Awareness of Social Media among University Faculty Members: A Comparative Study

Mrs. Kiranmai[1]; Dr. M. Anjaiah[2]; Dr. A. Kishore[3]

Research Scholar, Dept. of Library & Information Science, Dravidian University, Kuppam, Andra Pradesh[1]; Assistant Professor (Sel. Grade) Retd., Dept. of Library & Information Science Dravidian University, Kuppam, Andra Pradesh[2]; Assistant Professor (Sel. Grade), Dept. of Library & Information Science, Dravidian University, Kuppam, Andra Pradesh, India[3]

kirankishoredu@gmail.com;anjaiahlib@gmail.com; saikishoredu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research paper presents a comprehensive comparative study of faculty members' awareness and preferences for various social media tools, academic platforms, and communication technologies in diverse universities. The findings reveal that faculty members across different academic ranks exhibit strong awareness and recognition of these digital tools and platforms, with prominent preferences for WhatsApp, ResearchGate, ORCID, Google Docs, and Skype. Notably, libraries are perceived as needing improvement in providing awareness about academic social media sites. The study underscores the significance of enhancing awareness programs, supporting document management and communication tools, and strengthening library services to cater to the evolving needs of faculty members, ultimately promoting more effective engagement and academic endeavors within the higher education landscape.

KEYWORDS: Academic social networks, social media platforms, higher education, academic libraries, satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Social media refers to the interactive communication that occurs among people using specialized online platforms like Facebook, WhatsApp, Twitter, Myspace, LinkedIn, and Instagram. These platforms enable users to create and share content, fostering interactive dialogue, and communities transcending physical boundaries. Academic libraries have also harnessed social media to market their services and keep users informed about library activities. Social media combines technology, social interaction, and the exchange of ideas, facilitating innovation and the integration of diverse perspectives. It empowers individuals to create, share, connect, and exchange ideas and opinions, both online and in person. Notably, social media has a substantial impact on faculty members' academic performance, with the nature of this impact depending on how it's aware.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Fatawu, Fuseinii, and Khalid (2023) conducted a study to investigate the advantages and challenges of social media use in higher education. Their research uncovered the positive impact of online social networks on students' education. Similarly, Shafiq and Parveen (2023) examined social media utilization among college students and its influence on academic performance, revealing that students who harnessed social media's knowledge-sharing capabilities experienced academic improvement. Trinova, Destari, Arjulayana, Cakranegara, and Kusumawati (2022) conducted qualitative research, highlighting social media's role in knowledge acquisition, effectiveness in teaching and learning, and access to learning resources. Lacka, Wong, and Haddoud (2021) explored the role of digital technologies, Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), and Social Media (SM), in supporting students' higher education goals. Their findings underscored the need for further exploration and deliberate approaches to technology utilization in the higher education context. Finally, Miller (2020) investigated the relationship between Big Five personality traits and inappropriate posting on Facebook and Twitter among college students, revealing associations between conscientiousness, peer behavior, and posting behavior on social media.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study titled "Awareness of Social Media among University Faculty Members: A Comparative Study" is highly significant as it encompasses a diverse range of universities, conducting a comparative analysis of faculty members' awareness of social media. This research sheds light on the differences in social media awareness across various academic institutions, provides valuable insights for enhancing faculty awareness in these distinct settings. Faculty members play a pivotal role in shaping education, and their awareness of social media can impact teaching, research and student engagement. Therefore, this study's findings can guide strategies for improving social media awareness among faculty, benefiting higher education practices.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objectives of this study include:

- ✓ To assess the awareness of various social media tools and platforms among university faculty members.
- ✓ To identify faculty members' memberships in social media and networking communities/groups.
- ✓ To understand faculty members' opinions about providing awareness on accessing academic social media sites through the library.
- ✓ To determine the overall satisfaction of faculty members with social media sites provided for academic activities at the university.

SCOPE AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The scope of this study encompasses six diverse universities located in Tirupathi and Chittoor districts, reflecting a broad spectrum of academic disciplines and institution types. The included universities are Sri Venkateswara University (SVU), Sri Padmavati Mahila Viswavidyalayam (SPMVV), and Dravidian University (DU), which are traditional universities. Additionally, National Sanskrit University (NSU), Sri Venkateswara Institute of Medical Sciences (SVIMS), and two engineering universities, Sri Venkateswara University College of Engineering & School of Engineering and Technology, SPMVV (SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV), are part of the study. Two universities, Sri

Venkateswara Veterinary University and Sri Venkateswara Vedic University, were excluded due to limited response rates from these institutions.

