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INTRODUCTION

Using social media effectively enables libraries to connect with users in a space that they already occupy, while bringing added value to existing activities. This FreeBook thus provides library practitioners and students of Library and Information Science (LIS) with suggestions on how librarians, and academics, can use social media to improve audience engagement, create a community of users, and enhance the libraries profile – all of which is in light of Social Media in the Library.

This FreeBook features contributions from experts in their field, including:

**George Veletsianos**, Canada Research Chair of Innovative Learning and Technology and Associate Professor at Royal Roads University in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. He has been developing and researching digital learning environments since 2004.

**Bikramjit Rishi**, an Associate Professor of Marketing at the Institute of Management Technology, Ghaziabad, India.

**Subir Bandyopadhyay**, a Professor of Marketing at the School of Business & Economics, Indiana University Northwest, USA.

**Helen Fallon**, Deputy University Librarian at Maynooth University, Ireland. She has published extensively and has presented workshops on academic writing in Ireland, the UK, the USA and Malaysia.

**Graham Walton**, Honorary Research Fellow in the Centre for Information Management at Loughborough University, UK, where he was Assistant Director [Academic and User Services] in the University Library until July 2016. He has 15 years’ experience as a journal editor and has published widely around management issues in libraries and the move to the digital world.

*Note to readers: As you read through this FreeBook, you will notice that some excerpts reference other chapters in the book – please note that these are references to the original text and not the FreeBook. Footnotes and other references are not included. For a fully referenced version of each text, please see the published title.*
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How are scholars using online networks to engage in the creation and dissemination of knowledge? What scholarly materials do they post online? What scholarly activities are they engaged in? In this chapter, I explore the milieu that scholars enact online with respect to knowledge creation and dissemination, and describe how academics use networks for scholarship. I present examples of academics using networks to support each other’s scholarly endeavours, to conduct research, and to share their knowledge with communities outside of academia.

The image of the “lone scholar” tirelessly working on his or her research in a dimly lit office is in stark contrast to the connected and visible scholarly activities that scholars engage in online, at least by the measure of the scholars that I have encountered in my investigation of networked scholarship. While a number of specialized tools have been developed specifically for networked scholarly practice (e.g., Mendeley; see Figure 4.1 for Academia.edu), scholars also use their own individual websites, most often blogs, as spaces in which they enact and pursue their scholarship in a visible manner. Personal websites often serve as areas where faculty’s digital presence is aggregated and various scholarly artefacts are featured. For example, the personal websites of those who actively manage their online presence frequently feature the creator’s blog, Twitter feed, teaching/research statements, scholarly artefacts (e.g., copies of syllabi and publications), and links to topics of interest (e.g., professional organizations) or blogs that the individual reads.

Figure 4.1 • Screenshot of Academia.edu
DIGITAL RESIDENTS VS. DIGITAL VISITORS

Not all scholars use digital technologies and social media in the same ways, of course. While some members of a university community may be deeply professionally embedded in online platforms and networks, others may approach digital practices far more cautiously, or with instrumental rather than social purposes in mind. One way to conceptualize the differences between scholars who fully embrace social media vis-a-vis those whose approach may preclude them from taking full advantage of networked platforms is to consider the purposes and perspectives they bring to their engagement.

White and LeCornu (2011) use the continuum of digital visitors and digital residents to understand participation in online spaces. Applied to networked participatory scholarship, digital residents are those scholars who understand the affordances of the participatory web for scholarship, cultivate digital identities and relationships online, and view the web as a crucial component of their scholarly work and identity. Digital visitors on the other hand are those scholars who use the web as a tool when they see a need for it. A digital visitor would visit electronic databases to update a literature review for a paper when a need arises, while digital residents would have developed a learning network of colleagues through which they could track and categorize publications and resources of interest on an ongoing basis. Other than using tools for information management, being a digital resident also means cultivating an online identity – not just having a presence online via a website, but actively managing that presence. For instance, remaining visible on a social networking and fast-moving platform such as Twitter means that one has to share often and frequently, or else one’s voice and presence are diluted in the sea of information that is already present. Coupling these issues with other activities that demand scholars’ time – activities that may be more highly rewarded in the current academic structure – and it becomes clear why online participation akin to digital resident status may not represent all of today’s scholars.

PRACTICES: WHAT RESIDENTS DO

In one of my own research projects, I dedicated time to be an active participant and contributor on social media sites, collecting data via ethnographic means. In these spaces, I interacted with educators, researchers, and students within the field of Educational Technology, participated in virtual events (e.g., open courses), and kept a journal of these activities. This journal consisted of observations, thoughts,
reflections, and a number of digital artefacts (e.g., screenshots, hyperlinks, news articles). Some of these artefacts were derived from a wide array of social media sites such as blogs, micro-blogging sites, and video-sharing sites. This journal centred on three main questions, “What am I observing in my social media participation with regard to scholarly practice? What phenomena and/or issues arise? What do these observations mean for scholarly practice, and how can we make sense of them?” Some of the main practices that I observed scholars enacting in public digital spaces were the following:

• Announcing publications, awards, and job opportunities, among other things
• Sharing drafts of manuscripts and requesting/receiving feedback on them
• Developing and releasing textbooks written as part of a course (e.g., Amado et al, 2011; Correia, 2012)
• Sharing syllabi and instructional activities
• Live-streaming or sharing video/photographs from one’s own teaching
• Live-blogging and live-tweeting a conference keynote or session
• Authoring and participating in the writing of collaborative documents pertaining to conference sessions/workshops
• Engaging in debates and commentary on professional issues
• Teaching: for example, scholars have led open courses which invite participation from individuals who are not formally enrolled at the institution in which the course is offered (e.g., Hilton et al., 2010)
• Making one’s tenure and promotion materials publicly available
• Reflecting on and conversing about the doctoral process and thesis/dissertation
  • doctoral students using blogs and wikis to share their work, and to reflect upon and document their progress
  • self-organized systems through which some of these activities are enacted have also been formed (e.g., #PhDChat – see page 43)
• Creating video trailers to describe, promote, and highlight academic artefacts (e.g., books)
• Crowdsourcing and help-seeking with professional activities (e.g., research, teaching): individuals ask for help in locating research literature or relevant materials
Research on the extent to which these practices are present is scarce, though large-scale social media surveys of US faculty show (a) increasing adoption of social media tools for professional purposes over the years, (b) greater use of social media for personal rather than professional purposes, and (c) around half of faculty members using social media for professional purposes (Moran, Seaman, & Tinti-Kane, 2011; Moran & Tinti-Kane, 2013).

Use of particular tools undoubtedly varies among scholars. While Bowman’s research shows that social media uptake by faculty members ranges from 70 percent (Facebook) to 50 percent (Google Plus), a survey of 1,600 education scholars by researchers at Michigan State University (Bergland, 2014) puts the use of social media for professional purposes at much lower rates for Twitter (15 percent), YouTube (28 percent) and Facebook (39 percent).

Further, the ways that adopters use social media tools also varies. Bowman’s (2015) survey of 613 scholars who indicated having a Twitter account, showed that 42 percent of respondents reported using Twitter for both personal and professional purposes, while use of Twitter for distinctly personal and distinctly professional purposes was less prevalent (29 percent for each use). For instance, social media has been found to both permeate some scholars’ lives and to have been used in targeted goal-oriented ways (Kieslinger, 2015).

In the cases where scholars use social media for knowledge creation and dissemination purposes, we observe a diverse range of practices to support such goals. Timothy Gowers, a professor at the University of Cambridge at the time, used his blog as a platform to engage individuals in producing ideas and solutions to a complex mathematical problem, generating substantial contributions from 27 individuals, and announcing a proof of the problem approximately a month and a half after the inception of the project (Gowers & Nielsen, 2009).

Alec Couros, a professor at the University of Regina, taught an online course in fall 2010 entitled “Social Media and Open Education” that was available to anyone for free. Couros asked colleagues to help him in teaching the 345 students who expressed interest in enrolling as non-credit students. Couros’ volunteer colleagues acted as online network mentors and actively supported these students. Within a few days, 124 individuals volunteered to serve as mentors and collectively aided Couros in teaching the course (A. Couros, personal communication, June 13, 2011).

Results from a research project I conducted to understand what scholars do on Twitter may further illuminate these activities. In that project, I collected the latest
100 public tweets from 45 early adopters of Twitter who represented multiple academic disciplines. Thirty-eight were men and seven were women. Two scholars did not list their location, and the rest were located in the United States (32), Canada (6), UK (2), Spain (2), and Portugal (1). I categorized their tweets to understand what they were doing on Twitter.

One of the findings was that scholars used their Twitter network to intentionally enhance their own knowledge and practice. For instance, participants requested examples and resources that they could use in their teaching (e.g., “Do you have any excellent examples of interactive whiteboard uses in education? I’m looking for examples for Thursday’s class,” and “Can you point me to your favourite politicians’ Facebook pages that I can use in my course?”). In other instances, instructors sought recommendations and assistance that would enhance their skills and/or practice (e.g., “How do you use [technology] in or out of the classroom? I want to learn from you, so please tell me about it” or “[Software] does not allow me to create an interactive image to publish on the Web. What software can do this?”). Finally, participants sought information relevant to their scholarship and research (e.g., “I am writing a paper on [topic]. If you have knowledge of [topic] I would be grateful for your suggestions,” and “Does anyone have any article recommendations on the impact of Internet access on [population of interest]?”).

In addition to requests for assistance and input, I observed the responses from the community to such requests. For instance, participants answered questions (e.g., “Yes, @user. [School name] should add a class on [topic]” or “@user1 @user2, here is the information on [topic]: [URL]”), and provided resources in response to such requests (e.g., “This is an example of digital content creation: [URL], @ user”). In other cases, participants directed users to examples and offered to provide further input if that was needed (e.g., “Here is an example [URL] @user. I can also send my course schedule if you need it”), or voluntarily offered suggestions to colleagues: “If you teach [topic], this might be valuable to your students: [URL].” It is important to realize however that knowledge creation and dissemination practices, as well as requests for scholarly assistance as we see above, vary from platform to platform. Social media sites have their own norms and structures. What researchers observe in one platform (e.g., Facebook) may not transfer to other platforms (e.g., Twitter or Pinterest). This poses challenges for the generalizability of results that researchers may observe when they examine scholars’ participation on social media (cf. Tufekci, 2014). Thus, the help-seeking behaviours I found on Twitter, may not fully transfer to help-seeking behaviours on Facebook, even though researchers have observed help-seeking behaviours on Facebook as well.
While such behaviours may not be exactly the same, what might be some common elements? Tufekci’s argument is convincing in that practices may differ between social media platforms (and that big data analyses focusing on one platform may not transfer to others). However, one common element in the use of social media for knowledge production and dissemination that seems to be a persistent theme is the concept of crowdsourcing. Crowdsourcing refers to the process of gathering contributions from large groups of individuals in order to solve a common problem or tackle a challenge. Though readers may be familiar with modern crowdsourcing examples that are mediated by technology (e.g., Wikipedia as a content crowdsourcing platform), the practice existed long before the rise of social media. For instance, the design of the Sydney Opera House was crowdsourced. It was based on a 1955 international design competition that received 233 entries. Crowdsourcing content and ideas characterizes social media use, and scholars have capitalized on this practice to gather readings for their syllabi, activities for their courses, resources for their research, and other input – including effort – intended to solve scholarly problems. One aspect of knowledge creation and dissemination in which crowdsourcing activities have been conducted that makes for an interesting phenomenon is the sharing of scholarly papers.

SHARING SCHOLARLY PAPERS

Imagine being at a university whose library does not have access to a journal that you need for your teaching or research. Or that even though you have access to the journal, the year in which a particular paper was published falls outside of your institution’s subscription dates. For example, the journal may impose a 6-month lag between the time the paper is published and the time it becomes available electronically. Or, as I discovered, you may request an article via interlibrary loan and licensing restrictions may only allow you to receive the paper in hard copy. What options are available to you?

You could purchase the article. Or, you could email the article’s author and ask for a copy of the paper. Alternatively, you could search for the article online in the hopes that the author has self-archived the paper (e.g., on his/her personal website or institutional repository).

Scholars may seek the assistance of their networks to access scholarly papers that they need, posting requests on Twitter or Facebook. “Does anyone have access to a digital copy of ‘Networked Scholars’ by Veletsianos to share?” may be the type of request that I might come across in the future. In response to similar requests, I have
observed academics reply with Dropbox links to papers (Figure 4.2) or with confirmations that they would provide papers via email.

Figure 4.2 • Sharing of Dropbox Links to Papers.

Reminiscent of peer-to-peer networks for music sharing, scholars have sought the assistance of broader networks of individuals and have used PirateUniversity.org, ThePaperBay.com, and the Scholar subreddit to access scholarship that they need. On these websites, individuals request papers that they do not have access to, and those who have access (e.g., through their institution’s libraries) provide them with a copy of the papers. The Scholar subreddit for example has more than 24,000 subscribers at the time of writing. Reddit.com is a popular content aggregator whose content was contributed by users. A subreddit is a community of users who share a common interest (e.g., exercise, veganism, education). The Scholar subreddit is described as a place for “requesting and sharing specific articles available in various databases” and advises individuals to “be aware of copyright issues and Fair Use Copyright,” while cautioning them that “many journal sources embed identifying information into the PDF.”

The #ICanHazPdf hashtag is another way that users have accessed papers that they need. This works as follows: a user posts a note on Twitter describing the paper that they need access to (e.g., title and author information or DOI) and includes the #ICanHazPdf hashtag with it. Users who follow the hashtag and who are willing and able to provide access to the paper locate the paper and make it available for download. They notify the original sender and once the original sender retrieves it, the tweets pertaining to this transaction are often erased.

