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Abstract

The creativity, collaboration, and advanced communication afforded by the use of social media also opens privacy and safety concerns for potential users inside and outside the realm of higher education. As the promise of the positives afforded by weaving social media into the fabric of higher education has been realized, so too have concerns over how this “social network” is governed and managed at colleges and universities. News stories, predominately negative in nature, have highlighted the unprofessional conduct of college and university employees and the issues surrounding the implementation of social media policies at institutions of higher education. Consequently, the approach to studying social media (SM) and social media policy (SMP) is not refined to the point where data can be leveraged to inform clear and well supported decision making.

This quantitative study explored the gaps in the literature on SM and SMP in higher education as it relates to the experiences of faculty, administration, and staff. By investigating the degree to which faculty, administration, and staff use SM, the existence and details of SMPs, and perceptions related to SMPs, data supported approaches could offer further insight into how guidelines could be customized to suit specific user needs. The study employed a comparative analysis approach through distribution of an electronic survey to a target population consisting of faculty, administration, and staff members across 48 degree granting institutions in the state of New Jersey. Questions guiding the research were: 1) What are the behaviors, experiences, and perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff in regard to social media’s usage and social media policy at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey? Do similarities and/or differences exist between faculty, administration, and staff who use/do not use SM and whose
home institution has/does not have a SMP in place?, 2) How do the personal and professional behaviors of faculty, administration, and staff differ, if at all, on social media at institutions of higher education in the State of New Jersey?, and 3) How, if at all, do SM and SMP behaviors and perceptions differ by gender, age, institutional type and program/department at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey?

Key findings that could have significant implications in higher education were 1) the frequency of SM usage 2) lack of SMP “buy in” and 3) SM boundaries and SMP “constraint”. Social media usage across institutional roles and age groups in higher education settings in the study’s response sample was shown to be on an upward trajectory; while the same respondents indicated more often than not they were not sure if a SMP existed at their institution. If a policy was perceived to exist, participants noted it may not clearly define how personal and professional SM behaviors differ or provide the necessary amount of outreach and support to this diverse group of stakeholders at various levels of the SMP making process.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Methods and means of communication in the 21st century are boundless, creating opportunities for individuals to instantaneously communicate on a global scale. As this communication network has grown exponentially, so have the concerns over how this network is governed and managed. Specifically, social networking applications such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and LinkedIn have increased the complexity of individuals’ behavior in the private, public, and professional spheres. Time of day, location, and Internet access are no longer obstacles that individuals face in order to communicate instantly with a narrow or broad audience (Orange, 2011). In fact, increasing access to social media (SM) with the advent of the smartphone has only accelerated its growth across broader demographics.

As SM’s popularity has grown exponentially, so have efforts to quantify its popularity among various groups. As many as 59% of adult Internet users reported using at least one social networking site on a consistent basis, which according to a 2011 study conducted by the Pew Research Institute (Hampton, Goulet, Rainie, & Purcell, 2011) was a 25% jump among adult Internet users from a similar study in 2008. Specific data on individual SM sites (e.g., Facebook or Twitter) indicated that 52% of Facebook users and 33% of Twitter users engaged in the platform on a daily basis with multiple visits per day. In lockstep with the surge in popularity is a surge in controversy regarding what defines “acceptable” personal or professional SM behaviors. SM indiscretions share a common narrative, whether nursing residents blogging about private experiences with patients (Jaschik, 2013), leading to expulsion; former professional athletes such as Curt Schilling, who exposed sexually explicit tweets directed toward his
daughter and demanded repercussions from the justice system and the perpetrator’s educational institution (Murphy, 2015), or a University of Oklahoma fraternity being exposed via SM for shouting racial epithets in a public setting (McCoy, 2015). That is, what steps can be taken to evaluate and judge SM behaviors and, if necessary, to remediate poor choices in an equitable fashion?

Just as the telephone granted mobility of communication to 20th-century users, SM is once again changing the scope and reach of new social networks (Asunda, 2010). This change is embedded in the jump from Web 1.0, or static data being transferred to a user in the form of text or images, to Web 2.0, which urges users to interact and even contribute to the content (O’Reilly, 2005). In light of the data above, SM is impressive in scope and boundless in possibility; it can no longer be viewed as a fad. Therefore, the contemporary interest to stakeholders in higher education is leveraging the advantages of social media and managing consequences (Auer, 2011). However, managing the potential negative outcomes is seen as the more pressing issue; a delicate balance must be struck between guidance and governance.

**Statement of the Problem**

Opportunities for leveraging the advantages of SM are seemingly always matched with the acknowledgment that there exists the potential for negative outcomes. The creativity, collaboration, and advanced communication afforded by the use of Facebook and Twitter also open privacy and safety concerns for potential users inside and outside the realm of higher education. In reference to the dismissal of the University of Oklahoma students, the comments made, no matter how racially driven, could be protected by the First Amendment (McCoy, 2015) because the university is a public institution. Similar court cases involving students and
threatening remarks on Facebook (Keefe v. Central Lakes College, 2014) and sexist remarks in
the pre-professional setting (Yoder v. University of Louisville, 2013) exemplify the repercussions
of expanding policies on personal conduct of students into the realm of SM. Given the fluidity
of the SM landscape and the growth of smartphone applications, some institutions have honed
student-centered SM policies that educate (Straumsheim, 2015) rather than govern.

Beyond the student perspective, the universal nature by which SM has become
intertwined with professional advancement, pedagogy, and community outreach at colleges and
universities is both impressive and imposing for another group of stakeholders, faculty members.
This population is experiencing the same boom in SM participation in the personal and
professional spheres. For instance, among a sample of 1,920 faculty members from various
institutional types, more than 75% indicated they had visited a SM site within the past month for
personal use and 90% indicated they used SM in some form for courses they taught or for career
advancement (Moran, Seaman, & Tinti-Kane, 2011). Possibility is also met with uncertainty on
many levels; faculty members feel less in control regarding the commentary and resources
placed on SM outlets. Perceived control and level responsibility can drive a faculty member’s
decision to use SM in a personal or professional context (Aijan & Hartshorne, 2008). The
polarized experiences of faculty members with SM point to a distinct tension that exists between
the advantages maintaining personal accessibility while simultaneously projecting a professional
presence (Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013).

Therefore, the process of adopting, implementing, and eventually measuring the results of
social media policies (SMPs) that govern the use of SM at colleges and universities is
paramount. If the approach to SM and SMP research is not refined, two intervening factors will
continue to slow progress in this field. First, the discourse of SM research more broadly tends to have a limited focus on several fronts. A focus on SM’s perceived impacts on pedagogy, the K–12 sphere, the faculty-to-student SM dynamic, and pre-professional programs in higher education persist in much of the literature. Secondly, as SMPs have become more restrictive to students, research has predominately focused on their experience; therefore, advancement of research into SMP implications for other college and university stakeholders, such as administration, faculty, and staff, is somewhat limited. SMP research must begin to take into account the behaviors and views of these stakeholders that fall into rising age demographics among SM users (Hampton et al., 2011; Moran et al., 2011) in order to properly inform the processes associated with adopting, implementing, and measuring efficacy of SM guidelines in the future (Owen & Moyle, 2008).

