Do You Facebook? Usage and Applications of Facebook Page among Academic Libraries in Malaysia

A.R. RIZA AYU
Perpustakaan Hamzah Sendut,
Universiti Sains Malaysia,
Pulau Pinang, MALAYSIA
ayu@usm.my

A.ABRIZAH
Digital Library Research Group,
Faculty of Computer Science & Information Technology,
University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, MALAYSIA
abrizah@um.edu.my

ABSTRACT

This paper explores usage and application of Facebook among Malaysian academic libraries in order to provide academic libraries with ideas for best practices in using social networking sites to better profile themselves and communicate effectively with their users in this new milieu. The research questions guiding this study are as follows: (a) What are the extent and nature of institutional Facebook use by Malaysian academic libraries?(b) What information that Malaysian academic libraries deliver through Facebook page? This study employs content analysis to examine current uses of the library Facebook page. A checkpoint was developed to analyze the libraries' usage and application of Facebook page. A total of 14 academic libraries in Malaysia are using Facebook page as part of their services to users. However only 3 libraries are fully utilizing their Facebook page and they have been identified as "Skaters" based on the 8-S Framework of Category Development for Facebook user. Most libraries are using their Facebook page for marketing and creating awareness of library services to their users.

Keywords: Facebook, Social Networking Sites (SNS), Web 2.0, Academic Libraries,   Malaysia

INTRODUCTION

As an effort to be a "third place" for their users in the new web order, many academic libraries have created their own library Facebook page to reach students before, during and after their university experience. Facebook is becoming a trend of library users that libraries just cannot ignore (Breeding 2007). Spomer (2008) opined that "Facebook is certainly something with which librarians ought to be familiar with, if not proficient", and the author further emphasized that Facebook is alive and well in the library profession. Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Research Planning and Review Committee (2010) reported that social networking sites (SNS) such as Facebook is one of the most important technological changes that are affecting academic libraries at present and in the near future.

Facebook defines itself "as a social utility that helps people communicate more efficiently with their friends, family and co-workers" (Facebook.com, 2010). Facebook provides users with the ability to personalize profiles with photos and information about activities, interests and location. A profile allows users to update and display personal information (Ganster & Schumacher, 2009). Spomer (2008) reported that when Facebook opened up its services in 2006, librarians immediately began to explore the possibilities to use it for their organizations. However, Facebook shut down all profiles representing libraries and other group entities, as Facebook argued that profiles should represent only individuals, not groups of people or organizations. Librarians were then forced either to create groups or to use their own profiles for the purposes of their libraries. Facebook pages, a hybrid between personal profiles and groups, are the latest option for librarians, and were made available in late 2007. It is a free organizational profile for business, performers, brands/products, public figure and non-profit groups. In this Facebook page, individual users may post comments, engage in discussions, share videos and photos, or merely identify themselves as so-called "fans"(Sokoloff, 2009). Facebook has changed the term "fans" to "people like this" in April 2010. Subsequently, Facebook launched a platform

that allows third-party programmers to create applications for instance, library-related applications such as JSTOR and WorldCat (Sodt & Summey, 2009).

Facebook is estimated to reach 600 million users in 2011 (Socialbakers.com, 2011a). Time magazine estimated that "one out of every dozen people on the planet has a Facebook account" (Grossman, 2010). In Malaysia, there are 10,075,420 Facebook users (as of January 2011) which is 38.51% of Malaysia total population (Socialbakers.com, 2011b). Statistics by Socialbakers.com shows that Millenials (aged 18-24) are the majority of Malaysian Facebook users (38%). The second largest group is those aged 25-34 years old (33%) followed by 35-44 years old age group (10%). The popularity of Facebook among Malaysians can be seen from Alexa.com, a premier ranking website, which ranked Facebook as number one most visited site among 100 sites in Malaysia. (Alexa.com, 2010). Furthermore, Facebook phenomena among Malaysians is prevalence as Malaysia is among top ten growing countries in using Facebook in the last six month of 2010 (Socialbakers.com, 2011a).

This paper reports on an exploratory and descriptive study of Facebook adoption among academic libraries in Malaysia. The research questions guiding this study are as follows: (a) What are the extent and nature of institutional Facebook use by Malaysian academic libraries?; (b) What information that Malaysian academic libraries deliver through Facebook page? To answer these questions, we studied the presence of Malaysian academic libraries in Facebook, and their use and applications of this Web 2.0 technology.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Searches done in library and information science (LIS) discipline databases see increasing scholarly articles on Facebook since 2006. These trends in the literature revealed that, scholars begun to realize Facebook's growing significance to the LIS community. Librarian's perspective in using Facebook in academic libraries can be found in the work of Charnigo & Barnett-Ellis (2007). Some librarians in their study viewed Facebook as a tool in delivering library services and communicating with patrons. Other respondents perceived it as a distraction and addiction that is outside the scope of a librarian's job. Another study on uses of Facebook among 72 librarians (Hendrix, Chiarella, Linda Hasman, Murphy & Zafron (2009) found that libraries used Facebook mainly to market the library, push out announcements to library users, post photos, provide chat reference, and have a presence in the social network. The time spent maintaining and updating a library Facebook page ranged from no weekly maintenance to 120 minutes a week. This study revealed that the majority of libraries surveyed (85%) did not have a Facebook page. The two most-cited reasons were the lack of time to set up and maintain a Facebook page and the belief that Facebook demonstrated little to no utility in an academic setting.

