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Abstract
There has been a lot of research done on Web 2.0 technologies and social media facilities in academic libraries. Social media like Facebook, Twitter, blogs and instant messaging (IM) offer a lot of scope for librarians to communicate and interact with students reaching a wider population of students, disseminating information in a variety of ways, and getting feedback from students. A survey of 99 students at the Dublin Business School measured whether students use the different social media facilities provided by their academic library. It also asked, if they do not use the social media facilities provided by the library why they don’t and whether they think it is important that the library provides these facilities. Many of the respondents had not used the social media facilities provided by the library. The research showed that about half of students did not know that the library provided social media facilities such as Facebook, Twitter, or Blogs, and approximately another third were not interested in the facilities. Although the IM feature was the most popular with over half of students having used the facility at least once, almost a quarter of students did not know the library provided the service. The study also showed that even though many students had not been aware or were not interested in using the social media facilities provided by the library, more than half of students thought that the library should have a Facebook and Twitter account, and a large majority thought having the IM service was important. The results of the study indicate that if the DBS library is to benefit from the potential of social media facilities it must look into different ways to promote the awareness and advantages of these facilities into the consciousness of the student population.
1.0 Introduction
This dissertation is seeking to answer the question ‘Do undergraduate students use the social media facilities provided by their academic library?’ “The advancements of the technological age have – drastically changed the role and function of the library and the librarian” (Burke 2010). The role of the library has changed since the introduction of the internet to the masses when Cern announced the World Wide Web would be available to everyone in April 1993 (www.webfoundation.org). We are now living in an information age and with access to search engines like Google, this revolution has led to a change in the way users look for and access information. This has had a profound impact on libraries and specifically on academic libraries whose main role was always as a place to find information and facilitate research “libraries exist to collect large quantities of information, to organize that information – and to make the information assessable to patrons” (Gilman and Kunkel, 2010). The library is no longer the primary place to find information; users look for information through search engines (Pundalikrao Chavan, 2012). Academic libraries have embraced new technologies by digitising collections, subscribing to ejournals and when Web 2.0 technology (which can be broadly defined as the interactive internet) was introduced in the middle of the first decade of the 21st Century, libraries created Facebook pages and Twitter accounts. This interactive technology has become an intrinsic part of most young peoples’ everyday life therefore it appears to be a logical step to incorporate new modes of communication and interaction into libraries. “Since anecdotal evidence indicated that the vast majority of students (as well as many librarians) were active users of social networking sites, it appeared to be a natural opportunity to reach and communicate with students” (Sachs et al, 2011).
1.1 Objectives of the study
The objective of the study is threefold; to find out:

1. Do undergraduate students use the social media facilities provided by their academic library?
2. If they do not use the social media facilities provided by their library why don’t they?
3. Do students think it is important the library provides social media facilities?

The study is conducted as a case study using the DBS. The Hypothesis for this study is ‘Students at the DBS, do not use the social media facilities provided by the college library’. The use of the term ‘social media facilities’ will be used through this discourse to refer specifically to the different types of social media services implemented in academic libraries, such as Facebook pages, Twitter accounts, blogs and Instant messaging (IM) services.

1.2 Aims of the study
The question is important for several reasons,

- There is a cost involved in implementing new resources.
- These resources (or facilities) have to be maintained and updated by librarians and or IT personnel, which can be time consuming.
- Librarians have to be consistently retrained in how to use these new facilities which is both time consuming and costly.

If the students are using the social media facilities then it is important to invest in them to ensure that they are working for the library and the students as effectively as possible. If students are not using the facilities then librarians may be spending their time updating and implementing these technologies unnecessarily. Or if it is deemed necessary to have these facilities can they be re-marketed to encourage students to use them to benefit their study?

1.3 Scope and limitations of current research
Until now much of the research on whether students use the social media facilities provided by their academic libraries has relied upon a systems analysis perspective
such as John S Brantley’s 2010 article ‘Exploring Library 2.0 on the Social Web’ but as David Nicholas states in his 2010 article ‘The behaviour of the researcher of the future (the ‘Google generation’)’ “The big mistake – is to assume that hits equate to satisfaction and demand”. There have been studies on specific social media facilities such as Facebook where surveys of students are part of the study such as the 2011 study by Sachs et al ‘striking a balance: Effective use of Facebook in an Academic Library’ which conducts a survey of students regarding their comfort level with a library’s presence on Facebook as part of the study. The survey does not go into the students’ actual usage and is carried out in regard to Facebook only. This dissertation will endeavour to provide an answer to the question of whether undergraduate students are using all or any of the library’s social media facilities, by asking students directly about their usage. The study will use the Dublin Business School (DBS) Library as a case study. The DBS Library currently has a Facebook page, blog page, Twitter account and IM service called ‘Ask a Librarian’. The case study involves conducting a survey of 100 students currently studying at the DBS. The Survey includes questions regarding whether or not the students use the social media facilities (named above) provided by the college library, whether they are aware these facilities exist, and if students themselves think it is necessary for libraries to have these facilities.

1.4 Organisation of the dissertation
The dissertation is organised into six basic chapters.

Chapter 1: introduction and background gives an overview of how libraries have changed over the last fifteen years and how this has impacted the way libraries and librarians work.

Chapter 2: The literature review examines the current literature regarding Web 2.0 technologies in libraries and the implementation of social media facilities in libraries. The main points to be examined include defining what Web 2.0 and Library 2.0 are, the potential and the concerns arising from implementing social media into libraries i.e time management, content, strategies, and whether it is necessary to have social media facilities in academic libraries.
Chapter 3: Looks at the research methodologies used in the study, why the methodologies were chosen, how they were implemented and how the data was analysed.

Chapter 4: looks at the Data analysis. The data analysis is presented under the headings of the three objectives. Do students use the social media facilities provided by the library? If they don’t, why not, and do students think it is important that the college library has social media facilities?

Chapter 5: Looks at the conclusions that can be drawn from the data analysis and how these conclusions can help further the study in this area.

Chapter 6: Outlines some recommendations for the DBS Library and for possible areas of further research.

1.5 Background: An overview of the change in Academic libraries over the last 15 years

1.5.1 Introduction
The function of libraries has changed considerably in the last fifteen years since the advent of the World Wide Web in 1993 (www.webfoundation.org). This is especially true of academic libraries whose main function was and still is perceived to be a repository of knowledge to facilitate research (Gilman and Kunkel, 2010). Information was ‘physical’, it was kept in print or on tape, microfiche, CD Rom etc. With the advent of the World Wide Web information has become ‘virtual’ in a very short space of time. In less than two decades researchers no longer have to visit a physical location to access information. Information now exists virtually. Researchers have the ability to access information from any destination as long as they have access to a computer and more recently a smart phone and the Internet. This information revolution has led to a change in the way users look for and access information. These changes can be broadly broken down into three sections.

1  The change (or redefining) of what academic libraries provide.
2  How they provide it?
3  What this means for the future of both academic libraries and librarians.
1.5.2 What Academic Libraries Provide?

Fred Heath states in his study ‘The impact of evolving information-seeking behaviours upon research libraries’ that:

“The time-honoured practice of a community of scholars gathering on a single campus to pursue a common research interest is being challenged as the symbol of university research. In its stead there has emerged world-wide discipline-centred scholarship where collaboration and synergy are dependent upon the Internet and the World Wide Web”

Libraries were always information repositories and librarians were the facilitators of that information (Gilman and Kunkel, 2010). The invention of search engines (like Google) mean that it is not now essential for researchers to use a librarian as an intermediary to find information and it is no longer necessary for researchers to enter a library to access information. Students are more likely to log straight onto the Internet to find information than go straight to the library (Nicholas 2010), and this has wrought changes to the traditional view of the library. Academic libraries now have online access to check if a book is currently on loan or not and the facility to reserve that book. They provide access to selections of ebooks and digital archives. Academic libraries subscribe to online databases to provide students and researchers access to ejournals and articles. The library has given over more space to study tables, study rooms and computer labs in recent years (Heath 2007).

1.5.3 How they provide the new resources

Libraries provide more study space for desks and computers by taking away stacks that used to hold books. They spend more money on ejournals and ebooks and less money on print books and print journals. Time and money is spent on implementing new technologies such as social media facilities, and on IT maintenance and upgrades. There is still the need to catalogue and shelve books on the stacks, but increasingly the job of a librarian is to make students and other users aware of what the library has to offer online, like ejournals and ebooks, along with access to other resources via the web (Rowland, 2008). It is also now a large part of the librarian’s job is to teach information literacy either one to one or in a classroom context, to improve students’ use of online resources. These changes have created challenges
for librarians as they struggle to embrace the new technologies available to them (Sodt and Pedersen Summey, 2009).

1.5.4 What these changes mean for Libraries and Librarians: Fear versus Enthusiasm

1.5.4.1 Fear
The main factors that concern librarians are the fear of irrelevancy, the growing cost of operating libraries and the fact that students are unaware of the resources the library actually provides (even if they are using them) (Rowland 2008), along with the concern over the level of information literacy of users.

1.5.4.1.1 Maintaining Relevancy
The changing role of the librarian has left some fearing that libraries will become irrelevant. Albright states that the library needs “to stay relevant during an era when libraries, museums and other institutions are being squeezed from both ends”. This quote comes from an article by Blom entitled ‘Sharing knowledge online delights some, frightens others’ (1997). The quote and the title of the article convey the fear that was felt in the library community in the initial years following the introduction of the web as a research tool. This perception has changed in the intervening years as libraries have embraced new technologies; “libraries have always extended themselves beyond their physical buildings and collections by increasing access to online resources available from library websites” (Sachs et al, 2011), but at the same time there is still the fear of irrelevancy. Users can do a huge amount of research without the need to step inside the library. This has caused a reduced footfall in libraries and some libraries such as the undergraduate library at the University of Texas have closed their doors altogether, ‘Impact of Evolving Information-seeking behaviours upon research libraries, Heath, 2007). It is not surprising then that there is an emphasis on academic libraries to continuously adapt to new technologies to remain relevant, ”If we can understand more about how library 2.0 tools are being used now, perhaps we can anticipate change in order to remain relevant” (Brantley, 2010).
1.5.4.1.2 Rising Costs

Academic libraries are continually investing in implementing new technologies while maintaining the existing ones, and more and more money is needed to keep up with developing technology. Libraries provide students with access to a wide variety of information at a great cost, and many students are unaware that the library is the entity providing the information.