These activities are important because they suggest that individuals are willing and able to circumvent and defy restrictions to the sharing of knowledge and research. In fact, in my ethnographic investigations, I found that broadening access to scholarship appears to be close to the hearts and minds of many scholars who use the Internet for professional purposes. Even though some may not publicly embrace or endorse
the activities described above, they often make their stance in support of open access known. For example, a number of them have blogged their refusal to publish in or review for non-Open Access journals.

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

There are different ways that scholars have used social media and online networks to create and share knowledge. Here are four in-depth examples.

EXAMPLE #1: COLLEAGUES HELPING COLLEAGUES ON FACEBOOK

My colleagues and I recently completed a synthesis of the literature on a topic of interest. We identified about two hundred papers on the topic, and as we were examining this literature, we became interested in exploring whether the authors contributing to this literature came from different disciplines. We searched the literature for ideas on how other researchers studied the presence of interdisciplinarity in a corpus of papers, and it seemed that one popular approach was to categorize authors by the discipline of their doctoral program and report descriptive statistics. We sought to complement our findings by asking colleagues on social media for their input. If someone used any of the methods we found, s/he might be able to give us more input as to their relative merits.

I posted the following note, presented here verbatim, on the “Professors of Instructional Design and Technology” group on Facebook:

Does anyone know how I can go about examining whether there’s evidence of interdisciplinarity in a set of papers? For example, let’s say that I collected 100 papers examining learning experiences in online courses. What are some ways to use that would enable me to say that there is or that there is no evidence of interdisciplinarity in my data corpus of 100 papers? I could categorize authors by discipline, and can report if there are collaborations between authors from different disciplines, but that’s as far as I got. Any thoughts?

A number of colleagues provided suggestions. Wendy Gentry was one of the individuals who replied. At the time of writing, Wendy was a doctoral student at Virginia Tech. She offered these thoughts, and gave me permission to reproduce them here:
Something to ponder:

1. Categorize the citations within the papers by discipline.
2. Identify and categorize any referenced theories by founding discipline (multi-step citation trail backward in time).
3. Categorize the authors by discipline of their PhD (multi-step search in vitas, bios, back flaps of any authored books).
4. Or, flip the concept by going forward in time and identifying the disciplines where the papers are cited.

Given Wendy’s familiarity with the topic, I asked if she knew of any papers that used any of these approaches, so that we could see them in practice. She replied:

You may regret asking … but here are some places to start!

Wendy then recommended a key foundational text as a point of departure, and offered an in-depth analysis of five alternative options for assessing cross-disciplinarity: interdisciplinarity by citations received (import of knowledge), discipline of PhD, interdisciplinarity by exported citations, Aboela’s (2007) research into interdisciplinarity, and her own personal co-citation techniques and steps. Her response was extensive and thoroughly cited, and graciously offered a synthesis of the field.

Wendy’s reply illustrated the depth of knowledge exchange and serious academic discourse that can occur on social networks. While one would expect this exchange to happen in a doctoral defence, scholarly presentation, or in private among colleagues, this example is neither original, nor uncommon.

EXAMPLE #2: #PHDCHAT

Social media messages often include hashtags. A hashtag refers to the use of a # symbol followed by a word or a phrase (e.g., #education, #elections2016, #TechConference15). The practice originated on Twitter and has spread to other platforms. Each hashtag collates all contributions on a particular topic. Hashtags enable users to group and retrieve messages around a common topic or event; this practice has allowed users to form networks around shared interests and practices. One hashtag network that my colleagues and I have examined is #PhDChat (Ford, Veletsianos, & Resta, 2014). This network arose when a group of UK doctoral students began using it in 2010 to hold discussions related to pursuing a doctoral degree [Thackray, n.d.]. Individuals convened weekly to discuss specified topics and over time, #PhDChat’s membership grew. Individuals often use the network to update
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each other on their progress, share resources, learn about the profession, socialize, and provide emotional and academic support to each other. Figure 4.3 shows a visualization of the network of users who mentioned or were mentioned in a tweet containing the #PhDChat hashtag. This image shows that some users comprise the core group of participants while others had little interactions with the group.

Figure 4.3 • Visualization of the Network Of Users Who Mentioned or Were Mentioned in a Tweet Containing the #PhDChat Hashtag.

EXAMPLE #3: IDENTIFYING FISH SPECIMENS

In 2011, a team of ichthyologists set out to examine the species of fish in Guyana’s Cuyuni River. They collected 5,000 fish specimens, but in order to leave the country they needed to report species counts to the Guyanese government. The researchers explained: “As a condition to securing an export permit, we had just one week to complete a detailed report with each of our 5,000 specimens identified to genus and species. Given the limited library resources at our disposal and the time constraint, the task seemed impossible” (Sidlauskas et al., 2011, p. 537). One of the scholars on the team, Devin Bloom, a doctoral student, suggested that they post the photos on Facebook and call on their colleagues to identify the samples they collected. The team had already taken photos of each fish and by uploading the photos (that is, their data) to Facebook, their contacts, [the majority of whom held doctorates in
ichthyology-related fields) could help them identify the species. And it worked. Their networks helped them identify more than 90% of the 5,000 fish specimens collected within 24 hours. The researchers were appreciative:

We packed our specimens for shipment and returned home, grateful beyond words for the generosity of our colleagues, and for the social network that allowed us to harness their vast collective expertise and provide faster and more accurate identifications than we ever would have dreamed possible.

(Sidlauskas et al., 2011, p. 537)

EXAMPLE #4: REDDIT “ASK ME ANYTHING” THREADS

I have mentioned Reddit.com as a popular content aggregator and the existence of various communities within the site, called subreddits. One subreddit is called IAmA, which stands for “I am A.” In this community, users post “Ask Me Anything” or “Ask Me Almost/Absolutely Anything” threads, inviting others to ask questions of them. For example, a user might post a thread as follows: I am a researcher specializing in educational technology. Ask Me Anything about how people learn with technology. This community is one of the most popular on the site, and it features more than 8 million subscribers. “Ask me Anything” threads appear in other subreddits as well (e.g., in the Science subreddit).

While politicians, actors, and artists have used this platform, a number of scholars have also initiated threads and have sought to share their knowledge with this community. Such scholars included Tina Seelig1 (a professor of Innovation and Creativity at Stanford), Steven D. Munger2 (a researcher of tastes and odours at the University of Florida), Peggy Mason3 (a professor of Neurobiology at the University of Chicago who studies empathy in rats), David Kimhy4 (a professor of Psychiatry at the University of Columbia who discussed the results of his latest research study), and Mae Jemison5 (former NASA astronaut who discussed the teaching and learning of science).

Owens (2014) provides more history on this phenomenon and describes in more detail how, through these threads, “Reddit created the world’s largest dialogue between scientists and the general public.” However, it is important to note that Reddit’s creators impose little restrictions and take a hands-off approach to user-contributed content. Thus, while Reddit features some shining examples of knowledge exchange, it has often – and rightly so – been criticized for being a festering ground for communities promoting misogyny, racism, and homophobia.
CONCLUSION

Online social networks offer much hope for improving and rethinking scholarly communities. Central to this hope is the idea of crowdsourcing, but also the generosity and goodwill of colleagues. While collegiality may be a characteristic of scholarly networks, tensions, conflict and conundrums also permeate these spaces. We explore these topics next by examining the complicated realities that an individual scholar faces when considering the use of social media.

NOTES

1. www.reddit.com/r/IAMA/comments/383mpu/i_teach_creativity_and_innovation_at_stanford_i
2. www.reddit.com/r/science/comments/3456kh/hello_my_name_is_steven_d_munger_and_i_am_the
3. www.reddit.com/r/science/comments/23o5w4/science_ama_series_hi_im_peggy_mason_i_study
5. www.reddit.com/r/science/comments/2x0i75/science_ama_series_ask_me_anything_about_learning
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In previous chapters, I argued that the majority of the research on scholars’ digital and networked practices focuses on professional matters, and little effort is directed toward how people use these technologies to care for one another and to disclose matters that are deeply personal to them. I have also explained how scholars’ expression of identity online is fragmented. These two findings together reflect a broader gap in the literature. In effect, research into open, digital, and social scholarship focuses predominantly on professional matters, and thus provides little insight into how scholars’ lives intersect with social media, networks, and technology overall. To understand scholars’ lives, we need to examine more than just their scholarly practices. We need to explore their activities, participation, and experiences with social media and networks in an expansive way that includes both their professional and non-professional ways of being. And, yes, that includes the pictures of the food they share.

**WHAT DO SCHOLARS EAT FOR BREAKFAST?**

The Academic Breakfast Tumblr blog was started in May 2014 as a networked project to gather photographs and descriptions of academics’ breakfasts. Each blog post starts with a photograph of an individual’s meal followed by a response to a set of standard questions, some of which are demographic and some of which are intended to describe the individual’s breakfast and his/her philosophy of food. The creator of the project, Lucas Crawford, a faculty member at Simon Fraser University at the time, listed six reasons for the project. Crawford (2014, ¶ 2) wrote that this project was created to:

- remind ourselves that eating is a public matter ...
- see how food habits may differ across rank, region, nation, and gender ...
- test our hypotheses about social class, precarious work, and food access ...
- demystify academia by entering its intimate spaces and nourishing scenes ...
- remember that academics are bodies ...
- produce an alternative aesthetic representation of academic life.

A quick glance at the tumblr site reveals participation from around the world, with scholars from New Zealand, Mexico, Scotland, and Slovenia all featured on the first page alone, in addition to North American contributions.

This project illustrates the fact that scholars’ digital lives go beyond scholarship. They are intertwined with scholars’ sense of self, and even though scholarly identity may be a defining characteristic of who scholars are, online activities don’t end with
scholarship. This project not only demystifies academia, but it also humanizes it, making visible the diversities and commonalities – coffee features heavily in the majority of posts – of how scholars feed their bodies and minds.

LIVING SOCIAL

Twitter is frequently dismissed as a platform of meaningless soliloquies and dull updates. Malesky and Peters (2012) assert that “many Tweets contain relatively mundane status updates or information about the Tweeter,” and Hough [2009, p. 411] acknowledges that the service is “[o]ften ridiculed as a frothy time-waster.” During his time as president of the University of British Columbia (UBC), Dr. Stephen Toope summarized his feelings about Twitter in an interview with UBC’s student run newspaper, and highlighted many of the concerns that academics in particular may have with the platform:

I despise Twitter, truthfully. I think it’s one of the worst things that’s been created in my lifetime, and so there’s no way I’m going to go on it. I dislike everything about it. I think that the notion of the immediate reaction to something without any reflection, the idea that you can say anything that matters in the limited number of characters you’re given, and that you have to do it immediately, and everyone will respond immediately with no reflection, I think it’s the worst of our society. (Wakefield, 2013).

While Toope may be correct about the fact that Twitter limits the number of characters per message, the rest of his diatribe is more a reflection of cultural narratives about social media and minimally examined assumptions and prejudices about what people do on it. We can gain a more refined and informed perspective on scholars’ engagement – and reflective processes – by examining the information that they post. For instance, in Veletsianos and Kimmons (2015), a project where we analysed about 650,000 tweets from 469 scholars, we found that more than half of the tweets mentioned other users and about a quarter were replies to others.

In the data set of 4,500 tweets I used to investigate scholars’ practices, I found that, without exception, all participants shared updates pertinent to their day-to-day activities. These updates might be construed to be meaningless chatter. However, they can also be seen as representing important personal and social commentary and identity signalling because they inform others of the sender’s current activities, intentions, likes and dislikes, and life outside the profession. Rather than representing
meaningless chatter, such updates introduce opportunities to explore shared interests, experiences, goals, mindsets, and life dispositions/aspirations; like water-cooler conversations in offline professional contexts, they serve as ways for individuals to form connections. More than 40% of the scholars in VanNoorden’s (2014) Nature study indicated that they use Twitter specifically to discover peers, and Stewart’s (2015b) study suggests that commonality is seldom defined by active Twitter users based on disciplinary interests alone. Thus, extra-curricular signals of identity serve a purpose that Toope should not dismiss. Scholars share information about matters that are important to them including their hobbies, relationships, beliefs, events, meals, and celebrations. Examples of such updates include the following:

- I am reading Gibson’s Neuromancer tonight.
- I ♥ Hey Jude by the Beatles: [URL]
- Here is my latest artwork: [URL]
- My son and I are really excited to see my parents tomorrow.
- [Husband’s name] and I are celebrating our 12th anniversary today!
- mmmm earl grey tea
- Heading to Vancouver: [URL to map pinpointing current location]
- Happy birthday @GeorgeVeletsianos
- We are watching Star Wars The Empire Strikes Back tonight!

Stewart’s (2015a) investigation of how networked scholarship lined up against Boyer’s (1990) vision for scholarship determined that one of the key benefits for the participants in her study was that while networks enabled contribution on all of Boyer’s components of scholarship, they also exceeded the boundaries of institutional academia. In other words, networked participation allowed scholars to be far more themselves, in their own estimations, than their institutional roles allow. For example, one participant in Stewart’s (2015a, p. 55) study noted

> My role is a hybrid admin-academic role – as far as the university is considered I’m half and half but I consider myself an educator, so my networked participation is much more fulfilling, less limiting than my job title … I couldn’t live without that network because the way that I work and teach and learn is different from my immediate peers where I sit at the university – the level of exchange and challenge that I get on Twitter is really important to me.
This capacity of networks to allow scholars to round out their identities is rooted, in part, in the sharing of mundanities. Tweeting everyday activities allows people to connect to each other as people, and not just on professional topics. In a profession as hierarchical as academia, the ways in which networked conventions of casual everyday sharing allow for cross-status conversations is particularly interesting, and potentially valuable. A scholar in a related study (Stewart, 2015b, p.16) stated:

"I feel like Twitter is the Great Equalizer. Take a recent back and forth with the Dean of my college ... I am too intimidated to talk to him and he has no idea who I am, and yet on Twitter he posted about being at Microsoft Research and I started asking him questions. He ended up tweeting pictures of things I was asking about etc., and we even traded a few jokes."