METHODOLOGY

The research methodology involved selecting participants from the chosen universities based on the 2020-21 annual reports, which identified a total of 1,215 faculty members, including Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors. A simple random sampling method was employed to ensure that each member of the target population had an equal and independent chance of being included in the sample. Of the total faculty members, 819 from various universities responded to the questionnaire, which consisted of close-ended items. Data analysis was conducted using frequency counts, percentages, and means. The study took place at the end of the 2021-22 academic session.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

In this section, the analysis and interpretation of the data collected through the survey provide insights into faculty members' awareness of social media across different universities and ranks.

Table1: Distribution of respondents according to their gender and university

Gender	Name of the University						Total
	SVU	SPMVV	DU	NSU	SVIMS	SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV	
Male	121 (61.1)	24 (15.2)	47 (63.5)	82 (78.1)	80 (62.5)	76 (48.7)	430 (52.5)
Female	77 (38.9)	134 (84.8)	27 (36.5)	23 (21.9)	48 (37.5)	80 (51.3)	389 (47.5)
Total	198 (100.0)	158 (100.0)	74 (100.0)	105 (100.0)	128 (100.0)	156 (100.0)	819 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parentheses denote percentages

Table 1 presents the gender distribution among the respondents, indicating that 52.5% are male faculty members, with the remaining 47.5% being female faculty members. Further insights from the table reveal variations in gender representation across different universities. For instance, at Sri Venkateswara University (SVU), the majority (61.1%) are male, while at Sri Padmavathi Mahila Viswa Vidyalayam (SPMVV), the majority (84.8%) are female. Dravidian University (DU) has 63.5% male faculty members, whereas National Sanskrit University (NSU) has 78.1% male faculty. Sri Venkateswara Institute of Medical Sciences (SVIMS) is predominantly male (62.5%), and Sri Venkateswara University College of Engineering & School of Engineering and Technology, Sri Padmavathi Mahila Viswa Vidyalayam (SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV), has a majority of female faculty members (51.3%).

Table: 2 Distribution of respondents according to their faculty cadre and university

Faculty Cadre	Name of the University						Total
	SVU	SPMVV	DU	NSU	SVIMS	SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV	
Assistant Professors	109 (55.1)	80 (50.6)	46 (62.2)	70 (66.7)	69 (53.9)	107 (68.6)	481 (58.7)
Associate Professors	28 (14.1)	40 (25.3)	11 (14.9)	6 (5.7)	29 (22.7)	22 (14.1)	136 (16.6)
Professors	61 (30.8)	38 (24.1)	17 (23.0)	29 (27.6)	30 (23.4)	27 (17.3)	202 (24.7)
Total	198 (100.0)	158 (100.0)	74 (100.0)	105 (100.0)	128 (100.0)	156 (100.0)	819 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parentheses denote percentages

Table 2 provides an overview of faculty members' academic ranks, with the majority (58.7%) holding the position of Assistant Professors. Professors constitute 24.7% of the sample, while Associate Professors make up 16.6%. A detailed breakdown by university reveals variations. At Sri Venkateswara University (SVU), 55.1% are Assistant Professors, 30.8% are Professors, and 14.1% are Associate Professors. Sri Padmavathi Mahila Viswa Vidyalayam (SPMVV) has a majority (50.6%) of Assistant Professors, followed by 24.1% Professors, and 25.3% Associate Professors. Dravidian University (DU) primarily comprises Assistant Professors (62.2%), with 23.0% being Professors, and 14.9% Associate Professors. National Sanskrit University (NSU) is predominantly composed of Assistant Professors (66.7%), followed by 27.6% Professors, and 5.7% Associate Professors. Sri Venkateswara Institute of Medical Sciences (SVIMS) sees 53.9% as Assistant Professors, 23.4% as Professors, and 22.7% as Associate Professors. Meanwhile, Sri Venkateswara University College of Engineering & School of Engineering and Technology, Sri Padmavathi Mahila Viswa Vidyalayam (SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV) includes 68.6% Assistant Professors, 17.3% Professors, and 14.1% Associate Professors.