“Although research libraries spend millions of pounds providing seamless desktop access to expensive copyrighted electronic content: journals, books and monographs, much of this is news to their users. Either they do not know that the library provides this material, or they get to it, possibly via Google, and assume it is free’. Libraries are increasingly between a rock and a hard place: the publisher or search-engine gets the credit; they just pick up the tab” (Rowland et al. 2008).

There is a gap between what is available and what students are aware is available. “The inability of library budgets to keep up the ever increasing amount of published journals – has been an enduring topic in the library literature for many decades” (Woodward, 2009). “A survey in 2009 by Taylor Roe found that many librarians were maintaining their big deals, at the expense of their book budget and a growing number were considering cancellation of one or more, of their big deals” (Woodward, 2009). ‘Big deals’ are the contracts that libraries pay for access to ejournals and articles online. These big deals are bought in bundles, and much like digital television the more you want access to the more you have to pay, and what you get access to as part of your package may not be relevant. “The purchase of one item in an electronic environment might require licensing of a whole database because the single item is not available independently” (Koehn and Hawamdeh, 2010). Libraries are left with the choice to either continue subscribing to certain bundles of journals or continue to stock their physical library.

1.5.4.1.3 Information Literacy

Academic Librarians spend more and more of their time teaching information literacy to students and users of library and non-library resources. It has become an important part of the academic librarian’s job to try to ensure that users are aware
of where to find verified information and how to ensure what they are citing is from a legitimate source. A large study was published in 2008 which was funded by the British Library and JISC written by Rowland et al. The study is entitled ‘The Google Generation: the information behaviour of the researcher of the future’. The study's main purpose was to investigate the characteristics of information seeking behaviour of those born after the World Wide Web went global in 1993. This study states that "young people have a poor understanding of their information needs and thus find it difficult to develop effective search strategies". Students know how to use the internet and are comfortable with technology but they are unaware of what they want or to effectively organise, locate and access the most current and relevant information. When librarians were the primary facilitators of research they could ensure any information given to a user was verified, now users must be taught how to gauge the veracity of the information found, and learn how to discern whether the information they find is accurate, reliable, or relevant. Many websites are not updated for long periods of time and the information held on them may be out of date. "Many sources located on the Web are filled with inaccurate and even false information” (Burke 2010). Information found on the internet can be self-published or written by anyone. In 1999 a survey was undertaken by Davis and Cohen regarding students’ level of information literacy. They state in the study that "internet research shows that the speed of young people's web searching means that little time is spent in evaluating information, either for relevance, accuracy or authority". The same study also states that "Researchers have similarly found young people give a consistent lack of attention to the issue of authority. In one study many teenagers thought that if a site was indexed by Yahoo! It had to be authoritative". They go on to ask the question "are students using popular resources in lieu of scholarly ones?" the results in their study show that "there was a significant decline in the mean use of scholarly materials from 6.1 citations per bibliography in 1996 to 4.6 in 1999." They maintain that "this change can be explained almost entirely by the decrease in book citations". This means that the amount of students using non scholarly resources increased by almost the same amount as book citations dropped. Things have changed in the last ten years or so, but information literacy is still an issue for third level institutions (Nicholas 2010). These concerns
with information seeking behaviour and veracity have led to observations about the quality of academic research and graduates’ ability to research. According to Leavitt’s article ‘21st Century Workforce Initiatives: Implication for Information Literacy Instruction in Academic Libraries’ employers who hire graduates have concerns about their “ability to find, organize, analyse and present quality information in a timely and professional manner” (2011).

1.5.4.2 Enthusiasm

In general terms academic libraries have embraced technology as it has come along “libraries have always had a history of adopting technology” (Shoniwa and Hall, 2007). Whether this is a reaction to fear of irrelevancy or genuine enthusiasm for what technology can bring to the area of research, academic libraries have been front runners in implementing new technologies in the hope of enhancing the scope and quality of research. Woodward’s (who is the University Librarian at Cranfield University in the) article ‘Digital collections and services: The future role of academic libraries and library consortia’ states that “information technology, online databases and catalogues and digitised archives have put the library back at the heart of teaching learning and academic research on campus” (2009). She states that the internet has added a new dimension to Libraries and library staff and there is a significant place for librarians in the future of research. She also says that “while face to face interaction is diminishing, the use of our collections is soaring with 24/7 remote access” (Woodward, 2009). The traditional idea of a library is changing rapidly. What Woodward is saying is that these changes are an improvement, for students who are not restrained by library opening hours, and have the ability to find information and access books in electronic format (ebooks) even if there are no physical copies left in the library. As new technologies arise the concerns of librarians can be addressed by using social media and online tools to tackle information literacy problems, using library web pages to advise students of information literacy classes and online tutorials and materials. Students who are not going to be physically on campus can have access to books, journals and librarians through the use of the internet, with the rise of distance learning and part time learners this has
to be a good thing “The growth and development of distance learning programs is on the rise” (Notar et al, 2012, from abstract).

1.5.5 Conclusion
Over the past 15 years there has been a shift in the way libraries operate. On one side librarians see the potential of what technology has to offer, digitisation, ejournals, social media facilities and 24 hour access. On the other side the cost of maintaining these technologies, and the fear that students do not have a high enough degree of information literacy are real concerns for librarians. Then there is concern of relevancy, librarians now feel that they have to prove they are relevant to justify their funding and their place on a college campus.
2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction
The literature review looks at the readings surrounding social media facilities in academic libraries. Several themes arise again and again in the literature concerning Web 2.0 technologies and social media. Social media technologies are part of the Web 2.0 phenomenon. The implementation of Web 2.0 into libraries has become known as Library 2.0. All change has its champions and its critics and the implementation of social media in libraries is not different. The main topics that continue to arise throughout the research are the potential that social media has for libraries, and the problems that implementing the social media could bring. This chapter first looks at Web 2.0 then move onto Library 2.0 and social media. This is followed by an outline of the literature regarding the potential and concerns arising from implementing social media. The main topics addressed are social media as a marketing tool, social media as a networking tool, strategies needed to implement social media in academic libraries, time management, content and communication and whether it is necessary for academic libraries to implement social media into their libraries.

2.2 Web 2.0
To discuss the implementation of Social Media facilities in academic libraries you must first look at Web 2.0 and Library 2.0. Firstly Web 2.0. There are differing interpretations of what Web 2.0 is. At the first Web 2.0 conference in 2004 Tim O’Reilly of O’Reilly media described Web 2.0 as a platform where software applications are developed on the web instead of a desktop, and where users generate the content (Aquil et al, 2011). “Web 2.0 refers to the interactive, user-centred design of the world wide web where users not only access the web content but at the same time generate web content” (Aqil et al, 2011). Sodt and Pedersen Summey define Web 2.0 as “the development of the World Wide Web moving from stagnant Web 1.0 to a more user-driven, collaborative and participatory, and personalised Web” (2009). Web 2.0 at its most basic level is interactive
communication on the web. Instead of users accessing a website to view content, now they can add content, review content, tag content, and or pass it on to other users. Social media and social networking tools are part of the Web 2.0 phenomenon. Tools such as blogs, Facebook and Twitter are being implemented by libraries to communicate with users in new ways. This implementation of social networking tools into libraries is part of a phenomenon called Library 2.0 “Library 2.0 has made it possible to engage the users in ways that have not be possible before” (Shoniwa and Hall 2007).

2.3 Library 2.0

2.3.1 Defining Library 2.0
The literature shows that there are differing interpretations of what Library 2.0 is and what exactly it encompasses. Shoniwa and Hall state that “Library 2.0 is predominantly viewed as the selective application of Web 2.0 tools and techniques with user services at the heart of any implementation” (2007). Their interpretation defines Library 2.0 as the application of Web 2.0 technologies in a library. Casey and Savastinuk argue that Library 2.0 is not just the application of Web 2.0 technologies in the library but it is more than that, “any service, physical or virtual, that successfully reaches users, is evaluated frequently, and makes use of customer input is a Library 2.0 service”. They stress that it is the collaborative aspect that defines Library 2.0 not the technological aspect and that “even older, traditional services can be Library 2.0 if criteria are met. Similarly, being new is not enough to make a service Library 2.0” (2006). Aqil et al argue that Library 2.0 is an idea “a transformation of the library services-the way they are delivered to the user community, basically allowing the library services to operate in an interactive, collaborative atmosphere driven by community needs” (2011). The common themes that run through all interpretations are that Web 2.0 is a collaboration between librarians and users, and that Web 2.0 technologies do have an important if not complete role to play in the implementation of Library 2.0.

2.3.2 Is Library 2.0 a new phenomenon?
Researchers question whether or not Library 2.0 is a new phenomenon for libraries or just a natural progression of library services, “libraries have always had a history
of adopting technology and user-centred improvements to services, and thus Library 2.0 may not even be anything new” (Shoniwa and Hall, taken from abstract, 2007).

In the same article ‘Library 2.0 and UK academic libraries: Drivers and impacts’, Shinow and Hall state their study showed that librarians do not view Library 2.0 as something entirely new, however they do refer to the increased rate of change in libraries, but qualify this by saying the feel the pace is “not necessarily unwelcome”.

“The majority of web survey respondents did not regard Library 2.0 as something brand new. The interviewees were largely in agreement. However, a few fundamental differences were noted. These centre on the pace of change, which is now said to have greatly increased in light of Web 2.0 technology. Interviewees employed vocabulary such as ‘the culture of change’, ‘embracing change’, ‘enthusiasm’ and ‘pace of change’” (2007).

Casey and Savastinuk also state that “the heart of Library 2.0 is user-centred change. It is a model for library service that encourages constant and purposeful change, inviting user participation in the creation of both the physical and the virtual services they want” (2006). Sodt and Pedersen Summey also refer to the on-going change of Library 2.0, stating “Library 2.0 libraries experience constant change, not just for the sake of change, but change in response to the needs and feedback from library users” (2009).