Scholars’ participation in the “childhood walk” Internet meme also exemplifies the ways in which scholars’ digital activities extend beyond scholarly matters. An Internet meme is a recognizable visual, verbal, aural or bodily enactment that spreads virally across the web by being slightly altered and then shared. Examples of popular memes include: LOLcats, Three Wolf Moon T-shirt, Numa Numa dance, the Harlem Shake videos, the Ice Bucket Challenge, and so on. “A childhood walk” was a concept developed by Internet performance artist Ze Frank, in which he asked individuals to use Google Maps – and in particular its Street View feature – to share stories and screenshots of childhood walks and memories. Numerous individuals contributed stories (archived at http://www.zefrank.com/the_walk), and among those a number of researchers and educators shared their stories of childhood walks. These stories present a self that is often unseen in academic circles outside of conference gatherings and other small-group gatherings, and may enable individuals to develop relationships and bonds.

The public networked scholars observed in my investigations tend to share both professional and personal information. While the literature is largely premised on the argument that social media participation can enhance scholarly outcomes, this research highlights that the details that scholars share from their private lives also matter and contribute to overall social media experiences. Taken literally and out of context, scholars’ microblogging updates may appear to have no real function, but seemingly unimportant tweets serve significant social purposes. Non-scholarly social interaction is “essential to forging bonds, affirming relationships, displaying bonds, and asserting and learning about hierarchies and alliances” (cf. Tufekci, 2008, p. 546).
potentially leading to positive scholarly impacts. For example, learning that a colleague enjoys the same hobby as you do might be the tidbit of knowledge necessary to commence a conversation leading to future scholarly collaboration. On the other hand, however, knowledge gained from non-scholarly social interaction can alienate colleagues and hinder relationship-building when people have differing personal beliefs or vastly different boundaries around sharing.

SCHOLARS’ HASHTAG USE: AN ILLUSTRATION OF SCHOLARS’ PARTICIPATION ONLINE EXTENDING BEYOND SCHOLARSHIP

By examining the hashtags that scholars use, we can gain insight into the degree to which scholarly participation online is focused on scholarly matters or whether it extends beyond those.

In examining the use of Twitter hashtags, Page (2012) shows that hashtags may fall into a number of categories. For example, hashtags are used to indicate fields of professional expertise and make professional identities visible and searchable (e.g., a scholar tagging his/her messages with #STEM, #ScienceEducation etc.), but are also used to contribute to national events such as politics and sports. In Veletsianos and Kimmons (2015), we found that popular hashtags used by education scholars related to three areas: education (e.g., #edchat, #highered, #edreform), civil rights or advocacy (e.g., #Ferguson, #BlackLivesMatter), and general Internet culture (e.g., #FF for Follow Friday, #TBT for Throwback Thursday). This result suggests that scholars’ participation in and contributions to hashtags extends well beyond traditional notions of scholarship. While education hashtags are used to indicate professional expertise, scholars’ online participation may also be understood to be influenced by temporal events that may or may not be scholarly in focus. For example, the marches and protests that originated in Ferguson, Missouri, in 2014 generated the hashtags #Ferguson and #BlackLivesMatter, which were prevalent in our study. Although some individuals within the sample we studied may have used the #Ferguson hashtag because it related to their area of expertise, the sheer volume of tweets pertaining to this topic and the number of individuals contributing to it suggests that at least some of those scholars may not have had a scholarly or professional connection to the topic.

The significance of this finding stems from the fact that nearly all frameworks devised to date to explain, explore, and augment scholarly practice (i.e., Social Scholarship, Digital Scholarship, Open Scholarship) focus on a narrow sliver of
scholars’ activities online, namely those that deal with scholarship, and ignore other fundamental aspects of online presence. Scholars however enact a wide range of activities online, and to understand scholars’ online lives and participation researchers need to explore a wider range of activities. For instance, activities may be professional but not scholarly; discussing the impact of online learning on higher education may be a professional activity for all faculty but a scholarly activity only for those who study the topic. By examining scholars’ digital activities without framing them as scholarly, we may be able to make sense of day-to-day facets of academic life such as the role of fun and humour in academics’ online interactions, or the discourses used to describe academic life. The scholarly community lacks frameworks to investigate and understand the uniqueness and diversity of scholars’ online and networked participation because online participation extends beyond scholarship, but current frameworks are incapable of accounting for this reality.

Networked Scholarship offers the breadth required to allow an examination of identity and experience beyond scholarly practice. While understanding scholarly participation online is significant, the research community would benefit from the further development and adoption of frameworks to understand scholars’ online participation beyond scholarship. Future research in this area may seek to examine scholars’ activism online (e.g., in relation to the adjunctification of higher education); scholars’ online participation as it relates to civil rights issues like gender, sexual orientation, race, and violence; and scholars lived experiences online.

CONCLUSION

The narratives of knowledge production/dissemination and public scholarship are pervasive in discussions pertaining to networked scholarship – so much so, that the higher education community tends to lose sight of the fact that networks are inherently human, and as such will be complicated and complex. Shifting our focus from **scholarly networks** to **scholars in networks** allows us to face the fact that scholars will engage, exist, and function within networks in a myriad of ways, and will perform both scholarly and non-scholarly activities in them.
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INTRODUCTION

Social media are commonly defined as ‘a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and that allow the creation and exchange of user-generated content’ (Kaplan and Haenlein 2010, p. 61). They include a variety of applications, including collaborative projects (e.g. Wikipedia; cf. Kaplan and Haenlein 2014), content communities (e.g. YouTube), micro-blogs/blogs (e.g. Twitter; cf. Kaplan and Haenlein 2011a), social networking sites (e.g. Facebook) and virtual worlds (e.g. World of Warcraft; cf. Kaplan and Haenlein 2009).

Since the inception of social media technology, many corporations and institutions have adopted and applied it successfully, displaying the power of these applications to lead to remarkable outcomes. In the entertainment industry, pop stars such as Britney Spears have developed their marketing activities entirely around social media (Kaplan and Haenlein 2012). In politics, social media communications and viral marketing activities (Kaplan and Haenlein 2011b; Kaplan 2012) led to Barack Obama’s first presidential election in 2008, and nowadays they are indispensable in any political campaign. Several governments and public administration bodies make ample use of Twitter, Instagram and other social media platforms. One of the declared objectives of the European Union, for example, is to foster a feeling of European identity among its citizens through the use of social media (Kaplan 2014a). In recent years, the higher education sector has also begun to undergo an important transformation, triggered by the arrival of social media in particular and the expansion of the digital sphere in general (Kaplan and Haenlein 2016; Pucciarelli and Kaplan 2016). Social media marketing is a key element in the recruitment strategies of higher education institutions and is a means not only of attracting potential students but also of maintaining strong relationships with alumni and other stake-holders. In addition to focusing on relationships with students before and after their studies, social media are increasingly being used during students’ time at the university. The current generations of freshmen who are entering university classrooms are digital natives and expect social media and user-generated content to be incorporated into their learning experiences. In fact, many of these students are comfortable replacing traditional in-person lectures with MOOCs (massive open online courses) or SPOCs (small private online courses). Accordingly, it is important for higher education institutions to be able to market themselves as being up-to-date on pedagogical innovations that integrate social media and online features. Despite the fact that research on the intersection of social media and higher education is at an early stage (Junco, Heiberger and Loken 2011), an increasing number of scientific
articles on this topic are available. The majority of this literature analyses the micro-blogging service Twitter, which is commonly used in a classroom setting (e.g. Chen and Chen 2012; Ebner, Leinhardt, Rohs and Meyer 2010; Junco, Elavsky and Heiberger 2012). Nevertheless, there are also studies focusing on other social media applications and their usefulness in higher education such as collaborative projects (Daspit and D’Souza 2012), blogs (Gray 2016), content communities (Steffes and Duverger 2012), social networking sites (Ractham, Kaewkitipong and Firpo 2012) and even virtual worlds (Dreher et al. 2009).

This book chapter takes a close look at the potential of social media applications in the three main phases of a student’s interaction with the university: before enrolment, i.e. for marketing and recruitment purposes; during his/her studies, i.e. for augmenting the student’s learning experience; and after graduation, i.e. for alumni relationship management. Additionally, online distance learning in its different formats (MOOC, SPOC, SMOC [synchronous massive online course], SSOC [synchronous small online course]) will be explained and analysed with a special focus on so-called cMOOCs (connectivist MOOCs), in which social media applications are a cornerstone, since they enable MOOC participants to develop their own pedagogical content that can then be further commented on and improved by others.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND ITS KEY CHALLENGES

The future of higher education is, and will continue to be, uncertain and challenging. Some scholars are rather optimistic, whereas others view this evolution with a great deal of pessimism. Pucciarelli and Kaplan’s (2016) SWOT [strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats] analysis of the higher education sector identifies three core challenges, referred to as the ‘Three E’s for Education’: [1] Enhancing higher education institutions’ prestige and market share; [2] Embracing a deeper entrepreneurial mindset; [3] Expanding links, interactions and value co-creation with key stakeholders. Each of these challenges is discussed briefly in what follows.

ENHANCING PRESTIGE AND MARKET SHARE

Globalization and digitization have increased the level of competition in the higher education sector and have forced universities in general, and business schools in particular, to expand their market shares to encompass new and untapped populations of students. Institutions have achieved such expansion by diversifying and expanding their portfolios. The London Business School, an example of a traditional
MBA school, recently launched a Masters in Management programme targeting students without any professional experience. Other players who used to focus exclusively on the graduate segment have expanded into the undergraduate market. ESCP Europe Business School, for example, with its six campuses in Berlin, London, Madrid, Paris, Turin and Warsaw, started a three-year and three-country Bachelor programme in 2015.

Notably, the possibilities of the digital sphere have lowered and sometimes even completely eliminated entry barriers to new players in the education sector. Thus, long-standing and well-known universities are finding themselves in competition with newly-established private online schools, as well as with MOOCs produced by top players such as Harvard or Stanford. Anybody, even students on the other side of the world, can participate in such MOOCs. In this landscape of strong competition, it becomes all the more important for a university to be clearly positioned and to build prestige and a strong brand in a precise area. For example, while future investment bankers prefer Wharton, a lawyer’s first pick would most likely be Yale, and aspiring cross-cultural managers would probably choose ESCP Europe.

EMBRACING AN ENTREPRENEURIAL MINDSET

To cope with a competitive environment, academic institutions need to adopt an entrepreneurial mindset and a managerial approach that enables them to rapidly adapt to new markets and demands. In the executive education market, for example, institutions must cater to demand for online training – demand that has increased as a result of tight budgets and the fact that companies are reluctant to let their managers be away from their desks for an entire day, preferring the idea of more flexible distance learning. Moreover, it may be insufficient to develop one standard educational programme, as both students and high-paying clients are increasingly requesting customized solutions. Adaptive learning environments relying on mass-customization techniques (Kaplan and Haenlein 2006) as well as the power of communication via social media can be of high interest in this regard.

The principle of embracing an entrepreneurial mindset means that professors must evolve towards becoming managers. Specifically, although these individuals will continue to contribute to the academic standing and prestige of their universities mainly through research activities and teaching, they will also be required to show stronger engagement with the management of their institutions. Such engagement entails, for example, marketing themselves and their research projects in order to develop their own resources and build up stronger relationships with other universities.
and corporate partners, as well as with former students. Social media can be highly useful in this context. Cambridge University, for example, has begun encouraging its faculty members to set up accounts on social media that clearly display their link to Cambridge, for presentation and marketing purposes. Following this move, Cambridge University increased its number of Facebook followers by 400%.

EXPANDING INTERACTION AND VALUE CO-CREATION

Responding to higher education’s third challenge, that is, expanding interactions and co-creating value with main stakeholders, means completely reshaping and rebuilding a variety of relationships with several different partners. Of particular interest are the relationships with alumni, who are playing an ever-more vital role for the institutions with which they are affiliated: Alumni are the best advocates for a university’s brand and serve as its most loyal supporters, acting as potential donors with respect to fundraising, as advertisers via their positive word-of-mouth communications, or simply as highly-valued experts with regard to their alma mater. By maintaining communication channels with alumni via social media applications, universities can keep them informed of new developments and current events – thus, the message that alumni share will not only be positive but also up-to-date.

The potential of a higher education institution to cope with this third challenge depends primarily on the degree to which it makes use of new information technologies in general and social media in particular. If one takes a close look at Peking University’s Twitter feed, for example, one immediately sees that the university retweets a large number of posts by engaged alumni. This is a perfect way to stay close to your fan base and community while at the same time displaying your institution’s prestige and influence.

SOCIAL MEDIA AS A MEANS OF OVERCOMING THE CHALLENGES THREATENING HIGHER EDUCATION

Social media in contrast to more traditional media are “mainly conceived of as a medium wherein “ordinary” people in ordinary social networks [...] can create user-generated “news”” (Murthy 2012, p. 3). They enable a broad range of participants, an easier two-way conversation and therefore are considered emancipatory (Castells 2007). According to Hansen, Schneiderman and Smith (2011), social media have created entirely new ways of interacting and facilitate a transparent and authentic exchange, potentially leading to more informal, closer
relationships between organizations and individuals. The differences between traditional and social media empower the latter to play a vital role in each of the three main challenges that the higher education sector currently faces. When used correctly, social media can enhance a university’s brand and market share, adapt learning and teaching to an increasingly diverse student population, and facilitate contact with precious alumni and other stakeholders (cf. Table 2.1).