**Purpose of the Review**

SM networks such as Facebook and Twitter are leading a new wave of communication tools in the 21st century, with their popularity only growing as mobile technologies become more accessible (Scrogan, 2011). Literature continues to support the notion that SM is transforming society; therefore it is safe to draw a parallel to propose that the same effect is taking place in higher education. Administrators, faculty members, staff support, and students are leading the charge in how to coalesce personal and professional SM activity, whether the outcomes are perceived as positive or negative. SMP research is therefore relevant to the current higher education narrative, and its timely nature is a prudent contemporary response.

Building on the problem identified here, the gap in the current literature may not necessarily be in the preponderance of SM or specifically SMP research but on the focus of the
research. Given that SMPs and their inherent regulation of Facebook and Twitter behavior(s) are beginning to impact higher education faculty and administration (Rodgers, 2012), the problematic nature of not having reliable evidence to support their role in the SMP process is evident and deserves further exploration. Two countering principles are therefore identified by the SMP research to date: the growth of SM and subsequent policies that govern their use (Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills, 2010) versus the lack of applicable research and input from multiple stakeholders (e.g., administration, faculty, staff) from the policy adoption to impact phase.

**Research Questions**

In this study, I explored the gap in research related to the experiences of administration, faculty, and staff relative to the more student-centered SM research and resulting policy discourse. The research problem outlined and the ensuing review were framed by the following primary research questions:

1. What are the behaviors, experiences, and perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff in regard to social media usage and social media policy at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey? Do similarities and/or differences exist between faculty, administration, and staff who use or don’t use social media and whose home institution has/does not have a social media policy in place?

2. How do the personal and professional behaviors of faculty, administration, and staff differ, if at all, on social media at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey?
3. What impact, if any, do characteristics such as gender, age, institutional type, and program/department have on social media and social media policy behaviors and perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey?

Proper exploration of these questions provides a basis for understanding the current state of SM/SMRs in higher education, as well as for mining deeper issues related to current research gaps. New markets for advertising and applications for smartphones facilitate the growth of SM and are being introduced seemingly on a daily basis. Therefore, the research challenge is keeping pace with a growing industry to meet the needs of stakeholders in higher education. Overarching principles outlined by these research questions will serve to elevate the potential implications for future SMP research later in the review.
Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Outlining the Literature Review

As institutions of higher education, and subsequently stakeholders, become more immersed in a variety of social networking platforms, the manner in which SM as an element of college and university life is reviewed through the creation and adoption of SMPs must be carefully crafted and tested. Thus, this literature review properly defines SM in the context of higher education. Secondly, due to the relatively recent phenomenon of the SM landscape in higher education, a substantial review of current issues and SMP practices is necessary.

In practice, the literature review was conducted primarily through the use of Boolean phrase searches on library and journal databases. Literature stretching back to 2005 was reviewed with the goal of providing context to the evolution of SM within the higher education landscape. As is the case even today, the growth of SM outpaced empirical research particularly in regard to its application at colleges and universities. However, Facebook exploded from a small network of colleges with permission-based access to an institution with students, and subsequently other stakeholders, from 2005 to 2006. Therefore, although 2005 marks the beginning of Facebook’s popularity, the amount of literature specifically focusing on its place in higher education emerges further down the line and is more pertinent to the direction of this study. Literature published through 2015 was reviewed in order to maintain as contemporary a lens as possible. In this same fashion, primary resources such as SMPs were acquired through searches on Google Scholar and selected based on characteristics relevant to the current research. They were also reviewed for revisions made to policies through March 2015. Literature emerged
after a specific focus on SM and SMPs was combined with phrases such as “effects,” “stakeholders,” and “issues.” Devoid of the proper context and control for applicable time intervals, the review of current empirical studies would not serve to highlight the gaps in the research.

Lastly, a tiered approach was used in order to properly review the current landscape of SM and SMP research to draw a clear line of sight between contemporary research gaps. First, examples of SM research primarily in the context of higher education are presented in order to outline common themes and trends that drive the direction of SMP research. The second part of the literature review was guided by an analytical framework that focused on one concept (policy analysis) and related guiding theories to organize the literature review in a manner that highlights the current issues empirical research has yet to examine. The framework supports the SMP literature review functions and encourages those responsible for devising SM governance to stay informed on the factors that influence SMP success or failure in the short- and long-term.

**Defining Social Media**

For the purposes of this literature review, “social media” and “social networking” refer to platforms that facilitate online communication and leverage a profile or update format to allow users to publish information and digital media (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). SM websites, also referred to as social networking websites, are based on the fundamental principal of creating an individual electronic profile that specifically represents an individual or a group within a broader network of individuals or groups (Ellison, 2007). SM platforms specifically under review include, but are not limited to, Facebook, YouTube, LinkedIn, Instagram, and Twitter (Phillips, 2007). Although more anecdotal contemporary research exists on emerging SM platforms such
as SnapChat, YikYak, and Whisper, it may take more time to build an empirical research base viable enough to warrant them being the primary focus of a review. Furthermore, the following additional definitions are necessary to fully comprehend the literature review:

- **Social Media Policy (SMP):** A document that sets standards or guidelines at varying degrees for the proper use of and behavior on social networking websites. The focus and goals of such policies varies if and when they are adopted (International Society for Technology Education, 2009).

- **Web 2.0:** Compared to Web 1.0, where users are *consuming* content, Web 2.0 users *contribute* to content and use websites as means to communicate ideas, feelings, and information (O’Reilly, 2005).

- **Facebook:** A Web 2.0 platform where the participant has an interface that allows for message transmission, acquisition of “friends,” and customized profiles for users that update those within the network about interests, occupations, trends, and at times location (Moore, 2011).

- **LinkedIn:** Similar to Facebook in the transmission of messages and acquisition of friends but manages contacts in a more “professional network” oriented manner with an eye on future occupations and resume exposure (Moore, 2011).

- **Twitter:** Differs from the more traditional Web 2.0 platforms in that communication is delivered in short, 140-character chunks and may be supplemented with links or images (Byrd, 2010).

- **Instagram:** Built on the same principles, with images being the predominant focus of user posts.
YouTube: YouTube is a video-sharing site that allows users to create profile channels, rate and comment, and store/edit content (Byrd, 2010).

It is important to note that the modern SM websites evolved from a simple campus resource to a more intuitive and easy-to-use platform that allowed users to upload photos, music, video, and even their current location (Hirschen, 2007). According to statistics developed by Barnes and Lescault (2011), Facebook was the preeminent form of SM and was used in 98% of college and universities by students or administration. An increasing number of postsecondary institutions had also adopted Twitter, a similar SM outlet, with an 87% participation rate in 2009–2010 (Barnes & Lescault, 2011). Referencing more overarching studies adds a foundation from which more focused studies on SM in higher education may build. However, studies that implement a focus on a highly specific population are not as useful in a broader context and may stall the overall progress of research in this field. This research is necessary given the current SM climate in higher education.

