12	46.2	12	31.6	665.35	30.00
Total	432	100	241	69.5	106	30.6	85	19.7		

Table I.
Summary of data by follower category

Notes: [a]Texas A&M University departments and organizations; [b]Other libraries or librarians. [c]Included in follower percentages calculations

Type	Followers No.	(%)	Active No.	(%)	Inactive No.	(%)	Protected No.	(%)	Tweets Av.	Median
Freshman	3	3.16	2	100.00	0	0.00	1	33.3	2,332.50	2,332.50
Sophomore	12	12.63	9	100.00	0	0.00	3	25	4,886.56	338.00
Junior	29	30.53	17	94.44	1	5.56	11	37.9	590.44	181.00
Senior	33	34.74	14	87.50	2	12.50	17	51.5	844.69	264.00
All undergrad.[a]	77	81.05	32	41.03	42	91.30	4	8.7	1,617.49	225.00
Grad.[b]	18	18.95	7	63.64	4	36.36	7	38.9	506.18	81.00
Exchg.[c, d]	1		0	–	1	100.00	0	–	114.00	114.00
Unknown[d]	6		3	100.00	0	–	3	50	1,425.67	411.00
Total	102		52	86.67	8	13.33	42	41.2		

Table II.
Students by academic year

Notes: [a]All undergraduates; [b]Masters, PhD and professional students; [c]Exchange student. [d]Excluded from follower percentage calculations

Planning, 2011) were used to derive an estimate of the number of undergraduate and graduate/professional students by college that could be expected to follow Evans tweets. The expected number was based on the percentage of undergraduate or graduate/professional students in each college from the spring 2011 enrollment figures multiplied by the total number of students, undergraduate or graduate/professional, following Evans tweets. Results are shown in Table IV.

Faculty and staff

The 23 non-library faculty and staff members came from 18 different departments and campus units. Only eight (34.78 percent) of the faculty and staff members were part of an academic department; the rest were from administrative level units, such as the

College	Followers No.	Followers (%)	Active No.	Active (%)	Inactive No.	Inactive (%)	Protected No.	Protected (%)	Tweets Av.	Tweets Median
Agriculture	11	11.46	5	100.00	0	–	6	54.55	891.60	242
Architecture	2	2.08	1	100.00	0	–	1	50.00	97.00	97
Business	13	13.54	7	100.00	0	–	6	46.15	1,935.00	832
COP[a]	1	1.04	0	–	1	100.00	0	–	1.00	1
Education	8	8.33	4	100.00	0	–	4	50.00	1,041.75	171.5
Engineering	16	16.67	8	80.00	2	20.00	6	37.50	178.90	125.5
Gen. stud.[b]	6	6.25	5	100.00	0	–	1	16.67	1,102.60	314
Geosciences	3	3.13	1	100.00	0	–	2	66.67	480.00	480
Liberal arts	28	29.17	14	93.33	1	6.67	13	46.43	2,867.47	222
Science	5	5.21	3	75.00	1	25.00	1	20.00	1,315.75	299
SRPH[c]	1	1.04	–	75.00	-	25.00	1	100.00	–	299
CVMBS	2	2.08	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	–	11.00	11
Unknown[d]	6	5.88	3	60.00	2	40.00	1	16.67	879.80	114
Total	102	100.00	52	86.67	8	13.33	42	41.18		

Notes: [a]TAMHSC College of Pharmacy; [b]General studies; [c]TAMHSC School of Rural Public Health. [d]Excluded from follower percentage calculations

Table III.
Students by college

College	Actual	Expected
Undergraduate		
Engineering	9	16
Liberal arts	24	13
Agriculture	9	11
Gen studies[a]	6	9
Business	12	8
Education	6	8
Science	5	4
Vet med[b]	2	3
Architecture	2	3
Geosciences	2	1
Total	77	77
Graduate/professional		
Engineering	7	4
Liberal arts	3	1
Agriculture	2	2
Education	2	2
Geosciences	1	1
Pharmacyd	1	
SRPH[c, d]	1	
Total	17	10

Notes: [a]General studies; [b]Veterinary medicine; [c]School of Rural Public Health. [d]Texas A&M Health Science Center colleges. Enrollment figures not available

Table IV.
Followers by college enrollment

Office of Graduate Studies, Computer and Information Systems, and International Student Services. Half of the academic faculty/staff accounts were protected. Of the unprotected accounts, only the Agriculture faculty/staff account was active at the time of the data collection. There were 33 follower accounts belonging to library faculty and staff members. Most of these members worked at Evans, 29 (87.88 percent), 3 (9.09 percent) were from the West Campus Library, and 1 (3.03 percent) was from the Medical Sciences Library.