2.4 Social media tools

“librarians have adopted social media tools as part of the Library 2.0 movement” (Fernandez, 2009). What are social media tools and what do libraries use them for. Social media tools include Facebook, Twitter and blogs and are interactive web based communications. Libraries are implementing these tools to enhance their communication with their users. There is a good deal of research on the potential of Facebook and its uses and usage in academic libraries (Wan, 2013 and Sach et al., 2011), however there benefits of Twitter and blogs are also lauded. Sodt and Pedersen Summey state in their 2009 article ‘Beyond the Library’s Walls: Using Library 2.0 tools to reach out to all users’ the advantages of social media like Twitter and blogs, Twitter “has provided a great way for people to share information quickly
and with a wide audience”, they go on to state “There are blogs that provide news about library events, blogs with book recommendations that are often specialized by subject area, and blogs advertising, promoting, and educating library users about new resources like databases”. Fernandez too espouses the advantages of Twitter and blogs stating that “Twitter has millions of users. It allows users to follow other Tweeters and re-Tweet (repeat) others’ Tweets for the benefit of one’s own library users. More and more libraries are beginning to make their presence felt on this microblogging social tool” and “many libraries use blogs to showcase their collections, workshops, and databases; they also use blogs to make announcements” (2009).

Whether Library 2.0 is a new phenomenon for libraries or an organic progression it does have a primary focus on technology specifically Web 2.0 technologies. According to a study done by Coelho on the implementations of Web 2.0 technologies (which include social media such as Facebook, Twitter, RSS feeds and blogs) in academic libraries in Portugal over a 3 year period from 2008 to 2010, Web 2.0 has definitely taken hold in academic libraries. The study states that in 2008 58.7% of universities used none of the tools; by 2010 no library remained at level zero. It is then left to librarians to argue the pros and cons of implementing these social media facilities, whether it is necessary to do so and what the implantation of these social media facilities mean for librarians.

2.5 Social media in academic libraries Potential and concerns

The literature surrounding social media in libraries primarily addresses the potential of social media; the different ways that social media can be used to benefit libraries and the concerns that arise from implementing these social media facilities. Social media are communication tools and so their potential for academic libraries lies in the ability to disseminate information to larger numbers of students, peers and faculty and collaborate with them in a meaningful way. The concerns relate to the management of content and the lack of strategy for implementing these social media facilities.
2.5.1 Social media as a marketing tool

Social media can be used as a marketing tool for libraries, in Fernandez’s ‘SWOT analysis for social media in libraries’ he puts forward several advantages of marketing with social media. “One of the greatest advantages of marketing with social media is that users can be anywhere to receive information-related news from librarians. They don’t need to physically be in the library”, “Social networking applications such as Facebook and MySpace, for example, allow libraries to reach a wide range of library users because they are very common social tools used by millions of people”. He states “Librarians have realized the marketing potential of social media”. It can be used for rebranding the library as a technological hub “People who might not be familiar with the library, possibly viewing it as old fashioned, can become users once they see the library using social media” (Fernandez 2009). Chu and Meulmans agree that social media can be used to market the library. They state that social media can be used to disseminate information to students and remind them that the library is there for them to utilise if they need it.

“Several libraries on MySpace/Facebook use the blog feature to promote new materials added to the collection, while soliciting student suggestions on further additions. During stressful times of the semester, librarians can remind students of the library services and resources available to support their academic success-from expert research help to additional study hours.” (2007)

They go on to say that “Social networking sites can be utilized as an additional promotional venue to create awareness of library services and events”. In their study ‘Writing a Social Media Policy for your Library’ (2012) Enders and Wineland say that after deliberation the college on which the study was based (Kentucky Christian University) decided on implementing a Facebook page for their library as it was in keeping with their mission statement of communication and education through a variety of platforms.

“The library staff and faculty determined that a Facebook page would be beneficial to the library’s communication needs, allowing the library to interact regularly with students, provide information quickly, and distribute
hints and tips in small units. Furthermore, the page would help fulfil the library’s mission statement of supporting the curriculum, providing access to information in a variety of forms, and encouraging the development of lifelong learning”

Although there is a huge potential for libraries to use social media facilities, such as blogs for marketing purposes, Draper and Turnage reference the fact that Librarians are not “marketing savvy” and this “aversion” to marketing has carried over to new technologies such as blogging. “While many of us are blogging, not nearly as many of us are actively marketing those blogs” (2008).

2.5.2 Social media as a networking tool

2.5.2.1 Networking with other librarians and libraries
Social media in libraries can be used to network with students but it can also be used to network with other librarians to collaborate and share ideas. “Libraries and librarians are tweeting to each other about news in the library world or to patrons about new resources. Facebook is also used among librarians both for communication and collaboration and for outreach to patrons” (O’Dell, 2010). Sodt and Pedersen Summey say that “Libraries are finding a multitude of ways to use blogs to reach students, staff, and faculty” (2009). In Bodnar and Doshi’a review of the current literature (2011) they state that “Librarian’s need to network with other librarians and information professionals. Institutional reasons include the need to keep in touch with library users, to help with library-user information needs and to promote awareness of and access to library resources and services”. They go on to say that although recent literature states collaborating with other librarians pays huge dividends there is “little, if any, evidence to support their claims” (Bodnar and Doshi, 2011).

2.5.2.2 Networking with students
Chu and Meulmans talk about how “social networking technologies – are used to facilitate information flow and develop relationships”, and the potential that can be derived for libraries to connect with the student population. They go on to discuss how students of California State University San Marco’s use social media for “maintaining strong ties and establishing weak ties” and suggest that with “such a
variety of ties being maintained and established it is conceivable that these technologies can be adopted by faculty and librarians as well to connect with the student population”. Draper and Turnage discuss the potential of library blogs and exploiting the interactive nature. They say that blogs allow users to create content, open dialogue with librarians and provide feedback (2008). Although the potential is there to reach out to the student population through blogging and Facebook, Coelho argues in her study ‘Web 2.0 in Academic Libraries in Portuguese Public Universities: A Longitudinal Study’ that networking and interacting with students and peers is not what social media is being used for. She states “results show that Web 2.0 tools are used mainly to disseminate information and rarely to collaborate” (2012). This argument is backed up by Sachs et al who state Facebook in libraries is used less for interactive purposes like reference and more for announcements and marketing. This dissemination of information alone does not utilise the collaborative and interactive nature of social media.

2.6 Social media strategies for libraries
There is much discussion in the literature over the lack of detail of strategies for implementing social media into academic libraries. Enders and Wineland state that “Many use social networking media haphazardly with no guiding plan or structure and risk the very problems that the non-users fear” (2011). They go onto say “A social media policy should be in place before establishing a Facebook page”. Bodnar and Doshi agree that social media strategies put forward in current literature only skims the surface and does not detail what librarians should do with their social media facilities to get the most positive impact. They state that

“most, however, offer rather simplistic advice. That is, post frequently, encourage interaction, choose an identifiable name, follow site specific rules of conduct, post authentic and engaging content, and do not be selective about who can friend you. Yet rarely do those who put forth this advice discuss it in detail” (2011).

However Shoniwa and Hall state the results of their study show implementations of Web 2.0 Technology “are not being driven for the desire of just implementing the
latest ‘gadgets’ and ‘widgets’ so that it can be seen to be 2.0 compliant. Rather, the main focus has been to implement these Web 2.0 tools in the context of end-users’ needs” (Hall and Shoniwa, 2007). This suggests that the libraries are doing research and creating strategies, however the article gives no examples of what their strategies are. There are many articles with general pointers about implementing a social media strategy but there appears to be very little in-depth study into the implementation or follow through of social media strategies in academic libraries.

2.7 Concerns about content and communication

There are several primary concerns that arise in the literature about the content of social media facilities provided by the library. The primary concerns outlined are whether students want to ‘friend’ librarians on Facebook or MySpace and how to manage and or police the content.

2.7.1 Will students be our friend?

Brian S. Mathews said in his 2009 article ‘Looking for What’s Next: Is It Time to Start Talking about Library 2.1?’ that old concerns such as “how is Facebook going to fit into our outreach program? What is the value of social tagging? Will patrons want to be ‘friends’ with us?” are no longer issues for librarians, however Bodnar and Doshi say in 2011 librarians fear of overstepping the bounds of the student librarian relationship and the fear of not getting friends or likes on Facebook still exist. Wan states in his 2011 study ‘How Academic Libraries reach users on Facebook’ that results show some librarians “felt that Facebook should serve as a space exclusively for more students and librarians, professors, administrators and other uninvited people should stay out”. On the other side of the argument Sach et al, state in their study ‘Striking a balance: effective use of Facebook in an academic library’ that “58% of students would accept a friend request from the library, and 17% would take the initiative to friend the library”. Bodnar and Doshi go onto to ask the question “Should librarians assume that students who do not change their default privacy settings are comfortable having library employees view the details of their lives?” in contrast to this question put by Bodnar and Doshi, Chu and Meulmans (2008) argue that “Faculty and administrative presence on Facebook might prompt students to take caution and accountability for their online actions”, however They do not
clarify why they think this might be the case. Wan says that “when creating Facebook profiles, librarians must be cautious and let students set the parameters of the social network relationship” (2011).

2.7.2 Student content
The second concern with the content is the collaborative nature of social media. Social media is interactive therefore both librarians and students post information. There are two issues that arise in the literature regarding student content, the first is how to police the content and the second is the quality of the content.

2.7.2.1 Policing content
“Are Facebook, Twitter, and other social networking sites safe to use if librarians cannot control every aspect of them?” (Bodnar and Doshi, 2011). “What types of interactions might a librarian want to encourage or discourage? What exactly are the site-specific codes of conduct for librarians on Facebook, Twitter, and other social networking sites? The answers to these questions are not obvious and likely vary from context to context” (Bodnar and Doshi, 2011). These concerns can be addressed in a number of ways. A possibility put forward by Enders and Wineland, is that a statement of purpose must be outlined for the Facebook page with the emphasis on ensuring that both students and employees are safeguarded. The Facebook policy must also then be matched to the institution’s goals. The library’s Facebook page policy must be created keeping in mind the institutions overall public image and policies. Issues of plagiarism, cyber-bullying and defamation were discussed. Tappendorf in her article ‘Legal issues relating to social networking’ agrees, stating that the implementation of a social media policy is very important to ensure an awareness of the library’s legal responsibilities (2013). Bodnar and Doshi state that some libraries have decided not to allow students to post on the Facebook page however they state that “the decision to deny users the right to post to a library’s wall is similar to a friend’s refusing to listen to something you have to say”. Fernandez states that “librarians have the option to screen user input if they are deemed to be controversial or offensive”. However Bodnar and Doshi argue that based on an “informal” information study they have not seen any evidence that
libraries have encountered any problems from letting students post to their walls (2011).