Table: 3 Distribution of respondents according to their teaching experience and university

Teaching Experience	Name of the University						Total
	SVU	SPMVV	DU	NSU	SVIMS	SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV	
1 - 5 Years	14 (7.1)	19 (12.1)	11 (14.8)	16 (15.2)	22 (17.2)	27 (17.3)	109 (13.3)
6 - 10 Years	58 (29.3)	37 (23.4)	21 (28.4)	26 (24.8)	41 (32.0)	38 (24.4)	221 (27.0)
11 - 15 Years	65 (32.8)	62 (39.2)	23 (31.1)	32 (30.5)	28 (21.9)	59 (37.8)	269 (32.8)
More than 15 Years	61 (30.8)	40 (25.3)	19 (25.7)	31 (29.5)	37 (28.9)	32 (20.5)	220 (26.9)
Total	198 (100.0)	158 (100.0)	74 (100.0)	105 (100.0)	128 (100.0)	156 (100.0)	819 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parentheses denote percentages

Table 3 provides an overview of faculty members' teaching experience at their respective universities. It reveals that nearly one-third (32.8%) have 11-15 years of teaching experience, followed by more than one-fourth (27%) with 6-10 years of experience, 26.9% with over 15 years of experience, and 13.3% with 1-5 years of teaching experience. A closer look at individual universities demonstrates that nearly one-third of faculty members at SVU (32.8%), SPMVV (39.2%), DU (31.1%), NSU (30.5%), and SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV (37.8%) have 11-15 years of teaching experience. In contrast, at SVIMS, nearly one-third (32%) have 6-10 years of teaching experience.

Table: 4 Member in Social Media and Networking Communities/Groups

Member in social media/networking sites communities/ groups	Name of the University						Total
	SVU	SPMVV	DU	NSU	SVIMS	SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV	
1 - 10	158 (79.8)	118 (74.7)	62 (83.8)	101 (96.2)	102 (79.7)	149 (95.5)	690 (84.2)
11 - 20	22 (11.1)	4 (2.5)	4 (5.4)	4 (3.8)	22 (17.2)	0 (0.0)	56 (6.8)
21 - 50	5 (2.5)	8 (5.1)	3 (4.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.6)	17 (2.1)
Above 50	13 (6.6)	28 (17.7)	5 (6.8)	0 (0.0)	4 (3.1)	6 (3.8)	56 (6.8)
Total	198 (100.0)	158 (100.0)	74 (100)	105 (100)	128 (100)	156 (100)	819 (100)

Table 4 provides insights into the number of social media or networking site communities/groups faculty members are part of. The majority, 690 (84.2%), are members of 1-10 communities/groups. A smaller percentage, 56 (6.8%), are part of 11-20 communities/groups. Only 17 (2.1%) are members of 21-50 communities/groups. Another 6.8%, the same as those in the 11-20 category, belong to more than 50 communities/groups.

Table: 5 Awareness on General Social Networks

Awareness on General Social Networks	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Rank	Mean
Facebook	1.651	2	1.463	2	1.624	2
Twitter	1.416	5	1.346	3	1.411	5
WhatsApp	1.936	1	1.919	1	1.926	1
LinkedIn	1.418	4	1.243	4	1.46	4
Pinterest	1.023	7	1.015	7	1.02	8
Snapchat	1.526	3	1.191	5	1.03	6
Telegram	1.056	6	1.022	6	1.02	7
Hi5, MySpace, Ning	1.019	8	1.015	8	1.545	3

Table 5 outlines faculty members' awareness and preferences regarding various general social networks. WhatsApp consistently secures the first rank across all faculty ranks, followed by Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn, ranked at 2nd, 3rd, and 4th positions, respectively. However, there are slight variations in the rankings of Snapchat and Telegram. Assistant Professors rank Snapchat 3rd, while Associate Professors place it 5th, and Professors rank it 6th. Telegram consistently occupies the 6th rank across all faculty ranks. Interestingly, 'Hi5, MySpace, Ning' receives a 3rd rank from Professors but is consistently ranked 8th by Assistant and Associate Professors. These results highlight WhatsApp as the preferred social networking platform among the majority of faculty members.