Texas A&M University

38 of the Evans followers were Texas A&M University units or organizations. Nine of these were student organizations or clubs. The remainder included administrative level units such as Parking and Transportation, the university hosted public broadcasting radio station, accounts created for specific special events, and the Bush School of Government and Public Service. There were 29 (76.32 percent) active accounts, 9 (23.68 percent) inactive accounts and none was protected. Several of the inactive accounts and accounts with low numbers of tweets were created for special campus events that had occurred in the past. The average number of tweets was 425.13, the means was 132, and there was a high of 3,799 and a low of 2.

Alumni

Alumni accounted for 50 (11.57 percent) of the followers. The graduation date could not be determined for 8 (16.00 percent) alumni. Of those with a known graduation date, 18 (42.86 percent) had a graduation date before 2009, and 24 (57.14 percent) were identified as recent graduates having graduated since 2009. Liberal Arts had the most alumni followers with 14 (28 percent), followed by Engineering with seven (14 percent) and Business with five (10 percent). The degree awarding college could not be determined for 17 of the alumni.

There were differences in the activity and posting pattern between recent and pre-2009 graduates. Recent graduates had a greater number of protected accounts and more accounts that were inactive than alumni who graduated before 2009. Recent graduates had five (20.83 percent) protected accounts; ten (52.63 percent) of the unprotected accounts were still active and nine (47.37 percent) were inactive. Alumni who graduated before 2009 had three (16.67 percent) protected accounts; 13 (86.67 percent) accounts were active and only two (13.33 percent) were inactive. Pre-2009 alumni posted an average of 2,120.8 tweets, a median of 770, a high of 15,539, and a low of 14. Removing the outlier who tweeted 15,539 times dropped the average to 1,162.5, the median to 747.5, and the high to 4,814 tweets. Recent alumni averaged 846.89 tweets, with a median of 30, a high of 5,039, and a low of 1. There was no identifiable college affiliation for four (16.67 percent) of the recent graduates. Nine (45.00 percent) of the recent alumni graduated from Liberal Arts, four (20.00 percent) received degrees from Business, two (10.00 percent) were from the College of Education, and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (COALS) and Architecture each had one alumnus (5.00 percent). College affiliation was only available for eight of the pre-2009 alumni. They included three (37.5 percent) from Liberal Arts, two (25.00 percent) from Engineering, and one (12.50 percent) each from Agriculture, Business and Science.

Corporations and outside followers

85 (19.00 percent) of the non-affiliated followers were corporate entities. Of these, 37 (43.53 percent) were local corporations and 48 (56.47 percent) were not local. Corporate followers included 18 (21.18 percent) library vendors, nine (10.59 percent) restaurants, eight (8.24 percent) corporations with services directed at students, such as writing services and professor evaluations, and 4 (5.00 percent) Aggie fan based corporations. The remaining 45 were a diverse group which included utility companies, a local TV station, local real estate agencies, health plans, and coupon floggers. Four of the corporate followers had protected accounts.

Other library/librarian

The 33 (7.64 percent) other library/librarian followers included 20 (60.60 percent) libraries of which of eight (40.00 percent) were university or college libraries, three (15.00 percent) public libraries, and 13 (39.39 percent) librarians, eight of who (61.54 percent) had a university or college affiliation, 4 (30.77 percent) public librarians, and 1 (7.69 percent) was unknown.

Discussion

The number of affiliated and unaffiliated followers was very similar to that found by Cuddy *et al.* (2010) and is approaching 50 percent. While this number is higher than expected, it is still quite low given the size of the campus and an enrollment of 36,952 undergraduate students and 8,956 graduate level students. This low percentage does not mean that Twitter is not an effective mechanism for Evans to communicate with its patrons; it just cannot be the only method. While Twitter is the most talked about microblogging site, it is not the only one. Tumblr, Cif2.net, Plurk, Jaiku and identi.ca are just a few of the options available (Wikipedia, 2012). This would allow any number of individuals to follow Evans library without appearing as a follower. In a study by Loudon and Hall on librarians' opinions on and use of Twitter, librarians surveyed reported that, in an academic setting, younger patrons were more interested in other types of social media, such as Facebook, than they were in Twitter (Loudon and Hall, 2010). Cassidy *et al.* reported similar findings in their paper on use of social media by Sam Houston State University students. They found that their students had very little interest in following the library on Twitter and were more interested in liking the library on Facebook (Cassidy *et al.*, 2011).