2.7.2.2 Quality of content
Fernandez argues that “one of the greatest strengths of social media is the users’ interaction with librarians. It is no longer a one-way flow of information from librarians” and that “Library social media enable two-way communication between librarians and users, the input from users is crucial for libraries in making strategic decisions to provide optimum services to their clientele”. However Brantley argues that some “mistakenly assume that user-generated content creates a conversation between equals” (2010), although he does not clarify the statement further, it can be inferred that student content may not be of the quality that librarians expect.

2.8 How other services are affected
After librarians address the issues of whether they should allow their users to post to the library Facebook page they also have to address the concern over whether their venture into social media communication effects other library service “The web while creating new opportunities, can also become a rival for library services” (Coelho, 2011). David Nicholas puts forward the idea that instead of jumping on the social media bandwagon librarians should try to improve what already exists “We are all looking to populate Facebook and Second lives and start twittering but somehow have ignored what can be done much nearer to home to make our product more social and interactive”. Shoniwa and Hall state “there was a concern that two types of service delivery would need to be supported in the future, one for those ‘born with the chip’ and one for the older generation”. (Although there are allusions as to how social media facilities affect library services, there is very little concentrated study done on this area, and it could be a possible area for further study).

2.9 What the Implementation of Social media facilities means for librarians
Librarians are being told to jump on the social media bandwagon, and that “libraries should acknowledge and embrace this phenomenon by integrating such tools and services into the library environment (Shoniwa and Hall 2011). However keeping
social media up to date is time consuming for librarians. They also have to find a way to evaluate the success of their social media facilities, and where does all this technology leave librarians who are not “tech savvy librarians” (Sody and Pedersen Summey, 2010).

2.9.1 Evaluation of success
A review of the literature shows that studies primarily use systems analysis to see if social media and other Web 2.0 features are successful in libraries. John S. Brantley in his 2010 study ‘Exploring Library 2.0 on the Social Web’ uses systems analysis to see how college students are using social media. He does this by analysing the popularity of “library-specific terms and phrases” on a variety of social media to see if students were in fact engaging with the library through these facilities. “The search terms selected were phrases like ‘reference librarian’, ‘information literacy’, or ‘public librarian’ – the terms were chosen to be specific enough to nearly always return hits created by or directly associated with a library”. The study does show that there is enough evidence to support implementing social media facilities in academic libraries. However David Nicholas states in his 2010 article ‘The behaviour of the researcher of the future (the ‘Google generation’)’, that with systems analysis studies “The big mistake is to assume that hits equate to satisfaction and demand”. He goes on to say “many young people are promiscuous in information terms. Thus around 40% of visitors do not come back to a site”. Wan says in reference to Facebook that the number of “Fans2 a page has is a good indicator of popularity (2011). However Bodnar and Doshi discuss the problems of evaluating success. They say that the literature does not really “question whether the number of friends associated with a Facebook page adequately reflects its value, and few consider other value measures librarians might apply to Facebook and other social networking sites, we need to understand the different ways we might measure success” (2011).

2.9.2 Time Management
The time involved in keeping social media facilities up to date is an issue for many librarians. The nature of social media tools means that time must be devoted to maintaining them. “Some librarians look at the library 2.0 concepts and technologies to see how they can be incorporated into the library setting. Others see the concept
as just something else that needs to be mastered and added to already hectic work schedules” (Sodt and Pedersen Summey, 2010). In Coelho’s study ‘Web 2.0 In Academic Libraries in Portuguese Public Universities: A Longitudinal Study’ in her points for further discussion she references the time and effort it takes to keep social media facilities up to date,

“while Twitter and blogs in general require a certain amount of effort in periodic updating in order to be dynamic enough to engage readers, not to mention the attention due to readers’ comments. The same that is said about blogs and Twitter also applies to the maintenance of a profile on a social network” (2011).

Librarians are faced with the issue of once they implement these social media facilities how do they maintain them, how do they incorporate it into their work schedules?

“There are still many questions but they are changing. Now, I hear people asking about evaluation, effectiveness, methods for reaching more users, ways to get faculty onboard, and what we should try next. This is a huge step. Social software is starting to be viewed less as a disruptive force and more as a regular part of a librarian’s workflow.” (Brian S. Mathews 2009).

Enders and Wineland sum up these issues by stating “the amount of time invested in social media versus the benefits that can be derived - how the social media tool will limit the librarian’s effectiveness, and how much time the technology will require of librarians” (2012). Bodnar and Doshi say “the authors of most ‘how to’ and ‘best practices’ articles have also said little about Facebook and other social networking sites in relation to the work-flow of libraries” and they go on to say questions need to be asked regarding whether or not it is more beneficial to have a single librarian in charge of all of the libraries social media, or should it be shared among a number of librarians?

Social media must be updated regularly Fernandez suggests that “if users find the library’s social media sites to be tastefully presented and useful, they would most
likely add them to their own Facebook or MySpace – this is a great incentive for librarians to ensure that their social networking applications meet the needs of users”. He goes on to say “Library social media that diverge from their original mission of connecting users with services and information will soon find themselves becoming irrelevant and without any followers; users can unsubscribe from social media sites very easily at the click of a button” and that “keeping social media sites relevant and current is crucial in maintaining followers” (2009). Casey and Savastinauk suggest that the implementation of Library 2.0 encourages “the development of a schedule that includes regularly soliciting customer feedback and evaluating and updating services” (2006). However Brantley suggests that is not that easy and states that “librarians implementing a blog or a social networking presence” have to “balance the benefits with the amount of work required to maintain an up to date presence (Brantley 2010).

2.9.3 Technical
Fernandez states that implementing social media facilities in libraries allows librarians to be creative, however not all librarians are “tech savvy” (Sodt and Pedersen Summey), Buono and Kordeliski state that “The content you post will be determined by your, and your fellow staff members’, skill sets and knowledge” and they go on to say that “Newcomers to social media or librarians working alone may find using social media to communicate with their community overwhelming”. In the 2006 article ‘Exploring Web 2.0 and Libraries’, Stephens refers to the need for a Next – Generation Librarian or ‘Librarian 2.0’. A Librarian with the technological background to understand the benefits of Web 2.0 technologies, be able to learn the major tools needed, and use and develop social networks to their best advantage for the benefit of the library among other things. He also references that Wayne State University advertised in February 2006 for a “NextGen Librarian”. The advert is summarised as “asking that applicants come in the door already familiar with social software and ready to train other librarians to use the technologies as well”.

2.10 Necessity of implementing social media in Academic Libraries
Whether or not Librarians have the time or the technical ability to implement and maintain social media facilities within their libraries authors keep referring to the
implementation of Web 2.0 technologies and social media as ‘necessary’ and they use words like ‘must’ and ‘vital’ (Mathews 2009) when they are referring to the implementation of these technologies. Coelho states that “the future of academic libraries will depend on their ability to monitor the development of new technologies, to explore them, and to integrate advantageous innovations in their services, in order to resume their traditional leadership in regards to the discovery of information” (2011). And impression exists that libraries have lost something that they are trying desperately to regain. This is reiterated by Brantley when he says “if we can understand more about how library 2.0 tools are being used now, perhaps we can anticipate change and adapt in order to remain relevant” (2010). Enders and Wineland state that “to lack a social media presence in 2012 is like not having a telephone twenty years ago. Contemporary student simply will not engage with any entity that is not using current popular technology” (2012). Sodt and Pedersen Summey’s argue that “With the enrolment of Internet-dependent millennial students, returning students who hold full-time jobs and the rise of distance education, Internet-based library services have become a necessity” (2009). Bodnar and Doshi argue that simply implementing social media and other web based technologies into a library does not fix the underlying anxieties expressed in the opinions above and that “to some it is as if simply creating a Facebook account makes the library dynamic, modern, relevant and vibrant”. “The library is not a separate archive of old information, but a part of the on-going discovery process. Libraries need to ensure that the community is aware of the value they add to the research process” (Sue O’Dell)

2.11 Conclusion
A review of the literature shows that there is great potential in the implementation of social media as a marketing and networking tool, and as a way to collaborate with students and other librarians. However there are many concerns about the implementation of social media facilities in academic libraries, concerns over the amount of time it will take to maintain these facilities, and concerns over the content and questions of whether it is necessary to implement these social media
facilities at all. This study endeavours to answer some of these questions and shed some light on others from the point of view of the student.

3.0 Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

“Research aims to describe a phenomenon or a process that has previously been inaccessible or only vaguely understood” (McQueen and Knussen 2002). Research methods are the various methods employed to undertake research study in a systematic way. The term methodology refers to the philosophy and the approach to the research along with the strategy. The main concerns of the methodology are:

- Why the certain data was collected?
- What data was collected?
- Where it was collected?
- How it was collected?
- How it was analysed?

(Collins & Hussey, 2003, p. 55).

This chapter will consider the philosophy, approach and strategy and the reasons why each method was chosen. The research design will then be discussed in detail, the method employed, how it was created, and why the test subjects were chosen. Why the data was collected, what data was collected, where it was collected, how it was collected and how it was analysed.

3.2 Research Philosophy

This research topic falls into the category of Social Science research. Social Science research includes a vast array of subjects including psychological studies and sociological studies. Examples of the studies that fall into this category are the Census, and market research. In essence it is the research of people, their attitudes, beliefs and behaviours (McQueen and Knussen, 2002, p.3). In this case the study is concerned with a specific group (students at the DBS) and their behaviour, and attitudes regarding social media facilities in the library. The two main philosophies that are employed are Positivism and Interpretive. Positivism is the older of the two
philosophies. It is a functionalist approach to studying patterns of ordered events or behaviours with the belief that the best way to study is through an objective approach (Neville, 2007, p.6). Positivism usually starts with a hypothesis which is then tested to see whether it is true or not and is explanatory in nature. On the other hand the Interpretive (or Phenomenology) philosophy is exploratory in nature and is “particularly concerned with understanding behaviour from the participants’ own subjective frames of reference” (Neville, 2007, p. 6). There are many considerations to think about before deciding on which philosophy suit the study and the individual conducting the study.