A study by Burhanna, Seeholzer & Salem (2009) showed that Facebook and YouTube are part of students' campus life and a "must activity" for them. However Harinarayana and Raju (2010) revealed that Facebook is not a popular Web 2.0 application used among academic libraries. In a study of Web 2.0 features among 57 university library web sites worldwide, Harinarayana and Raju (2010) found that only 5 libraries (8.77 percent) were using social networking tools and 3 libraries were using Facebook.

Librarians (Mack, Behler, Roberts, & Rimland, 2007) study found that the majority of reference questions were asked through Facebook compared to e-mails, in person consultation and telephone.. This showed that students must have found the ability to connect with a librarian through Facebook as a convenient and useful method of communication. However Ismail's (2010) survey found student preference for using e-mail over Facebook when seeking research assistance. She indicated that "when catering to this new user group, the question that should be asked is not which new technologies and services librarians should implement at the library today but what new technologies and services, if any, will be most desired by the Net Gen users".

Graham, Faix and Hartman (2009), shared their library's experiences in using Facebook applications such as group, photo album, discussion board, contact information and links to individual profiles that serve as an "Ask a Librarian" feature. For example, applications in Facebook related to library such as search application from JSTOR and Worldcat, and Visual Bookshelf. The library's visibility across campus increased after librarian profiles were created and Facebook can be used as a tool to develop a professional relationship.

Secker (2008) explored the following uses of Facebook as a tool for libraries and librarians: JSTOR Search, LibGuides Librarian, Facebook Librarian, Books iRead, Bookshare. There are also various Library Catalogues available for searching from within Facebook including: COPAC Search, European Library Search, World Cat Search and UIUC Library catalog. The author perceived that providing services through a social networking site could have enormous benefits in terms of raising the profile of a library or a specific service. Librarians (Aziz, Boon, & Loh, 2010) study found out that "viral marketing" in Facebook help publicize the library in many ways. They wrote "When a user become a fan (or likes) of our Facebook page, all of his/her friends are informed. It is likewise, when librarians comment on someone else's status update, their network of friends view the comments too".

Despite its popular usage for knowledge-sharing, many authors voice their concern over lower uses of Facebook in the library environment. Breeding (2007), who urged librarians to join Facebook felt that the constant development and new features to explore as one of the reasons behind Facebook's success. Landis (2007) explained that SNS such as Facebook can be a great way to discover what library user wants and needs, because they can be used for marketing, reference, instruction, and improvement of services. He explained further that library marketing is effectively done through SNS because it is time and budget saving to reach out to users as it can be done anytime and free. In other way, it is a way of creating library branding. Farkas (2007) concluded that creating presence in Facebook makes the library more visible and more convenient to access, and it could be used as a medium to remove barriers between users and library services.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, web content analysis was used in gathering data from library website and library Facebook page. Krippendoff (2004) described content analysis as a research technique for making replicable and inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use. Today, web pages are growing into one of the main types of materials studied using content analysis. This useful method provides new insights, increases a researcher's understanding of particular phenomena, or informs practical actions (Krippendorff, 2004).

A total of 25 academic libraries which are affiliated to PERPUN (Persidangan Perpustakaan Universiti dan Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia) was sampled for this study (Table 1) . PERPUN is a forum of cooperation between the Head of University Libraries and the Director General of Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia (Malaysia National Library). PERPUN consists of academic libraries from 20 Malaysian public universities and 5 private universities (http://portal.perpun.net.my/portal/index.php). However, the focus for this study is only on the main library. This study does not take into consideration branch libraries within the sampled academic library that have their own Facebook page.

The study developed the following instruments to evaluate the library Facebook page based on the works of Burkhardt (2010); Nguyen (2008) and Tripathi and Kumar (2010):
   a) Library Facebook page application index
   b) Library Facebook page status usage

After browsing the sampled libraries' Facebook page, the researchers finalized 30 checkpoints that were used to understand the usage and application of Facebook page among academic libraries. The checkpoints were divided into 4 categories as presented in Table 2. Each academic library was investigated for presence of the 30 checklist regarding features and applications of the library Facebook page. Each checklist was binary-coded either as 1=Yes or 0=No to denote the presence or absence of the features and applications for the library Facebook page. The library's webpage was examined in one day in November 2010. Then, the library Facebook page was examined between November 2010 and December 2010.

