

Social Networking Tools in Academic Library

Sandra Ejiro Ukubenyinje and Odemi Evelyn Ogbimi

College of Education Library Warri, Delta State

Abstract

Networking is a social structure that allows users to communicate and cooperate with other users, including the capacity to use the web, search, invite friends to connect and communicate with the web globe. In the web 2.0 globe, social software not only increases the practical usability of the library, but also helps the librarians to add value to their job, considering the importance or potential of a librarian being questioned in the data landscape. This article examines the importance of social networking technology instruments in academic libraries, purpose, advantages and issues of using social networking instruments in libraries; and lastly some suggestions have been made to reduce the library's issues and difficulties.

Keywords: Social networking, academic libraries, networking tools, Social media.

Introduction

The World Wide Web enables people to access, create content and disseminate ideas more effectively. It optimizes the social networks in which people are linked by expanding channels of communication and reducing expenses (Barsky and Purdon 2006). Social networking sites first emerged for Internet users to discover long-lost friends & classmates, linking to each other to share profiles. Because these sites are free and easy to use, a large number of individuals have become members of one or more social networking sites that lead to an increase in membership. These social networking sites have gained a foothold among companies, organizations, and even leaders who want to reach their target populations (Read 2006). Academic libraries have been suggested to use these social networking instruments to disseminate data, market services and encourage fresh releases (Burkhardt 2010).

There are different definitions of websites / tools for social networking.

Alexander (2006), for example, provided a wide definition: social networking can include nearly all cooperative environments using Web 2.0 technologies. Web 2.0, also known as Participative (or Participatory) Blank, Grant Reisdorf, Bianca (2012) and Social Web, relates to World Wide Web sites that emphasize user-generated content, usability (ease of use even by non-experts), participatory culture and interoperability (this means that a website can function well with other products, technologies and devices) for end customers. The word was created by Darcy Di Nucci in 1999 and popularized at the O'Reilly Media Web 2.0 Conference at the end of 2004 several years later by Tim O'Reilly and Dale Dougherty.

Tim, O'Reilly (2005). Jonathan (2007). Darcy, Di Nucci (1999). Tim Berners-Lee.' (2006) Web 2.0 does not refer to updating any technical specifications, but to modifications in the design and use of web pages. The transition was progressive and there is no precise date on which the change occurred.

A Web 2.0 website may allow consumers to communicate and cooperate as user-generated content creators in a virtual community in a social media dialogue, as opposed to the first generation of Web 1.0-era websites where individuals were restricted to passive content viewing. Examples of Web 2.0 characteristics include social networking sites and social media sites (e.g. Facebook), blogs, wikis, folksonomies ('tagging' websites and keywords), video sharing sites (e.g. YouTube), hosting services, internet apps ('apps'), cooperative consumer platforms, and mash-up apps. World Wide Web inventor Tim Berners-Lee, who defines the word as jargon, has questioned whether Web 2.0 is substantially distinct from previous Web technologies, Lee-Berners (2005). On the other hand, Berners-Lee, Tim; James Hendler; Ora Lassila (2001) by Berners-Lee created the term Semantic Web (sometimes referred to as Web 3.0) to refer to a web of information where the meaning could be processed by pcs. Web 2.0 systems pledge to encourage client cooperation and create fresh alternatives to satisfy the evolving society's requirements (Chu & Kennedy 2011; Chu, Chan and Tiwari in the media ; Glassman & Kang 2011). Web 2.0 offers a fresh way of using the internet for interactive reasons instead of referring to a fresh standard or natural progression in the growth of Web systems (Murray 2008). These instruments include blogs, wikis, RSS, podcasting, social bookmarking, social networking, feeds, and Google utilities (Churchill 2007).

Social networking tools enable users to share interests and interact with others Barsky and Purdon (2006) clarify that pages of social networking collect membership information, store user

profiles and share them. These websites are free and enable users in the form of pictures, music, and videos to readily generate personal pages filled with information. Such websites operate as a social network, as members can share internet pages with friends and find fresh friends with comparable interests. Blogs have also been seen as a type of social networking as blogs that promote social connections (Taylor-Smith & Lindner 2009). Wikis, blogs, chat rooms, instant messengers, message boards and social bookmarking are Web 2.0 technology apps that have been used to promote communication between employees and are therefore known as social networking tools (Jones & Conceicao 2008). It should be observed that while websites such as YouTube and Flickr enable users to build profiles and share links, they are recognized rather than social networking as sharing videos and pictures (Hoffman 2009).

While social media use has been suggested to be all about sharing, learning, conversation and providing (Burkhardt 2010), sites like Flickr and YouTube focus on content sharing with restricted potential for social networking. Slide sharing, Issus and blogs are also instruments for content sharing with the potential for user-to-user discussions. This research therefore embraced a comparatively limited definition of social networking instruments, referring to those not mainly intended for content sharing (Boyd & Ellison 2007; Burkhardt 2010; Hoffman 2009).

