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ABSTRACT

The paper highlights the extent of awareness on the social media tools among the engineering faculties and students in Puducherry through a survey conducted with 551 respondents from nine engineering colleges. The findings revealed that more than 90 percent of the respondents were aware of social media tools in general; and particularly, Facebook Live was found to be most familiar among the respondents; 93.15 percent of the faculty respondents were aware of Instagram while 97.49 percent each of the students are most familiarized with Mention and Tweetdeck and 97.26 percent of the faculties opined that Friends request from unfamiliar person was found to be the major security concern while 94.56 percent of the students opined that Junk posting of photos and videos was found to be the major security concern. Overall, it was found that most of the respondents were aware of the social media tools and their applications for various purposes. However, the respondents should be motivated to make use of these tools for academic purposes through which the recognition of the institutions and their stakeholders in a better place with more visibility.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The evolution of the social networking sites can be traced back to the shift of internet technology from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0. Web 2.0 is described as the interactive platform where two or more persons are getting involved virtually engaging in the activities (Kroski, 2007). Social networking sites became one of the most used channels of informal communication and ways to explore and exploit the knowledge resources (Steinfield et al., 2008; Haque, 2013) and they are the most sought after sharing platforms on the internet (Alexa, 2008). Social networking sites allow their customers to interact with others sophisticatedly and express their personal feelings by sharing with friends and families (Haque, 2013; Governatori & Iannella, 2011; Murray & Waller, 2007). Classroom reading and acquiring of knowledge is becoming real time through the online media which is the fashion of the time (Russo, et al., 2009). Importantly these platforms provide a lot more than an opportunity for collaboration irrespective of the space and time (Minocha, 2009). Thus, social networking is the process where a relationship is created by a group of people with same interest. Social networking sites could be of two types namely Internal Social Networking Sites and External Social Networking Sites (Suraweere, 2010).

It is clear from the literature that social networking sites are popular and widely used by the academic fraternity in India. Though there are large number of academic oriented social networking sites available to use for academic and research purpose, only limited number of social networking sites or tools are being used in the country because of lack of awareness and experience. Imparting proper education and orientation to use social networking sites for academic purpose would result in high scholarly output because of easy access to primary data and swift and instant responses from the target audiences. Therefore, the present study intends to find out the awareness on social media tools among the faculties and students of selected engineering colleges in Puducherry.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
There are number of studies which appeared from 2000 to till date on social networking sites. A few prominent studies reported very recently related to the current study have been reviewed and presented below:

Asmi and Margam (2018) reported that research scholars were aware of social networking sites. Academic social networking sites such as ResearchGate and Academia.edu were found to be the most used ones by the respondents. The constraints identified while using social media were time-consuming and data security. Yan and Zhang (2018) suggested that social media tools can serve as indicators for evaluating the research activities of research institutions, and such sites can be helpful and credible for acquiring resources, keeping informed about research, and promoting academic influence. Zientek et al., (2018) emphasized that the use of Google Scholar supplements the researchers in reporting their research, improving future research, scholarly networking for collaborations, and marketing their research.

Aleryani, Mofleh and Alariki (2017) found that more than 33% of researchers are not aware of academic social network sites. Ali and Richardson (2017) showed that accruing citations was the main reason for the respondents to upload their publications. The studies by Bardakci, Arslan and U’never (2017), Meishar-Tal and Pieterse (2017), and Mering (2017) proved that the use of social network sites enhanced the research collaboration and information development with researchers across the globe. Jeng et al., (2017) motivated the respondents by stimulating scholarly interactions to reduce the rate of confusion, improving the clarity of questions, and promoting scholarly content management. The use of the social
networking sites creates impact on the research work among the respondents (Kenchakkanavar, Hadagali & Ranadev, 2017; Manca & Ranieri, 2017).

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The study was carried out with the following objectives:
- To identify the level of awareness on social media tools among the faculties and students of engineering colleges in Puducherry based on their demographic variables;
- To assess whether the respondents are aware of the social media tools to organize the dashboard; to schedule posts ahead of time; to segment audience for easy following; and to automate and synchronize multiple social media apps in one Social Media tool; and
- To seek the opinion of the respondents on the awareness of the security concerns related to SM tools and platforms.