Table 1 : Sample Population of 25 Academic Libraries in Malaysia

Library	University
1. Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya	Universiti Malaya (UM)
2. Perpustakaan Hamzah Sendut	Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM)
3. Perpustakaan Sultan Abdul Samad	Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)
4. Perpustakaan Tun Sri Lanang	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM)
5. Perpustakaan Sultanah Bahiyah	Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM)
6. Perpustakaan Sultanah Zanariah	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM)
7. International Islamic University Malaysia Library	Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Malaysia (IIUM)
8. Perpustakaan Tun Abdul Razak	Universiti Teknologi MARA (UTM)
9. Centre for Academic Services	Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UniMAS)
10. Perpustakaan Universiti Malaysia Sabah	Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS)
11. Perpustakaan Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia	Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia
12. Perpustakaan Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka	Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka (UTeM)
13. Perpustakaan Sultanah Nur Zahirah	Universiti Malaysia Terengganu (UMT)
14. Perpustakaan Universiti Malaysia Pahang	Universiti Malaysia Pahang (UMP)
15. Perpustakaan Universiti Malaysia Perlis	Universiti Malaysia Perlis (UniMAP)
16. Perpustakaan Universiti Malaysia Kelantan	Universiti Malaysia Kelantan (UMK)
17. Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia Library	Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia (USIM)
18. Perpustakaan Universiti Pertahanan Nasional Malaysia	Universiti Pertahanan Nasional Malaysia
19. Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun	Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI)
20. Perpustakaan Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin	Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin (USZA)
21. Universiti Kuala Lumpur Library and Resource Centre	Universiti Kuala Lumpur (UniKL)
22. Tan Sri Dr. Abdullah Sanusi Digital Library	Universiti Terbuka Malaysia (OUM)
23. Siti Hasmah Digital Library	Universiti Multimedia (MMU)
24. UTP Information Resource Centre	Universiti Teknologi Petronas
25. Universiti Tenaga Nasional Library	Universiti Tenaga Nasional (UNITEN)

Table 2: Category of Checkpoint

Category	No. of checkpoints
A. Presence of library information	2
B. Usage of the "Wall"	9
C. Characteristics of the Page	11
D. Communication application	8
Total	30

Collection of data comprised the following steps:

a) Identification of academic library with Facebook page

The presence of the library Facebook pages were discovered from their library homepage. Only the main library of each academic library was selected. Each of these libraries homepages were screened for the Facebook icon. The Facebook icon represents either with a symbol "f" or sometime with the tagline "Find us on Facebook" (Figure 1). If the library homepage has that icon, that library will be given a "Yes" mark as indication of as having Facebook page. Otherwise, the library without Facebook icon will put as "No". The functionality of the Facebook icon inside these homepage was also being tested. It was found that by clicking on the Facebook icon on the library homepage, it will immediately direct the user to the library Facebook page.

Figure 1: Facebook Icon

b) Identification of usage and application of the "Wall" and characteristics of the Page

The library Facebook page was accessed directly from the library homepage. Since the first author has an account with Facebook, each library Facebook page was accessible. A checklist "Library Facebook page checklist" was created to collect data for the library Facebook page. Information that were collected in the "Library Facebook page checklist" were such as the library's name, the name used for the Facebook page, the year they started the Facebook page and the numbers of "People like this" as on November 2010. The checklist also identified any general information about the library and the link to library's homepage. Any activities on the "Wall" such as publicising library's news and events, link to web resources and video, new acquisition for books, journal and databases and sharing photos were examined. The activities are only for year 2010. Applications for Facebook by third party such as library catalogue search, LibGuide or BooksiRead and database search utilities were also checked whether it had been applied in the library Facebook page. Besides these, used of custom tab and boxes such as "discussion", "events", "notes" and "photos" were also examined whether it had been put in the library Facebook page.

c) Examination of the communication applications usage

News related to library's activities and events, sharing videos and photos, greetings to users that are posted by library Facebook page administrator are known as status update. Anyone can "Like" and "Comment" the status in the "Wall" by clicking both icons at the status. Updating status on the "Wall" in the Facebook page are described as communication applications (Russell, 2007). Facebook (2011) defined "Like" as "a way to give positive feedback or to connect with things users care about on Facebook. "Like" is an easy way to let someone know that users enjoy it, without leaving a comment." The "Like" and "Comment" features in Facebook have become central to the way people communicate on Facebook. They are the most heavily used features on the site and have proven to be a simple way to discuss posts and show appreciation for the content friends share on Facebook (Whitnah, 2010).