Current Policy Issues and Climate

Lenhart, Purcell, Smith, and Zickuhr (2010) conducted a quantitative research study aimed at gathering information on young adult SM users as compared to their middle-aged adult counterparts. Their findings indicated that 72% of 18–29-year-olds used social networking websites frequently, whereas 47% of online adults actively used social networking websites on a personal or professional level. Drawing a trend line across the two studies from 2008 and 2011, Hampton et al. (2011) found that the average age of the adult SM user jumped from 33 to 38. Similar conclusions in regard to “typical” SM user age were made by Moran et al. (2011), who noted that level of SM awareness does not vary with age, only the level of participation. The
studies conducted by Hampton et al. (2011) and Moran et al. (2011) are intriguing due to their research being in the extreme minority of SM-centered research that used the same methodology more than once over time. Larger-scale studies that provide multiple data points give more of an environmental context that is useful to a wider array of stakeholders.

More to this point but on a smaller scale, a study conducted by Inside Higher Ed addressing college and university human resource officers indicated that 38% of the professionals agreed or strongly agreed that colleges should have explicit policies that limit faculty members’ speech on SM related to the workplace, and 37% agreed that the same measures should be applied to staff members as well (Lederman, 2014). As the contextual data and ensuing literature review indicate, the bevy of issues surrounding SM in higher education has solidified its place as a polarizing topic.

Consequently, the tide of SMPs and the ensuing debates among policy makers and institutional employees is beginning to reach a tipping point. In the winter of 2014, the University of Kansas Board of Regents, in an effort to encourage responsible use of SM (Nel, 2013), approved a policy that would permit the termination of university employees if they, “communicated through social media in a way that adversely [sic] affects the schools” (Rothschild as cited in Nel, 2013). Policy not only governs specifically who uses SM in this case but how it is used. These measures were taken in response to an associate professor who reacted negatively on Twitter in response to the Washington Naval Yard shootings in September 2013 (Schmidt, 2013). In preemptive fashion, an offer of employment was revoked to a prospective professor at the University of Illinois Urbana–Champaign (Cohen, 2014) in the American Indian studies program. This was following SM posts related to the war in Gaza, in which Steven Salaita
remarked, “You may be too refined to say it, but I’m not: I wish all the (expletive) West Bank settlers would go missing” (Cohen, 2014). East Stroudsburg University’s dismissal of a sociology professor for commenting on her Facebook page that she “had a good day today, didn’t want to kill even one student” (Miller, 2010) underscores the notion established earlier that in small or large cases freedom of speech considerations may be distorted (Parkinson & Turner, 2014) in order to preserve order and function in the day-to-day operations of a college or university.

Maintaining the efficient functionality of the college or university has held precedent over more individual concerns at times in the age of SM. Sam Houston State has attempted to require faculty members and staff to grant administrative access to their SM websites for monitoring purposes (Martin & Samels, 2012), presumably to maintain the institution’s image and professional behavior. However, what happens in the event that SM is used to expand the reach of institution and/or responsibilities are given to individual administrators to maintain these platforms? In the case of Northern Illinois University, the number of “unregistered” Northern Illinois University Facebook and Twitter pages was in the 70% range (Howard, 2013). East Carolina University has shared a similar form of SM anxiety, altering “official” SM outlet logos (Straumsheim, 2015) frequently to maintain brand integrity and combat the “unregistered” SM trend. The idea that SM accounts can have all the attributes of an official institutional entity but hold unofficial or “unregistered” status is certainly unnerving. Therefore, ambiguity, fear, and reactionary governance have all led institutional decision makers to (in the minds of some) overestimate the necessary boundaries of SMPs currently on the table.
This constant evolution in the guidance/governance of SM in higher education is illuminated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) April 2013 update of their Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications document. The addendum and expanded text includes “Article C. Scholarly Communication and Social Media” (Reichman et al., 2013). This AAUP 2013 addendum allocates a significant amount of text to scholarly communication (i.e. conferences, classrooms, inter-institution), but later adds in explicit terms, “The AAUP has upheld the right of faculty members to speak freely about internal college or university affairs as a fundamental principle of academic freedom that applies as much to electronic communication as it does to written and oral ones” (Reichman et al., 2013, p. 7).

Finally, and most important to understanding the idiosyncrasies of the current climate of SM in higher education, is the AAUP’s stance on SMPs. The document goes on to state that any type of policy or restriction imposed on faculty access and use of SM or electronic communication must clearly identify infractions that are deemed unacceptable and provide feasible ways for faculty to undergo review if suspension/termination is necessary (Reichman et al., 2013). The AAUP makes its abundantly clear that college administrators, faculty members, and policy makers must work in concert to develop fair and acceptable policies that govern the use of SM (Schmidt, 2014). However, without proper context to understand the scope of SMPs in the nonacademic sector and within higher education, the current issues outlined do not resonate, and further underscore the necessity of future study.

**Social Media Policies in Practice**

Within the higher education sphere, the myriad of stakeholders involved use SM for personal and professional means of communication aimed at several end goals. The fact that the
higher education sector has so many contributing stakeholders presents a unique set of issues to contend with when it comes to managing SM on a policy level. As such, policy generally follows growing trends across many sectors in order to proactively manage the behavior of individuals. The rising tide of SM’s prevalence at institutions of higher education and abroad raises key issues related to the need for SMPs, their eventual implementation, and concerns over their infringement on individual freedom of expression. Before the current empirical literature related to SMPs in higher education is reviewed, it is critical to understand the contemporary context of SMPs both outside and within institutions of higher education.

**SMPs Outside of Higher Education**

Processes that dictate the adoption of policy have in the past required the higher education sector to look toward more interdisciplinary examples to guide and inform the construction of SMPs. Within the past 5 years, the framework constructed for managing social networking activity is noted across many sectors including health and medical professions (Lannin & Scott, 2013; McBride, 2012), professional sports organizations (Sellitto, 2014), military branches (United States Air Force, 2008), philanthropic organizations (American Red Cross, 2009), Corporate America (Cisco Systems, 2008; Coca-Cola, 2009; Microsoft Corporation, 2011), and state departments of corrections (Chang, 2012). These SMPs certainly provided a blueprint for the higher education sector with evidence that points to growing concerns over protecting the name and image associated with a specific product, organization, or franchise. Additionally, within organizations such as the American Red Cross (2009) or United States Air Force (2008), policies are also created to ensure the physical safety of individuals deployed at domestic or international installations.
SMP themes in higher education today, such as brand and image protection, are also noted in the “five core values” model adopted in Coca-Cola’s (2009) policy, along with guidelines for personal and professional behavior on SM (Microsoft Corporation, 2011). Central policy tenants of identifying stakeholder needs, maintenance of image, protection of confidential information, and personal guidelines have been adapted to some degree to SMPs in higher education. The extent to which these principles may apply to all stakeholders is explored later in the review.