### TABLE 2.1 Social media as a means of overcoming higher education’s three core challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attracting future students</th>
<th>Augmenting current students’ learning experience</th>
<th>Amplifying relationships with past students (alumni)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ESCP Europe Business School: Enhancing a university’s brand, reputation and prestige via differentiated use of social media applications</td>
<td>• Berkeley, University of California: Empowering interactivity in big size classes by projecting live Twitter feeds from students on the wall and incorporating these tweets into the course</td>
<td>• Harvard Business School: Increasing alumni engagement via hyper-targeting efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University of Southern California: Increasing market share through a strengthened direct marketing and word-of-mouth approach</td>
<td>• Colorado Technical University: Adopting adaptive learning and teaching environments to customize course content and sequences</td>
<td>• Ohio State University: Expanding interactions with alumni through careful listening to, and learning from, their social media conversations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATTRACTING POTENTIAL FUTURE STUDENTS

Social media can play a vital role in increasing the market share of a higher education institution, as well as enhance its prestige. With respect to market share, social media can serve as an effective means of attracting potential students. For example, Juntae DeLane, Digital Brand Manager at the University of Southern California, has made social media an inherent part of his general effort to strengthen digital communications for recruiting purposes. He points out that social media are vital to several steps of the recruitment funnel: acquiring prospects, engaging with them, driving them to apply and ultimately converting them into actual students. As a step towards achieving these goals, the University of Southern California produced a YouTube series, inspired by MTV’s Cribs, in which each video presented a distinctive dorm. Viewers could vote on their favourite dorm, creating further engagement and word-of-mouth. DeLane states that this campaign ‘was created based on social listening’, given that university managers recognized that campus housing was a
recurring question from prospects (Foulger 2014). Similarly, England’s Cambridge University regularly shares time-lapse videos on its social media channels (e.g. one called ‘A Winter Waltz in Cambridge’) to display what life could look like for a future student. These videos are often very cost-efficient, with Barney Brown, the university’s head of digital communications, pointing out that ‘the answer isn’t always to throw money at it’; instead, ‘we have to make things work’ (Milbrath 2015).

Social media can also play an important role in enhancing a university’s brand, reputation and, finally, prestige. For example, ESCP Europe, the world’s first business school, has adopted the goal of ensuring, via its social media activities, that its brand is considered dynamic, innovative and modern. This goal is particularly important given that ESCP Europe, established in 1819, has been around longer than any other business school and wants to avoid being seen as old-fashioned. Furthermore, the school’s ‘overall objective is to position [itself] as an expert on European, cross-cultural management’ says Andria Andriuzzi, Community manager at ESCP Europe (Kaplan 2014b). One of the school’s viral marketing videos, applying the stop-motion technique, was a real success, with more than 300 students acting together to express the values and spirit of ESCP Europe in a fun, imaginative and entertaining way. Quickly after its launch, the video attracted over half a million views on ESCP Europe’s YouTube channel, with viewers located all over the world.

AUGMENTING STUDENTS’ LEARNING EXPERIENCE

Social media can help higher education institutions respond to students’ demand for universities that are technologically savvy and that provide augmented educational experiences (McHaney 2011). Likewise, social media technologies can enable these institutions to adapt teaching and learning for increasingly diverse populations, comprising students from a variety of cultural, ethnic, geographical, religious and social backgrounds. An early adopter of adaptive learning is the Colorado Technical University, which is committed to making adaptive learning and teaching part of its general academic and pedagogical strategy.

A university’s social media capabilities are also an important marketing factor, since digital natives act as rational and informed customers when selecting their future alma maters (Temple and Shattock 2007).

Millennials approach learning through social networking sites and other forms of multimedia- and digitally-based delivery systems that facilitate instantaneous and customized student-teacher interactions (Budde-Sung 2011). As a result of demand
for such interactions, social media and user-generated content are increasingly being used for pedagogical purposes, to enhance learning, communication and student engagement. For example, micro-blogging platforms such as Twitter (Kaplan and Haenlein 2011a) enable students to continue in-class discussions outside the classroom and to express their opinions regarding all sorts of course assignments. Professors also use social media applications to hold virtual review sessions for their respective courses, thereby freeing up time in face-to-face classes. Moreover, the use of social media platforms for course discussions can start a dynamic in which students are encouraged to ask their peers for help, and peers are willing to assist because their efforts become highly visible, both to their classmates and to their instructors. Another example can be found at the University of California Berkeley. Here professors teaching very large class sizes (more than 800 students) have the option of a live Twitter feed shown on screen behind them. This can be used during the course in order to enable interactivity despite high student numbers. Indeed, an analysis by Hoffman (2009) shows that incorporation of social media into teaching yields numerous benefits, including collaborative learning, retention, sense of control and ownership, socialization and increased student engagement. Yet, it is still unclear how the availability of course material on public channels is going to impact such notions as academic freedom, intellectual property rights and privacy laws – a concern that decelerates this development but clearly does not stop it.

AMPLIFYING RELATIONSHIPS WITH ALUMNI

As discussed above, alumni are key stakeholders with whom higher education institutions should seek to preserve relationships. Alumni are becoming ever-more important, not only in terms of fundraising, but also – and this is where social media come in – in terms of communication and marketing activities. Obviously, social media and viral marketing are used to encourage word-of-mouth communication. When applied correctly with alumni, social media can be very beneficial. Robert Bochnak, for example, Social Media Manager at Harvard Business School’s alumni office, increased alumni engagement on social media by nearly 300 per cent within a single month. Specifically, HBS made efforts to hyper-target alumni by creating specific alumni lists on Twitter, taking into account users’ personal and professional interests, graduation year and additional demographic data such as city of residence. Each piece of news that HBS shared on Twitter specifically targeted the alumni who would potentially be interested in it – thus creating high involvement and engagement, and encouraging retweets.
Ohio State University undertook a similar effort. When it started its Facebook page, the main objective was to communicate with students. However, it turned out to be alumni, who were nostalgic about their days at the university, who were the most involved and interactive members of this social media application. Kristen Convery, Director of Multimedia Content, thus experimented with ways of further engaging with alumni. One of Ohio State’s Facebook campaigns involved posting pictures of the university’s dorms and encouraging alumni to share anecdotes and to tag themselves if they had lived in the featured building. Kristen Convery states that ‘One of the things we really do at the University of Ohio State is to listen to our audiences and learn, and try to use that to form our relationships’ (Foulger 2014).

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA IN THE DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION OF ACADEMIA

Like the tourism and entertainment industries some time ago, academia is under-going a steep transformation process due to a digital revolution within the sector. In particular, the arrival of MOOCs, SPOCs, SMOCs and SSOCs has the potential to profoundly change higher education. In what follows, we first provide a brief overview of these different forms of online distance education, as well as a short historical sketch of their evolution. We subsequently focus on the important role of social media in digital forms of higher education in general, and in so-called connectivist MOOCs in particular (Kaplan and Haenlein 2016).

DEFINING AND CLASSIFYING DIGITAL COURSES: MOOCS, SPOCS, SMOCS, SSOCS

In line with Kaplan and Haenlein (2016, p. 441), we define distance learning as any form of ‘providing education to students who are separated by distance and in which the pedagogical material is planned and prepared by educational institutions’. Two key categories of online distance learning courses are MOOCs and SPOCs, mentioned briefly above. Kaplan and Haenlein (2016, p. 443) define MOOCs as open-access online courses that allow for unlimited (massive) participation, and SPOCs as online courses in which class size is limited, such that students must formally enrol. In MOOCs and SPOCs, students might be separated not only by space but also by time. In asynchronous distance learning, students study according to their own schedule and speed, whereas synchronous distance learning refers to students who follow a course simultaneously and in real time.

Applying the two dimensions of ‘time distance’ and ‘number of participants’ enables one to classify online distance courses into four groups: MOOCs, which are unlimited...
in the number of participants, usually welcome students who are separated by both space and time, enabling them to learn asynchronously at their own pace; SMOCs, in contrast, are massive online courses in which students participate synchronously and in real-time; similarly, in SPOCs, where the number of students is limited, learning takes place in an asynchronous manner; whereas SSOCs require participants to follow the lessons in real time.

PRECURSORS OF MOOCS AND ONLINE DISTANCE LEARNING

The development of distance learning can be separated into three distinctive periods, each corresponding to a specific medium for dissemination of material: i.e. print, audio-visual channels and the Internet (Kaplan and Haenlein 2016). Distance learning started in 1728 when the Boston Gazette printed an ad for a weekly stenography course that participants would follow using traditional mail. In the second period, radio and television replaced printed materials as the main media channels. A cornerstone of this second era was the establishment of the Open University in 1969. The Open University was the first higher education institution that made use of television for distance learning purposes, providing a mix of residential courses as well as supporting lessons at different physical locations.

The third era of distance learning began with the advent of the Internet and its incorporation into higher education. An important milestone in this era was the creation of an entire online campus by the University of Phoenix in 1989, proposing a portfolio of online undergraduate and graduate programmes. In 2008, the term MOOC was used for the first time by Dave Cormier to refer to a course titled ‘Connectivism and Connective Knowledge’. This course integrated mass social media such as blogs, forums and wikis, social networking sites such as Facebook, and even the virtual social world ‘Second Life’. The year 2012 was declared by the New York Times to be ‘The Year of the MOOC’, marking the arrival of several major MOOC platforms and providers, including Coursera, edX and Udacity.

SOCIAL MEDIA + MOOCS = CMOOCS

While the majority of MOOCs are based on traditional lecture formats, the first MOOC, mentioned above can be considered a cMOOC (connectivist MOOC). In cMOOCs, social media form an essential part of the learning experience, with participants creating their own pedagogical materials via blogs, tweets and the like. Such user-generated pedagogical content can then be commented on and discussed by other participants in the online course. Compared with traditional MOOCs, cMOOCs are more focused
on collaboration and cooperation among participants, with the instructor facilitating interactions between students instead of merely transmitting knowledge along the lines of a formal curriculum.

Students who evolve into pedagogical content developers deeply change the traditional professor/student model, which is characterized by a clear relationship of authority and subordination. Lee and McLoughlin (2007, p. 31) state that ‘these changes are inevitable and unavoidable, given the morphing nature of higher education’, confirming the current and especially future importance of social media in the higher education sector.

CONCLUSION

This chapter started by outlining three core challenges higher education currently faces (the Three E’s for Education): [1] enhancing prestige and market share; [2] embracing an entrepreneurial mindset; and [3] expanding interaction and value co-creation. We then showed how social media can play a vital role in overcoming these challenges by [1] attracting future students, [2] augmenting current students’ learning experience, and [3] amplifying relationships with past students (alumni).

Finally, we looked at the role of social media in academia’s digital transformation process by [1] defining and classifying online courses into MOOCs, SPOCs, SMOCs and SSOCs, [2] briefly sketching out the history of MOOCs and distance learning, as well as [3] analysing connectivist MOOCs (cMOOCs) as open online courses which are heavily supported by, and based on, social media applications.

Though the title of this chapter is ‘Academia goes social media’, one should remember that some of the most important inventions in the social media landscape originated within higher education institutions. One only needs to think of Mark Zuckerberg, who was a Harvard sophomore when he developed Facebook in 2003 – which essentially started as an online ‘face book’ of Harvard students. Similarly, the mobile social media application Foursquare (Kaplan 2012) effectively grew out of a graduate thesis written about a similar platform, Dodgeball, developed by Dennis Crowley, who graduated from New York University in 2004. One might say that these students were ahead of their universities in creating and developing new means of communication, and that nowadays these same applications are re-entering academia – both for teaching and learning purposes, and as highly effective tools for marketing and communication.
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INTRODUCTION

Social media are a game changer in the contemporary marketplace. As a relatively new terrain, social media marketing has attracted attention from both marketers and researchers. The mainstream literature ascribed to for-profits has explored social media for various marketing benefits including marketing positioning, segmentation and planning (Mangold and Faulds 2009). Non-profit higher education systems have only recently experimented with social media marketing in response to the mounting global education competition (Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka 2006). While marketers applauded the immediacy, proximity and easy access of social media, which is unmatched by traditional media (Agnihotri, Kothandaraman, Kashyap and Singh 2012), they overlooked the underlying conflict between the relational and participatory philosophy inherent in social media and the promotional nature of marketing (Motion, Heath and Leitch 2016). Today’s publics, especially technology-savvy college students, appear to resist corporate intrusion into the public sphere, such as intrusion into social media and companies’ exploitation of online marketing (Bal, Grewal, Mills and Ottley 2015). The clash between corporate-driven marketing and public participation on social media invites us to refocus on the value and necessity of community-based relationship marketing. Marketers need to be aware that they are playing in other folks’ playgrounds (i.e. social media), so they cannot behave deterministically. Community is not foreign to marketing strategies, and social media are deemed ideal avenues for community building and relationship marketing due to their collaborative and interactive nature. Moreover, relationship marketing seems to suit higher education institutions which, in addition to surviving economically, need to fulfil public expectations of creating 'social benefits including emotional satisfaction, spiritual values and the sharing of humanitarian ideals’ (Arnett, German and Hunt 2003, p. 91). For relationship marketing to be truly effective, universities should act like a neighbour immersed in wider communities (Juarez, 2011).