Only status posted in the month of September and October 2010 were collected for this study. These two months were chosen because it is in the middle of semester for Malaysian universities and most likely students are busy using library services at this time. Status on the "Wall" are categorized either it is posted by library Facebook page administrator or posted by users. Data for status on the "Wall" was gathered through 2 forms: a) Status posted by library; b) user posting. The data collected in the form "Status posted by library" are: date of the status posted, subject of the status, types of status (identified by the researchers), numbers of "Like" and numbers of "Comment" for that status. Data collected were sent to each library Facebook page administrator for verification through e-mails.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Status posted in the "Wall" of Facebook page indicates the activeness of the library Facebook page. The status posted by library Facebook page administrator was calculated to get an average posting either daily or weekly as shown by following formula:
a) Daily

Average updated status (daily) = Numbers of status posted in September & October
                                                        40 working days*
            *Working days for every month are 20 days

b) Weekly
    Average updated status (weekly) = Numbers of status posted in September & October
                                                            8 weeks (2 months)

The researchers also identified and categorized the status posted by library Facebook page administrator into 6 types and the users posting in the library Facebook page into 4 types as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Types of status posted

Library Administrator		Library Users	
Status	Type	Status	Type
Any kind of greeting	1	Any kind of greeting	1
Information on library news	2	Enquiry on library services	2
Information on library resources	3	Suggestion/comment to library	3
Information on web resources	4	Others	4
Library solicit feedback	5		
Information on community	6		

Data collected from the checklist and communication applications were calculated by using application index. Each checkpoint was allocated a value of 1 or 0 according to yes or no answer. The percentage of Facebook page usage and application for each library was calculated by the following formula:

$$\text{Application index} = \frac{\text{Total of "Yes" answers}}{\text{Total of checkpoints}} \times 100$$

An application index indicates the degree of usage and application of Facebook page in a specific library. The overall application index of all libraries was tabulated which made it easy to see the differences in the usage and application of Facebook page among academic libraries in Malaysia. Adapting 8-S Framework of Category of Development by Ramasamy (2010), the library Facebook page was ranked accordingly as presented in Table 4.

Table 4: 8-S Framework of Category for Facebook users

Index score range	Classification Nomenclature	Description
More than 80-100	Skaters	In a strong position for taking advantage of Facebook opportunities
More than 70- 79	Striders	Moving very fast and gaining momentum for Facebook activities and participation
More than 60- 69	Sprinters	Moving fast but lacking consistency in the momentum
More than 50- 59	Sliders	Moving steadily but lacking momentum due to lack of motivation
More than 40- 49	Strollers	Moving ahead with Facebook uptake but not very consistent in growth
More than 30- 39	Shufflers	Embracing Facebook in a slow phase due to challenges like affordability
More than 20- 29	Starters	Recognize the importance of Facebook phenomena and have begun to embrace Facebook
20 and below	Sleepers	Hardly started to embrace new age of Facebook era

FINDINGS

Research question 1:
What are the extent and nature of institutional Facebook use by Malaysian academic libraries?

The study reveals that there are 14 academic libraries in Malaysia (as of November 2010) having a Facebook page as can be seen through their library's homepage. Table 5 shows that the year 2008 marked the beginning of Facebook usage among academic libraries in Malaysia. UM library is the first academic library started using Facebook page in October 2008. Although registration and usage of Facebook page is free, not many libraries are having

Facebook page in 2009. Only 4 libraries started their Facebook page in that year. Most libraries (9 libraries) just started using their Facebook page in early 2010 (see Table 5)

Table 5: Academic Libraries with Facebook Page

Categories	Libraries	No.	Year Started
Public University- Research Intensive University (RU)	UM		2008
	USM		2010
	UPM	3	2010
Public University- International University	IIUM	1	2010
Public University	UTM		2010
	UUM		2010
	UMT		2009
	UMP		2010
	UMK	5	2010
Private University (Government Linked Company –GLC)	OUM		2009
	MMU		2009
	UNITEN		2009
	UNIKL		2010
	UTP	5	2010
Total		14	

Numbers of "people like this" are different for each libraries (as of November 2010) from a minimum of 88 people to a maximum of 4,389 people. Prior to April 2010, Facebook page use term "Fans" instead of "people like this". The number of "people like this" can be categorized as in Table 6.

Table 6: Range no. of "people like this" (N=14)

Range no. of "people like this"	No. of libraries	Libraries (Number of people like this)
More than 4,000	2	UM (4389) IIUM (4072)
Between 3,000 and 4,000	1	OUM (3793)
Between 2,000 – 3,000	1	UMP (2241)
Between 1,000 – 2,000	4	USM (1073) UTM (1880) UMT (1039) UniKL (1239)
Between 500 – 1,000	4	MMU (679) UPM (735) UUM (897) UNITEN (964)
Between 100- 500	1	UTP (470)
Below 100	1	UMK (88)

All except one, academic libraries have basic information about the library in their Facebook page (category A) such as library's opening hours, address, telephone number and library webpage address. In term of usage of "wall" (category B), 3 out of 14 libraries are fully utilize the "wall" for promoting library related activities such as publicizing library's news and events, providing link to web resources and video, announcement on new acquisition for books, journal and new subscription of databases and sharing library's photos. Publicizing library's events and sharing photos are activities that used by most libraries in the usage of "wall".