It is also important to remember that the data on Twitter followers is just a snapshot in time and does not represent all the accounts that ever followed Evans up to the point of data collection. During the short time between gathering the follower information from the Evans Twitter page and the data analysis, four of the followers' accounts had disappeared. There could be additional patrons who were not following Evans Library at the time of the data collection but have been followers in the past. Data were gathered in the summer and patrons may have stopped following for the summer or stopped after graduation.

Follower numbers may be underrepresented if an alternate path is chosen to monitor tweets. These paths include using Twitter to view Evans library tweets without following, and using Twitter lists. In 2009, Twitter introduced the concept of lists. An account holder can create a list or custom group of accounts they want to monitor and they will not appear as a follower of the accounts on the list. In addition,

lists can be made publicly available and shared allowing others to follow the list and also be excluded from the information on account followers (Wikipedia, 2012).

As expected, students were the predominant followers of Evans Twitter, and of the student followers, most were undergraduate. This analysis was undertaken in July resulting in a disproportionately low number of freshmen as most had matriculated to sophomore for the upcoming academic year and the large influx of new freshman had yet to arrive. This would be true for the other classes as well. It could explain the high number of engineering graduate students, since their designation indicated that they were master's students and could be engineering students who followed Evans tweets as undergraduates, and have since been admitted to the master's program. The undergraduates were also much more active posters than the graduate students; even when the undergraduate outlier who tweeted 36,922 times was dropped from the analysis, undergraduates still had much higher average and median posts than graduate students. They also had a higher percentage of active accounts, 93.33 percent compared to 63.64 percent for the graduate students. The percentage of graduate accounts that had been designated inactive was much greater than that of the undergraduates, 36.36 percent inactive for graduates versus 8.70 percent for undergraduates. This corresponds to the findings by Park (2010) for CyWorld and Thompson *et al.* (2008) for Facebook. As students become more involved in an intensive course of study they are less likely to take time for social media, and it supports the author's assumption that Twitter is more appropriate tool to reach an undergraduate population.

Since undergraduates made up the majority Twitter followers, it would seem logical that the college with the largest undergraduate population would have had the largest number of undergraduate followers; however, this was not the case as Table IV demonstrates; the number of expected followers based on enrollment data are much higher for Liberal Arts than it is for the engineering. There could be several explanations. One possible explanation would be that students pursuing a career in one of the social science disciplines are more likely to be Twitter followers than students who are engaged in the natural sciences. Liberal arts may also be higher than expected because the departments tend to focus more on the literature and items that are less likely to be available electronically. Finally, in their analysis of marketing effects on LibGuide use, Foster *et al.* (2010) reported a direct relationship between in person instruction and the use of LibGuides. The personal connections the liaison librarian created with the faculty and students had a direct impact on the use of the LibGuides. While no data were available on how Evans librarians market library services and Web 2.0 technologies to their departments, it is possible that this had an impact on the number of followers found in the various colleges.

The low number of faculty and staff followers was also expected. Park found that Faculty are less interested in social media than either undergraduate or graduate students (Park, 2010). Academic faculty and staff accounts had much lower activity than the non-academic faculty and staff accounts. This could be attributed to the need for non-academic units to market themselves and their services, and the greater need to communicate with the individuals, and university department and units they serve. Library faculty and staff follower numbers were artificially elevated. A large number of these accounts showed no activity, and were likely created as part of the exploration

process when Evans launched its Twitter account, not because the person had an active interest in using Twitter.

Liberal Arts also had the most recent graduate alumni followers. This would support the assumption that alumni represent a carryover of student followers after graduation. Though Liberal Arts also had the most pre-2009 followers, the small sample size makes it difficult to assign any significance. Recent alumni were not as active as expected when compared to pre-2009 alumni. After removing the outlier in the pre-2009 group, they still had a much higher average and median number of tweets. Further investigation is needed to determine the source of this difference.