Literature on strategic issues, case studies and best practices of social media marketing specific to a university context is limited. Extant research (e.g. Belanger et al. 2014; McAllister 2012; Raciti 2010) reveals that universities mainly use social media for one-way newsfeeds, information delivery, publicity and advertising campaigns to present universities in the best light possible which, arguably, constitutes an instance of hyper-real identity assemblage (Ramirez and Palu-ay 2015). Little is known about how social media can be employed for community engagement and relationship marketing in universities that operate on a collaborative, rather than a consumptive, model (Gibbs 2002). To fill this gap, this
case study aims to investigate whether and how three popular social media platforms (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube) are being employed in a New Zealand university to build relationships and student communities.

New Zealand was chosen as a case study as it is ranked fifth in higher education exportation markets (following the US, UK, Canada and Australia) (Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka 2006) and enjoys a high adoption rate of social media (Pham 2011). Since the 1990s, when government reduced funding on a large scale, New Zealand universities have attempted to recruit external students and forge international relationships. To tackle the issue of social media use in university community building and relationship marketing, what follows is a theoretical review that draws literature from three aspects: marketing universities on social media, relationship marketing and community building, and social media engagement. This chapter then describes data collection and analysis, based on which major findings will be presented by themes. Both theoretical and practical implications will be discussed at the end of the chapter.

MARKETING UNIVERSITIES ON SOCIAL MEDIA OR NOT?

The idea of marketing educational institutions has been controversial and often gained limited support given the concern that commercialisation might undermine academic quality and excellence (Gibbs 2002). Nonetheless, it is increasingly accepted that ‘educational institutions are considered as a service provider, students as potential customers and the parties to a mutually interactive process, and training has a marketable service quality’ (Ozkanal and Uygucgil 2016, p. 91). A trend of marketing universities has emerged to not only adopt corporate-like marketing techniques such as distributing promotional materials and appealing advertisements, but also to venture into the realm of social media marketing.

According to extant studies (see Table 3.1 for a summary), social media marketing in universities is still in its infancy (Constantindes and Zinck Stagno 2011) and its main application can be divided into four stages. Stage I is to adopt and present on social media ‘just for the sake of it’ (Belanger et al. 2014, p. 27), or ‘because everyone else has [a social media account]’ (Charlesworth 2014, p. 329). Those universities that do not take advantages of social media are ‘missing out on marketing and recruitment opportunities’ (Greenwood 2012, p. 27). Stage II is to use social media for branding and projecting university images that are often loosely connected to physical bodies; as Ramirez and Palu-ay (2015) commented, ‘You don’t look like your profile picture’ (p. 139). Stage III involves using social media for pedagogical purposes such as...
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engaging and improving student learning, whereas stage IV, also an underdeveloped one, is to manage social media for relationship building and marketing.

Noticeably, Table 3.1 shows that the participatory and interactive potential of social media has not yet been fully explored, nor their strategic function of relationship marketing, which, arguably, fits best with higher education institutions (Gibbs and Murphy 2009). Many universities are not yet ready for dialogue online or prepared to build communities based on value exchange between universities and students, or among students themselves. What is even more pressing is what Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka (2006, p. 18) conclude, that “The current literature on university marketing is incoherent, even inchoate, and lacks theoretical models that reflect upon the particular context of higher education and the nature of their services.” Universities lack research-based guidance on how to navigate social media for community building and relationship marketing that appears to be more effective than traditional transactional marketing. To combat this deficiency, a close look at the nature of community-based relationship marketing is needed, and is detailed in what follows.

### Table 3.1: Extent studies addressing social media in higher education institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research streams</th>
<th>Issues examined</th>
<th>Primary methods</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social media adoption</td>
<td>Whether and to what extent social media are adopted in universities</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter) have been increasingly adopted in universities (e.g., 69% in Canada, 81% in US)</td>
<td>Belanger et al. (2014); Kelleher &amp; Sweetser, (2002); Ricotti (2010), 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social media for learning improvement</td>
<td>How universities use social media for pedagogical purposes</td>
<td>Experiments; Comparative case studies</td>
<td>Social media are used as online teaching tools to improve student engagement</td>
<td>McAlistair (2012), Rossmann &amp; Young (2015), Siwon &amp; Brennan (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social media for relationship building and marketing</td>
<td>How universities use social media to build relationships</td>
<td>Surveys; Interviews</td>
<td>A low percentage utilizes social media interactive features to foster dialogue and relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHY RELATIONSHIP MARKETING AND COMMUNITY BUILDING?

Emerging from the context of services marketing in the early 1980s, relationship marketing has no unified definition due to having had a short lifetime in which to develop a fully-formed paradigm [Moller and Halinen 2000]. Nonetheless, a review of literature shows that Grönroos’ (1994, p. 6) definition, which defines ‘relationship marketing’ as ‘an interactive process in a social context where relationship building is a vital cornerstone to marketing’, gains the most popularity in the field.

Relationship marketing represents a paradigm shift from the transactional model of sending brochures or emails to an interactive and participatory process involving...
relationships. Harker (1999) summarized seven conceptual categories that underpin relationship marketing: creation, development, maintenance, interaction, long term, emotional content and output. Recently, Lehtinen (2011) proposed an integrated approach, a RELMIX [RELationship-MIX] framework, to combine the use of relationship marketing (e.g. exchange both transactions and relationships) and a transactional model (e.g. marketing mix of the 4Ps), as the two are not necessarily contradictory but rather complementary to one another.

Since relational exchange involves interaction between human beings, social bonds, along with emotional attachment or mutual liking that develop between parties, are an important feature of relationship marketing (Sashi 2012; Szmigin, Canning and Reppel 2005). To craft and strengthen the social bonds, modern relationship marketing literature has theorized four key virtues that are vital to relationship quality: trust (Veloutsou, Saren and Tzokas 2002), commitment (Moorman, Zaltman and Deshpande 1992), conflict handling (Ndubisi and Chan 2005) and communication (Arnett and Badrinarayanan 2005).

Although the above factors are widely cited in subsequent studies, the current scholarship is still criticized for several reasons. Firstly, it provides a narrowed and simplified understanding of ‘relationships’ by only focusing on the firm-customer relationship, which is not applicable to other organizational contexts like universities. Universities are not firms in a rigid sense but instead have the dual needs of marketing to and serving wider communities. Secondly, most empirical studies emphasize the ‘effect’ or ‘impact’ of relationship marketing on customer satisfaction and loyalty (e.g. Laroche, Habibi, Richard and Sankaranarayanan 2012; Negi and Ketema 2010), with the result that there is lack of knowledge on the ‘process’ and ‘strategies’ of relationship marketing. Thirdly, current relationship marketing theories seem to be at a lip-service stage without providing much insight into its practicality and operationality. Many organizations use relationship marketing to create a firmer grip on customers ‘much like the fisherman’s relationship to the fish’ (Harker and Egan 2006, p. 228).

Given the above theoretical and empirical gaps in the field, a broader and more integrated perspective that goes beyond the classical firm-customer relationship is needed. Community is such a useful instrument for relationship marketing. According to Rossmann and Young (2015), communities are characterized by connections, interaction, self-organising and consensus-building. Compared to one-way marketing promotion, community-based relationship building has a better
chance of success through improved communication and customer engagement, and increased brand loyalty. Generally, the idea of community building is to develop a sense of belonging and emotional attachment among the members of a community (Charlesworth 2014).

In recent years, some researchers (e.g. Chaston and Mangles 2001) have introduced ‘brand communities’ as a solution to serving customers in the wake of internet technologies. Laroche et al. (2012) also find that brand communities support sharing information, perpetuating the history and culture of a brand, and providing assistance to consumers. Community-based relationship marketing is deemed important and suitable to a social media environment where sociality plays out in the marketing process. However, there are no systematic efforts to examine how social media can support university community building and relationship marketing. For this reason, we need to better understand social media characteristics as well as how social media can enable community-based relationship marketing in practical ways.

**HOW CAN SOCIAL MEDIA HELP?**

Social media, also called ‘Web 2.0’ or ‘social networking sites [SNS]’, refer to ‘a set of technology tools that are just as they sound—mediated opportunities for bringing people together and encouraging social networking and dialogic communication’ (Sweetser and Lariscy 2008, p.180). Macnamara and Zerfass (2012, p. 293) summarized two defining features of social media environments: [1] the ‘openness for participation and interactivity involving dialogue, conversation, collaboration, and co-creativity harnessing collective intelligence’; and [2] relinquished control that ‘characterises one-way, top-down information distribution models, as well as a requirement for authenticity instead of pre-packaged content’. Social media users have increased expectations of appropriate communication online and also have a space to voice such expectations at volume. This is especially true with cynical college students, in Tapscott’s (2009) term, the ‘net generation’, who were born after 1990 with an unprecedented level of exposure to modern technologies and social media.

One radical change brought about by social media is from spectatorship – customers as passive audience waiting for sales representation responses – to participation, whereby they have agency in information creation, sharing and mutually influencing each other’s purchase decisions. The central spirit of conversation and interaction online is critical to community building as well as to remind marketers of going beyond just pushing message awareness. As such, scholars (e.g. Baird and Parasnis
In a university context, Belenger et al. (2014) find that the more engaged students become online, that is, the more they comment, like, share or otherwise interact with a university, the more receptive and sympathetic they will become to institutional
branding. Hence, engaging online students requires building digital communities where like-minded students congregate on social media as they might in a club. Belanger et al. (2014) also identified three approaches to engaging students online: (1) news feed and content production, particularly encouraging user-generated content (UGC) that allows peer-to-peer communication; (2) student-university interaction, mainly targeting a specific audience such as sports teams or interest groups, and urging discussions among the cohort or soliciting feedback on the university; (3) a hybrid approach combining these two.

To sum up the preceding literature, we can clearly identify that many universities tend to rely on social media for one-way promotion and transactional marketing, whereas relationship marketing from a broader community perspective is better suited to both higher education institutions and the social media environment. Although considerable efforts have been made to address the end and effect of relationship marketing, a large gap exists in the process, strategies, techniques and tactics of community building and relationship marketing on social media for universities. This gap will be addressed by the current case study.

METHODS

Given its exploratory nature, this research applied a case study approach (Yin 2009) to exploring the state and strategies of using social media for university community-based relationship marketing. A public New Zealand university was chosen for two reasons. Firstly, it has the largest number of students enrolled in multiple campuses across three different cities in New Zealand, with one third being international students, while at the same time facing the pressure of retaining domestic students. Secondly, the university has actively used social media by embedding Facebook (with 52,230 likes), Twitter (with 10,800 followers) and YouTube (with 10,000 subscribers) into its main website.

Two sets of qualitative data were collected. One is eighteen in-depth interviews with the university’s marketing team to gain insights into the overall online marketing strategies and the rationale of decision-making. The semi-structured interview guide covered issues such as the perceived importance of community building among marketers, ideal relationships with students, and social media engagement strategies and tactics. The other data set was gathered through content analysis of the university’s Facebook pages, Twitter posts and YouTube videos for a semester span starting from 29 February to 3 June 2016 which, as justified by Belanger et al. (2014), is a reasonable time frame to capture the real-time social media usage in a full semester.
Two hundred and sixty-two pages of interview transcripts were analysed through inductive thematic analysis. Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 86) define ‘thematic analysis’ as ‘searching across a data set...to find repeated patterns of meaning’ and to link the synthesized data back to research questions and the theoretical framework. The social media content was analysed by using basic descriptive statistics, such as gauging the number of posts pertaining to a particular topic (e.g. paper offerings, course materials, success stories, research highlights, executive activities, events) and the number of student reactions (e.g. likes, shares, retweets, comments, views).

To improve the research validity, a member-checking technique was applied by reporting the interview results back to the participants and asking them to verify the accuracy (Creswell 2009). Both interview data and content analysis were then cross-validated.

LACK OF SOCIAL MEDIA MARKETING STRATEGIES AND THE REASONS BEHIND THIS

The first major finding derived from the data is that the university has yet to develop a full social media marketing strategy in general, and a relationship marketing protocol in particular. Most participants shared that the current use of social media is tactical, fragmented and largely experimental. There are no clear guidelines as people are learning by doing. For example, one digital officer said, “It must be quite shocking to hear that we don’t have a strategy but that’s true.” Another marketing officer added, “I think the university is a bit young when it comes to social media. We do it because it’s trendy, but there hasn’t been a strategy or any real thought into how we should do it and get value out of it.” However, the participants held a strong belief in the value of social media and appeared keen to build a marketing strategy based on it and develop relationship and community building around the university. As one marketing executive explained:

Eventually we want to build a community, provide a sense of belonging and make students feel part of the university by using social media, as opposed to a post that just says here is a brand. We are selling students not only a brand, but also a multi-faceted life, a living thing, a community.

The data continued to reveal several reasons for the absence of an overarching social media marketing strategy. One is lack of ownership of this new terrain of social media from the senior leadership team (SLT). In one participant’s words, “It’s unclear who takes leadership over this new land.” The marketing team has hoped the SLT
can be more visionary and drive a strategy from the top down, but they found even senior executives have no idea of how to do it. One participant said, “The SLT seems to be willing to invest serious amounts of money for new buildings to attract new students, but they won’t invest small money like building a social media strategy.”

Another reason for this lack of strategy relates to different views held by different clusters of professionals [e.g. marketing, recruitment, PR] about what it means to be ‘strategic’ in social media marketing – to present the university in the best light possible or to engage with wider communities. One participant explained, “Strategy is a contingent thing. My desired version of strategy might not be what others want.”

A third reason was found relating to the internal resistance to social media technologies as the appetite for in public institutions is often not enormous. As one marketing practitioner described the situation, “People still feel nervous about social media and don’t see them as a priority so marketing campaigns just start to go digital like everywhere else.”