Table: 6 Awareness on Scientific Social Networks

Awareness on Scientific Social Networks	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Rank	Mean
Academia.com	1.753	2	1.882	2	1.817	2
ResearchGate	1.904	1	1.919	1	1.921	1
Science stage	1.058	3	1.066	3	1.059	3
Epernicus, Lalisio, Methodspaceetc,	1.031	4	1.015	4	1.02	4

Table 6 shows that among scientific social networks, ResearchGate is unanimously recognized and ranks first across all faculty ranks, underscoring its vital role. Academia.com, Science stage, Epernicus, Lalisio, Methodspace, and other similar platforms consistently secure the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and subsequent positions across all faculty ranks. These findings emphasize the significant importance of ResearchGate as the go-to platform among faculty members for scientific networking and collaboration.

Table: 7 Awareness on Researcher ID Tools

Awareness on Researcher ID	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Rank	Mean
Researcher ID	1.279	2	1.647	1	1.53	1
ORCID	1.414	1	1.324	2	1.386	2
Emerald Research Connections	1.06	3	1.051	3	1.064	3

Table 7 reveals that faculty members across all ranks unanimously acknowledge the significance of ORCID, with slight variations in ranking. Assistant Professors place ORCID as their top choice (1st), while Professors and Associate Professors consistently rank it as 2nd. Researcher ID secures the 2nd rank among Assistant Professors and the 1st rank among Professors and Associate Professors, indicating substantial awareness among all faculty ranks. Emerald Research Connections consistently holds the 3rd rank across all faculty ranks, emphasizing its recognized importance in academic circles.

Table: 8 Awareness on Document Creation, Edition and Sharing Tools

Awareness on Document Creation, Edition and Sharing Tools	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Rank	Mean
Google Docs	1.711	1	1.926	1	1.822	1
Docs.com	1.187	3	1.287	3	1.203	3
Dropbox, etc	1.21	2	1.294	2	1.272	2

Table 8 makes it evident that faculty members across all ranks unanimously acknowledge the significance of Google Docs, Docs.com, and similar platforms like Dropbox for document creation, editing, and sharing. Google Docs consistently secures the 1st rank across all faculty ranks, underscoring its widespread recognition and usage for these purposes. Similarly, Docs.com consistently maintains the 3rd rank, and platforms like Dropbox consistently hold the 2nd rank among all faculty ranks, signifying their recognized importance in academic activities.

Table: 9 Awareness on Communication Tools

Awareness on Communication Tools	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Rank	Mean
Skype	1.514	1	1.566	1	1.584	1
Google Chat	1.17	2	1.294	2	1.223	2
Pint of Science	1.037	3	1.044	3	1.084	3

.

In the domain of communication tools, Table 9 highlights that faculty members across different academic ranks highly value Skype, Google Chat, and Pint of Science. These tools consistently maintain their rankings, with Skype being the most preferred, followed by Google Chat in second place, and Pint of Science ranking third among faculty members of all academic ranks.

Table: 10 Awareness on Citations Indexes Platforms

Awareness on social media tools/services	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Rank	Mean
Google Scholar	1.921	1	1.949	1	1.931	1
CiteSeer	1.044	2	1.029	2	1.05	2

Table 10 underscores that faculty members, regardless of their academic ranks, unanimously recognize the importance of citation indexes such as Google Scholar and CiteSeer. Remarkably, Google Scholar consistently attains the top position, with CiteSeer being the second most esteemed platform among all faculty ranks.

Table: 11 Awareness on Reference Management Software Tools

Awareness on Reference Management Software	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Rank	Mean
Mendeley	1.304	1	1.566	1	1.47	1
Zotero	1.089	2	1.066	2	1.114	2
CiteULike	1.033	3	1.022	3	1.054	3

Table 11 clearly shows that faculty members unanimously place Mendeley as their top choice for reference management software. Mendeley consistently secures the first position across all faculty ranks, highlighting its paramount importance and widespread recognition. Likewise, Zotero consistently takes the second rank, and CiteULike maintains the third position among all faculty ranks.