The number of corporate entities following the library, especially library vendors, was understandable in light of French's (2010) article advocating the use of Twitter in a listening model to learn about potential customers, the competition, and experts. This would also be the rationale for the other libraries and librarians following the Evans tweets, and even local businesses. It was more difficult to understand why corporations which are not local, or do not have a higher education or library focus would follow Evans' tweets. It is also difficult to understand why several bloggers, authors, and random individuals who were seeking financial assistance or promoting financial schemes would be Evans followers. It is possible that they have a misconception of what Twitter can do for them, and assume that by following the library they would be more visible to students and librarians, thereby drawing more attention to their cause, issues, or products. Instead, they find themselves buried in the growing number of Evans followers and not visible to anyone.

Conclusion

Given that MSL's student patron base is heavily skewed toward graduate and professional students, is Twitter truly a viable means of communicating with library patrons? The research reported here indicates Twitter is not the most effective method to reach this audience. Even though the total number of affiliated followers examined was close to 50 percent, given the low number of graduate followers, the caution of Stuart (2010) to not do a halfhearted job with social media, and the need for a thorough marketing and evaluation plan, it is unlikely that the MSL will be deploying Twitter in the near future. Further analysis is needed, especially in the form of patron feedback, particularly from the graduate and professional students. The author and colleagues plan to conduct a survey before the end of 2012 to learn more about MSL patrons' social media preferences and their preferred methods of interaction with the library.

References

Acar, A. and Muraki, Y. (2011), "Twitter for crisis communication: lessons learned from Japan's tsunami disaster", *International Journal of Web Based Communities*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 392-402.

Cassidy, E.D., Britsch, J., Griffin, G., Manolovitz, T., Shen, L. and Turney, L. (2011), "Higher education and emerging technologies: student usage, preferences, and lessons for library services", *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 380-91.

Cuddy, C., Graham, J. and Morton-Owens, E.G. (2010), "Implementing Twitter in a health sciences library", *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 320-30.

Ekart, D.F. (2011), "Making Twitter work for you", *Computers in Libraries*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 34-5.

Fields, E. (2010), "A unique Twitter use for reference services", *Library Hi Tech News*, Vol. 27 Nos 6-7, pp. 14-15.

Filgo, E.H. (2011), "#Hashtag librarian: embedding myself into a class via Twitter and blogs", *Computers in Libraries*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 78-80.

Forrestal, V. (2011), "Making Twitter work: a guide for the uninitiated, the skeptical, and the pragmatic", *Reference Librarian*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 146-51.

Foster, M., Wilson, H., Allensworth, N. and Sands, D.T. (2010), "Marketing research guides: an online experiment with LibGuides", *Journal of Library Administration*, Vol. 50 Nos 5-6, pp. 602-16.

French, B. (2010), "Listening: the fast track to social networking", *Information Outlook*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 15-17.

Loudon, L. and Hall, H. (2010), "From triviality to business tool: the case of Twitter in library and information services delivery", *Business Information Review*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 236-41.

Mathews, B.S. (2008), "Twitter and the library: thoughts on the syndicated lifestyle", *Journal of Web Librarianship*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 589-93.

Office of Institutional Studies and Planning, Texas A&M University (2011), *Texas A&M University Enrollment Profile, Spring 2011,* Planning, OOISA, College Station, TX, p. 156.

Park, J.-H. (2010), "Differences among university students and faculties in social networking site perception and use: implications for academic library services", *The Electronic Library*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 417-31.

Rodzvilla, J. (2010), "New title tweets: using Twitter and Microsoft Excel to broadcast new title lists", *Computers in Libraries*, Vol. 30 No. 5, pp. 26-30.

Stephens, M. (2007), "Chapter 7: messaging in a 2.0 world: Twitter & SMS", *Library Technology Reports*, pp. 62-6.

Stuart, D. (2010), "What are libraries doing on Twitter?", *Online (Weston, CT)*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 45-7.

Thompson, L.A., Dawson, K., Ferdig, R., Black, E.W., Boyer, J., Coutts, J. and Black, N.P. (2008), "The intersection of online social networking with medical professionalism", *Journal of General and Internal Medicine*, Vol. 23 No. 7, pp. 954-7.

Wikipedia (2012), *Twitter*, available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Twitter (accessed February 28, 2012).

About the author

Robin R. Sewell has a DVM from the Washington State University and her MLS from the University of Arizona. Currently she serves as the Coordinator for Emerging Technologies at the Texas A&M University Medical Sciences Library. Robin R. Sewell can be contacted at: rsewell009@library.tamu.edu

To purchase reprints of this article please e-mail: **reprints@emeraldinsight.com**
Or visit our web site for further details: **www.emeraldinsight.com/reprints**