4. MATERIALS AND METHODS
A questionnaire was used to get the data related to demographic profile of the respondents and the awareness on social networking sites meant for academic related activities. A total of 716 faculty members and 9536 students were spread over the selected nine engineering colleges in Puducherry. The Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling Technique was adopted. 10 percent of Faculties and 5 percent of students were proportionately taken from each college for the study. Table 1 depicts the collection of duly filled in questionnaires.

| S. No. | Institution                                           | Abbreviation | Faculty (10% of Total Population) | Students (5% of Total Population) | Total | % of Response |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|---------------|
| 1      | Pondicherry Engineering College                      | PEC          | 14                                | 123                               | 137   | 24.86         |
| 2      | Achariya College of Engineering & Technology          | ACET         | 9                                 | 50                                | 59    | 10.71         |
| 3      | Alpha College of Engineering & Technology             | ALCET        | 4                                 | 33                                | 37    | 6.72          |
| 4      | Christ College of Engineering & Technology            | CCET         | 9                                 | 65                                | 74    | 13.43         |
| 5      | Dr. SIS Paul Memorial College of Engineering & Technology | PMCET       | 6                                 | 30                                | 36    | 6.53          |
| 6      | Manakula Vinayagar Institute of Technology            | MVIT         | 10                                | 75                                | 85    | 15.43         |
| 7      | RAAK College of Engineering & Technology              | RAAKCET      | 3                                 | 8                                 | 11    | 2.00          |
| 8      | Rajiv Gandhi College of Engineering & Technology      | RGCET        | 15                                | 75                                | 90    | 16.33         |
| 9      | Sri Ganesh College of Engineering & Technology        | SGCET        | 3                                 | 19                                | 22    | 3.99          |
|        | Total                                                 |              | 73                                | 478                               | 551   | 100           |
5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Social media tools are mushrooming and gradually creating a complex situation off late for the users to identify and use reliable SM tools for various purposes. Towards this direction, an attempt was made to assess the level of awareness among the respondents on various SM tools. The options given in the questionnaire on the awareness are multiple in nature. The extent of awareness based on the demographic variables is presented in the following sections:

Gender wise awareness on social media tools

Table 2 provides the data on the Gender wise awareness on social media tools. It was found that 98.68 percent of male respondents were aware of Facebook Live which ranks first in order followed by Facebook Ads (97.68%), Mention (96.69%), Instagram (96.36%), Engage by Twitter (95.70%), Facebook Insights (95.70%), Tweetdeck (95.70%), IFTTT (94.04%), Social Hunt (93.71%), Hubspot (92.38%), Adobe Spark (87.75%), Hootsuite (79.80%), Buffer (77.81%), Everypost (76.49%), Sprout Social (71.19%), Quickmeme (70.86%), Piktochart (66.56%), Canva (64.57%), Feedly (62.58%), Buzz Sumo (62.25%), Panda 5 (60.60%), Sum All (57.28%), Nuzzel (54.64%), Brook (51.66%), and Zapier (49.34%).

With regard to female respondents, it was found that 97.19 percent of the respondents were aware of Facebook Insights which ranks first in order followed by Facebook Ads (96.79%), Mention (96.79%), Engage by Twitter (96.39%), Facebook Live (96.39%), Instagram (96.39%), Tweetdeck (96.39%), Social Hunt (95.58%), IFTTT (94.78%), Adobe Spark (93.98%), Hubspot (93.57%), Feedly (87.15%), Buffer (83.13%), Everypost (81.53%), Sprout Social (78.31%), Brook (77.51%), Hootsuite (76.31%), Piktochart (72.29%), Buzz Sumo (64.26%), Quickmeme (63.05%), Panda 5 (60.64%), Canva (53.82%), Nuzzel (52.61%), Zapier (50.20%), and Sum All (46.99%).

Overall, it was found that Facebook Live was found to be most familiar among the respondents reporting 97.53 percent followed by Facebook Ads (97.23%), Mention (96.74%), Facebook Insights (96.44%), Instagram (96.37%), Engage by Twitter (96.04%), Tweetdeck (96.04%), Social Hunt (94.65%), IFTTT (94.41%), Hubspot (92.98%), Adobe Spark (90.86%), Buffer (80.47%), Everypost (79.01%), Hootsuite (78.05%), Sprout Social (74.75%), Feedly (74.87%), Piktochart (69.42%), Quickmeme (66.96%), Brook (64.58%), Buzz Sumo (63.25%), Panda 5 (60.62%), Canva (59.19%), Nuzzel (53.62%), Sum All (52.14%), and Zapier (49.77%).