**SMPs in Higher Education**

Guidance in the proper and acceptable use of SM at institutions of higher education has become more frequent in regard to policy adoption/implementation over the course of the last half decade. A variety of postsecondary institutions have adopted and implemented SMPs that regulate the use of the medium by students, faculty members, and administrators. Implementation of SMPs is fueled by three primary motivations, which include but are not limited to (a) maintenance of college/university image, (b) protection of confidential information, and (c) preservation of personal and professional image for stakeholders. Although the first two subcategories draw on the example set in the adoption process by the corporate sector, the latter emphasizes the prevalence of SM as a primary means of communication among students who are being prepared for entry into the workforce. The complexity in the purpose of college and university SMP creates interesting avenues for further exploration of the future efficacy for all stakeholders.

**Maintenance of image.** SMPs can contribute to the protection of institutional intellectual property and maintenance of school image. Ball State University (2009), Loyola
University of Chicago (2010), and Princeton University (2011) implemented SMPs that provide students, faculty, and administrators with guidelines for promoting and protecting institutional reputation. Maintaining compliance to copyright, Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) regulations, as well as university images and logos, is paramount for successful SM endeavors. Additionally, these policies aimed at maintenance of institutional image also account for protocols for sharing information with the broader community, forbidding dissemination of personal beliefs (Loyola, 2010). Princeton University (2011) even noted the duality of SM personas as they relate to proper representation and maintenance of SM accounts. Oregon State University (2011) went a step further to inform students, faculty, and administrators of how deleting comments made by alumni, fans, and friends by anybody in the campus community inhibits freedom of speech. The policy notes that even if individuals are doing so to monitor behavior on personal or professional accounts, this same guideline applies.

Protection of confidential information. Furthermore, colleges and universities have also gone to certain lengths to implement SMPs that include regulation related to the protection of personal information and private business conducted by the institution. The importance of privacy and confidentiality of institutional information is echoed by the SMPs implemented by Harvard University (2012), University of Kansas Medical Center (2013), and University of Texas (2014). All of the policies indicated share a common thread of keeping proprietary information regarding university students, faculty, alumni and other employees private. Specific user confidentiality applies in the case of the University of Kansas Medical Center to ensure restrictions on the personal information of working staff, as well as the confidentiality of
information related to patient records, video/pictures of procedures, and secured locations such as childcare and mental health facilities. In the case of SMP implemented at the University of Texas (2014), as the responsibility of the individual on a professional level increases so do the boundaries of the policy being implemented. The policies implemented by all of these institutions protect the sensitivity of university business through a bound professional agreement built on responsibility and loyalty to the institution above individual views.

Preservation of personal and professional image. Moreover, postsecondary institutions are beginning to understand the momentum of SM and the necessity for policy to guide the acceptable use of these resources by individuals on personal accounts as well. Colleges and universities are beginning to recognize the need not only to monitor the personal accounts of stakeholders but also to educate them on their proper use and the implications their actions have for the future. There are certain instances where the preservation of the image of the university and the preservation of the personal and professional image of students may come to a nexus. Such a case involves the SM behavior of student athletes at colleges and universities. Florida State University (2009), University of Southern California (2010), and Michigan State University (2013), for instance, implemented a policy that identifies student athletes as university ambassadors; as such, they are constantly held to a higher standard due to their public exposure. As a result, the university and athletic department prohibit the inclusion of inappropriate pictures, videos, commentary, or display of illegal activity on SM websites. The focus on the short-term implications (university image) is supplemented by outlining the effects of future goals and aspirations (personal/professional image).
Similarly, University of Massachusetts–Boston (2010), Vanderbilt University (2010), and University of California–Berkeley (2013) included specific “personal site guidelines” in an effort to educate students, administration, faculty, and staff on the proper steps toward protecting identity, being ethical/civil, and acknowledging the permanence and liable nature of anything malicious that is posted on SM websites. The propriety of personal image is highlighted by the University of Minnesota (2014) SMP as a short-term and long-term tool for success, encouraging students to think before participating in SM. Montclair State University (2014) utilizes an SMP that takes a considerable step toward governance seeking to blend the desire to inform and educate with procedural guidelines in the event policy is violated. More specifically, a clear definition of all relevant social networking websites is included, as well as clear distinction between the professional and personal purview of the guidelines. The outline of policies and procedures of colleges and universities around the country provides contextual evidence that although many institutions wish to guide participation on SM networks such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, few have attempted to govern it in the manner in which the University of Kansas has.

Major educational institutions in the United States are faced with decisions for their future on the state and national level every day. The challenge is collecting and reviewing actionable data to inform decision-making processes, as well as to review choices already made in the past regarding policy. Taking logistics further, the development of SM (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and the like) calls for measured steps to build a knowledge base in regard to the narrative of SM in higher education today.
Literature Review

The development and subsequent execution of SMPs varies on an institutional level. However, SM governance has been guided by the principle that postsecondary institutions wish to avoid controversy at all costs in favor of rational and seemingly effective regulation (Junco, 2011). Identifying themes across SMP research in higher education and supplementing this with an analysis of specific literature regarding creation, implementation, and effects of SMPs in higher education environments may help to turn the tide in regard to the trend above. Consequently, I subscribe to this proposed plan of action to review the literature that supports the demand for actionable data derived from all SMP stakeholders. Therefore, the purpose of this review was threefold: (a) to identify trends and gaps in higher education SM research, (b) to examine how these trends are reflected in several stages of the SMP-making process, and (c) summarize how SMP can advance with focus and methodology.

To provide an orientation to SM research and its context within higher education, the first part of the literature review consisted of a general overview. This overview highlighted some trends in the current research that contribute to more detailed research concerning policy. It should be noted once again that SMP research in higher education is in much more of an adolescent stage, whereas SM research more generally has gained significant attention over the last decade as its uses as a communicative and instructional tool have become widely considered.

Several trends emerged that defined the gaps in the current research base overall. The context established by the first step of the review can be applied to the second step, which had more of an eye toward literature specifically dedicated to SMP research in higher education. With an eye toward developing a clear line of sight to properly inform SMP research, the
following trends were noted: (a) focus on SM and pre-professional programs, (b) focus on the faculty-to-student SM dynamic, (c) focus on SM and pedagogy, and (d) limited exploration of critical data. More than one of these designations may apply for an example of the current literature; however these represent the trends most closely associated with the research below.

Focus on Social Media and Pre-professional Programs

Pre-professional programs aid in the development of students at colleges and universities who wish to pursue a career in medicine, dentistry, psychological counseling, education, or business. Preparing future professionals to integrate SM skills practically in the workplace beyond college or university has become a concern (Bristol, 2014) while also ensuring students recognize the enhanced exposure of their chosen profession. Although the occupations differ significantly, a level of commonality exists between them, namely exposure. As Mullen, Griffith, Greene, and Lambie (2014) outlined, the more high-profile professions tended to invest more time into researching SM’s place in their preparatory programs at the postsecondary level. The majority of the in-depth studies, usually implementing qualitative methods (e.g., interviews) centered on preservice teachers’ experiences with SM transitioning to professional practice. Foss and Olson (2013) used the interviews of 14 individuals entering different levels of the pre-professional teaching certification process at a Midwestern public university in the United States. Aside from further underscoring the notion of future school teachers and administrators drawing more attention through Facebook and Twitter posts, the 12 interviews yielded themes of preservice teaching students’ wish to keep their SM connections and having misconceived notions of privacy while also wishing to maintain a professional image.
Dindar and Akbulut (2014) supported the focus on how preservice teachers use SM by developing an instrument that seeks to explain the differences in personality and behavior among Facebook users and nonusers while also investigating which preservice teachers would quit Facebook for awhile or quit Facebook forever. A dissertation by Gooch (2012) researched best practices for preservice and early-service teachers using SM, and Bradley (2011) used interviews to imply that the behaviors of preservice teachers in college or university programs differs little on SM, whether posting from home or at school.