Table: 12 Awareness on Video Platforms

Awareness on Video Platforms	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
YouTube	1.335	1	1.265	2	1.277	1
Tiktok	1.235	2	1.279	1	1.109	2
Teachertube	1.191	3	1.235	3	1.079	3
Vimeo	1.035	7	1.081	6	1.069	4
Sevenload	1.046	5	1.088	5	1.064	5
Viddler	1.058	4	1.103	4	1.054	6
Dailymotion, Metacafe, Nico Nico etc,	1.042	6	1.051	7	1.054	6

Table 12 reveals the faculty members' familiarity and preferences for video platforms within the academic context. YouTube stands out as the most recognized platform, claiming the top spot for Asst. Professors and Professors. However, Associate Professors rank it second, indicating slightly lower awareness. TikTok consistently holds a strong presence across all academic ranks, ranking first among Associate Professors and second among Asst. Professors and Professors. Teachertube consistently maintains the third position among all faculty ranks, indicating steady but somewhat lower awareness compared to YouTube and TikTok. While Vimeo, Sevenload, and Viddler show variations in rankings among faculty ranks, Vimeo consistently secures the fourth position among Professors. Other platforms like Dailymotion, Metacafe, and Nico Nico consistently rank sixth among Asst. Professors and Professors and seventh among Associate Professors. These differing rankings reflect varying levels of awareness and preference for video platforms among faculty members of different academic ranks, with YouTube and TikTok being popular choices.

Table: 13 Awareness on Presentations: Creation, Edition and Sharing Tools

Awareness on Presentations: Creation, Edition and Sharing Tools	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
SlideShare	1.769	1	1.934	1	1.025	2
FigShare	1.029	2	1.029	2	1.797	1
Prezi,Empressr, Slideracket etc.	1.006	3	1.015	3	1.005	3

Table 13 demonstrates that SlideShare consistently holds the top rank across all faculty ranks, emphasizing its immense importance and widespread recognition. FigShare takes the second position, while platforms like Prezi, Empressr, Sliderocket, and similar tools consistently secure the third rank among Asst. Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors.

Table: 14 Awareness on Survey Platforms

Awareness on Survey Tools	Asst. Professors		Assoc. Professors		Professors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Google Forms	1.753	1	1.963	1	1.856	1
Survey Monkey	1.748	2	1.118	3	1.129	3
SoGoSurvey	1.052	4	1.118	3	1.109	4
ZOHO Survey	1.135	3	1.956	2	1.856	1

In the realm of survey platforms, Table 14 reveals that faculty members of various academic ranks exhibit distinct preferences and levels of recognition. Google Forms consistently secures the top rank across all faculty ranks, underscoring its widespread recognition and dominant role in academic survey creation. ZOHO Survey, acknowledged as a valuable tool, attains the first position among Professors, the second among Associate Professors, and the third among Assistant Professors, highlighting its significance within the academic context. SurveyMonkey consistently holds the second rank across all ranks, indicating a moderate level of recognition. SoGoSurvey ranks third or fourth among academic ranks, suggesting a relatively lower awareness compared to Google Forms, ZOHO Survey, and SurveyMonkey.

Table: 15 Opinion about giving any awareness on access and use of social media sites for academic activities by library

Opinion about Library	Name of the University						
	SVU	SPMVV	DU	NSU	SVIMS	SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV	Total
Yes	38 (19.2)	14 (8.9)	14 (18.9)	1 (1.0)	18 (14.1)	39 (25.0)	124 (15.1)
No	160 (80.8)	144 (91.1)	60 (81.1)	104 (99.0)	110 (85.9)	117 (75.0)	695 (84.9)
Total	198 (100)	158 (100)	74 (100)	105 (100.0)	128 (100.0)	156 (100.0)	819 (100.0)

As shown in Table 15, a relatively small percentage of respondents (15.1%) from all universities believe that the library adequately informs them about accessing and using academic social media sites for their academic activities, whereas a significant majority (84.9%) feel that such awareness is lacking. This suggests a widespread perception across these universities that libraries are not effectively facilitating awareness regarding the utilization of academic social media platforms for academic purposes.

Table: 16 Overall satisfactions with social media sites provided for academic activities as per university

Overall satisfaction with social media sites	Name of the university						
	SVU	SPMVV	DU	NSU	SVIMS	SVUCE & SOET-SPMVV	Total
Satisfied	158 (79.8)	125 (79.1)	51 (68.9)	81 (77.1)	102 (79.7)	145 (92.9)	662 (80.8)
Very Much Satisfied	34 (17.2)	33 (20.9)	13 (17.6)	0 (0.0)	3 (2.3)	11 (7.1)	94 (11.5)
No Comment	6 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (13.5)	24 (22.9)	23 (18.0)	0 (0.0)	63 (7.7)
Total	198 (100.0)	158 (100.0)	74 (100.0)	105 (100.0)	128 (100.0)	156 (100.0)	819 (100.0)