In category C, "Characteristics of the Page", the percentage for all libraries is below 50 percent. It was found out that none of the libraries is using any application for Facebook by third party such as library catalogue search, LibGuide or BooksiRead and database search utilities. Custom tab and boxes in Facebook page such as ""Photos" are widely used by all libraries. However, none of the libraries use custom tab and boxes "Ask a librarian".

Category D ("Communication applications") is a category which examined communication between the libraries and its Facebook page users during September and October 2010. Only 3 libraries (21 percent) updating their status daily. It was found that only 6 out of 14 libraries (42 percent) updated their libraries every week. It can be seen that 6 libraries are responding within 24 hours to any enquiries or comment from their user posting. In this category, usage of communication applications for most libraries is above 50 percent. 3 libraries got 100 percent that showed they are actively communicating with their users.

Table 8 contains data related to communication applications in library Facebook page. It was found that only 3 libraries (Library UM, IIUM, OUM) updated their status daily (more than 1.0) while the other 11 libraries did not. The number of libraries that posted their status by weekly also not that encouraging. It was found that only 5 libraries did update their status by weekly. The amount of status posted by library administrator in 11 libraries was less than 10 entries within that particular two months. The numbers of "Like" and "Comment" reflected with numbers of status updated within the Page. Libraries that updated their status daily were having high numbers of "Like" and "Comment". The 3 libraries that updated their status daily were having more than 100 times of "Like" and more than 100 numbers of "Comment". Library OUM which had updated its status daily was having 385 people who "Like" the status and received 1294 "Comment" within September and October of 2010.

Users are most likely to post in the status of library Facebook page if they see the library page is active. This is shown in the case of library UM, IIUM, OUM. These libraries which updated their status daily are receiving more user posting. The total numbers of posting from their users were more than 20 entries to be exact 24 entries (UM), 52 entries (IIUM) and 60 entries (OUM) respectively. For libraries that did not update their status daily, it was found that these libraries users posting were below 10 entries.

Based on 8-S Framework of Category Development for Facebook user, the academic libraries can be categorized under 8 classification nomenclature; Skaters, Striders, Sprinters, Sliders, Strollers, Shufflers, Starters and Sleepers. Table 9 shows that there are 3 libraries (Library UM, IIUM, OUM) under category "Skaters" which is "in a strong position for taking advantage of Facebook opportunities". 5 out of 14 libraries are under category "Sliders" which is described as "moving steadily but lacking momentum due to lack of motivation". There is one library (Library UMK) that is categorized as "Starters" as it "recognize the importance of Facebook phenomena and have begun to embrace Facebook".

Research question 2:
What information that Malaysian academic libraries deliver through Facebook page?

The researchers had identified 6 types of status posted by library administrator and 4 types of status posted by user on library Facebook page (Table 10). It was found that most of the library administrator posted status is Type 1; "Any kind of greeting" with 106 entries. Type 2, "Information on library news" is the second type of most posted status among academic libraries in Malaysia. Information on library resources (50 entries) and information on web resources (43

entries) are also posted by library administrators through their Facebook page. "Library solicits feedback", Type 5, is the least posted status by library administrator with only 6 entries. Only 2 libraries (library IIUM and USM) posted the type 5 status.

Most of the status posting by users is type 2, "Enquiry on library services" with 73 entries. Status type 1, "Any kind of greeting" is only posted by users in 4 libraries (library UM, IIUM, OUM and UMT) with 34 entries. Some users are willing to give comment and suggestion to library as shown in status Type 3, "Suggestion/ Comment" to library (16 entries). As users are allowed to post almost anything on library Facebook page, it is difficult to categorize some of the status posting by users. Therefore, Type 4, "Miscellaneous" is assigned to any posting that cannot be categorized under Type 1, 2 and 3 posted by users.

Table 7: Usage and Applications of Library Facebook Page

LIBRARY	UM	IIUM	USM	UTM	OUM	MMU	UPM	UUM	UNITEN	UMT	UMP	UniKL	UTP	UMK
Year started since	Oct 2008	Mac 2010	Mac 2010	Mac 2010	Apr 2009	Jul 2009	Apr 2010	Apr 2010	Dec 2009	Dec 2009	Jul 2010	Jan 2010	Jan 2010	Jul 2010
No. of "people like this" (until 30th Nov. 2010)	4389	4072	1073	1880	3793	679	735	897	964	1039	2241	1239	470	88
A. Presence of library information 1. Library general information (address, opening hours, tel. no.)	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2. Link to library's homepage	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Percentage (2/2 x 100)	100	100	100	50	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
B. Usage of Wall 1. Publicizing library's news & events	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
2. Guidance to use library facilities	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
3. Providing link to web resources	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
4. Providing link to video	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
5. Announcement on new acquisition for books / journals	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
6. New acquisition for databases	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
7. Providing reference services	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