3.3 Research approach
This study is both positivistic and phenomenological. This study has taken both a deductive and inductive approach to the research. Inductive applies to theory building while deductive is theory testing. This study has started with a hypothesis and using the data provided and using deductive reasoning answers whether the hypothesis is true or false. While the study aims to test a hypothesis it is also concerned with the participants’ own views and finding a possible theory for what students’ opinions are on certain topics. This research study is conducted primarily under a positivist philosophy. The study is primarily explanatory, and is trying to explain in a quantifiable way certain student behaviours regarding social media facilities in the college library. However there is an exploratory nature to the study as the study is also interested in the ‘why?’ of the behaviour. (Bhathacherjee, 2012). The study starts with a Hypothesis which is then tested. This is different to an interpretive approach, which usually start from a more vague position. The study is also conducted with an emphasis on objectivity (McQueen & Knussen, 2002, p. 23), however when analysing qualitative data and interpreting answers to open ended questions to form a theory the researcher cannot be objective, as they are interpreting the opinions of others and hence the approach is interpretive and subjective. The Interpretive approach employs “an inductive approach that starts with data and tries to derive a theory about the phenomenon of interest from the observed data” (Bhathacherjee, 2012, p 38).
3.4 **Hypothesis**

After conducting initial research about the topic of social media facilities in academic libraries, there was a large focus on systems analysis to determine usage and not a lot of research collected on the student population’s use of social media in the college library. The Hypothesis put forward for this study is:

*Students do not use the social media facilities provided by the college library at the DBS.*

The study tests this hypothesis with 3 objectives in mind

1. To find out if students do use the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library.
2. To find out if students do not use the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library, why they are not being used (from a student perspective).
3. To find out whether students think it is important the library provides social media facilities.

The ‘unit of analysis’ is the group who are going to be analysed. The unit of analysis for this case study are current students of the DBS. The study comprises of a survey of quantative and qualitative questions.

3.5 **Research Strategy**

The paradigm used in this research study is functionalism. This study wishes to see patterns of behaviour and attitude using an objective approach through conducting a standardised survey (Appendix 1). A case study strategy was adopted for the study. The DBS was used as a case study as it is reflective of typical students within an Irish university. Undergraduate courses are applied for through the CAO, the courses follow the same semesters as other colleges in Ireland, and the DBS has several interconnected academic libraries. The DBS Library currently has several social media facilities. They have a Facebook page, Twitter account, blog page and IM service. These services are indicative of the social media services that many college libraries in Ireland have. Trinity College Dublin’s Library has a Facebook page, Twitter account and blog page ([www.tcd.ie/library](http://www.tcd.ie/library)) as does University College Limerick’s Library ([http://www2.ul.ie/web/WWW/Services/Library](http://www2.ul.ie/web/WWW/Services/Library)). The case study consists of a survey
disseminated to students to test the hypothesis put forward and will answer the objectives of the hypothesis. It was felt that a survey would be the most appropriate and economical way to gain the data given that time constraints were an issue for this study. Other strategies were considered such as focus groups of students and librarians but were dismissed as not conducive to answering the hypothesis and changing the scope of the study. However had time allowed to increase the scope of the study other strategies would have been considered.

3.6 Research Design
The research design section discusses the method employed, how it was created, the test subjects and how the data was analysed, why the data was collected, what data was collected, where it was collected, how it was collected and how it was analysed.

3.6.1 Method Employed
The method employed was a case study. The data was collected in the form of a survey. The questionnaire or survey is generally used as a tool to collect descriptive quantative data. Therefore to test the hypothesis that ‘students at the DBS do not use the social media facilities provided by the library, it is an appropriate tool to determine whether or not this is the case. Surveys can also be used to obtain qualitative answers, and the format enabled qualitative questions to be asked in a limited way so that all three objectives could be answered.

1. Do students do use the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library?
2. If the students do not use the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library, why don’t they?
3. Do students think it is important the library provides social media facilities?

3.6.2 How it was created: Construction of Survey
The Survey is made up of 39 quantative (closed questions, e.g. yes/no questions) and qualitative questions (open ended questions, e.g. why?). There are seventeen main quantative questions. The survey uses Skip logic, which means every respondent does not have to answer every question. If the respondent answers a specific question they skip to the next corresponding question. There were 17 main quantifiable questions with and extra 22 questions which helped to either further quantify or qualify the main question being asked. The questions were broken down
into six sections all of which referred to a different topic of the survey. The six sections were ‘control questions’, ‘Facebook’, ‘Twitter’, ‘blogs’, ‘Ask a Librarian’ and ‘Your thoughts’. The survey was drafted and then passed to a librarian at the DBS. This was followed by an informal interview and discussion with the librarian to see if any changes had to be made. Suggestions were made, justified and taken on board. The survey was then finalised and disseminated.

3.6.3 Construction of Survey

3.6.3.1 Constructs

When a survey is created certain constructs have to be put in place so that the unquantifiable, become quantifiable. For example the word ‘frequently’ can mean different things to different people and a specific number cannot be attributed to the word. For the purposes of quantifying data a construct can be put in place to define the word ‘frequently’ as meaning a certain number or falling within a range of numbers. For this survey several constructs were devised.

- Often - For the purposes of this survey the term ‘often’ refers to use of library facilities. The students are advised that often in the context of the survey refers to more than once every two weeks.
- Sometimes - For the purposes of this study the term ‘sometimes’ is clarified as once every two months or more.
- Rarely – The term rarely is defined as more than once for the purposes of this study
- Never - is never

3.6.3.2 Parameters were set for the age ranges

- 18-25 – Loosely reflects students who are labelled the ‘Google generation’ (students born after 1993)(Rowlands, 2008) and in this instance are young enough to not remember a time without the internet.
- 25-35 – Are those students who are older than the ‘Google generation’ and loosely fall into the millennial generation (students born after 1980) (Kubiatko, 2013). This group have a positive outlook towards technology.
• Over 35 – Are those students who are considered ‘Digital Immigrants’ (Kubiatko, 2013) and are deemed to be less likely to have natural technical ability.

3.6.3.3 Breakdown of survey questions

3.6.3.3.1 Sections
The survey consists of 6 sections. All sections are clearly defined.

3.6.3.3.2 Section 1 – General Information
Section 1 relates to the control questions of the survey. These questions consist of students’ age, gender, whether studying full-time or part-time, how often they use the non-social media facilities that the library provides and what social media students are currently registered on. There was reference to the rise of distance learning and life-long learning (involving going back to college part-time) (Sodt and Pedersen Summey, 2009). With these questions the study can analyse whether there is a significant relation between both age and type of student (part-time, full-time) and the use of the library’s social media facilities.

The study can also analyse whether,

1. There is a significant relationship between how often students use the non-social media facilities and how often they use the social media facilities provided by the college library.
2. There is a significant relationship between students use of social media generally and their use of the social media facilities provided by the college library.

3.6.3.3.3 Section 2 - Facebook
Section 2 is concerned with questions about student’s use of the library’s Facebook page. The literature review references the popularity of Facebook. It also references the popularity of MySpace but in the last couple of years MySpace has become much less popular (Sach et al, 2011). The DBS Library has a Facebook page but not a MySpace page. The questions asked in this section are about the frequency of use of the library’s social media page and whether students use the Facebook page, and if not why not? Social media is an interactive media (Bodnar and Doshi, 2011) and
students were asked the question of whether those who visited the library’s Facebook page ‘liked’ the page, to discern whether students who have visited the library Facebook page, joined it.

3.6.3.3.4 Section 3 – Twitter
Section 3 is concerned with whether students follow the library’s Twitter account. The literature review references the popularity of Twitter as well as Facebook, and states that micro-blogging is very popular (Sodt and Pedersen Summey, 2009). It is very easy to unsubscribe to a Twitter feed, so students were asked, if they said that they did not follow the library on Twitter, had they followed at one time and unsubscribed?

3.6.3.3.5 Section 4 – Library Blog
Section 4 is concerned with whether students use the Library blog. The literature review refers to blogging as an asset to communicating with students to give them information about the library and also to engage with students getting feedback from them and reviews of books and facilities. In this section students are asked about whether they use the library blog, and if they have used the blog have they ever reviewed anything on the blog. This question is designed to deduce whether students are interacting with the social media.

3.6.3.3.6 Section 5 – ‘Ask a Librarian’
Section 5 is concerned with the library’s IM service ‘Ask a Librarian’. The service is found on the library webpage and students can IM with a Librarian in real time to ask them questions. Students are asked whether they have used the service and how frequently they use it.

3.6.3.3.7 Questions common to Section 2 through to Section 5
All of the questions from Section 2 to Section 5; asked students whether they knew about the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library. Much of the literature about the potential of social media refers to how well it can be used as a marketing tool, however the marketing tool also needs to be marketed, and if students are unaware of the social media facilities in the library then they are not going to be of benefit to the library for marketing, or communication purposes.
All of the questions from Section 2 to Section 5; asked students who said they were not interested in the social media facilities why they were not interested. This qualitative data can be quantified and categorised to highlight why students say they are not interested in the library’s social media facilities. The results of this data can inform librarians at the DBS Library about the attitude of students who do not want to use the library’s social media facilities and help to inform the implementation of further strategies for marketing the social media facilities to students.

3.6.3.8 Section 6 – Your thoughts

Section 6 is concerned with whether students think it is important that the library have social media services. The students were not asked to answer the questions on a scale of importance, but rather were asked to answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ questions. Because the questions was asked in a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ format, students were asked why they answered the way they did for each question. This question was designed so that qualitative answers would be given to answer ‘why’ they answered either yes or no to the questions. The qualitative answers can then be quantified and categorised to highlight the most frequent answers given. Much of the literature is concerned with the time management of implementing and maintaining social media and the necessity of providing social media facilities to the students. After evaluating the data of the use of the social media facilities and comparing it with what the students think is important, librarians in the DBS can use this information to formulate strategies for the implementation or not, of certain social media, and maintenance of same.

3.7 Delivery of the survey

The survey was given out in various classes over a period of two weeks. The classes included full time and part time (evening) degree courses. 99 students filled in the survey. Not all students answered every question, but every student made an attempt to complete the survey.

3.8 Unit of analysis

“The unit of analysis refers to the person, collective, or object that is the target of the investigation’ (Bhathacherjee, 2012, p.13). The study is designed to find out if students at the DBS are using the social media facilities provided by the library. In
In this study, the unit of analysis are the students at the DBS. The survey that was carried out was cross sectional as opposed to longitudinal. A cross sectional survey is when a selection of people are given a survey in similar conditions usually in a short time frame to get a snapshot of behaviour of the respondents at a given time. A longitudinal study is a series of surveys taken over a longer period of time, a series of snapshots to see if change is occurring. A cross sectional survey is appropriate for this study as the hypothesis is that ‘students do not use the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library’. The study is looking for a current snapshot of student behaviour.