Although there is a dearth of SM literature in higher education that focuses on the high-profile nature of future educators, other pre-professional programs share in this trend. Future student affairs professionals were the focus of a historical review of technology, SM, and the perceptions of their student affairs programs by Valliere (2014). Following a similar but more legal-angled analysis, Parkinson and Turner (2014) analyzed the behaviors and uses of SM within dental school programs by students and faculty alike and came to the conclusion that higher-profile programs would benefit from more scrupulous monitoring of behavior. Legal considerations also supported research in the pre-professional counseling research conducted by Mullen et al. (2014), more specifically examining procedures for positive interactions with potential clients on SM platforms.

Due to the future high profile of medical, educational, and counseling professions, it is practical to conduct SM research into the behaviors of students in these unique settings. As visibility increases so do the perceived consequences for any indiscretions, as the recent media coverage shows. However, the scope of SM research must increase to meet the demographics of all SM users in higher education. Certainly, students outside the identified professions use SM,
and although humanities may not be “high profile,” insight into their experiences may be helpful moving forward into SMP construction and research. Drilling down a bit further, one can ask what the faculty’s role is in the SM research landscape. Could SM be used as a tool for their own professional development advisement as Bassell (2010) noted, exploring the data associated with nursing faculty advisement, still with the pre-professional program focus? Or, is the research reserved just for the student perspective? Or are faculty members becoming participants in the social network?

**Focus on Faculty-to-Student Social Media Dynamic**

When college and university faculty members are the focus of SM research, the objectives of the research are practical. The movement toward integrated technological resources, not just SM, into classroom teaching practices has spurred the growth of research in this particular field. To this end, a dissertation review conducted by Piotrowski (2015) using the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database concluded that only about 12% of SM related dissertations are precisely focused on higher education settings. Although simplistic in methodology, the review concluded that these dissertations focused on the faculty–student relationship, pedagogy, and what type of SM was used by faculty. Amador and Amador (2014) once again used interviews in a small qualitative study following 6 students seeking to understand advising interactions with faculty members. Additionally, the interview questions were designed to capture information related to the specific behaviors of students and faculty members in the SM advising environment and draw conclusions about the potential for future growth. Although this is yet another example of a small qualitative study that is also student-centered in nature, the dynamics of the faculty–student SM relationship are explored. Void of
the administrative or staff presence in higher education, who also may have a hand in advising students, SM research of this nature seems to silo these individuals as primary SM users within the specific context of a single institution.

Gauging the level of SM usage among faculty members is key, but using one research lens to gather data could widen the research gaps that impede SMP makers. In a survey conducted by Kolowich (2010), 80% of professors used SM of the 939 faculty members in the sample. Out of those who did maintain a SM account, 60% actually kept more than one, and more importantly 30% used one of these accounts to communicate with students. Finally, 10% of the sample population actually used these same SM platforms as interactive tools for course related projects. Two interesting trends develop here and are supported by similar studies by Bryer and Chen (2010) and Aijan and Hartshorne (2008). All specifically focus on the student–faculty SM relationship and further detail that these types of communications maintain professional connections and enhance transmission of resources. Once again, the administration and staff are absent in even fairly in-depth studies by Kolowich (2010), and a significant portion of college and university stakeholders are excluded. Finally, whether the SM research specifically intends to or not, a pedagogical or teaching-centered focus tends to outweigh any of the potential behavioral or perception-based questions that may carry more weight in the SMP discussion.

Focus on Social Media and Pedagogy

Coincidentally, some of the most extensive SM studies in regard to the faculty in higher education consist of survey instruments that measure basic data related to personal and professional use. However, the crux of the research is directed at how SM is utilized, if at all, in
the classroom. Small studies, albeit still focused on the student perspective within a business
school, such as Evans (2013), have mixed the trends already identified of the pre-professional
focus and faculty-to-student dynamic with an eye toward applying SM for instructional benefits.
Moran et al. (2011) conducted a large study of faculty across all disciplines in higher education.
Faculty were randomly selected from a total pool of 942,677 teaching faculty in the United
States based on a representative number in each Carnegie Classification. Access to such a large
potential sample is driven by this study’s affiliation with Pearson Learning Solutions, which
must be considered when interpreting the research direction and purpose of the study.

To this point, within the summary of findings the authors noted that SM research is an
inspiring endeavor that uncovers the new opportunities SM presents to students and instructors in
higher education. The inclusion of positive and unidirectional language that indicates a focus on
how SM benefits higher education in many formats, adds a dimension of caution when
interpreting results. In the case of Moran et al. (2011), large-scale research may encounter biases
that exclude the ways SM may be used by faculty, administration, and staff in less productive
ways. Moreover, the core principles of Pearson (2015) tout the importance of preparing a 21st-
century citizen equipped with skills to communicate across the SM landscape and information
systems. Therefore, participating institutions may be using studies to adhere to core values
established by investors, not necessarily in the interest of improving SM policies and procedures.
Although the potential participant pool is facilitated by Pearson’s access to faculty directories, it
may be unidirectional and less focused on the potentially negative aspects of SM among
stakeholders.
A total of 1,920 faculty members provided enough responses to be included in the study out of 50,000 e-mail addresses to which survey invitations were sent, yielding a notably low response rate of 3.8%. Additionally, this sample represented online teaching faculty, fairly new and experienced individuals, and slightly over 50% were female. It should also be noted that a similar study was again conducted by Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2013) for Pearson using a similar methodology and yielding 7,969 faculty members out of a potential 100,000. This yielded another relatively low response rate of 7.9%, of which two-thirds indicated they were full-time faculty members, one quarter taught online, and slightly over 50% were female. The large jump in participants is worth noting; however the precise focus did not change over the course of 2 years. Perhaps of larger importance is the low response rate generated by the two similar studies over time. Of course, access to a large participant pool can mitigate the effects of a low response rate out of sheer volume of completed surveys. However, assessing the components of the survey instrument that may have contributed to low response rates would beneficial to future research while also noting more practical reasons indicated by Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2013) of opt-out lists, spam filtering, and incorrect e-mail addresses.