LIBRARY	UM	IIUM	USM	UTM	OUM	MMU	UPM	UUM	UNITEN	UMT	UMP	UniKL	UTP	UMK
8. Providing information on Information Literacy	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
9. Sharing photos	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
Total	9	9	3	6	9	2	5	1	8	3	5	7	6	1
Percentage (9/9 x 100)	100	100	33	66	100	22	55	11	88	33	55	77	66	11
C. Characteristics of the Page 1. Application -Catalogue Search	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Application – LibGuide/ BooksiRead	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Application- Database search utilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Custom tab- "Discussion"	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
5. Custom tab -"Events	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
6. Custom tab - "Notes"	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
7. Custom tab- "Photos"	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8. Custom tab –"Ask a librarian"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	2	2	3	3	3
Percentage (8/8 x 100)	37	37	37	37	50	37	50	37	37	25	25	37	37	37

LIBRARY	UM	IIUM	USM	UTM	OUM	MMU	UPM	UUM	UNITEN	UMT	UMP	UniKL	UTP	UMK
D. Communication applications														
1. Status post on the "Wall" September	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
2. Status post on the "Wall" - October	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
3. Frequency of updating "Status" - daily	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Frequency of updating "Status"- at least once a week	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
5. "Like' for status	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
6. Comment for status – September	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0
7. Comment for status – October	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
8. User posting - September	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
9. User posting - October	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
10. Respond to users posting within 24 hours	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
Total	10	10	6	5	10	6	8	7	7	3	7	5	6	1
Percentage (10/10 x 100)	100	100	60	50	100	60	80	70	70	30	70	50	60	10
TOTAL	25	25	15	16	26	14	20	14	21	10	17	17	17	6
Application index	83	83	50	53	87	47	67	47	70	33	56	56	56	20

Table 8 : Communication Applications on September and October 2010

LIBRARY	UM	IIUM	USM	UTM	OUM	MMU	UPM	UUM	UNITEN	UMT	UMP	UniKL	UTP	UMK
Status on the "Wall" 1) September 2) October	21 22	24 28	3 4	1 3	72 66	1 2	5 3	1 1	1 8	2 0	10 3	1 1	4 2	0 0
Total	**43**	**52**	**7**	**4**	**138**	**3**	**8**	**2**	**9**	**2**	**13**	**2**	**6**	**0**
Average updated (daily) Total status/ 40 working days	1.07	1.30	0.17	0.10	3.45	0.07	0.2	0.05	0.22	0.05	0.32	0.05	0.15	0
Average updated (weekly) Total status/ 8 weeks	5.37	6.50	0.87	0.50	17.25	0.37	1	0.05	1.12	0.25	1.62	0.25	0.75	0
"Like" for status 1) September 2) October	96 78	188 127	20 8	3 14	196 189	3 1	20 19	4 4	2 31	0 0	66 17	0 0	3 3	0 0
Total	**174**	**315**	**28**	**17**	**385**	**4**	**49**	**8**	**33**	**0**	**83**	**0**	**6**	**0**
"Comment " for status 1) September 2) October	27 25	232 240	9 34	0 1	750 544	1 3	13 5	5 8	0 16	0 0	72 16	1 0	0 0	0 0
Total	**52**	**472**	**43**	**1**	**1294**	**4**	**18**	**13**	**16**	**0**	**88**	**1**	**0**	**0**
User posting 1) September 2) October	13 11	32 20	0 6	0 4	28 32	3 0	3 5	2 3	5 2	3 4	0 0	0 4	1 0	1 0
Total	**24**	**52**	**6**	**4**	**60**	**3**	**8**	**5**	**7**	**7**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**

Table 9: Category of Library Facebook Page

Classification Nomenclature	No. of Library	Library	Application Index
Skaters (More than 80-100)	3	UM	86
		IIUM	86
		OUM	89
Striders (More than 70- 79)	1	UNITEN	72
Sprinters (More than 60- 69)	1	UPM	69
Sliders (More than 50- 59)	5	USM	51
		UTM	55
		UMP	58
		UniKL	58
		UTP	58
Strollers (More than 40- 49)	2	MMU	48
		UUM	48
Shufflers (More than 30- 39)	1	UMT	34
Starters (More than 20- 29)	1	UMK	20
Sleepers (20 and below)	0	-	-

Table 10: Type of Status in Library Facebook Page (within September & October 2010)