3.9 **Why was the Data collected?**
The data was collected to test the hypothesis and to answer the three main objectives of the analysis:

1. To find out if students do use the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library.
2. To find out if students do not use the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library, why they do not use them.
3. To find out whether students think it is important the library provides social media facilities.

3.10 **What Data was collected?**
The target was to get at least 100 students to fill out the survey that represent a good cross section of DBS undergraduate students. 99 surveys were completed by students with a strong emphasis on undergraduate students (but not all). Students were a variety of ages and gender was split down the middle, there was also a good variety of disciplines covered from Film Study students to Business Management students. There were also part time and full time students. From the perspective of an explanatory approach the data collected gives scope for analysing whether variable play a part in students use of the social media services.

3.11 **Where was the Data collected?**
The Data was collected in the DBS. The decision was made to create the surveys and print them out in paper format. It was not feasible to email the survey to students.
Data protection issues meant student emails could not be given out for the purposes of the survey, and although a class may willingly give their email addresses out the study needed a larger number of respondents than once class. To get 100 surveys returned many more would have had to be emailed out. The surveys were printed out and via email with various lecturers it was organised that the survey was given out in class either at the beginning or the end of the class and collected before the end of the class. In that way respondents were assured. The study was given out in several day and evening courses over a two week period in April 2013.

3.12 How the survey was analysed
The survey was analysed using both Excel and SPSS 18. Excel was used for the preliminary input of the data and basic analysis. SPSS 18 was used to analyse the data in more detail. SPSS 18 was used for basic data analysis along with data analysis to find out if variables had any significant impact on the use of the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library. Graphs were created to illustrate the information. Tables were created to quantify the qualitative analysis, this meant taking an interpretive approach to the answers given, interpreting students open ended responses and categorising them where possible. The tables were created for two reasons:

1. To illustrate the primary recurring reasons given by students for why they said they did not use the social media facilities provided by the library.
2. To illustrate the primary recurring reasons for and against why students thought it was important the library has social media facilities.

3.13 Validity and Reliability
The data is reliable as a good cross section of DBS students representing different ages, genders study types (part-time, full-time) and discipline types filled out the survey. A similar survey should show up similar results. The data is valid as almost all students completed the survey. Some students skipped a question but there were very few and the rest of their data was incorporated into the data. All of the analysis clearly shows where students did not answer questions, and how many students did not answer the question is clearly expressed in the data analysis. (Neville, 2007, p.26).
3.14 Conclusion
The research philosophy used is primarily positivist. The approach is deductive and primarily explanatory. A cross sectional survey was used to analyse students at the DBS. This group was used as a case study that should be reflective of a typical Irish university. The survey was created in six sections and was handed out during classes over a two week period to gain as many respondents as possible. The data was analysed using Excel and SPSS 18 software. All surveys were filled out anonymously and will be used for the purposes of this survey only.
4.0 Data Analysis

4.1 Introduction

The data analysis was carried out using Microsoft Excel and SPSS 18. Initially the information was inputted into Excel and some of the basic results were compiled using Excel. The data was then imported into SPSS. The basic data was compiled to find frequencies and percentages of empirical information. Cross tabulation and Chi Squares were used to compile information which included variables. Excel was used to compile all the qualitative data (comments to open ended questions). This data is shown in tabular form in the data analysis to give a clear idea of the recurring themes in student comments.

This study focuses on several social media facilities provided by the DBS Library.

1. The Library Facebook page.
2. The Twitter account.
3. The Library blog page.
4. The library’s ‘Ask a Librarian’ instant messaging service.

The data analysis is presented in five different sections under the headings of the three objectives of the research and collaboration.

- Section 1: Do students use the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library? - The analysis shows the results of the basic control questions about some of their research behaviours, how often they visit the library how often, they use the library database and how often they use online search engines for research. Then the results of the basic descriptive questions are shown i.e. students’ use of the library Facebook page, Twitter account, library blog and IM service. Data regarding relationships between the control questions and use of the social media facilities is also presented.

- Section 2: If students do not use the facilities, why don’t they? - The data analysis presented under the second objective heading, shows the breakdown of quantified reasons for students not using the social media facilities (e.g. they were not interested or they did not know about them)
along with the qualitative answers quantified and illustrated in tabular format.

- Section 3: Collaboration - Shows the answers to the questions in the survey that refer to students’ interaction and collaboration through the social media provided.
- Section 4: Do students think it is important the library provides social media facilities? The data analysis is presented under the heading of the third objective, which is whether it is important for libraries to have social media facilities? The quantitative data is presented followed by the qualified data, again illustrated in tabular form to show the recurring themes.
- Section 5: Do students think that the library advertises its services well?

4.2 Section 1: Do students use the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library?

Firstly the survey asks how often students frequent the library, and how often they use the library’s online database for their research. They are also questioned on how often they use Google or other search engines for their research. These control questions are used to get an idea of the general habits of students and to analyse whether there is any significant relationship between a student’s research habits and their use of the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library. The literature showed the systems analysis of research habits (Brantley 2010) and systems analysis of implementations of Web 2.0 technologies in academic libraries (Coelho 2011). There are also studies of how students feel about interacting with librarians through Facebook, but none of these ask the students directly if they use the social media facilities provided by the library (Sachs et al., 2011). This section answers that question.

Below are the results of the analyses of students’ habits along with whether or not they use the library’s social media facilities.
How often do students visit the college library?

How often do you visit the DBS Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often do students use the library’s online databases for their research?

Oftend 66%
Sometimes 18%
Rarely 12%
Never 3%
How often do students use Google or other search engines for their research?

- Often: 34%
- Sometimes: 34%
- Rarely: 22%
- Never: 9%
Have you ever visited the library’s Facebook page?

- Often 86%
- Sometimes 18%
- Rarely 12%
- Never 0%

Figure 3

Do you use Google for research

- Often 86%
- Sometimes 18%
- Rarely 12%
- Never 0%
Are you a follower of the library’s Twitter account?

Yes Often  2%
Yes more than once  8%
Yes once  12%
No did not know the library had a Facebook page  55%
No am not interested in the library Facebook page  20%

Figure 4
Have you ever visited the library’s blog?

Yes I follow 3%
No I did follow but I unsubscribed 6.1%
No - did not know the library had a Twitter account 52.5%
No - not interested in the library’s Twitter 31.3%

(black means the student did not answer or gave an unusable answer)
Have you ever used the libraries IM service ‘Ask a librarian’?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes often</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes more than once</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes once</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – did not know the library had a blog page</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – not interested in the library page</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(black means the student did not answer or gave an unusable answer)
Graph of the social media that students are currently registered with

Students were also surveyed to find out which social media services they were currently registered users of. The graph below illustrates the results the respondents gave for this question. 90.9% of those surveyed were registered users of Facebook, 49.5% were registered users of Twitter, 69.7% were registered users of Youtube and 34.3% were registered users of MSN.
The data was analysed to see if there were any significant factors guiding student responses. Every student was asked their gender, whether they fell into 1 of 3 age ranges and whether they studied part time or full time.

- The analysis found that gender played no significant role in answers to the questions asked in the survey about either their research habits or their use of the library’s social media facilities. (Appendix 2)
- The analysis found that there was no significant role in a student’s age and their answers to the questions asked about either their research habits or their use of the library’s social media facilities. (Appendix 3)
- The analysis also found that there was no significant relationship in whether a student studies part-time or full-time and their answers to the questions regarding either their research habits or their use of the library’s social media facilities. (Appendix 4)
- The analysis found that there was no significant relationship between the amount of social media networks they were registered with and their answers to the questions asked about either their research habits or their use of the library’s social media facilities. (Appendix 6)
- The analysis found that there was no significant relationship between how often a student used the library’s online database and whether they used the library’s social media facilities.
• The analysis found that there was no significant relationship between in how often a student visited the library and how often they used the library’s social media facilities. (Appendix 7)

4.1.1 Summary of whether students use the social media facilities provided by the library

22% of students surveyed had logged onto the library’s Facebook page at least once. Over half of those surveyed did not know the library had a Facebook page and 20% were not interested. 3% of students surveyed follow the library’s Twitter account, 6% no longer follow now, having unsubscribed. Over half of those surveyed did not know the library had a Twitter account and over a third were not interested. Similar figures were given for the library blog with 13% having visited the library’s blog at least once, over half were unaware the library had a blog and a third were not interested. Just under half of students surveyed (48.5%) had used the ‘Ask a Librarian’ facility at least once. Just over a quarter did not know it existed and just under a quarter were not interested. No significant relationships were found between gender, age, and whether students studied part time or full time; and how frequently they used the library’s social media facilities. There was also no significant relationship found between students’ use of the library and the library database and their use of the library’s social media facilities.

4.2 Social media is collaborative and interactive

Social media is collaborative and interactive. Students who answered that they had visited the library Facebook or Blog page were asked whether they had either a) joined the Facebook page or b) reviewed anything on the Blog page. The results are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you join the Facebook page</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you review anything on the web site (2 did not answer)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
4.3 Students who are not using the social media facilities provided by the library

Why are students not using the social media facilities provided by the library? The survey asks several questions regarding students’ use of social media provided by the library. For each question there are defined negative answers. There are at least two options for answering in the negative. The two negative answers that are applicable to the four social media types are ‘No’ because the student was unaware the facility existed and ‘No’ because the student is not interested in the relative social media. Students were also asked if they were unaware of the social media, now that they have been informed would they consider joining the relative social media. There are some suggestions in the literature as to why students may not use the social media facilities provided by the college library, some students like to keep their social lives separate from their academic lives (Sach et al, 2011). In his study of Facebook in academic libraries Wan states that many libraries do not update their Facebook page regularly and this may be applied to all social media (2011). On the other hand maybe students are not using these social media facilities because they are unaware that they exist.

4.3.1 Facebook

55% did not know that the Library had a Facebook page and 20% were not interested in the library Facebook page. 34.3% said that if they knew about the Facebook page they would join it. 20.2% said that they would not. Each student was asked to fill in the reason why they would or would not join the Facebook page now that they knew it existed. The majority who answered ‘no’ and filled in the ‘why’ question said it was because they were not interested. Of those who said ‘yes’ and answered the question ‘why’ said it was to have access to more information.