Category wise awareness on social media tools

Table 3 highlights the category wise awareness on social media tools. It was observed that out of 73 faculties from nine engineering colleges, 93.15 percent of them were aware of Instagram which ranks first in order followed by Facebook Ads (89.04%), Facebook Live (87.67%), Facebook Insights (84.93%), Hubspot (83.56%), Feedly (80.82%), Engage by Twitter (79.45%), Hootsuite (78.08%), Tweetdeck (78.08%), IFTTT (75.34%), Social Hunt (73.97%), Canva (63.01%), Mention (60.27%), Adobe Spark (58.90%), Sprout Social (58.90%), Everypost (57.53%), Quickmeme (57.53%), Piktochart (56.16%), Panda 5 (53.42%), Zapier (50.68%), Buzz Sumo (49.32%), Nuzzel (47.95%), Brook (46.58%), Buffer (28.77%), and Sum All (28.77%).
Table 2 Gender wise awareness on social media tools

| Social Media Tool   | Male Aware | Male Unaware | Female Aware | Female Unaware | Total Aware | Total Unaware |
|---------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| Adobe Spark         | 265        | 37           | 12.25%       |                | 234         | 15            |
| Brook               | 156        | 46           | 48.34%       |                | 193         | 56            |
| Buffer              | 235        | 67           | 22.19%       |                | 207         | 42            |
| Buzz Sumo           | 188        | 114          | 37.75%       |                | 160         | 89            |
| Canva               | 195        | 107          | 35.43%       |                | 134         | 115           |
| Engage by Twitter   | 289        | 13           | 4.30%        |                | 240         | 9             |
| Everypost           | 231        | 71           | 23.51%       |                | 203         | 46            |
| Facebook Ads        | 295        | 7            | 2.32%        |                | 241         | 8             |
| Facebook Insights   | 289        | 13           | 4.30%        |                | 242         | 7             |
| Facebook Live       | 298        | 4            | 1.32%        |                | 240         | 9             |
| Feedly              | 189        | 113          | 37.42%       |                | 217         | 32            |
| Hootsuite           | 241        | 61           | 20.20%       |                | 190         | 59            |
| Hubspot             | 279        | 23           | 7.62%        |                | 233         | 16            |
| IFTTT               | 284        | 18           | 5.96%        |                | 236         | 13            |
| Instagram           | 291        | 11           | 3.64%        |                | 240         | 9             |
| Mention             | 292        | 10           | 3.31%        |                | 241         | 8             |
| Nuzzel              | 165        | 137          | 45.36%       |                | 131         | 118           |
| Panda 5             | 183        | 119          | 39.40%       |                | 151         | 98            |
| Piktochart          | 201        | 101          | 33.44%       |                | 180         | 69            |
| Quickmeme           | 214        | 88           | 29.14%       |                | 157         | 92            |
| Social Hunt         | 283        | 169          | 56.64%       |                | 238         | 11            |
| Sprout Social       | 215        | 87           | 28.81%       |                | 195         | 54            |
| Sum All             | 173        | 129          | 42.72%       |                | 117         | 132           |
| Tweetdeck           | 289        | 13           | 4.30%        |                | 240         | 9             |
| Zapier              | 149        | 153          | 50.66%       |                | 125         | 124           |

As far as the students are concerned, out of 478, 97.49 percent each of the students are most familiarized with Mention and Tweetdeck followed by Engage by Twitter (97.28%), Facebook Live (97.28%), Instagram (97.28%), Facebook Insights (97.07%), Facebook Ads (96.6%), IFTTT (96.23%), Social Hunt (96.23%), Hubspot (95.61%), Adobe Spark (92.68%), Feedly (92.26%), Sprout Social (90.79%), Buffer (89.96%), Everypost (89.75%), Piktochart (88.49%), Canva (86.82%), Broo (86.61%), Hootsuite (86.61%), Quicksomme (86.61%), Buzz Sumo (83.89%), Sum All (80.96%), Panda 5 (78.66%), Zapier (76.78%), and Nuzzel (71.97%).

Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 533 (95.22%) of them were most familiarized with Instagram followed by Facebook Live (92.48%), Facebook Ads (92.85%), Facebook Insight (91.00%), Engage by Twitter (88.37%), Tweetdeck (87.79%), Hubspot (89.58%), IFTTT (85.79%), Social Hunt (85.10%), Mention (78.88%), Feedly (86.54%), Adobe Spark (75.79%), Sprout Social (74.85%), Everypost (73.64%), Hootsuite (82.35%), Piktochart (72.33%), Canva (74.92%), Quicksomme (72.07%), Buffer (59.36%), Broo (66.59%), Buzz Sumo (66.60%), Panda 5 (66.04%), Sum All (54.86%), Zapier (63.73%), and Nuzzel (59.96%).