Library posting	UM	IIUM	USM	UTM	OUM	MMU	UPM	UUM	UNITEN	UMT	UMP	UniKL	UTP	UMK	Total
Any kind of greeting (1)	5	19	4	0	66	1	3	0	2	0	5	0	1	0	106
Information on library news (2)	6	21	0	2	30	2	4	1	0	0	4	1	1	0	72
Information on library resources (3)	5	2	0	2	26	1	1	1	5	0	3	1	4	0	50
Information on web resources (4)	25	5	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Library solicit feedback (5)	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Information on community (6)	2	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	12
User posting Any kind of greeting (1)	1	15	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	34
Enquiry on library services (2)	18	22	4	1	14	3	3	5	2	1	0	0	0	1	74
Suggestion/Comment to library (3)	0	7	0	2	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	16
Miscellaneous (4)	5	8	2	1	30	0	2	0	4	3	0	2	1	0	59

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

There are 3 academic libraries (Library UM, IIUM, OUM) which has been categorized as "Skaters" in the 8-S Framework of Category Development for Facebook user. This is the highest category which defined "Skaters" as "in a strong position for taking advantage of Facebook opportunities". These three libraries are from different type (status) of university: UM Library (Research university), IIUM Library (International university) and OUM Library (Distance Learning university). Uses of library Facebook page among Malaysian academic libraries are relatively new. Many are just started developing their Facebook page last year and in the learning process of using the page as effective as it should be. Most of Malaysian academic libraries use Facebook page as a marketing tool. The marketing activities are such as informing library users of their services, outreach to students as well as creating awareness on library services. Users see library Facebook page as a platform for them to communicate with library at anytime and anywhere. However library Facebook page should be consistently updating and more "human" to attract users' involvement and participation.

The concept of "viral marketing" in Facebook page allow marketing of library services is done quickly and spread rapidly(Ganster & Schumacher, 2009). However it is important that campus community and parent's organization are aware with the presence of library Facebook page in this new

space. The advertisement of library Facebook page could be done on the official library website, on bulletin boards around campus, in the student newspaper, during library orientation sessions or bibliographic instruction classes or within the physical library itself(Dickson & Holley, 2010).

Many academic libraries has created library Facebook page to be "within the realm" of students and "to be where the users are". However these library Facebook page seem unappreciated by users in their campus considering the low numbers of "people like this". David Lee King (2010) in his blog " Social Web, Emerging Trends and Libraries" suggested academic libraries to "humanizing their Facebook Pages". Humanizing Facebook pages are such as posting regular status updates; interacting with visitors in the comments of status updates; announcement of event in the library; regularly adding new photos and videos and use "Events" feature to list events in the campus. He explains further, ""This is easily fixable if you do one simple thing. Post an update every day, and make it interesting". Based on the finding of this study, it is true that libraries that posted status daily is having more "people like this" compare to libraries that updated the status only once a month. The same thing was remind by Burkhardt (2010) that libraries need to make the posting as "social" and "human". The term "social" means responding to people when they commenting on Facebook wall and the term "human" involves human and a personal touch.

Facebook page provide opportunities for libraries in communicating better with their users. It is a platform of interaction and a source of receiving feedback from users on library services. Libraries can gain insights into what their user want and need. Ultimately they can understand their users better. The function on the "Wall" such as "Post","Like" and "Comment" make it easy for users to give their feedback. If the users like something on the library posting but they do not want to put any comment, they can just simply click the button "Like". Doing this is a way to say that "I like the things that the library do". In this sense, Facebook offer users with a forum for self-expression, conversation and information sharing. It is also important that the library Facebook page and the library webpage are linked together. This link will automatically indicate that the Facebook page is officially created by the library. It is a fact that anyone with a valid e-mail address can easily create a Facebook page. There is a case where an unknown person creates a Facebook page for IIUM Library. This has forced the library's Facebook page to be named "The Official IIUM Library" instead of "IIUM Library" because the latter name was used by that unknown person. For sure his version of Facebook page was not endorsed by the library.

There are several library-related applications for searching information that has been developed since Facebook open third party applications in their platform. These third party applications are such as JSTOR for searching articles in database, WorldCat for searching books in libraries and LibGuides for subject guides. However none of Malaysian academic libraries are using any of these applications. The feature "ask-a- librarian" is also not available in any library Facebook page. This significantly indicates that Malaysian academic libraries do not offer their Facebook page as a reference tool to their users.

Academic libraries that are using Facebook page must address the consistency and timeliness of the service. Users will expect timely responses to any enquiries sent through Facebook page. They are unlikely to return to Facebook page for library assistance if librarians do not respond quickly to the enquiries. This also potentially risks the possibility that the student will not use other library services (Dickson & Holley, 2010).

This research provides new instrument to determine the level of Facebook page usage among academic libraries. A checklist which listed 30 items has been used to identify usage of library Facebook page. Besides that, the status in the "wall", either posted by library Facebook page administrator or posted by users were also identified. It is important for the academic libraries to realize the current trend of their users' communication through Facebook. Academic libraries should exploit Facebook that embrace a more dynamic view of users' involvement and capitalized it. As Breeding (2010) advises that social networking is a "fundamental characteristics of successful technology…..libraries need to move beyond ad hoc and informal uses of social technologies and make them an essential element of the way that libraries implement technology."