Although methodology and demographics are important to note later in this study, the pedagogical focus is undeniable. Survey items were directed at whether faculty members use SM in their teaching methods, what specific websites are used, and whether students are assigned to post, read, or review resources on these platforms. Across both studies, faculty who taught online were twice as likely to use SM in multiple ways than traditional brick-and-mortar faculty members (22% to 11%). Of faculty who incorporated SM in the classroom, 30%–35% (2011–2013) indicated the primary purpose was to assign readings/online video.
Smaller-scale studies with similar survey items (Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013) touch on personal SM usage and do so using interviews. The recirculated nature of pedagogically centered SM research restricts the potential for meaningful data on faculty, administration, and staff moving forward. Interesting data on faculty behaviors and perceived implications for SM in higher education are noted; they have yet to be explored in depth as the focal point of research meant to drive policy discussions. Similar occupation-focused data could be gathered on behalf of administration and staff at colleges and universities who comprise the other two-thirds of the human resources on campus. Pedagogical data are critical for informing proper utilization of SM in the classroom; however, the personal and professional behaviors and perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff are critical to building the complete picture.

**Personal vs. Professional Social Media Behavior**

SM in higher education can be categorized by the trends and gaps noted above, which are reflected in the current SMP research discussed later. However, critical data only briefly overviewed by a few studies are worth exploring a bit further in depth. For example, the Veletsianos and Kimmons (2013) qualitative study used semi structured interviews of only 3 faculty members at to compile data. One faculty member was an associate professor with more than 10 years of experience, one was a female assistant professor with less than 2 years of experience, and the last was a female assistant professor who just started at her school. All used SM in some capacity professionally, varying in desire to apply it to pedagogy. Most importantly, these individuals were also avid personal or professional SM account users. The trend identified that is ripe for further exploration is the tension between the personal and professional presence of each of these individuals. Each respondent indicated, in several instances, the necessity of
establishing personal and professional boundaries and reveals more of an experiential impact than pedagogical.

Larger-scale studies such as the Pearson-sponsored research conducted by Moran et al. (2011) admit within their limitations that personal SM use was used more as a predictor of potential use in the classroom than as a stand-alone measure. A data source so substantial and rich as this did not explore the potential overlap between personal and professional SM accounts detailed by faculty who used it frequently as part of instructional practice and communication. At the same time, the 2011 study noted that 70% of faculty had privacy concerns using SM and 80% believed that a lack of integrity on the part of students and faculty members were issues related to their use in the classroom.

Perhaps the closest any research has come to addressing all of the SM trends or gaps in higher education noted above is by Lenartz (2012). This exploratory study focused on faculty and administration within one community college system in the southwestern United States and utilized a two-phased approach with an electronic survey and focus groups to explore four emerging SM themes within higher education: (a) personal choice/usage, (b) barriers for SM usage, and (c) challenges. The fourth theme identified and explored toward the end of the study was the idea of blurred boundaries between personal and professional SM accounts among the faculty and administrative population within the sample. Although the aim was to cover both faculty and administration, of those who responded to the survey, 45.3% \((n = 310)\) were faculty and 2.0% \((n = 12)\) identified as administration (Lenartz, 2012).

Participation effects on response aside, the critical element of this study was an attempt to cross over from the faculty-to-student focus and pedagogical approach to focus on SM behaviors
Lenartz (2012) leveraged the use of focus groups to explore the personal vs. professional themes. Responses from an open-ended question on the electronic survey identified “personal vs. professional” as an issue of substantial concern, particularly when considering SM guideline implementation. The lack of boundaries or acceptable use procedures for either professional or personal accounts among the faculty population in this study opens the potential for indiscretions to occur among a number of institutional stakeholders. Beyond the limitations in this study, minimal attempts to propose research questions related to institutional and individual responsibility (Siemens & Weller, 2011) for personal and professional SM conduct (Eikenberry, 2012) have occurred. Adding the personal vs. professional element to SM research in higher education in the future is critical as SM usage continues to grow within the faculty ranks overall.

Leveraging the trends and research gaps noted in the high education SM literature overall, the second tier of the literature review focuses on the minimal amount of SMP research currently available to policy makers. As these themes remain a consistent foundation for critique moving forward, they complement the application of a theoretical lens to contemporary SMP research. The analytical framework for the SMP literature review is noted in the following section and helps to support the transition to a more thorough research methodology moving forward.

Analytical Framework

The second layer of the review provides insight into the contemporary literature and how research trends permeate into the three primary levels of the SMP analysis process: (a) policy adoption, (b) policy implementation, and (c) policy effect(s). A three-category approach was
used to add depth to the analyses of SM and its role in higher education on each level of policy analysis. Subcategories were developed in order to give resonance to the process of policy adoption, implementation, and impact.

Specific focus on the policy adoption phases is driven by its place as the natural, first stage of the policy-making process. In general, this phase is directed to understand the specific relationships between a governing body and its surrounding environment (Anderson, 1978). Additionally, the work of Anderson (1978) specifically identified the policy demands and policy decisions as the planning or adoption stage. Policy demands are focused on an outcry from the environment for the sanction of a specific behavior or the need for assimilation to like organizations existing within an environment. Policy decisions are enacted as a result of these demands by the culmination of planning and identification of key stakeholders by an administrative body. In the case of SMP, the policy adoption phase is an area of focus because it falls into each of these categories as noted by the evidence above. Additionally, Fowler (2000) developed a focus on the policy formulation and adoption phases in order to properly examine the documentation of policy before it was implemented, the funding of such endeavors, and the levels of bureaucracy in these phases. As such, the literature review divides the adoption category into subcategories based on adoption focus, characteristics, and environment.

The policy implementation phase is guided by a focus on the specific outcomes or behaviors expected following the process of policy adoption. Sabatier and Mazmanian (1980) developed a framework through which to examine regulatory policies that aimed to either change or prevent the negative behaviors of a specific constituency or make attempts to prevent them entirely. O’Toole (2000) underscored the challenges of policy implementation, highlighting its
necessary inclusion as a step in the policy analysis framework. Understanding not only why policies fail or succeed but also how to make connections to relevant data and methods for collection builds on the policy analysis principles laid forth by Montjoy and O’Toole (1979). More specifically, their failure or success research was based on policy analysis data related to inter-organizational dynamics. Each sector shapes the way in which policies are adopted and implemented, and ultimately whether they are well received or necessitate further review. All can be informed by reviewing the current literature and conducting targeted policy research. For these reasons, a specific subsection was included in the review dedicated to policy implementation strategies and focus.

Finally, the policy impact section aims to explore the literature related to specific stakeholders within the purview of SMP in contemporary higher education. Specifically, the policy impacts administration and students with specific focus on the pre-professional preparation of students and the curriculum encountered once they matriculate through colleges and universities. The stakeholder focus was explored by Dolowitz and Marsh (1996) in reference to how implementation impact could be measured by using how policies are interpreted by stakeholders in different ways, a principal that Anderson (1978) also used in measuring the difference between what policies aim to do and what is actually accomplished. Additionally, impact is not used in here in the traditional sense as alluding to something causal in nature. Because the impact stage is rarely addressed in the current SMP discourse with any implications in the long-term, short-term measures can be reviewed for applicability. This is certainly due to the small window of time SMPs have been relevant, and long-term effects therefore cannot be measured. Impact is framed by the following review primarily in more high-
profile higher education programs (e.g., pre-professional fields) and in the anticipated versus actual orientation noted previously.