CONTENT PRODUCTION IS STILL KING

Due to the absence of a social media marketing strategy, this study further found content production was used as a main approach to growing student communities and engaging them in a marketing process. An explicit emphasis has been put on delivering one-way information that either projects a positive image of the university or raises people’s awareness of particular promotional materials. As shown in Table 3.2, the information online has covered a range of topics from course/programme promotion, campus life, faculty achievements, student success, events/workshops and SLT visiting activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content themes</th>
<th>Facebook (posts)</th>
<th>Twitter (posts)</th>
<th>YouTube (posts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course/program promotion</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus life</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty achievement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student success</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events, activities, workshop</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International collaboration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior leaders’ activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial collaboration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total posts produced</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the marketers’ experience, while they tend to post practical information such as programme and course introductions, they realized the most well-received content (by counting the number of likes, shares, reposts) is about campus life, student success and events/workshop activities in which students can participate. This popular content shares common features such as originality, authenticity, relevance, personality and fun, creating a strong emotional appeal. For example, as a content editor emphasized, “It’s all about content, true stuff. Students nowadays can easily tell whether this is advertising. So we’d better write our own posts, take original photos, rather than duplicate the information that has already existed online.”

Content on student success adds relevance and creates coalitions among students. As the content editor explained, “Students don’t want big stories about impactful research but instead they like news about themselves and their peers.” This was verified by the content analysis which found, for example, that a story about a distance learning student who studied extramurally for seven years and finally obtained a master’s degree, was shared by 485 people on Twitter. In addition, personalized content based on popular culture also enjoyed support from students. A typical example is the ‘Running Man’ activity on Facebook, which called students from three campuses to dance in a Running Man style and then nominate peers to beat their moves. The marketing executive commented, “this is really engaging as we show future students there is a life on campus, rather than just showing them a product, say, an accredited program.”

In addition to this type of self-produced content, the marketing team also tried to energize and invite present students to contribute user-generated content that, preferably, is favourable to the university. As well as this, marketers invited students to either provide positive comments and reviews under the university posts, or to upload personal narratives and stories to the official accounts. For example, a number of videos about students’ overseas exchange experiences to promote the ‘Study Abroad’ programme were found on the university’s YouTube channel, with 2,903 viewers.

Further, the university enlisted a team of student advocates as social media interns to provide fun, interesting and engaging content from a student perspective. The marketing director explained, “Posting student-generated content can provide a more authentic and vivid depiction of the university experience to future students than can pamphlets, brochures, and other traditional recruitment materials.” Although the full potential of social media engagement [e.g. forums, chatrooms] has yet to be applied, the marketing director justified the value of one-way content production: “Content is still king because good content can at least help to build a consumer base to engage with.”
EMERGING TACTICS OF COMMUNITY BUILDING

Although the preceding findings showed that there was no overarching strategy to social media use and that the university relied on content production for marketing, both interview and content analysis data indicated emerging tactics of building student communities as a foundation of relationship marketing. According to the participants, community-based marketing means two relationships that the university aims to establish. One is the relationship between the university and students, being alumni, current and prospective, in order to create a sense of belonging and attachment to the university. The other is to inspire students to develop their own communities around common interests, in order to pave a way for improved recruitment and retention through helping future students connect to their soon-to-be peers. The marketing manager articulated this situation as follows:

Students need to feel that they belong to a community and if our social media are bland they don’t get that feeling. So we want people to feel that it’s a bit of a club that they belong to, and we deliver stuff that is tailored to them.

To this end, the data disclosed three tactics of community building for marketing benefits, including role model motivation, social network support, and top-down empowerment. Marketers employed role model motivation by selecting influential student representatives to share their learning experience online, tell how they overcame various hurdles or describe why they enjoy what they are doing. For instance, one disabled PhD student was established as a role model for pursuing his dream with commendable courage and perseverance. His story was then widely distributed on Facebook and Twitter so that a page, ‘PhDs@Uni’, was created as an inspiration for both current and future students having adventures within the university.

Social networks support refers to the university tends to attract and retain students by establishing social support systems. This is mainly done by embracing diverse cultures in the university and seeking every opportunity to celebrate different cultural festivals. For example, the Maori (a minor ethnic group in New Zealand) marketing officer shared her experience of engaging with Maori students:

We really need to engage with Maori and Pacific students’ extended families and communities. We want Facebook to actually speak to the whole family, not just to the students. We want to show Maori student achievements to their ethnic group and the whole country.
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A third tactic of top-down empowerment refers to the endorsement from the senior management to empower a participatory approach to interacting and engaging with students. For example, the Vice-chancellor created his own Twitter account to post original contents or opinions, rather than reposting the template-like information prepared by the marketing office. He also retweeted student achievements or solicited public feedback on a university policy or initiative. This power sharing signalled a shift from the organisational deterministic approach to marketing, to a participatory mode of co-promoting the university brand. However, this top-down empowerment has not yet reached a critical mass. The university has yet to explore the full interactive potential of social media for the community-based relationship marketing.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The big-picture takeaway from this case study is that community-based relationship marketing, albeit considered important, is not yet largely practiced on the university social media. In line with earlier studies (e.g., Fitch 2009; Macnamara & Zerfass 2012), this research found no overarching social media strategy even though the university embraces large followers probably “due to the prestige or brand recognition of the institution” (O’Hallarn, Morehead & Pribesh 2016, p. 40). Apart from the newness and changeable landscape of social media, this study revealed several reasons for the missing social media strategy. Unlike large firms with a clearly-structured and dedicated marketing team, there is a lack of ownership within the university as to who takes leadership over the new terrain of social media. Different perceptions of either earning quick gains or building long-term relationships, along with internal resistance to new technologies, hindered social media marketing towards a strategic level.

This study offers both practical and managerial implications for higher education institutions on social media content production which can serve as a starting point to grow student communities. Specifically, developing authentic and relevant content for prospective students will enable them to gain insights into the everyday campus life, form an emotional attachment to the university, increase their willingness to listen, and eventually transform their online behaviours (e.g., browsing, sharing) to offline action (e.g., paying tuition fees for enrolment). Personality-rich and fun contents deriving from popular culture with a link to “the everyday, the intimate, the immediate…” (Jenkins et al. 2002, p. 3) can show future students a real dynamic life that they might desire to join. Additionally, integrating student-generated content into social media can encourage future students to trust their soon-to-be peers’ opinions more than advertising when making purchase decisions. Marketers should hence
bear in mind producing high converting social media profiles that function to transform community members to potential customers.

Further, this study informs that community-based relationship marketing can only be successful when the social media engagement transcends from being distributive, pushing message awareness, to being communicative, enabling relational practice of value exchange. The findings identified a few techniques to achieve this communicative engagement. Role-model motivation, by leveraging peer influence, can not only inspire prospective students to pursue their dreams with a university, but also retain current students to learn from like-minded peers. Developing social networks support by engaging with students’ families, ethnic groups and communities can attract and retain students, whose choices of universities are often shaped by their significant others. Additionally, the top-down empowerment from the senior leadership is critical to fostering dialogue and participatory culture online, which is the cornerstone to relationship marketing. This is particularly important for a public institution that has low risk-taking but high bureaucracies in innovating.

In conclusion, this study has offered the following insights and contributions:

- Refocusing on the value of community building and relationship marketing to address the overlooked conflict between the promotional nature of marketing and the participatory culture of social media. Social media marketing is no longer a “spectator sport” with excessive emphases on pushing message awareness to attract attention. An integrated community-based relationship marketing approach necessitates viewing customers as partners, contributors, and facilitators of social media marketing.

- Addressing the shortcomings of traditionally linear, promotional marketing by advancing social media engagement from a distributive to a communicative level. At this level, community-based relationship marketing should have participation and empowerment as its core to leverage the agency and creativity from wider communities.

- Providing a contextual understanding of how to steer social media, both strategically and operationally, to market universities that are nowadays prevalently being commercialised but still expected to fulfil social expectations.
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DEVELOPING SOCIAL MEDIA TO ENGAGE AND CONNECT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL LIBRARY
ABSTRACT

This case study presents the Liverpool experience of using social media as an academic library to enhance audience engagement and create a community of users. It looks at the development of social media in the library, focusing on the concerted effort to grow followers and develop a meaningful use of these tools. It considers the value of taking a team approach, ensuring a diversity and breadth of output. Using social media effectively enables libraries to connect with users in a space they already occupy and bring added value to existing activities. A strong, well maintained social media presence enhances a library’s national and international profile and ensures good on campus relationships with main stakeholders. This case study demonstrates the relevance of social media as a communication channel and the importance of selecting the correct platform depending on audience or aims. A literature review and recommendations based on experience are included.

INTRODUCTION

The use of social media by academic libraries, although a relatively new practice, is the subject of much discussion. Social media can bring many advantages for an academic library including the opportunity to raise its professional profile, the freedom to interact with users and the ability to connect with different departments within their institution (Taylor & Francis Group, 2014, p. 5). This study will contribute to the growing body of literature and provide guidance and recommendations to other academic libraries who are thinking of using this invaluable tool.

CONTEXT

The University of Liverpool Library first engaged with social media in 2007, creating a Facebook profile used to display images of the libraries and publicize service updates. In 2009 three members of the Academic Liaison section started using Twitter, sharing responsibility to monitor and add content. Although accepted that the library should have a social media presence, there was uncertainty as to the approach and staff had only limited time to dedicate to creating content. The decision was taken to post content onto Twitter that would automatically feed into Facebook. There was minimal user interaction and when comments were received, via either platform, they were handled outside of the digital space. The informality of Twitter was viewed positively, but there was no conscious effort at humour. Concern about misrepresenting the library inevitably led to short factual tweets. The perceived need
to appear professional at all times resulted in a monotonous Twitter feed and no individual identity on Facebook.

In 2013 the new Head of Academic Liaison suggested forming a larger social media group to reinvigorate our offering and better engage with users. This group included representation from across the library involving people who had previously shown interest or had at least some experience of tweeting. Initially, the group decided to focus on Twitter as this had the largest following. It was clear that the most popular tweets were those that gave the library a character and personality and the aim was to use this as a basis to develop the social media presence and increase followers, then at 1,800, to ensure maximum impact.

LITERATURE REVIEW

On reviewing the extant literature, it is clear that academic libraries are using social media in different ways and for different reasons. The recent report on social media usage in libraries produced by Taylor and Francis (2014) helpfully summarizes many of these. It provides statistics and analysis on current social media practices as well as predicting the future importance of social media for libraries. Other literature is also available that can be summarized as libraries using social media to provide customer service, building a community of users, and the promotion of the library or institution, and its resources.

The Taylor and Francis Group (2014) report found that one of the most common uses of social media by libraries is providing customer service. The challenge here though, is timeliness of response. One of the key characteristics of tools like Twitter is its immediacy, but this is difficult to maintain when most librarians operate within a traditional working pattern. The advent of the 24-hour opening of many academic libraries has made this even more of an issue. Students are using social media to feedback about services during all hours of the day but may perceive a response that comes the following day as slow.

For many libraries, an important aspect of using social media is to build a community of users (Taylor & Francis Group, 2014). This is typically achieved through engagement and interaction with library users and a variety of approaches can be found in the literature. Young and Rossmann (2015) at Montana State University Library looked at the content of their tweets after the creation of a new social media group. Their aim was to tweet with “personality and presence” (p. 23) and found that most interaction came from tweets about the local community and student life. A case study conducted
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in Australia (Palmer, 2014) found that posts with competitions or challenges gained the most comments, with images or posts directing users to other websites having the least. Although this suggests libraries should focus on the former, in reality most would probably struggle to invest the time and staffing resources. A study of academic libraries in Ontario (Collins & Quan-Haase, 2014) found that, despite the popularity of Facebook and Twitter amongst most academic libraries, it was in fact YouTube where they found evidence of most interaction. They suggest producing content for YouTube may be beneficial as despite initial staff investment, it needs little managing thereafter.

The Taylor and Francis (2014) report found that the top objective of libraries when using social media is promotion, leading them to conclude that for most libraries it is primarily a marketing tool. One example of this is the use of Pinterest. Pinterest is a social media platform which allows its users to curate digital media, such as images and videos, using “pinboards.” Many libraries now use Pinterest as a way to promote their resources, for example the British Library uses it to promote their exhibitions and collections. De Jager-Loftus and Moore (2013) conducted a study into how research libraries in the United States use Pinterest and found that it was particularly useful to promote special collections. One example is the University of Virginia that has several pinboards. Each item has a description and links back to the library’s webpages, thereby improving the discoverability of the library’s collections.

There are of course challenges around using social media in academic libraries and some of these were evident when conducting the literature review. These include policies, resourcing, and how to measure impact. This study will outline how the University of Liverpool Library approached these challenges and will provide recommendations for other academic libraries embarking on the use of social media.

SOCIAL MEDIA AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

SOCIAL MEDIA POLICY

The University of Liverpool encourages staff to use social media for engagement and to exploit opportunities that may arise from interactions. Although there is a compliance policy which defines social media, identifies personal responsibilities and highlights potential risks, the emphasis is on a set of social media guidelines. These outline effective and sensible use of social media without stifling individual freedom and creativity.
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The guidelines offer a brief framework of reference for those establishing and monitoring departmental social media accounts. Within these guidelines, the University requests that departments inform a named contact when an account is launched and to use an agreed format to ensure consistency and clear brand identification. The library uses these guidelines to monitor its social media accounts. Key advice is to use an informal style, encourage comments, deal with negative posts fairly and transparently, and monitor responses. The guidelines also emphasize the need to be accurate but not to be afraid of making mistakes. Clarity that the account is being run by human beings rather than an automated system is a key factor.