Awareness on the social media tools to organize the dashboard

Table 4 illustrates the category wise awareness of the respondents on the social media tools to organize the dashboard. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 88.24 percent of them are aware that Facebook Live could be used to organize the dashboard followed by Hubspot (88.52%), Instagram (88.24%), Facebook Ads (86.15%), Facebook Insights (82.26%), Engage by Twitter (81.03%), Feedly (79.66%), Mention (75%), Hootsuite (71.93%), Buffer
(71.43%), Canva (65.22%), IFTTT (58.18%), Panda 5 (51.28%), Adobe Spark (51.16%),
Brook (47.06%), Tweetdeck (45.61%), Buzz Sumo (41.67%), Piktochart (41.46%), Nuzzel
(40%), Everypost (33.33%), Sprout Social (32.56%), Quickmeme (30.95%), Zapier (29.73%),
Social Hunt (29.63%), and Sum All (28.57%).

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 98.27 percent of them were aware that Facebook
Ads could be used to organize the dashboard followed by Facebook (98.27%), Facebook
Insights (98.06%), Facebook Live (97.63%), Buffer (95.81%), Instagram (95.48%),
Tweetdeck (95.06%), Canva (94.94%), Brook (94.20%), Feedly (93.65%), Mention
(93.13%), Adobe Spark (92.78%), Everypost (92.31%), Nuzzel (91.86%), Engage by Twitter
(91.83%), Hootsuite (91.06%), Piktochart (90.78%), Social Hunt (88.91%), IFTTT (87.61%),
Buzz Sumo (86.03%), Zapier (85.56%), Quickmeme (84.30%), Sum All (83.98%), Sprout
Social (83.41%), Panda 5 (81.91%), and Hubspot (77.68%).

Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 511 (92.74%) of them were most
familiarized with Facebook Live followed by Facebook Ads (92.56%), Facebook Insights
(91.83%), Instagram (91.47%), Engage by Twitter (86.03%), Tweetdeck (85.12%), Mention
(84.75%), Feedly (83.48%), IFTTT (78.95%), Adobe Spark (78.58%), Buffer (77.50%),
Social Hunt (77.13%), Canva (76.95%), Hootsuite (75.86%), Everypost (74.41%), Hubspot
(74.23%), Brook (73.68%), Piktochart (72.78%), Sprout Social (68.24%), Quickmeme
(65.70%), Buzz Sumo (65.34%), Sum All (60.07%), Nuzzel (59.89%), Panda 5 (59.53%), and
Zapier (58.98%).

Table 3 Category wise awareness on social media tools

| Social Media Tool | Faculty | Students | Total |
|-------------------|---------|----------|-------|
|                    | Aware   | %        | Unaware | %      |
| Adobe Spark       | 43      | 58.90    | 30      | 41.10  |
| Brook             | 34      | 46.58    | 39      | 53.42  |
| Buffer            | 21      | 28.77    | 52      | 71.23  |
| Buzz Sumo         | 36      | 49.32    | 37      | 50.68  |
| Canva             | 46      | 63.01    | 27      | 36.99  |
| Engage by Twitter | 58      | 79.45    | 15      | 20.55  |
| Everypost         | 42      | 57.53    | 31      | 42.47  |
| Facebook Ads      | 65      | 89.04    | 8       | 10.96  |
| Facebook Insights | 62      | 84.93    | 11      | 15.07  |
| Facebook Live     | 64      | 87.67    | 9       | 12.33  |
| Feedly            | 59      | 80.82    | 14      | 19.18  |
| Hootsuite         | 57      | 78.08    | 12      | 21.92  |
| Hubspot           | 61      | 83.56    | 12      | 16.44  |
| IFTTT             | 55      | 75.34    | 18      | 24.66  |
| Instagram         | 60      | 93.15    | 5       | 6.85   |
| Mention           | 44      | 60.27    | 29      | 39.73  |
| Nuzzel            | 35      | 47.95    | 38      | 52.05  |
| Panda 5           | 39      | 53.42    | 34      | 46.58  |
| Piktochart        | 41      | 56.16    | 32      | 43.84  |
| Quickmeme         | 42      | 57.53    | 31      | 42.47  |
| Social Hunt       | 54      | 73.97    | 19      | 26.03  |
| Sprout Social     | 43      | 58.90    | 30      | 41.10  |
| Sum All           | 21      | 28.77    | 52      | 71.23  |
| Tweetdeck         | 57      | 78.08    | 16      | 21.92  |
| Zapier            | 37      | 50.68    | 36      | 49.32  |

Awareness on the social media tools to schedule posts ahead of time

Table 5 reports the results of category wise awareness of the respondents on the social media
tools to schedule posts ahead of time by using any of the tools as mentioned in the Table. The
result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 97.67 percent of them are aware that Hubspot could be
used to schedule posts ahead of time followed by Instagram (96.49%), Facebook Ads

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3479089
and, out of 478 students, 96.59 percent each of them were aware that Facebook Ads and Tweetdeck could be used to schedule posts ahead of time followed by Facebook Insights (95.78%), Piktochart (92.75%), Adobe Spark (92.58%), Canva (92.31%), Facebook Live (92.13%), Feedly (92%), Everypost (91.24%), Instagram (91.10%), Bro...Sum All (50%), and Hubspot (71.94%).

Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 472 (96.25%) of them were most familiarized with Facebook Ads followed by Facebook Live (94.02%), Instagram (93.80%), Facebook Insights (92.89%), Buffer (92.67%), Feedly (91.56%), Engage by Twitter (90.97%), Mention (87.26%), Hootsuite (86.99%), Hubspot (84.81%), Canva (82.05%), Adobe Spark (80.28%), Brook (78.85%), Tweetdeck (78.30%), IFTTT (75.73%), Panda 5 (75.15%), Nuzzel (72.90%), Buzz Sumo (71.45%), Piktochart (68.38%), Sum All (68.24%), Sprout Social (68.06%), Zapier (64.26%), Quickmeme (63.89%), Everypost (62.81%), and Social Hunt (60.20%).

Awareness on the social media tools for segmenting audience for easy following

Table 6 shows the results of category wise awareness of the respondents on the social media tools for segmenting audience for easy following by using any of the tools as mentioned in the Table. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 83.78 percent of them are aware that Hubspot could be used for segmenting audience for easy following followed by Facebook Live (80.95%), Feedly (78.79%), Instagram (78%), Facebook Insights (77.50%), Facebook Ads (72.50%), Hootsuite (61.54%), IFTTT (57.14%), Mention (56.25%), Engage by Twitter (55.81%), Bro...Sum All (50%), and Everypost (15.38%).

Table 4: Awareness on the social media tools to organize the dashboard by Category

| Social Media Tool | Faculty | Students | Total |
|-------------------|---------|----------|-------|
|                   | Aware   | Unaware  | %     | Aware | Unaware | %  | Aware | Unaware | %  |
| Adobe Spark       | 22      | 51.16    | 21    | 48.84 | 411     | 92.78 | 32    | 7.22    | 433   | 78.58  | 53 | 9.62 |
| Brook             | 16      | 47.06    | 18    | 52.94 | 390     | 94.20 | 24    | 5.80    | 406   | 73.68  | 42 | 7.62 |
| Buffer            | 15      | 71.43    | 6     | 28.57 | 412     | 95.81 | 18    | 4.19    | 427   | 77.50  | 24 | 4.36 |
| Buzz Sumo         | 15      | 41.67    | 21    | 58.33 | 345     | 86.03 | 56    | 13.97   | 360   | 65.34  | 77 | 13.97 |
| Canva             | 30      | 65.22    | 16    | 34.78 | 394     | 94.94 | 21    | 5.06    | 424   | 76.95  | 37 | 6.72 |
| Engage by Twitter | 47      | 81.03    | 11    | 18.97 | 427     | 91.83 | 38    | 8.17    | 474   | 86.03  | 49 | 8.89 |
| Everypost         | 14      | 33.33    | 28    | 66.67 | 396     | 92.31 | 33    | 7.69    | 410   | 74.41  | 61 | 11.07 |
| Facebook Ads      | 56      | 86.15    | 9     | 13.85 | 454     | 98.27 | 8     | 1.73    | 510   | 92.56  | 17 | 3.09 |
| Facebook Insights | 51      | 82.26    | 11    | 17.74 | 455     | 98.06 | 9     | 1.94    | 506   | 91.83  | 20 | 3.63 |
| Facebook Live     | 57      | 89.06    | 7     | 10.94 | 454     | 97.63 | 11    | 2.87    | 511   | 92.74  | 18 | 3.27 |
| Feedly            | 47      | 79.66    | 12    | 20.34 | 413     | 93.65 | 28    | 6.35    | 460   | 83.48  | 40 | 7.26 |
| Hootsuite         | 41      | 71.93    | 16    | 28.07 | 377     | 91.06 | 37    | 8.94    | 418   | 75.86  | 53 | 9.62 |
| Hubspot           | 54      | 88.52    | 7     | 11.48 | 355     | 77.68 | 102   | 22.32   | 409   | 74.23  | 109| 19.78 |
| IFTTT             | 32      | 58.18    | 23    | 41.82 | 403     | 87.61 | 57    | 12.39   | 435   | 78.95  | 80 | 14.52 |
| Instagram         | 60      | 88.24    | 8     | 11.76 | 444     | 95.48 | 21    | 4.52    | 504   | 91.47  | 29 | 5.26 |
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Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 82.29 percent of them were mostly familiarized with Feedly followed by Facebook Insights (81.52%), Facebook Live (81.51%), Facebook Ads (79.75%), Instagram (79.24%), Hubspot (75.88%), Hootsuite (72.18%), Engage by Twitter (71.17%), Mention (68.99%), IFTTT (65.6%), Tweetdeck (63.6%), Quickmeme (60%), Bro (59.66%), Buffer (59.21%), Canva (58.25%), Social Hunt (56.34%), Buzz Sumo (56.33%), Panda 5 (54.95%), Nuzzel (53.54%), Piktochart (53.10%), Sprout Social (50.36%), Zapier (50.33%), Everypost (49.79%), Sum All (49.74%), and Adobe Spark (49.09%).
AWARENESS OF SOCIAL MEDIA TOOLS AMONG ENGINEERING FACULTIES AND STUDENTS IN PUDUCHERRY – A STUDY