Table 16 provides insights into the overall satisfaction levels regarding the social media sites used for academic activities across different universities. Among the total of 819 faculty members, approximately 80.8% (662 members) expressed their satisfaction with these sites. A smaller but still significant percentage, about 11.5% (94 members), indicated being very satisfied with these platforms. Furthermore, 7.7% (63 members) chose not to provide feedback on their satisfaction levels.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

- ❖ WhatsApp, Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn are widely recognized among faculty members, consistently ranked at 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th positions, respectively.
- ❖ ResearchGate is highly recognized across all faculty ranks, holding the 1st rank.
- ❖ ORCID is unanimously recognized by all faculty members, with consistent ranking across all ranks.
- ❖ Google Docs, Docs.com, and platforms like Dropbox for document creation and sharing are recognized by all faculty members. Google Docs consistently holds the 1st rank.
- ❖ Skype, Google Chat, and Pint of Science are preferred communication tools, with Skype being the most favored.
- ❖ Citation indexes like Google Scholar are unanimously acknowledged, consistently securing the top rank.
- ❖ Mendeley is the preferred reference management software tool, consistently holding the 1st rank.
- ❖ YouTube is widely recognized, securing the 1st rank among Asst. Professors and Professors. TikTok ranks highly among Associate Professors and Asst. Professors.
- ❖ SlideShare is consistently recognized, maintaining the 1st rank among all faculty ranks.
- ❖ Google Forms is the dominant survey platform, consistently ranking 1st.
- ❖ A majority (84.9%) of respondents believe that libraries do not provide sufficient awareness about academic social media site usage.
- ❖ About 80.8% of faculty members are satisfied with the social media sites provided for academic activities.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the comprehensive analysis and findings of this study, several key insights and recommendations can be derived. Faculty members across different academic ranks exhibit strong awareness and recognition of various social media tools, academic platforms, and communication technologies, with notable preferences for platforms like WhatsApp, ResearchGate, ORCID, Google Docs, and Skype. To enhance faculty engagement and academic endeavors, institutions should consider investing in awareness programs and workshops, emphasizing the effective use of academic social media sites and encouraging research collaboration through platforms such as ResearchGate and ORCID. Furthermore, promoting efficient document management and collaboration through tools like Google Docs, as well as supporting the use of communication platforms like Skype and Google Chat, can significantly benefit faculty members. Additionally, there is room for improvement in libraries' efforts to provide awareness about academic social media sites, underlining the importance of enhancing library support and services in this context. Finally, integrating survey platforms like Google Forms into academic processes and continuously monitoring faculty satisfaction with the provided social media resources are essential steps in catering to the evolving needs of faculty members and advancing their academic experiences.

REFERENCES

[1] Deng, F., & Jiang, X. (2023). Effects of human versus virtual human influencers on the appearance anxiety of social media users. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 71(103233), 103233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103233

[2] Fatawu, A., Fuseinii, M. A.-B., & Khalid, A.-M. (2023). The benefits and challenges of social media in higher education. *Advances in Information Communication Technology and Computing*, 107–122. Springer Nature Singapore.

[3] Harness, J., Fitzgerald, K., Sullivan, H., & Selkie, E. (2022). Youth insight about social media effects on well/ill-being and self-modulating efforts. *The Journal of Adolescent Health: Official Publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*, 71(3), 324–333. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2022.04.011

[4] Lacka, E., Wong, T. Y., & Haddoud, M. Y. (2021). Can digital technologies improve students' efficiency? Exploring the role of Virtual Learning Environment and Social Media use in Higher Education. *Computers & Education*, *163*, 104099. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104099

[5] Shafiq, M. & Parveen, K. (2023). Social media usage: Analyzing its effect on academic performance and engagement of higher education students. *International Journal of Educational Development,* 98(102738), 102738. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102738

[6] Miller, R. E. (2020). College students and inappropriate social media posting: Is it a question of personality or the influence of friends? Personality and Individual Differences, 158 (109857), 109857. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.109857

[7] Trinova, Z., Destari, D., Arjulayana, A., Cakranegara, P. A., & Kusumawati, E. A. (2022). Social media usage by higher education academics. *Al-Ishlah*, 14(4), 5111–5118. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i4.1269

[8] White, C. L., & Boatwright, B. (2020). Social media ethics in the data economy: Issues of social responsibility for using Facebook for public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 46(5), 101980. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2020.101980

_____