MANAGING DIFFERENT PLATFORMS

All social media activities at the University of Liverpool Library are conducted by the aforementioned social media group. The makeup of the group and how the meetings function are pivotal to how social media content is delivered. The group is large and consists of eleven people from all areas of the library. All group members are extremely busy so by having such a large pool of staff to contribute, content is constantly being generated. Similarly, by having representation from across the library, the content that is generated is likely to be diverse. Members of the group come from roles within customer services, academic liaison, special collections and electronic resources. A greater diversity in the makeup and size of the group results in a greater diversity of content across all of the library's social media channels.

The group meets every two weeks and meetings are short, usually only thirty minutes long, and are relaxed in style without formal minutes. This format is very different to other working groups within the library and is deliberately so. The advantage of social media, particularly platforms like Twitter, is its immediacy and so the group’s meetings reflect this. Meeting so frequently means the group can share information on relevant events and news from across the library and the wider university which can then be used to create social media content. The group also uses the meetings to generate new ideas for campaigns or competitions and is generally viewed as a catalyst for creative thinking.

ACTIVITIES

The majority of successful activities have been focused on Twitter due to the number of followers; 6,300 on Twitter as opposed to 1,700 on Facebook. Moreover, the algorithms used within Facebook do not guarantee that people who have “liked” your page will see your post. This does not apply on Twitter. An example of a successful...
campaign is the library’s “golden tickets” promotion during revision week, which offered students the chance to win a hot drink. Taking part gave them a welcome break from their studies, the chance to recharge their batteries and most importantly, it also demonstrated the library’s interest in their wellbeing. To win a golden ticket, students had to take part in engaging and interactive activities designed to generate interest in @LivUniLibrary. The promotion ran for one week, with a different activity each day. These included asking students to tweet revision notes, a “selfie with a shelfie,” and a library treasure hunt which proved by far the most popular. Students seemed to enjoy sending spontaneous selfies when they discovered the golden tickets. The student newspaper covered the story positively and as the week progressed there was a real buzz generated and an increase in interaction. This resulted in the Twitter feed being full of positivity about the campaign and the library, and other followers were quick to comment on the great impression this gave.

To make sense of all the tweets generated, hashtags are used which means specific information can be gathered if required. Examples include #LivUniReadList when promoting the library’s reading list software, #LivUniSCA for special collections, and #LivUniLibZoo for the ever popular knitted library zoo. The zoo is a light-hearted distraction used to promote the library collections. A member of the social media group received a “knit your own zoo” book for Christmas and decided to involve the knitted animals in an occasional series of popular tweets, where Camel, Armadillo, and Elephant are seen reading books featuring themselves. Again, this is a way of emphasizing that the library’s social media is managed by people with personality and creativity.

Despite a general feeling of goodwill toward the library, social media is also a place where people go to vent the many frustrations of academic life. When a student is upset about the content of their course or high tuition fees this can be directed at the library and vocalized as frustration with the lack of study space, heating issues, missing books, or library fines. These situations can be diffused by offering practical help, or using gentle humour. Occasionally this does not work and learning when to pursue a conversation and when to retreat is an important lesson. Additionally, who follows or likes social media accounts cannot be controlled. Most of the library’s followers are from the university or those with a connection or interest in education, libraries or the local area. However, some tweets have been liked by members of far-right organizations or pornographic industries, attempting to use the library’s followers as a means of promoting themselves.
Social media is an invaluable method of communicating with departments and colleagues across campus. The library has developed a close working relationship with the university students’ union as a result of using Twitter to promote each other’s activities. The use of social media to communicate with other university departments has raised the profile of the library significantly and led to conversations that would not otherwise have taken place. As followers increase so does the library’s reach, and students are now communicating with the library even before they arrive on campus. Interaction using Facebook has been less successful. The nature of the platform makes it harder to maintain a dialogue with individuals as an institution and although people share and like the library’s posts, comments are few and far between.

WHICH PLATFORM?

There is a cornucopia of social media channels in existence and knowing which to invest your time in can often seem like a gamble. Many libraries make the decision to use every social media platform students may use but this is not the approach taken at Liverpool. Although it is important to be in the same digital space as library users, not every platform will be suitable. For example, both Snapchat and Instagram are particularly popular among students. After evaluating the two platforms, the social media group decided to start using Instagram but was against using Snapchat. Instagram allows the library to share images of the buildings and the campus as well as updating on library space projects. Any content shared on Snapchat however, will disappear after ten seconds and so this did not seem like a worthwhile method of communication. There are other instances, where a new social media tool is created and seems appropriate, but lacks current popularity. Nonetheless, there is always the possibility that in the future usage could increase so the group will usually hedge their bets by creating an account thereby guaranteeing the “LivUniLibrary” name. This approach has been taken with many social media platforms. Some, such as Instagram, have fulfilled their potential. Others however, such as Google+ and Weibo, have not.

In total, the University of Liverpool Library maintains three social media accounts on a regular basis: Twitter, Facebook and Instagram. There are others that are used such as Flickr and Vine, but these are primarily utilized as tools in conjunction with the others, with no real interaction with followers. Twitter has been the fastest growing library account and the number of followers has more than tripled since 2013. Facebook has grown at a much slower pace but followers are retained and Instagram has shown a recent sharp growth (Figure 1). The three that are maintained...
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are favoured for their popularity and the ways in which they enable the library to communicate. Both Facebook and Twitter still dominate the social media market (Statista, 2015) and both are felt to provide the most effective ways of developing a community of users and communicating with them.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the experience of successfully using social media to communicate effectively with users, these authors would make several recommendations for other academic libraries. These recommendations can be divided into two sections: managing social media in an academic library and generating content for different social media platforms.

In many academic libraries, it is common for a limited number of people to be responsible for managing social media but from the Liverpool experience the recommendation to other institutions would be to take the opposite approach. Large groups can help generate ideas and ensuring members represent the complete library service means that people’s interests, and therefore content, is varied and interesting. It is important to avoid social media being seen as any other project or working group, it is inherently different and should be approached accordingly. Meet regularly to keep abreast of changes and to pool ideas; this helps to keep out-
engaging and up-to-date. Management of each social media platform should be based on the platform itself. Do not be tempted to take the same approach with all platforms simply because it is easier to manage. For example, at Liverpool the group instigated a weekly rota for posting to Facebook. This works well as Facebook is more appropriate for longer, more academic posts and it is therefore easier to maintain a similar tone from week to week. The informal nature of Twitter however, means that type of rigidity should be avoided.

Be timely in your response when dealing with comments or questions. A profile that is not monitored on a regular basis will quickly lose followers. Content should be lively, humorous, and interactive and avoid repeating service information that can be easily found on the library website. Rather than just delivering library content, use social media as an opportunity for the library to curate content on its users’ behalf. Broadcasting information is not interesting but creating conversations and interactions is and having these conversations gives users the chance to feedback to the library in a relaxed, informal way. This is also applicable when faced with negativity; try to avoid appearing defensive and be open and willing to take criticism.

At Liverpool, the group tries to respond with as much good humour as possible but equally knows when to step away.

When posting content consider your platform. Facebook is more structured where posts will linger whereas Twitter can be more ephemeral where shorter, snappier tweets and a more humorous tone excel. Exploiting the interests of library staff is crucial to creating a vibrant and interesting social media presence. The University of Liverpool Library social media group includes members with a natural humour and this shines through on a platform like Twitter. Visual content is always really popular on both platforms and a post often generates more interest if accompanied by an image. A picture can often say much more than words.

In December 2014 a social media group member tweeted a photograph of an empty sandwich box shelved within a row of library books. Previous photographs of rubbish abandoned around the library designed to shame students into tidying up had received minimal interaction. This time, the photograph caught our followers’ imagination who retweeted it at an incredible rate. Librarians discussed whether the sandwich had been correctly classified and students accused each other of littering. It was soon retweeted as far away as Nevada and Vancouver and eventually #shelfwich was retweeted over 2,500 times. This just goes to show that ultimately, however hard you plan and strategize, in the world of social media you can never entirely predict what will be a success.
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ABSTRACT

Librarians at Linköping University help researchers keep abreast of developments in their fields and to increase the visibility of their work. Strategic, professional use of social media ought to be an essential part of a researcher’s communication strategy. This article investigates the level of awareness of the professional use of social media among LiU researchers. The investigation showed that use of social media was not significant; however, a small number saw potential. The purpose of this article is threefold. The first purpose was to evaluate the potential of using social media as a tool for communicating research outside LiU. Second, the article presents a study in which views of LiU researchers on social media were ascertained via seminar discussions, informal feedback, and interviews. The study has a case study approach involving eight researchers. Third, the article covers how LiU Library created a web-based information package to support researchers in social media use.

INTRODUCTION

Linköping University Library (LiU Library) has used various forms of social media (Facebook, Twitter and Instagram) to interact with users over the last four years and as such has an expertise in social media tools: how they are used, their benefits and limitations. Furthermore, the Library’s role in analysing the publication output from the University via bibliometric analysis and subsequent involvement with researchers’ publishing strategy, made us aware of the potential of social media as a communication tool for researchers. We saw an opportunity for Linköping University (LiU) to increase the visibility of its research, using social media as a communication tool. The aim of this article is to evaluate the potential of using social media as a tool for communicating research outside LiU. This article also presents a study of a project in which views of LiU researchers on social media were ascertained via seminar discussions, informal feedback and interviews.

In 2014, LiU Library initiated a project in collaboration with the Communications and Marketing Division and the ICT studio [Information and Communication Technologies] at LiU, to develop a multiple approach to interact with researchers to identify the social media usage of LiU researchers. These departments also work with social media at LiU and as such were natural collaboration partners in the project and the creation of a web-based information package to support researchers in their social media use. During the autumn of 2014, we briefly examined the web sites of six major Swedish university libraries’ looking for web-based support on social media for...
researchers that could serve as an inspiration for our project. We could not find any examples of prominently placed services on any library web site. Outside Sweden, we were inspired by two guides; one created by Newcastle University Library, “Social media for research” [http://libguides.ncl.ac.uk/socialmedia] and a guide by Mollett, Moran, and Dunleavy (2011), “Using Twitter in university research, teaching and impact activities” [http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/38489/].

As part of the library’s work with LiU’s bibliometric analyses, members of the project group (staff from the department of Publishing Infrastructure and the Communications and Marketing Division), participated in some 45 seminars during 2014 and 2015 presenting the analyses and equally addressing publishing strategy. As part of publishing strategy, ideas and techniques for making use of social media were presented. Each of these seminars was followed by a discussion session in which researchers’ views on the role of social media in a professional context was brought up, to ascertain their awareness and knowledge level. During the same period four open seminars were hosted by the authors of this article and two colleagues from the department of Publishing Infrastructure on research communication with a focus on new ways of publishing and distributing research using social media.

RESEARCHERS AND SOCIAL MEDIA

Keeping up to date poses a constant challenge for researchers. A part of this revolves around how communication channels in the research world (e.g., conferences, personal contact, e-mail, etc.) are being complemented with social media tools such as LinkedIn, Twitter, blogs, and scholarly social media platforms including ResearchGate and Academia.edu, to network, voice opinions, and share journal articles. With the addition of these new communication channels comes the importance of building a brand and establishing a social media presence to stay visible, in order to attract potential collaborators and funders (Bik & Goldstein, 2013; Tregoning, 2016).

International studies show that some researchers are active users of social media tools and that the numbers are increasing, but the majority still remain hesitant (Lupton, 2014; Mas-Bleda, Thelwall, Kousha, & Aguillo, 2014). A researcher should consider social media as a communication tool since it is becoming more common that universities and funding agencies, especially in the United States and the United Kingdom, are convinced that outreach activities are important both for promoting and explaining research to the public (Scott, 2013; Wilkinson & Weitkamp, 2013). Furthermore, Bik and Goldstein (2013) adds “A growing body of evidence suggests that public visibility and constructive conversation on social media networks can be
beneficial for scientists, impacting research in a number of key ways” (p. 1). Academic success is frequently measured in terms of impact and where there is evidence that increased distribution of one’s publications leads to increased impact, researchers are more likely to use social media as a communication tool.

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

In Sweden there are 48 universities and university colleges. Most universities in Sweden are publicly funded, Linköping University being one of them.

LiU is located in the south of Sweden. It is a multi-campus university with four campuses, located in three different cities. The university has approximately 27,000 students, 4,000 employees of which 300 are professors and 1,300 PhD students. It is one of Sweden’s larger universities. LiU, which recently celebrated 40 years as a university, has four faculties; Arts and Sciences, Medicine and Health Sciences, Educational Sciences and Science, and Engineering. LiU has strong internationally recognized research environments in materials science, information technology, and disability studies. LiU has four libraries, located on the different campuses, and has 100 employees, 70 of these are librarians. Linköping University Press, an open access publisher, is part of the library as well as the department of Publishing Infrastructure. Subject librarians and the department of Publishing Infrastructure provide research support at LiU.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies show (e.g., Bik & Goldstein, 2013; Liang et al., 2014; Lupton, 2014; Van Noorden, 2014) that social media offers great potential for researchers to help them keep up to date with new developments in their field and to distribute their research output. Reaching wider audiences helps researchers increase their visibility and ultimately the impact of their research. Liang et al. (2014) state that “Being cited or mentioned on Twitter could be a new sign of one’s academic impact” (p. 776).

SOCIAL MEDIA STRATEGY

Having a social media strategy is helpful in achieving the aim of increasing visibility and impact. A well-formulated strategy helps to establish contact with the “right” people while networking and identifying the most appropriate social media tools to distribute one’s research. It should identify target groups and establish objectives to identify the most effective channels to use, depending on purpose or agenda (Bik &
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Goldstein, 2013). A researcher needs to know who their audience is. If the desired target group is not using the same communication channels the strategy will fail and will need to be modified (Woolman, 2014). Furthermore, by identifying risks or potential pitfalls, unnecessary stress can be avoided (Lupton, 2014).