Table of the breakdown of the 24 people who answered why they said they would not join the library Facebook page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have or don’t use their Facebook</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t see a reason for joining</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like more information before</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are not interested</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Want to keep Facebook for their social lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of the breakdown of the 22 people who answered why they were not interested in the library Facebook page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do not see the point in the library having a Facebook page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Don’t have or don’t use their Facebook account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Either feel the library is not the place for Facebook or they want to keep Facebook for their own social use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Are not interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Twitter

6.1% of students surveyed said that they had joined the library Twitter account but had unsubscribed. 52.5% said that they were unaware that the library had a Twitter account and 31.3% said that they were not interested in following the library on Twitter.

Of the 52.5% of students who said that they were unaware the library had a Twitter account 25 students gave reasons why they would not join the Twitter account now that they were aware of it. Below is a breakdown of the reasons students gave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Do not subscribe to Twitter or rarely log into their Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Are not interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don’t see the point of following the library on Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 31.3% of respondents who said they were not interested in following the library on Twitter 25 answered the question why. Below is a breakdown of the reasons students gave.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not subscribe to Twitter or rarely log on to their Twitter account</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are not interested</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t see the point in following the Library on Twitter</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.3 Blog

50.5% said that they were not aware that the library had a blog page and 31.3% said they were not interested in the library blog. Of the 50.5% of students who said they did not know about the library Blog page 27 said that they would be interested in visiting the library’s blog page and 17 said they would not be interested. Of the 17 that said they would not visit the library’s blog page 17 answered the question why. 5 students did not answer why.

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are not interested</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t follow blogs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said that following the library on Facebook and or Twitter would give enough information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 31.3% who said that they were not interested in visiting the library’s blog page 24 respondents answered the question why. The table below shows a breakdown of the responses received.
4.3.4 ‘Ask a Librarian’ IM service
25.3% said that they did not know the library had this instant messaging service and 23.2% said they were not interested in using the service. Of the 25.3% who said that they were unaware the library had an instant messaging service 17 said that now that they knew about the service they would use it and 5 said that they would not use it. Of the 5 that said they would not use the library instant messaging service 4 respondents answered the question why. Below is a table with a breakdown of the answers.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Said that they would rather talk to a librarian in person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other reasons, the reasons were “Don’t need it” and “no time”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 23.2% of respondents who said that they were not interested in the library’s instant messaging service 18 answered the question why. Below is a table showing a breakdown of the answers given

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Said they have never needed the service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>They would rather talk to a librarian in person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.5 Summary of reasons given for why students do not use the social media facilities provided by the library
There were three themes that kept occurring when students were asked why they do not use or would not use the social media facilities provided by their library. First
they stated that they were simply not interested in the library’s social media facilities. Second they could not see the point or usefulness of the library having social media services. Third in the case of Facebook, Twitter and the blog page, students said that they did not participate or rarely participated in the respective social media facilities they were being asked about (in the case of Twitter more than half of respondents said they either did not have Twitter accounts or rarely used them). For the instant messaging service the students said that they would rather talk to a librarian in person than use the instant messaging service.

4.4 Do students think it is important that the library service have social media facilities?

The final section of questions asked in the survey related to whether students believed that the DBS library should have social media facilities. In this section the questions were broken down into a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ questions followed by the question why? Below are a number of pie charts representing the answers to three questions. Each pie chart is followed by two table representing the main reasons for and against the library implementing the stated social media facilities. Much of the literature written about Web 2.0 technologies in academic libraries alludes to the need for libraries to keep up with technology to remain relevant (Ferandez, 2009), and the word ‘necessary’ is often used (Sodt & Pedersen Summey, 2009). Do students think it is important if not necessary for the library to have these social media facilities.

4.4.1 Facebook and Twitter

The students were asked if they think it is important that the college library should have a Facebook page and a Twitter account? Of those who responded 58.6% said the library should have Facebook and Twitter and 38.4% said that the library should not have a Facebook page and Twitter account.
Of the 58.6% respondents who said that they did think that the library should have a Facebook page and Twitter account, 58 answered the question why. Below is a breakdown of the main reasons that students believe the library should have Facebook page and Twitter account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For communication and information – it is a way of communication and getting information about library services and events</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For convenience</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library has to keep up to date</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For interaction with students and feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 38.4% of respondents who said that they did not think it was important for the college library to have a Facebook page and Twitter account, 31 respondents answered they question why. Below is a table of the main reasons why students said that they did not think it was important.
Could not see any advantages in the library having these facilities

Said there was no need for them as there are existing facilities like the library website and Moodle which fulfil their user needs

Said time should be spent improving existing services such as the Library website and getting more books for the library

Said ‘just visit the library’

Other reasons

4.4.2 IM service ‘Ask a Librarian’
Students were asked if they thought it was important that the college library should have an instant messaging service. 78.8% of respondents said that they thought it was important that the library has an instant messaging service, and 16.2% said that they did not think it was important that the library has an instant messaging service. The pie chart below illustrates these results.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Could not see any advantages in the library having these facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Said there was no need for them as there are existing facilities like the library website and Moodle which fulfil their user needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Said time should be spent improving existing services such as the Library website and getting more books for the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Said ‘just visit the library’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 78.8% of students who said that they thought it was important for the college library to have an instant messaging service, 73 answered the question why. Below is a table outlining the major occurring themes in the answers provided.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Speed – they like how instantaneous it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Help and Support – it is a good service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Convenience – you don’t have to be on campus to get information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good way to get information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 16.2% of students who answered that they did not think it was important that the college library has an instant messaging service 4 respondents answered they question why. As no two answers were alike, the table below shows the four reasons given.

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I don’t know”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I only use the study halls and the books in the library. Haven’t used the eresources much”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What questions are written?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Don’t see the reason”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 Library Blog

Students were asked whether they thought it was important that the college library should have a blog page. Of the students that responded 35.4% of them said that they did think it was important that the college library had a blog page, while 59.6% thought that it was not important.
Of the 35.4% who thought that it was important that the library have a blog page 32 respondents gave reasons. Below is a table of the main points that occur in the answers given.

**Table 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>For information purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>For interaction with and feedback to the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Could be interesting – respondents reference content about book reviews and student life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blogging is “popular” and “cool” – it keeps the library up to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 59.6% of respondents who said that they did not think it was important that the college library had a blog page 37 students responded to the question why. Below is a table of the main points that occur in the answers given.

**Table 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>No need – respondents either deemed it unnecessary or could not see any advantage to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Said that Facebook and Twitter would be enough, or only one media should be focused on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Said Blogs were not used or were a thing of the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Said they do not use blogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 Is there a relationship between students’ use of the library’s social media facilities and whether they think it is important that the library have social media facilities?

The data was analysed to see if there was any significant relationship between students’ use of social media facilities and their opinion on whether or not the library should have social media facilities. The results are as follows.

There is a significant relationship between those who have been on the library Facebook page. Whether a student often visited the Facebook page or only visited the Facebook page once the respondents believed that having a library Facebook page or Twitter account was important. (Appendix 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes often</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes more than once</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes once</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those students who did not know about the Facebook page also answered in favour of the library having a Facebook page and Twitter account (65.5%). However those respondents who said they were not interested in the library’s Facebook page answered negatively with 70% saying they did not think that it was important for the library to have a Facebook page and Twitter account.

There was no significant relationship between whether a student had used the library Twitter account and whether they thought it was important that the library has a Facebook page and Twitter account.
There is a significant relationship between those who have used the ‘Ask a librarian’ facility and those who think it is important that the library has an instant messaging service. Those who have used the library at least once all answered strongly in favour of the importance of the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes often</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes more than once</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes once</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who answered that they either had not used the service or did not know it existed both answered significantly lower in favour of the library having an IM service, however both were still in favour of having the instant messaging service. 73.9% of those who stated they were not interested in the IM service, answered favourably when asked whether it was important the library had an IM service. 72% of those who answered that they did not know the library had an IM service answered that it was important the library had an IM service.

There is a significant relationship between those who have visited the library’s blog page and those who have stated that it is important the library should have a blog page. There is also a significant relationship between those who have not visited the library’s blog and those who stated it is not important that the library should have a blog (Appendix 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes often</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes more than once</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes once</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – not interested</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – did not know the library had a blog page</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.5 Summary of whether students think it is important the library provides social media facilities

The majority of students think that the library should have a Facebook page and Twitter account. The majority of students also think that is important the library has
an IM service. However the majority of students do not think it is important for the library to have a blog page.

4.5 Section 5: Do students think that the library advertises its social media facilities well?
The final question that students were asked was whether they thought that the library advertised their social media facilities well. 56.6% of those surveyed said that the library did not advertise its social media well, 31.3% said that it did advertise its social media well and 12.1% did not answer the question. This is illustrated in the pie chart below.

![Figure 12]

Of the 56.6 % of respondents who said that the library did not advertise their social media facilities well, 49 gave a reason. Below is a table of the main points occurring in response to why they do not think the facilities are advertised well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Did not know about the facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Marketing not good – respondents did not say they did know the facilities existed but said they had not seen any</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 31.1% of respondents who said that the library did advertise their social media facilities well 14, answered the question why. Below is a table of the main points occurring in response to why they do not think the facilities are advertised well.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Found the social media facilities by accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Said there was good advertisements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Said the IM service was advertised well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Conclusions

The study had three primary objectives

- To deduce whether or not students at DBS used the social media facilities provided by the DBS Library. The social media facilities provided by the DBS Library include Facebook page, Twitter account, blog page and IM service.
- If they did not use the social media services provided by the library why they did not.
- To deduce whether students thought that it was important the college library provides social media services.

During the research of the literature around social media in libraries the main topics that arose were:

- Potential of social media for the purposes of marketing library services and networking with students.
- Creating a strategy so that social media can realise its potential.
- The concern over whether students would want to befriend the library, and concerns of managing the content of the social media facilities.
- Concerns over time management for librarians, how they will maintain the social media facilities.
- The necessity of academic libraries to provide social media facilities.
- How to evaluate success

The study answered its three main objectives and went someway to informing the main issues that arose in the review of the literature.

5.1 Use of the DBS social media facilities

To answer whether students use the social media facilities provided by the library each facility must be looked at individually, as the overall response indicates that at least one of the social media facilities provided by the library is used by the student population while the others are not.
5.1.1 Facebook

5.1.1.1 Do students use the Facebook page?
The analysis shows that although 90% of students are registered users of Facebook only 22% of students have logged onto the library Facebook. Of those 22% only 7% joined the Facebook page. From this data it can be deduced that students generally do not use the Facebook page provided by the college library. The Facebook page has the potential to communicate with 90% of the student population but according to the data is regularly communicating with only 7%. If the library wants to use Facebook’s potential as a marketing and networking tool, it must look at implementing a strategy.