Purpose of using social networking tools were supposedly used for marketing and advertising, improving reference facilities, and sharing knowledge among

employees for the purposes of using social networking tools within the operational definition of this study. Participants have been found to use Facebook and Twitter for marketing, while prior study has shown that libraries are indifferent to Facebook marketing (Charnigo & Barnett-Ellis 2007). It has been reported that instant messaging has been used to handle inquiry-related services and internal communication with employees. This tool has been demonstrated to improve the social presence of customers and promote a feeling of connection not supplied by emails and standard Web 1.0 websites (Boulos & Wheelert 2007). It is reported that wikis were also used to manage requests and frequently requested questions (FAQ), which is compatible with Chu's previous results (2009) that wikis facilitated communication between librarians and users. Wikis were also used for information generation, capture, sharing, and transfer (Chu 2008).

Using social networking instruments in libraries

Study in the mid-2000s demonstrates that most U.S. library managers and the general public did not believe libraries played a part in social networking (De Rosa et al. 2007). Libraries' emphasis on teaching was considered inappropriate with the nature of social networking, and issues were raised about time and money spent on social networking instruments. Using Facebook and MySpace (Chu & Nalani-Meulemans 2008) has proved the potential of using social networking in libraries. Through profiles showing a standardized identity, Facebook and MySpace were discovered to be useful in the social visibility of libraries. It was also discovered that MySpace enabled various

librarians to contribute expertise and data, keep a profile together and encourage fresh collections of libraries. Librarians proposed that Facebook could provide library facilities and interact with customers (Charnigo & Barnett-Ellis 2007). Facebook was used to provide guidance, library tours and facilities promotion (Graham, Faix, & Hartman 2009).

This library has also discovered that Facebook has helped peers get closer and understand each other better personally. While social networking websites appear to have library advantages, their use was not omnipresent, partially due to the perceived constraints of librarians in their ability to set up profiles and maintenance time (Hendrix et al. 2009). While Facebook's adoption by public libraries has also been dissuaded by council choices prohibiting its use (e.g., Lowe, 2008), the absence of public interest in the involvement of libraries in social networking instruments has also been observed as a discouraging factor in government libraries' use of Facebook (De Rosa et al. 2007).

This seems to be a relevant factor since it has been discovered that involvement in social networking websites depends on subjective standards and social identity (Cheung & Lee 2010). Students were shown not to be particularly willing to interact with teachers on Facebook or MySpace (Chu & Nalani-Meulemans 2008) when it comes to educational reasons, and they preferred email as it is considered to be more reliable. Students reported feeling more comfortable and interested in using social networking instruments to interact with individuals they considered to be friends, which

probably would not include librarians. Some college learners also demonstrated adverse emotions about librarians using Facebook and MySpace as outreach instruments as they may infringe their feeling of private privacy (Connell 2009). It appears that it is necessary to further understand the application of social networking as a library instrument in order to pave the way to exploit its future advantages. Since only the use of Facebook and MySpace has been documented, it would also be helpful to look at the social networking instruments of librarians from a broader view. We intended to obtain a deeper understanding of the ideas of librarians while gaining a broader geographical view at the same moment.

Benefits from the use of social networking tools

Benefits from the use of social networking instruments were also noted to include rapid dissemination of data through easy actions; communication and promotion; increased interaction between library and learners; and access to comments and suggestions from learners. Thus implying that the tools served a role in public relations by allowing the transmission of 'quick and direct information'. Also revealed were social networking instruments to help library employees keep up-to-date with their profession's resources and activities and find possibilities to learn new technology. It was also reported that Twitter was useful in maintaining updates for students who were active Twitter users, and little time was required to do so. The primary cost source was viewed as the extra time employees spent on studying and administering instruments for social networking. The price of monetary training

was minimal, and free technology was obtained. Boulos & Wheelert (2007) had previously pointed out that the cost of cheap growth made use of these social networking instruments worthwhile. One of the respondents in this research pointed out that whether the advantages outweighed the expenses or not depended on the library's requirements and knowledge.