Table 7 shows the results of category wise awareness of the respondents on automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps by using any one Social Media tool as mentioned in the Table. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 83.64 percent of them are aware that Facebook Live could be used for automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one tool followed by Facebook Ads (82.98%), Hubspot (82.98%), Facebook Insights (82.26%), Instagram (82.14%), Feedly (77.36%), Hootsuite (71.11%), IFTTT (70.83%), Mention (68.57%), Engage by Twitter (66.04%), Brook (63.16%), Adobe Spark (58%), Buffer (57.69%), Nuzzel (57.14%), Canva (54.29%), Panda 5 (51.72%), Quickmeme (50%), Social Hunt (46.67%), Tweetdeck (46.43%), Buzz Sumo (46.15%), Zapier (45.83%), Sum All (42.86%), Piktochart (40.74%), Sprout Social (34.38%), and Everypost (31.82%)

On the other hand, out of 478 students, 89.88 percent of them were aware that Zapier could be used for automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one tool followed by Tweetdeck (88.68%), Quickmeme (88.42%), Facebook Insights (88.26%), Facebook Ads (88.02%), Piktochart (84.24%), Facebook Live (84.10%), Mention (83.70%), Everypost (83.47%), Feedly (83.47%), Hootsuite (83.19%), Engage by Twitter (83.18%), Instagram (80.10), Buzz Sumo (79.84%), Buffer (78.88%), Panda 5 (78.52%), Canva (78.48%), Social Hunt (78.14%), Brook (77.35%), IFTTT (76.85%), Sum All (75.30%), Sprout Social (74.52%), Nuzzel (72.41%), Hubspot (71.10%), and Adobe Spark (67.63%).

Table 6 Segmenting audience for easy following through social media tools

| Social Media Tool     | Faculty (Aware %) | Students (Aware %) | Total (Aware %) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Adobe Spark           | 11 (29.73%)       | 26 (70.27%)        | 269 (68.45%)    |
| Brook                 | 13 (41.94%)       | 18 (58.06%)        | 301 (77.38%)    |
| Buffer                | 9 (40.91%)        | 13 (59.09%)        | 324 (77.51%)    |
| Buzz Sumo             | 14 (32.56%)       | 29 (67.44%)        | 294 (80.11%)    |
| Canva                 | 12 (33.33%)       | 24 (66.67%)        | 336 (83.17%)    |
| Engage by Twitter     | 24 (55.81%)       | 19 (44.19%)        | 379 (86.53%)    |
| Everypost             | 6 (15.38%)        | 33 (84.62%)        | 341 (84.20%)    |
| Facebook Ads          | 29 (72.50%)       | 11 (27.50%)        | 368 (87.00%)    |
| Facebook Insights     | 31 (77.50%)       | 9 (22.50%)         | 349 (85.54%)    |
| Facebook Live         | 34 (80.95%)       | 8 (19.05%)         | 334 (82.06%)    |
| Feedly                | 26 (78.79%)       | 7 (21.21%)         | 326 (85.79%)    |
| Hootsuite             | 24 (61.54%)       | 15 (38.46%)        | 294 (82.82%)    |
| Hubspot               | 31 (83.78%)       | 16 (16.22%)        | 331 (67.97%)    |
| IFTTT                 | 12 (57.14%)       | 9 (42.86%)         | 354 (74.06%)    |
| Instagram             | 39 (78.00%)       | 11 (22.00%)        | 367 (80.48%)    |
| Mention               | 18 (56.25%)       | 14 (43.75%)        | 349 (81.73%)    |
| Nuzzel                | 9 (34.62%)        | 17 (65.38%)        | 221 (72.46%)    |
| Panda 5               | 8 (30.77%)        | 18 (69.23%)        | 239 (79.14%)    |
| Piktochart            | 6 (22.22%)        | 21 (77.78%)        | 304 (83.98%)    |
| Quickmeme             | 5 (33.33%)        | 10 (66.67%)        | 286 (86.67%)    |
| Social Hunt           | 13 (38.24%)       | 21 (61.76%)        | 341 (74.45%)    |
| Sprout Social         | 9 (27.27%)        | 24 (72.73%)        | 285 (73.45%)    |
| Sum All               | 6 (25.00%)        | 18 (75.00%)        | 254 (74.49%)    |
| Tweetdeck             | 14 (40.00%)       | 21 (60.00%)        | 361 (87.20%)    |
| Zapier                | 5 (21.74%)        | 18 (78.26%)        | 251 (78.93%)    |