5.1.1.2 Why don’t students use the library Facebook page?
55% of respondents said that they did not know the library had a Facebook page. The minimal use of the Facebook page cannot be attributed to content. Over half of students surveyed did not know the library had a Facebook page that is a result of the marketing and publicity of the Facebook page. Of the 20% of students who said they were not interested in the library Facebook page the majority of them said that they simply were not interested or could not see the point of a library Facebook page. It is up to the library to publicise and show what the Facebook page can offer students.

5.1.2 Twitter

5.1.2.1 Do students follow the library Twitter?
49.5% of students surveyed were registered users of Twitter, 3% follow the library Twitter account and 6.1% had unsubscribed from the library Twitter account. It can be deduced from the data that students do not use the library Twitter account. Twitter is different to Facebook as although almost all students have Facebook accounts (90%), less than half of students surveyed are active on Twitter. From the data it can be deduced that Twitter should not be given the same emphasis as Facebook when strategy planning, as it only has the potential to reach half of the students that Facebook has the potential to reach.
5.1.2.2 Why don’t students follow the library Twitter?
52.5% of respondents said they didn’t know that the library had a Twitter account and 31.3% said they were not interested in the library’s Twitter account. Of 25 students who responded to why they were not interested 15 said it was because they did not have a Twitter account. If the library was struggling with time and resources to try and keep social media facilities up to date maybe there is an argument to be made for dropping the Twitter facility.

5.1.3 Is it important that the college library has a Facebook page and Twitter account?
The majority of students 58.6% answered yes. The main reasons given were convenience, access to information and communication with the library and interaction with the library. This suggests that even though it can be concluded a minority of students have not used either the Facebook page or Twitter account, the majority of students still believe that it is important that the library provides these services. This is important as it suggests the necessity of social media that is referred to in the literature review.

5.1.4 Blog page

5.1.4.1 Do students visit the Library Blog?
It can be concluded form the results of the survey that students at the DBS generally do not use the library blog 81.8% of students surveyed said that they did not use the library’s blog. Of the 13% who said that they had visited the library’s blog page at least once, only 1% (which equates to 1 individual) said that they had written a review on the blog page. Unlike Facebook and Twitter a student does not have to be a registered user to visit or contribute to a blog page, they just have to have access to the internet, but only a small minority of students are accessing the DBS Library blog.

5.1.4.2 Why don’t students visit the Library blog?
50.5% of respondents said that they were unaware that the library had a blog page and 31.3% of respondents said they were not interested in the library blog page. Of the 31.3% that said they were not interested 24 went on to explain why. Several said that they did not know enough about the blog page, several said they were not interested and gave no further explanation and several did not know why they were
not interested. There definitely appears to be scope there to convince students of the value of a library blog page and use it as an information and marketing tool for the library.

5.1.4.3 Do students think it is important the library has a blog?
The majority of students 59.6% answered that they did not think it was important the library had a blog page. The main reasons given were that it was deemed unnecessary or pointless. Some said Facebook and Twitter would be enough and others said they either didn’t use blogs or they were a thing of the past. However students who said that they thought it was important the library had a blog page said that it would be a great and easy place to get information about college opening hours, and could be a place to find reviews of college books. There is possible potential in blogs, if the blog is not updated regularly then students will become disinterested, but unlike the Facebook page, the blog does not have RSS feeds so the issue of adding content too frequently does not arise, in fact the Facebook page could feed into the blog to keep students up to date on a regular but not to frequent basis.

5.1.5 ‘Ask a Librarian’

5.1.5.1 Do students use the ‘Ask a Librarian’ IM service?
The IM feature ‘Ask a librarian’ stands apart from the other social media facilities as just under half of all students surveyed had tried the ‘Ask a Librarian’ facility at least once. It can be deduced from the data that the IM service is being used by students.

5.1.5.2 Do students think it is important the library has an IM service?
When respondents were asked whether they thought the IM facility was important for the college, there was an overwhelmingly positive response with 78.8% of students responding that they did think it was important. Some students said that even though they were not interested themselves they thought it was a good idea because “for some people it is a great help although I am not one of them”. The problem with the IM facility is, if everyone was using it frequently it would become a time management concern for the librarians as they would have to keep as quick a response time as possible, otherwise students may think that it was not working properly and may stop using it. 38 out of the 73 respondents who answered why it was important that the library have an IM service, commented that the instantaneous response and convenience of the service is what gave it its value. If this was to drop then students may turn away from it. The survey came back with
some responses of people who had either had bad experiences, or had heard negative things about it “I have heard countless negative stories involving the service”.

5.2 **Do students think the library advertises its social media services well?**

The majority of students surveyed said that they did not think that the library advertised their social media facilities well however some specifically did say the IM service was promoted better than the other social media facilities. This response is reflected in the popularity of the IM service.

5.3 **Control questions**

- Analysis of the data showed that there was no significant relationship between the frequency of use of the library’s non-social media services (visiting the library and using the online database) and their use of the library’s social media services.
- Analysis of the data shows that there were no significant relationships between students’ use of social media in general and their use of the library’s social media facilities. For example although less than half of students surveyed had Twitter accounts only 3% followed the library on Twitter. If the library’s Twitter was more popular there would have been a significant relation between those who are registered on Twitter and those who follow the library on Twitter, but the percentage was negligible.

The DBS library can use the conclusions drawn from the analysis to inform their strategies and policies going forward. While their IM facility is used frequently the other social media facilities suffer from lack of knowledge or lack of interest. Lack of interest can be due to not knowing what the benefits of the social media facilities could be. It is up to the library to market and publicise their social media. The librarians may also think that it does not matter whether they have a social media strategy or not, and to show that they have them might be enough. The Data analysis shows that students think it is important that the library has social media facilities even if the students don’t use them. However if the DBS Library is going to use its social media facilities to their full potential, factors such as objectives, strategy, content policy, time management, and necessity have to be considered.
6.0 Recommendations

During the research of this study a number of topics came up that warrant further discussion. As the research was a case study of the DBS library the findings of the study could be beneficial to that library. There are several recommendations that the DBS library could take into consideration when evaluating their social media facilities and when they are implementing strategies for the future. (Unfortunately due to time constraints and dissertation structure limitations the scope of this study was not large enough to include further areas of interest that arose). Below is a list of recommendations for the DBS Library and recommendations for avenues of further study.

6.1 Recommendations for the DBS Library

1. The literature refers to the fact that libraries need to decide what constitutes success in regards to their social media facilities. The DBS Library could decide on a target, a percentage of the student population to ‘like’ their Facebook page. They could look at other college library Facebook pages to get an idea of the average percentage that other college libraries currently have. For example the DBS Library Facebook page does not have a huge amount of content when compared with the Trinity College Dublin (TCD) Library Facebook page, in a college where there are over 9000 students 326 have’ liked’ the Facebook page this works out at approximately 3.5%. This is in comparison to Trinity college Dublin TCD which has a student population of about 17000 their library Facebook has 2130 ‘likes’ which is approximately 12.5%. The DBS library needs a marketing plan and a social media strategy. Students will not join the library Facebook page unless they are encouraged to do so. As the study shows the majority of students think it is important that the library has a Facebook page and or Twitter account for a number of reasons, to keep the Library up to date with technology, to help facilitate and communicate with students, to interact with students and receive feedback from them. This feedback should be encouraged and should help to form further strategies within the library.
2. The DBS Library should do some market research into what students would like to see on the library Facebook page or Blog page and try to incorporate them into their social media strategy.

3. The library could try and promote the Facebook page, Twitter account and blog at the beginning of the school year. One student advised in their comments that competitions were always a good way to publicise something, and the library could set up competitions that had to be entered through Facebook or Twitter.

6.2 Recommendation for further study
This field would benefit from further study. There are several studies that could be undertaken.

1. A similar study to this could be undertaken using multiple college libraries and a larger cross section of students. This would benefit the study by giving a more comprehensive impression of how social media facilities are used by students and their attitude towards social media facilities in libraries.

2. A behavioural study of what role students think social media has to play in the academic library. There have been studies undertaken recently regarding how comfortable students are with the academic library using social media as a tool for communication with students (Sachs et al, 2011). However it would be beneficial for a study to be conducted on how students view social media, what they think of libraries using social media to communicate with them, and under what circumstances they would use the social media provided by libraries. It would also be beneficial to look more closely at the importance that students put on the library having these facilities, and whether they use them or not, as the study shows some students think the library should have social media facilities like Facebook and Twitter, even if they have no interest in using them. This juxtaposition could be explored further.

3. A behavioural study of what role librarians think social media has to play in the academic library. There have been studies conducted (specifically regarding Facebook) looking at how Facebook has been implemented in
libraries and what librarians think it contributes (Sachs et al, 2011), but it would be interesting to see how much planning is put into a social media strategy by librarians in academic libraries what outcomes and evaluations they are looking for and how much time they allot to maintain the different social media on offer (Sodt and Pedersen Summey, 2010). It would also be interesting to find out if like students, librarians think that it is important the library provides these facilities whether they are used by students or not. And if they do think they are important is it because they think that libraries have to keep up with technology to remain relevant (Fernandez, 2009).

4. A longitudinal observational study of several college universities social media facilities, which could include, what they are using their social media for, their success rate, their ‘likes’ on Facebook, their followers on Twitter, the interaction on blogs, their content, their approach to maintenance of their social media facilities (frequency of updates etc.) and how much effort is put into the look of their homepages etc. Following the observation there could be a comparative study to see which college has made the biggest real impact, (did they change anything etc).

5. A longitudinal study of the implementation of a social media strategy in an academic library followed by a longitudinal study from implementation through the first year or so to see if the strategy is a success. Some research has been conducted through on Facebook only (Wan, 2011) or studies around implementing a social media policy (Enders and Wineland 2010), but a longitudinal study of the implementation, roll-out, marketing and maintenance of a social media strategy would be beneficial.

6. The review of the literature showed that it could be beneficial to do a study of the workflow habits of academic librarians and to gauge what percentage of their time they are spending updating social media facilities such as Facebook, Twitter and Blogs.
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