Challenges in the implementation of social networking tools in libraries

A number of difficulties have been recognized in the use of social networking tools in libraries, the most pressing of which seems to be limits connected with insufficient time. This can be difficult because the use of social networking instruments was not given priority owing to the lack of time to learn how to use them. Another participant observed that these instruments were very technical, not allowing them to learn, explore and execute social networking instruments in the library because of the restricted moment they had. There was also some difficulty in administration. For example, since Twitter's threads and newsfeeds required personal care, they were hardly monitored by library personnel users. The surveillance of social networking instruments was generally viewed as requiring extra time and resources in the library. One challenge to address is to find a way to use these instruments without spending too much time. Associated with the restricted time available to know how to use social networking instruments, it was also considered that insufficient technology mastery was a challenge. It was considered that social networking instruments were evolving rapidly and that library users might not be able to maintain

up. While extra time had to be spent on mastering the technology, regular updating of the instruments can also take time. Besides time, it was also hard for the libraries' aging and shrinking employees' to follow the tools' technological developments. In addition, some difficulties were viewed in comprehending how each instrument worked and how to align it with its particular company model.' As a result of the ongoing evolution of social media, the process of determining which tool users could welcome movement was viewed as challenging. Such concern was recognized in a previous research in which libraries found it hard to recognize famous sites as the instruments continue to develop (Chu & Nalani-Meulemans 2008). Library staff's involvement in social networking instruments had also been restricted, mainly because they discovered these instruments hard to comprehend. Some departments were more prepared to use these instruments, while others were reluctant, resulting in a lack of agreement.

Conclusion

This research shows that a number of academic libraries used social networking instruments. It is considered that the advantages of using these instruments outweigh the expenses claimed to be minimal, if not none. In encouraging library facilities and interacting with learners, social networking tools were considered to be useful. In addition, the instruments were also noted to be useful to communicate with inner employees. However, the application by library employees of these instruments was discovered to be challenged by a restricted amount of time and the employees considered inadequacy to maintain pace

with technology development. Training was discovered to be insufficient for employee users, and this suggests a component that needs to be resolved by organizations that plan to efficiently launch social networking platforms. A number of libraries that did not use these instruments stated plans to embrace them in the future, depending on the library users' reaction. The experiences of librarians in using social networking instruments that can provide a helpful foundation for library employees and practitioners considering the option of adopting social networking as part of their scheme. The social networking tools phenomenon is probable to continue to evolve quickly. As this happens, libraries form one group that can also profit from the changing use of these instruments.

References

- Alexander, B. (2006). A New Wave of Innovation for Teaching and Learning? *Educause Review* 41 (2):32-44.
- Arrington, M. (2006). Introducing Slideshare: PowerPoint + YouTube [cited October 28, 2010. Available from <http://techcrunch.com/2006/10/04/introducing-slideshare-power-point-youtube/>.
- Barsky, E. and M. Purdon. (2006). Introducing Web 2.0: social networking and social bookmarking for health librarians. *Journal of the Canadian Health Libraries Association (JCHLA)* 27 (3):65-67.
- Berners-Lee, Tim; James Hendler; Ora Lassila (2001). "The Semantic Web". *Scientific American*.
- Berners-Lee (2005) on the read/write web". *BBC News* Blank, Grant;

- Reisdorf, Bianca (2012-05-01). "The Participatory Web". Information. 15. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2012.665935
- Blood, R. (2000). Weblogs: A history and perspective.
- Boulos, M.N.K., and S. Wheelert. (2007). The emerging Web 2.0 social software: an enabling suite of sociable technologies in health and healthcare education. *Health Information and Libraries Journal* 24:2-23.
- Boyd, D. M., and N. B. Ellison. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13 (1).
- Burkhardt, A. (2010). Social media: A guide for college and university libraries. *College & Research Libraries News* 71 (1):10-24.
- Burroughs, B. (2010). Social networking websites and voter turnout. Dissertation, Public Policy and Policy Management, Georgetown University, District of Columbia.
- Charnigo, L. and P. Barnett-Ellis. (2007). Checking Out Facebook.com: The Impact of a Digital Trend on Academic Libraries. *Information Technology & Libraries* 26 (1):23-34.
- Cheung, C.M.K., and M.K.O. Lee. (2010). A theoretical model of intentional social action in online social networks. *Decision Support Systems* 49 (1):24-30.
- Chu, M., and Y. Nalani-Meulemans. (2008). The Problems and Potential of MySpace and Facebook Usage in Academic Libraries. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly* 13 (1):69-85.
- Chu, S.K.W. (2008). TWiki for knowledge building and management. *Online Information Review* 32 (6):745-758.
- Chu, S.K.W. (2009). Using wikis in academic libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 35 (2):170-176.
- Chung, K.S.K., and L. Hossain. (2010). Towards a social network model for understanding information and communication technology use for general practitioners in rural Australia. *Computers in Human Behavior* 26 (4):562-571.
- Chu, S.K.W. and D. Kennedy. (2011). Using online collaborative tools for groups to co-construct knowledge. *Online Information Review* 35 (4): 581-597.
- Chu, S.K.W. & Du, H. (2013). Social networking tools for academic libraries. *Journal of librarianship & information science*, 45(1), 64-75.
- Churchill, D. (2007). Web 2.0 and possibilities for educational applications. *Educational Technology* 47(2): 24-29.
- Connell, R.S. (2009). Academic Libraries, Facebook and MySpace, and Student Outreach: A Survey of Student Opinion. *portal: Libraries & the Academy* 9 (1):25-36.
- Cunningham, W. (2003). Correspondence on the Etymology of Wiki [cited October 28, 2010. Available from <http://c2.com/doc/etymology.html>.
- De Rosa, C., J. Cantrell, A. Havens, J. Hawk, L. Jenkins, B. Gauder, R. Limes, and D. Cellentani. (2007). Sharing, privacy, and trust in our networked world: A report to the OCLC Membership. Dublin, OH: OCLC Online Computer Library