Overall, it was found that out of 551 total respondents, 85.5 percent of them were mostly familiarized with Facebook Ads followed by Facebook Insights (85.26%), Facebook Live (83.87%), Instagram (81.12%), Feedly (80.42%), Hootsuite (77.15%), Hubspot (77.04%), Mention (76.14%), Engage by Twitter (74.61%), IFTTT (73.84%), Brook (70.25%), Quickmeme (69.21%), Buffer (68.29%), Zapier (67.86%), Tweetdeck (67.55%), Canva (66.38%), Panda 5 (65.12%), Nuzzel (64.78%), Buzz Sumo (63%), Adobe Spark (62.82%),
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Piktochart (62.49%), Social Hunt (62.40%), Sum All (59.08%), Everypost (57.65%), and Sprout Social (54.45%).

Table 7: Automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one Social Media tool

| Social Media Tool | Faculty | Students | Total |
|-------------------|---------|----------|-------|
|                   | Aware   | %        | Unaware | %        | Aware   | %        | Unaware | %        | Total |
| Adobe Spark       | 29      | 58.00    | 21      | 42.00    | 234     | 67.63    | 112      | 32.37    | 263    | 62.82   | 133       | 37.18    |
| Brook             | 24      | 63.16    | 14      | 36.84    | 321     | 77.35    | 94       | 22.65    | 345    | 70.25   | 108       | 29.75    |
| Buffer            | 15      | 57.69    | 11      | 42.31    | 310     | 78.88    | 83       | 21.12    | 325    | 68.29   | 94        | 31.71    |
| Buzz Sumo         | 18      | 46.15    | 21      | 53.85    | 301     | 79.84    | 76       | 20.16    | 319    | 63.00   | 97        | 37.00    |
| Canva             | 19      | 54.29    | 16      | 45.71    | 321     | 78.48    | 88       | 21.52    | 340    | 66.38   | 104       | 33.62    |
| Engage by Twitter | 35      | 66.04    | 18      | 33.96    | 351     | 83.18    | 71       | 16.82    | 386    | 74.61   | 89        | 25.39    |
| Everypost         | 31      | 81.22    | 30      | 68.18    | 298     | 83.47    | 59       | 16.53    | 339    | 80.42   | 71        | 29.58    |
| Facebook Ads      | 39      | 82.98    | 18      | 17.02    | 338     | 88.02    | 46       | 11.98    | 377    | 85.50   | 54        | 14.50    |
| Facebook Insights | 51      | 82.26    | 11      | 17.74    | 361     | 88.26    | 48       | 11.74    | 412    | 85.26   | 59        | 14.74    |
| Facebook Live     | 46      | 83.64    | 9       | 16.36    | 349     | 84.10    | 66       | 15.90    | 395    | 83.87   | 75        | 16.13    |
| Feedly            | 41      | 77.36    | 12      | 22.64    | 298     | 83.47    | 59       | 16.53    | 339    | 80.42   | 71        | 29.58    |
| Hootsuite         | 32      | 71.11    | 13      | 28.89    | 287     | 83.19    | 58       | 16.81    | 319    | 77.15   | 71        | 22.85    |
| Hubspot           | 39      | 82.98    | 8       | 17.02    | 305     | 71.10    | 124      | 28.90    | 344    | 77.04   | 132       | 22.96    |
| IFTTT             | 17      | 70.83    | 7       | 29.17    | 312     | 76.85    | 94       | 23.15    | 329    | 73.84   | 101       | 26.16    |
| Instagram         | 46      | 82.14    | 10      | 17.86    | 326     | 80.10    | 81       | 19.90    | 372    | 81.12   | 91        | 18.88    |
| Mention           | 24      | 68.57    | 11      | 31.43    | 339     | 83.70    | 66       | 16.30    | 363    | 76.14   | 77        | 23.86    |
| Nuzzel            | 16      | 57.14    | 12      | 42.86    | 189     | 72.41    | 72       | 27.59    | 205    | 64.78   | 84        | 35.22    |
| Panda 5           | 15      | 51.72    | 14      | 48.28    | 223     | 78.52    | 61       | 21.48    | 238    | 65.12   | 75        | 34.88    |
| Piktochart         | 41      | 57.74    | 14      | 49.26    | 294     | 84.24    | 55       | 15.76    | 305    | 62.49   | 71        | 37.51    |
| Quickmeme         | 8       | 50.00    | 8       | 50.00    | 275     | 88.42    | 36       | 11.58    | 283    | 69.21   | 44        | 30.79    |
| Social Hunt       | 14      | 46.67    | 16      | 53.33    | 311     | 78.14    | 87       | 21.86    | 325    | 62.40   | 103       | 37.60    |
| Sprout Social     | 11      | 34.78    | 21      | 65.63    | 269     | 74.52    | 92       | 25.48    | 280    | 54.45   | 113       | 45.55    |
| Sum All           | 9       | 42.82    | 12      | 57.14    | 247     | 75.30    | 81       | 24.70    | 256    | 59.08   | 93        | 40.92    |
| Tweetdeck         | 13      | 46.43    | 15      | 53.57    | 329     | 88.68    | 42       | 11.32    | 342    | 67.55   | 57        | 32.45    |
| Zapier            | 11      | 45.83    | 13      | 54.17    | 231     | 89.88    | 26       | 10.12    | 242    | 67.86   | 39        | 32.14    |