A social media strategy will also help manage a researcher’s social media return on investment (ROI) (Schaffer, 2013); researchers invest their time in social media, making it crucial that their time is well spent (Woolman, 2014). In addition to defined objectives, also mentioned by Bik and Goldstein (2013), Schaffer writes that tactics and metrics are essential in a well-formed social media strategy in order to manage and make sense of social media activities. Frequently reviewing and optimizing a social media strategy is a necessity as social media tools keeps changing, as well as methods of use.

SETTING UP A SOCIAL MEDIA STRATEGY

Schaffer (2013) refers to the PDCA cycle, as a suitable tool for setting up a social media strategy with an action plan. PDCA stands for:

- Plan, referring to social media strategy
- Do, referring to implementation of the strategy
- Check, referring to analysing
- Act, referring to adjust strategy

After a social media strategy, has been created with defined objectives, target groups and choice of tools to use, implementation of the strategy takes place. One needs to set up measurable goals which have to be analysed. If the desired outcome is not achieved the strategy needs to be adjusted. The cycle is infinite and has to be repeated many times during the process. Although Schaffer’s (2013) book is written for the marketing and business sector, much of it applies to the research community and for research communication.

SOCIAL MEDIA TOOLS AND SCHOLARLY SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS

“Social media” covers a wide range of resources and choosing which to use is not self-evident. It is better to use fewer social media tools than too many but there are no “rules” about which ones to use (Schaffer, 2013). Research has however been carried out on which tools are most preferred by researchers. 3,500 researchers from 95 countries participated in a survey conducted by Van Noorden (2014). The result
from the survey concluded that researchers preferred Twitter as a professional communication channel rather than Facebook which many found was more suitable for personal use. Twitter was primarily used to follow discussions, to comment on research and post work-related content. The survey also showed that it was common for researchers to create professional profiles with scholarly social media platforms such as ResearchGate and Academia.edu for networking with peers and to discover articles in their fields. Researchers also showed an interest in tracking metrics such as views and downloads from their account (Van Noorden, 2014).

Another survey showed similar results. 711 academics from the United Kingdom, Australia/New Zealand, the United States, continental Europe, and Canada were surveyed and Lupton (2014) found that those who used social media in a strategic way saw benefits such as the opportunity to start professional networks and to promote and share their own work. Speed of communication via social media platforms was noted by respondents as a major advantage. Difficulties with the boundaries between their private and professional lives when using social media in a professional setting were also reported. Concerns were raised that they might undermine their professional reputation if they were being too personal. The surveys indicated that the most common tools used by researchers is a combination of Twitter and ResearchGate and/or Academia.edu.

Researchers’ choice of Twitter as a communication tool is also supported by other’s findings. Yeo, Cacciatore, Brossard, Scheufele, and Xenos (2014) surveyed tenure-track scientists at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and found that “Scientists who perceived social media as effective communication tools were more likely to use Twitter” (p. 1). Furthermore, Yeo et al. made a comparison between Twitter and Facebook, and found that researchers prefer Twitter. This, speculates Yeo et al., is because researchers find Twitter to be a more professional application, thus agreeing with Van Noorden’s (2014) findings. Yeo et al. adds that ResearchGate and Academia.edu are tailored online communities for researchers, making Facebook superfluous.

EARLY-CAREER VERSUS SENIOR-CAREER RESEARCHERS

Findings from a small study [Nicholas et al., 2015] suggest that early-career scholars have more to gain by using emerging platforms (e.g., ResearchGate/Academia.edu). The reason for that could be that early-career researchers are not yet as established as senior researchers due to fewer active years in the profession. Another explanation for this could be because early-career academics to a large extent are the ones that are pushing the transition to (Cyber-) Science 2.01 forward and thus know how to handle Web better than their later career colleagues (Nentwich & König, 2014).
METHODOLOGY

The study has a case study approach. Yin (2004) refers to a case study as a small qualitative study where multiple methods often are used “...to produce a first-hand understanding of people and events” (p. 3). We carried out approximately one-hour-long, informal, one-to-one interviews with eight researchers at LiU who use social media professionally. The eight were between 30 and 60 years old, two of them were women. One of them is doing a PhD, three were early-career researchers, having obtained their PhDs within the past eight years. The other four were senior-career researchers and had finished their PhDs more than ten years ago. They were active in disciplines such as computer and information sciences, life sciences, social sciences, and humanities. All of the researchers had teaching duties at their faculties.

The interviews were held during the autumn of 2015 and were conducted by the authors of this article. Researchers were selected by the preferences of subject discipline, age, and gender, although it should be noted that at the point when candidates were being looked for, there were relatively few researchers actively using social media for research. Ten researchers who use social media were contacted by e-mail and eight responded, agreeing to be interviewed. The other two declined due to other engagements. The following open questions formed the base of the interviews:

- Which social media tool or scholarly social media platform do you use?
- How did you select which tool or platform to use and which not to use?
- How long have you been using social media?
- How much time do you spend using social media per week?
- For what purpose do you use social media?
- Which target groups are you targeting?
- Have you used a social media strategy when setting up a tool or platform?
- Do you receive any response on your research from visitors to your social media tool or scholarly platform?
- Compared to your colleagues, to what extent is your commitment to social media?
- Do you receive enough support from the University on using social media?

RESULTS

Our project to identify social media usage by researchers at LiU identified the following key themes: LiU researchers’ opinions on social media as retrieved from
Excerpted from Librarian as Communicator

seminar discussions, Reported benefits with social media amongst inter-viewed LiU researchers, Choice of social media communication channels, Social media and impact, Limitations identified in interviewed LiU researchers’ social media strategy, and Support in using social media. These findings will now be explored.

LIU RESEARCHERS’ OPINIONS ON SOCIAL MEDIA AS RETRIEVED FROM SEMINAR DISCUSSIONS

In essence, the majority of the researchers we talked to at the seminars we hosted had not thought about using and hence did not really understand how to use social media effectively in a professional setting but were curious enough to take part in the discussions. Social media was seen as:

- Time consuming
- Too difficult to learn
- Having irrelevant audiences
- Being for private rather than professional life
- Having too short a message length (referring to Twitter)

Concerns were also raised as to whether social media activity really increases the impact of a research publication. One researcher saw social media in a professional setting as highly unreliable and preferred traditional communication channels.

REPORTED BENEFITS WITH SOCIAL MEDIA AMONGST INTERVIEWED LIU RESEARCHERS

The eight researchers that we conducted informal interviews with were positive towards social media, and had already adapted social media tools and found that it was worth the effort. The researchers had being used social media in a professional capacity for between 6 months and 6 years. The estimated time of usage per week was between 30 and 60 minutes. All estimated that they were more active on social media compared to their colleagues.

A senior-career researcher argued that it is important to serve as a good example for students and junior researchers and to be where they are. Having started using social media a year previously he believed it was necessary to be responsive and open to changes in the academic world. He also stated that social media presents excellent opportunities to get in touch with researchers internationally.
Another senior-career researcher noticed that early-career researchers often use social media to a greater extent than senior-career researchers. The PhD student reported noticing that other PhD students often use social media as a way to gather information and to build a professional network which was similar to others' findings (Lupton, 2014, Nicholas et al., 2015).

CHOICE OF SOCIAL MEDIA COMMUNICATION CHANNELS

We observed that the interviewed LiU researchers often used Twitter or scholarly social media platforms like ResearchGate or a combination of both, similar to others' findings (Lupton, 2014; Van Noorden, 2014). The most common purpose they gave for using social media was to monitor their field by following other researchers and to find interesting articles. Three responded that they took part in discussions and in an active way worked on boosting their online presence and their research. They reported sometimes receiving responses from other researchers after posting content.

SOCIAL MEDIA AND IMPACT

Two of the researchers we interviewed were interested in how social media activity around a publication can be used as a measure of its impact. They described traditional bibliometrics (e.g., counting citations to a publication) as slow and saw potential with using measures of social media activity discussing a publication because of its relative speediness. One, however, mentioned that discussions in social media can be a bit shallow and often involve much broader audiences than only academics, raising questions as to whether measuring the impact via social media was equivalent (and meaningful) to measuring via more traditional techniques. Another researcher went so far as to suggest that the Swedish system for research funding might start to look at researcher’s impact in social media.

LIMITATIONS IDENTIFIED IN INTERVIEWED LIU RESEARCHERS’ SOCIAL MEDIA STRATEGY

Objectives, Target Group, and Professional Identity

Most of the researchers we interviewed had to some extent defined an objective and thought about which social media platform to use and which target group they wanted to address. Some were more interested in reaching the general public, some the scientific community and some both. There were however some important elements missing in their social media strategy. Five reported having problems
finding their professional identity, using social media professionally versus privately on their chosen platforms. They tried to keep their private and professional lives separate by having different accounts for private and professional use. One started to use Twitter for personal use and then expanded to using it professionally.

Another dimension added to this was difficulties with identity when representing themselves versus their research group. They noticed that other researchers seemed to struggle with their professional identity too, that is, the same concerns respondents reported in the survey by Lupton (2014). We found that a common way to promote a specific research group or a journal was to create an account for that specific reason.

**Engage Audience, Plan Content, and Identify Risks**

Few seemed to have a strategy on how to get to know and engage their audience, how to plan content accordingly and how to identify risks. Our findings show similarities with a study by Wilkinson and Weitkamp (2013), reporting “…the notion that researchers remain relatively non-strategic in their dissemination strategies” (p. 6). However, all researchers reported that an increasing awareness that they needed to be more strategic in order to obtain the best result. One of them said that only in the past few years had he begun to fully realize the potential impact of social media.

**Support in Using Social Media**

Despite having elements missing in their social media strategy the eight researchers saw themselves as having enough knowledge regarding social media and felt that they were not in any immediate need of support on how to use it professionally. Two researchers had however been in contact with the Communications and Marketing Division seeking guidance in setting up accounts. One researcher believed that for colleagues who are unfamiliar with social media tools, support could be highly beneficial. The same researcher was of the view that LiU does not see social media as a serious and professional communication channel.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Researchers are often short of time and communicating their research is often given little priority [Wilkinson & Weitkamp, 2013]. Learning new forms of communication such as Twitter takes a certain amount of time, engagement, and strategy. Thus many LiU researchers were unwilling to start using social media in their profession.
The researchers we interviewed prioritized social media, and saw several benefits although some concerns were raised regarding their professional identity in social media. It is not hard to grasp why researchers struggle with their professional identity, when they are their own brand name and at the same time need to be aware that they are representing an institution. Issues with identity for the researchers we talked to were probably due to not establishing which tone of voice they should use and how they should express themselves when wanting to be professional and yet at the same time showing a bit of personality.

There is a growing trend among funding agencies in the United States and in the United Kingdom toward looking at outreach activities. One of the researchers we interviewed speculated that the Swedish system for research funding might start to look at researcher’s impact in social media. If methods that measure universities’ interaction and involvement in society as a whole are developed it will be important for researchers to make use of communication channels beyond the traditional journals and academic book publishers.

LIBRARIES AND RESEARCH SUPPORT

As social media tools and scholarly social media platforms like ResearchGate are becoming more frequently used by researchers, they need guidance on creating an action plan such as the PCDA cycle, a social media strategy (i.e., learning how to define objectives and target groups, planning content accordingly and identifying risks) and best practice on distributing research through these channels. “Communication training and resources for researchers could better support them to plan, devise and support communication approaches in creative ways” (Wilkinson & Weitkamp, 2013, p. 6). Academic libraries can play an important part in this, as many already provide researchers with bibliometrics and advice on publishing strategies. Since many researchers remain sceptical towards social media, libraries need to help researchers to think of social media as a useful tool that can lead to increased visibility and impact and not just something that is time-consuming. Ward, Bejarano, and Dud’as (2015) state that librarians could help or guide researchers to create profiles on scholarly social media platforms like ResearchGate or Acamedia.edu and offer support on copyright issues, journal policies etc. when uploading material to these platforms.

SOCIAL MEDIA AND NETWORKS FOR RESEARCHERS (A LIU WEB RESOURCE)

In the light of given facts, that researchers either need guidance or need to be encouraged to use social media, we began to think about how LiU Library could offer
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support to LiU researchers. We decided to create a web-based information package together with the Communications and Marketing Division and the ICT studio that we call Social media and networks for researchers, http://www.bibl.liu.se/publicera-och-sprida/sociala-medier?lDen&scDtrue. Since many researchers struggle with time pressure, we wanted to make the threshold low by providing step-by-step guides to get started with social media.

The web-based information package contain sections on how researchers can use social media to best distribute publications and gain visibility, and how they can use social media to network and monitor their field. It contains specific chapters on Twitter, LinkedIn, Wikipedia, blogs, ResearchGate, and Academia.edu. There is a section with model examples of researchers in Sweden and internationally that use social media for research communication, linking to their various social media profiles. The web resource is simply to inform, support, and inspire those LiU researchers that are curious about social media as a tool for research communication.

Based on our findings, we recommend that academic librarians who want to support researchers in using social media (a) Find relevant collaboration partners at the university, (b) evaluate the awareness and knowledge about social media among faculty, and (c) set up a communication strategy for the project. Given the limitation of the study further work will be needed. A future project could be to investigate potential difference in usage between genders and differences between early-career and senior-career researchers. It is our belief that especially early-career researchers could benefit from use of strategic, professional use of social media to network and to disseminate their research output.

NOTES
1. Cyberscience 2.0 is a related term to Science 2.0 referring to scientists using web 2.0 tools such as social networks [Nentwich & König, 2012].
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