REFERENCES

ACRL Research Planning and Review Committee. (2010). 2010 top ten trends in academic libraries: A
    review of the current literature. *College & Research Libraries News, 71,* 286-292
Alexa.com. (2010). Top sites in Malaysia.   Retrieved 1st May 2010, from
    http://www.alexa.com/topsites/countries/MY

Aziz, N. A., Boon, C. Y., & Loh, H. (2010). *Sowing the seeds: towards reaping a harvest using social web applications in Nanyang Technological University Library*. Paper presented at the World Library and Information Congress: 76th IFLA General Conference and Assembly.

Breeding, M. (2007). Librarians Face Online Social Networks. *Computers in Libraries, 27*(8), 30-32.

Breeding, M. (2010). Taking the Social Web to the next level. *Computers in Libraries, 30*(7), 28-30.

Burkhardt, A. (2010). Social media: A guide for college and university libraries. *College & Research Libraries News, 71*(1), 10.

Charnigo, L., & Barnett-Ellis, P. (2007). Checking out Facebook.com: The Impact of a digital trend on Academic Libraries. *Information Technology and Libraries, 26*(1), 23-34.

Dickson, A., & Holley, R. P. (2010). Social networking in academic libraries: the possibilities and the concerns. *New Library World, 111*(11/12), 468-479.

Facebook.com. (2010). Facebook factsheet.   Retrieved 19th April 2010, from http://www.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics#!/press/info.php?factsheet

Facebook.com. (2011). Like feature on Facebook.   Retrieved 18 January, 2011, from www.facebook.com

Farkas, M. (2007). Going where patrons are: Outreach in MySpace and Facebook. *American Libraries, 38*(4), 27.

Ganster, L., & Schumacher, B. (2009). Expanding beyond our library walls: Building an active online community through Facebook. *Journal of Web Librarianship, 3*(2), 111-128.

Graham, J. M., Faix, A., & Hartman, L. (2009). Crashing the Facebook party: One library's experiences in the students' domain. *Library Review, 58*(3), 228 - 236.

Grossman, L. (2010). Person of the year 2010: Mark Zuckerberg.   Retrieved 23 January, 2011, from http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,2036683_2037183_2037185,00.html

Harinarayana, N., & Raju, N. (2010). Web 2.0 features in university library web sites. *Electronic Library, The, 28*(1), 69-88.

Hendrix, D., Chiarella, D., Hasman, L., Murphy, S., & Zafron, M. (2009). Use of Facebook in academic health sciences libraries. *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA, 97*(1), 44.

King, D. L. (2010, 4th April). Humanizing your Facebook pages. http://www.davidleeking.com/2010/02/09/humanizing-your-facebook-pages/

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Landis, C. (2007). Friending our users: Social Networking and reference services. In S. Steiner & L. Madden (Eds.), *The desk and beyond: Next Generation reference services*. Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Mack, D., Behler, A., Roberts, B., & Rimland, E. (2007). Reaching students with Facebook: data and best practices. *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship, 8*(2).

Nguyen, C. L. (2008). A survey of the application of Web 2.0 in Australasian university libraries. *Library Hi Tech, 26*(4), 630-653.

Ramachandran Ramasamy. (2010). Benchmarking Malaysia in the Global Information Society: Regressing or progressing. *Journal of CENTRUM Cathedra, 3*(1), 67.

Russell, E. (2007). *The Use of Facebook functions and the effect it has on other methods of communication*: University of Sheffield, Department of Information Studies.

Secker, J. (2008). Case study 5: Libraries and facebook. *Libraries and Social Software in Education. Available at: http://clt. lse. ac. uk/Projects/Case_Study_Five_report. pdf*.

Socialbakers.com. (2011a). Facebook reaches 600 million users.   Retrieved 15 January, 2011, from http://www.socialbakers.com/blog/100-facebook-reaches-another-milestone-600-million-users/

Socialbakers.com. (2011b). Malaysia Facebook statistics.   Retrieved 21 january, 2011, from http://www.socialbakers.com/facebook-statistics/malaysia

Sodt, J., & Summey, T. (2009). Beyond the Library's Walls: Using Library 2.0 Tools to Reach Out to All Users. *Journal of Library Administration, 49*(1), 97-109.

Sokoloff, J. (2009). International Libraries on Facebook. *Journal of Web Librarianship, 3*(1), 75-80.

Spomer, M. Y. (2008). The Fine art of throwing sheep: How Facebook can contribute to librarianship and community at theological institutions. *Theological Librarianship, 1*(1).

Tripathi, M., & Kumar, S. (2010). Use of Web 2.0 tools in academic libraries: A reconnaissance of the international landscape. *The International Information & Library Review, 42*, 195-207.

Whitnah, T. (2010). I like your comment.   Retrieved 6 January 2011, from http://blog.facebook.com/blog.php?post=399440987130