- Center.
- DiNucci, Darcy (1999). "Fragmented Future" (PDF). Print. 53 (4): 32.
- Dwyer, C., S. Hiltz, and K. Passerini. (2007). Trust and privacy concern within social networking sites: a comparison of Facebook and MySpace. Paper read at Americas Conference on Information Systems, at Keystone, CL.
- Fulk, J., J. Schmitz, and C. Steinfield. (1990). A social influence model of technology use. In *Organizations and communication technology*, edited by J. Fulk and C. Steinfield. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Glassman, M. and M.J. Kang. (2011). The logic of wikis: The possibilities of the Web 2.0 classroom. *Computer Supported Collaborative Learning* 6(1): 93-112.
- Graham, Paul (2005). "Web 2.0". Retrieved 2006-08-02. I first heard the phrase 'Web 2.0' in the name of the Web 2.0 conference in 2004.
- Graham, J.M., A. Faix, and L. Hartman. (2009). Crashing the Facebook party: One library's experiences in the students' domain. *Library Review* 58 (3):228-236.
- Hendrix, D., D. Chiarella, L. Hasman, S. Murphy, and M. L. Zafron. (2009). Use of Facebook in academic health sciences libraries. *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 97 (1):44-47.
- Hoffman, E. S. (2009). Evaluating social networking tools for distance learning. In *Technology, Colleges and Community Worldwide Online Conference*. Honolulu, HI.
- Homans, G. (1974). *Social Behaviour: It's Elementary Forms*. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE). (2009). *Global trends in higher education, adult and distance learning*. ICDE Environmental Scan.
- Jones, B.E., and S.C.O. Conceicao. (2008). Can social networking tools foster informal learning? In the 24th Annual conference on distance teaching and learning. Madison, Wisconsin.
- Lowe, S. (2008). MySpace, Facebook banned at the library. *Southbend Tribune*, 15 March 2008.
- McLean, R., Richards, B. H., and J.I. Wardman. (2007). The effect of Web 2.0 on the future of medical practice and education: Darwinian evolution or folksonomic revolution? *Medical Journal of Australia* 187 (3): 174-177.
- Murray, P. (2008). Web 2.0 and social technologies: what might they offer for the future of health informatics? Retrieved November 20, 2008, from <http://hcro.enigma.co.nz/website/index.FM?fuseaction=articledisplay&FeatureID=010608>.
- News-Press Release: Microsoft Launches MSN Messenger Service. (1999). In Microsoft News Center.
- O'Reilly, Tim (2005). "What Is Web 2.0". O'Reilly Network..
- Read, B. (2006). To the Chagrin of Its Clientele, Facebook Expands Its Membership. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 53 (5): A35.
- Richardson, Will (2009). *Blogs, Wikis, Podcasts, and Other Powerful Web Tools for Classrooms* (2nd ed.). California: Corwin Press. p. 1. ISBN 978-1-4129-5972-8.

- Strickland, Jonathan (2007). "How Web 2.0 Works". computer.howstuffworks.com.
- Stutzman, F. 2006. An evaluation of identity-sharing behavior in social network communities. *International Digital and Media Arts Journal* 3 (1):10-18.
- Suraweera, S. N., Razali N., Lal Bahadur Chouhan, Tamang, C. N, Hubilla, M. K. A U. Mano Ratnayake, A.R.M., Rubosa, N. C., Malik, F. A. & Mahesar S. N. (2011). Value of social networking in libraries and information organizations in Asia and Oceania. *World Library and Information Congress, 76th IFLA General Conference and Assembly*. 10-15 August 2010, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- Taylor-Smith, E. and R. Lindner. (2009). Using social networking tools to promote e-participation initiatives. In *Technology, Colleges, and Community Worldwide Online Conference*. Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Tim Berners-Lee". (2006) "Developer Works Interviews: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2006). *Global Educational Digest*. UNESCO: Institute for Statistics.
- "What is Web 1.0? - Definition from Techopedia". Techopedia.com.
- "What is Web 3.0? Webopedia Definition". www.webopedia.com.