The stages of policy adoption, policy implementation, and policy impact/effect separate each quantitative and qualitative study based on specific themes and subthemes related to their orientation in the policy analysis process described above. For example, Garber (2011) and Oden (2011) were located in the adoption section because they reference the environment the policy was created within. Wandel (2007) was located in the implementation section as she made reference to the methods for introducing the policy to stakeholders in a similar way to Sanderson (2011). That leaves the impact section, which has the potential to include literature that points to how administrators, faculty members, staff, and students react or view SMPs. Stakeholder feedback (Cain, Scott, & Smith, 2010) and views of policy characteristics (Chretien, Goldman, Beckman, & Kind, 2010) fall within the impact framework. Although not described explicitly in the literature, the convenience groups (Ryan & Bernard, 2003) created for organization of current SMP literature help to address broad research questions and isolate gaps for future investigation.

**Policy Adoption**

**Adoption environment.** The relative popularity of adopting SMPs at colleges and universities should keep pace with the emergence of SM’s popularity not only with students but also with faculty, administration and staff. However, Kaplan (2010) used a quantitative study using short surveys to indicate that 13% of randomly selected institutions of various classifications reported having a policy in place that specifically focused on SM. The scope of such a study is limited, however, creating an environment where policy discussions tackle key
issues can be hindered by perceived lack of relevance. Of course, conduct of faculty, administration, staff, and students could ripen the environment for adopted an SMP quickly. Conversely, if institutions look to peers for policy direction and find that they have none, or implement more general guidelines, then the adoption environment is flawed.

Furthermore, once an institution determines that an SMP is worth implementing, what are the specific mechanisms already in place to make the adoption environment an efficient environment? Procedurally, if the institutional standards for assessing the necessity of policy are not firmly in place, there may be adverse effects on the adoption environment. Chretien, Greysen, Chretien, and Kind (2009) added specific survey items to their existing quantitative research study focused on SMPs at U.S. medical schools and found that awareness of the issues at hand during the policy adoption process impacts whether policies are actually put into place. This outweighed lack of knowledge or understanding in terms of what has a greater overall influence on a positive or negative SMP adoption environment. Additionally, this research supports the necessity for assessing who is involved in the policy adoption process, what they experience, and what procedures are already in place to transform issues into policy.

Studying the SMP adoption process cannot be properly accomplished unless the environment in which the policy was created is understood as well. An atmosphere where ideas and input from various stakeholders are exchanged freely may produce different results from an adoption environment that is more restrictive. A qualitative research study conducted by Garber (2011) used a combination of document analysis, open-ended interviews, and focus groups to develop and explore research questions directed toward understanding a Midwestern university’s experiences adopting an SMP. Popular responses to research questions specifically directed at
the SMP adoption environment ranged from motivation to preserve institutional reputation, acknowledgment of risk, and paranoia. More specifically, Garber indicated that respondents were aware that establishing protections to the university brand outweighed concerns aiding individual knowledge of the potential implications of SM behavior. Current events, perceived future implications, and general campus climate are described by Garber as motivating factors in the SMP adoption phase.

Garber suggested that the underlying feelings impact the adoption environment in one direction or another, and a 2010 survey conducted by Associated Marketing Partners (on behalf of the Association for College and University Technology Advancement (ACUTA) seems to support this evidence. The 2010 survey of 73 college and university leaders in technology strategy first identified what or whom an SMP would be protecting. Since the majority of respondents indicated that student recruitment was one of the top reasons SM was being implemented by administrators, environmentally the policy would be adopted toward that end. However, concerns over identity issues, personal safety, professionalism, and privacy also shaped the environment to allow for a potential policy to reflect those concerns in the future (Associated Marketing Partners, 2010). Adoption environment, therefore, does have the potential to shift as more stakeholders may be rolled into the SMP adoption process and bring with them a variety of views and concerns.

Adoption focus. Precedent can play a significant role in the features of SMPs in higher education and can impact a policy’s specific focus even in the adoption phase. The current atmosphere of questioning whether First Amendment rights are infringed upon by policies that govern SM usage at higher education institutions, requires that policy makers incorporate legal
precedent in the overall policy focus. Castagnera and Lanza (2010) analyzed several legal cases involving the online activity of education administrators, faculty, and staff in order to assess potential policy implications in the future. Data gathered indicated that legal issues are linked to the personal and professional activity of both employees and students on Facebook and Twitter while also noting that legal backlash can occur if policies infringe on personal rights too aggressively. Without establishing a legal narrative, the findings of Castagnera and Lanza (2010) serve to identify the implicit nature of establishing policy goals and objectives to rate the level of importance of critical elements imbedded within an SMP.

Institutions of higher education, as stated earlier, have numerous stakeholders who present their own unique issues when considering the adoption of an SMP. For instance, faculty members may utilize SM, such as Facebook or Twitter, in a completely different way than students but could incur the same penalties for improper use no matter the purpose. Focus may refer not only to specific parties that policy is directed toward but also the means by which the policy will be adopted seamlessly. Armstrong and Franklin (2008) analyzed the potential for adding educational measures into SMPs by gathering data from 180 institutional leaders from five countries. The qualitative method employing short interviews aimed to address current and developing practices related to SM and SM governance. Their findings indicated that each individual group in the adoption process must be critically reviewed for specific behaviors on Facebook or Twitter, for instance, and what instruction and opportunities for proactive measures could be included in the policy. As the review of current SMPs indicated earlier, the educative value of SMP is clear in the implementation phase. However, Armstrong and Franklin noted that evaluating stakeholders should be carried as a focus in the policy adoption phase.
Within the policy adoption phase, maintenance of clear and identifiable goals results in the clarity of focus that may be necessary to push a potential SMP to the next implementation phase. Once again, Garber (2011) noted that the consistent effort to keep institutional branding or image a priority for administrator, faculty, staff and future student guidelines is imbedded within a potential SMP. Once goals and objectives were met on the adoption level, Garber also noted that the interviews yielded respondents who indicated the level of communication between administration and the broader community. Communication in the form of e-mails providing updates on the policy adoption process also served to monitor the level of buy-in or backlash toward an SMP. One might conclude in future studies that in order to measure the level of adoption focus, factors to consider are goals/objectives, voice, and tone as policy makers take critical steps toward implementing a policy that outlines proper SM behavior.

Adoption characteristics. Exploring the relative popularity of adopting an SMP is a necessary exercise in the policy adoption process, as noted by Kaplan (2010). However, once the policy is drafted in the adoption phase, isolating trends related to content and characteristics may be important. Outlining which SM websites are included, defining terms, and detailing negative behaviors are all adoption characteristics. Billington, Brack, and Sumy (2008) used an exploratory analysis methodology to breakdown existing SMPs as far back as 2008. Each state organization was asked if it currently had an SMP in place or if it was planning to in the future. Of the states that responded (n = 27), only New York maintained a detailed SMP that touched on blogging and SM. Higher education interest groups similar to the National School Boards Association could, in theory, use this methodology to craft a “State of Higher Education Social Media Policies” document. This policy, however, would not include characteristics that defined
terms, consequences for behavior, or parameters for what websites were considered permissible. The research exposed the need to evaluate the common practices not only associated with the documents themselves but also with the processes involved in creating them. Specifically, are all stakeholders considered a viable contributor in the planning process? Or do high-ranking faculty and/or potential student indiscretions gain the most attention in the preliminary phases of policy development?