Opinion of the respondents on the awareness of the security concerns related to SM tools and platforms

Table 8 reports the opinions of the respondents on the awareness of the security concerns related to SM tools and platforms. The result indicates that out of 73 faculties, 97.26 percent of them opined that Friends request from unfamiliar person was found to be the major security concern followed by Junk posting of photos and videos (94.52%), Virus detection (93.15%), and Fake accounts (80.82%).

Table 8: Opinion of the respondents on the Barriers in using SM tools and platforms

| S. No. | Barriers                  | Faculty (N=73) | %   | Students (N=78) | %   |
|--------|---------------------------|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| 1      | Lack of appeal            | 36             | 49.32| 369             | 77.20|
| 2      | Fear of addiction         | 54             | 73.97| 245             | 51.26|
| 3      | Cyber bullying            | 43             | 58.90| 368             | 76.99|
| 4      | Concern with privacy      | 65             | 89.04| 268             | 56.07|
| 5      | Very intrusive nature     | 56             | 76.71| 398             | 83.26|
| 6      | Data security             | 67             | 91.78| 402             | 84.10|
| 7      | Lack of IT skills         | 48             | 65.75| 125             | 26.15|
| 8      | Lack of awareness about various SMs | 36 | 49.32| 213             | 44.56|
| 9      | Ethical reason            | 58             | 79.45| 238             | 49.79|
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On the other hand, out of 478 students, 94.56 percent of them opined that Junk posting of photos and videos was found to be the major security concern followed by Fake accounts (90.38%), Virus detection (88.08%), and Friends request from unfamiliar person (52.93%).

6. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The outcomes of the study on the awareness of social media tools among the faculties and students of engineering colleges in Puducherry led to the significant findings such as more than 90 percent of the respondents were aware of social media tools in general; and particularly, Facebook Live was found to be most familiar among the respondents; 93.15 percent of the faculty respondents were aware of Instagram while 97.49 percent each of the students were aware that Facebook Ads could be used to organize the dashboard while 98.27 percent of the students were aware that Facebook Ads could be used to organize the dashboard; 97.67 percent of the faculties were aware that Hubspot could be used to schedule posts ahead of time while 96.59 percent each of the students were aware that Facebook Ads and Tweetdeck could be used to schedule posts ahead of time; 83.78 percent of the faculties were aware that Facebook Live could be used for segmenting audience for easy following while 87.2 percent each of the students were aware that Tweetdeck could be used for segmenting audience for easy following; 83.64 percent of the faculties were aware that Facebook Live could be used for automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one tool while 89.88 percent of the students were aware that Zapier could be used for automating and synchronizing multiple social media apps in one tool; and 97.26 percent of the faculties opined that Friends request from unfamiliar person was found to be the major security concern while 94.56 percent of the students opined that Junk posting of photos and videos was found to be the major security concern. Overall, it was found that most of the respondents were aware of the social media tools and their applications for various purposes. However, the respondents should be motivated to make use of these tools for academic purposes through which the recognition of the institutions and their stakeholders in a better place with more visibility.
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