Although it is acknowledged that these data may have changed since 2008, it does display the variance in policy characteristics and the need to evaluate if policy characteristics and objectives are made clear in the adoption phase, carried through the implementation phase, and evaluated for impact. Additionally, when assessing the dismissal of institutional employees based on SMP documents, are the characteristics of said policies clear enough to serve as grounds for termination?

More specific to the higher education sphere, policy characteristics are sometimes inextricably linked to the inherent goals of the SMP itself. In an investigation of SMPs employed by U.S. medical schools, Kind, Genrich, Sodhi, and Chretien (2010) broke down the SMPs of 132 medical schools in the United States using an investigative discourse analysis. The results indicate that of the 132 medical schools included in the study, 13 (10.2%) had an SMP. These data remain consistent with data presented earlier by Kaplan (2010) but build on this trend with more detailed information. Of this group, 5 (38.5%) outlined specific behaviors frowned upon or restricted by the institution. Additionally, 7 (53.9%) referenced the professional image portrayed by students on SM such as Facebook or Twitter and how words and images posted shape this image. Outlining the purview of the SMP itself, 9 (69.2%) focused on the specific
websites, such as Facebook, Twitter, MySpace, or YouTube, as applicable under the current policy guidelines. As recently as 2010, the adoption of SMPs in the United States, more specifically in medical schools, was still relatively low at 10.2%. However, the specific characteristics of these policies can help researchers outline questions in future studies that mine participant knowledge of policy details and their contribution to these characteristics in the adoption phase. It is interesting to note the continued trend in focusing on pre-professional programs and their usage of SM and the existence of SMPs. Understandably, individuals preparing to enter these fields and those in charge of developing their skills hold a substantially different responsibility to the public in terms of maintaining privacy and professionalism, which extends to their SM lives as well. A medical professional’s track record, once carried by word of mouth, also exists in the SM space and must be monitored accordingly. Clients may have varying levels of trust with a medical professional once their personal or professional SM habits are exposed. However, expanding beyond these programs may improve the quality of data that can apply to a wider group within the context of higher education.

Critical analysis of the characteristics of an SMP in the adoption phase isolates aspects of the policy that may have positive or negative effects in the implementation and impact phases. As part of a dissertation, Rodgers (2012) used an analytical approach to identify trends in acceptable use policies, sometimes the precursor or overarching document of SMPs. A hierarchical document analysis structure was used to review 41 acceptable use policies and SMPs to identify characteristics included and excluded from current guidelines, followed by coding these characteristics into themes. The study indicated that 15 (36%) defined specific types of SM for which the policy was created. Additionally, 13 (31%) showed that policies were
grafted onto, or included as a small piece within, a larger acceptable use policy. Most interesting to the discussion of SMPs and its application to higher education administration, faculty, and staff are the results related to whom policies apply to. In 2 (5%) of the cases, the policy applied to or was amended for specific groups within an institution. More specifically, the analysis noted that separate policies existed for employees and students. The ambiguity created here through the adoption characteristics highlights the gap in the current literature surrounding the level of customization according to occupation or status within an institution of higher education. SMPs intended for students but applied to administration, or vice versa, have the possibility of being contradicted in the event they are used to punish an individual in violation of the policy.

**Adoption in the nonacademic sector.** Perhaps researchers stand to learn an equal amount regarding the efficacy of SMPs, even in the adoption phase, by transitioning from SMP characteristics to target populations. At institutions of higher education, nonacademic sectors (e.g., athletics) present opportunities to observe populations with their own idiosyncrasies that can add depth to the SMP literature. Using a quantitative research design, Snyder (2013) distributed a survey that analyzed intensity of SM use and privacy management. Additionally, the survey implemented a newly developed Perception of Social Media Policy Measure (PSMPM) yielding $n = 193$ responses that shed light on Division I student athlete opinions and views of SMP adoption at their specific institutions. Specifically, this measure aimed to link the perceived effectiveness and acceptability of SMPs in the adoption phase to efficacy. In regard to the population identified by Snyder, 93% ($n = 179$) found a complete ban of SM unacceptable, whereas an average of 70% ($n = 135$) noted that it was acceptable for an athletics administrator or coach to monitor their SM activity. Finally, for this population of student athletes, according
to the PSMPM measure, 53% \((n = 102)\) were not accepting of SMPs that were enforced by faculty or an outsourced company.

Snyder (2013) identified and explored a significant gap in the research related to Division I student athletes, their SM behavior, and perceptions of the SMP adoption process. However, this study also underscored the need for exploration of populations outside college and university students in reference to SMP adoption perceptions and subsequent behaviors. In this case, another high-profile population of students was examined on a very small scale. Even in this regard, expanding the study to include administration and staff within the academic departments could create comparison groups to match population characteristics with policy details. Expanding this idea across colleges and universities addresses the issue of research focus that extends across SM research in higher education and into SMP research.

Perhaps the examination of nonacademic constituencies further highlights the administrative mechanisms in the SMP adoption phase. Oden (2011) conducted a qualitative research study using short interviews with Atlantic Coast Conference (NCAA Division I athletics) school employees, comparatively analyzing feedback in reference to SMP adoption and how the process was unique in this sphere apart from the rest of the university. Response to potentially dangerous or inflammatory situations or curbing the propensity to post inappropriate material were common reasons why an SMP policy was adopted, according to the study. Additionally, the interviews also pointed specifically to whom the SMP was directed within athletic departments. In most cases, athletic department personnel, administration, affiliated faculty, and students were all addressed in policies that governed SM usage.
Oden’s study is unique in that it acknowledges the more traditional concern for student athlete behavior while also ensuring to provide guidelines for managers of the student athlete population. Perhaps future research could use the traditional research questions focused on student behaviors and perceptions related proper behavior on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram and apply these same principles to administrative, faculty, and staff populations. Additionally, this is an example of research that could benefit from exploring the public vs. private, or more pertinent to this study, personal vs. professional, dynamic in some of the SM literature noted earlier. Again, the small scale and narrow lens used to study SMPs in pre-professional programs or athletics departments only reflect the narrow lens used in SM research in higher education overall.

The adoption of SMPs within this specific sphere of the nonacademic unit at colleges and universities is admittedly only a small snapshot of one unique department at any given higher education institution. However, the trends in the literature outlined above raise questions for future research related to the departmentalization of SMPs and the possibility of exploring administration, faculty, and staff perceptions of SMPs. Browning and Sanderson (2013) conducted a study of intercollegiate athletic department views of Facebook and Twitter usage among athletes, coaches, and administration. Their qualitative study using focus groups, most importantly, identified that SMPs varied in their target population focus across institutions. As the demographic information changed and institutional type varied so did athletic department policy on SMP usage among administration, staff, and student athletes. It is important to note that future SMP across all departments and programs at higher education institutions must
understand the potential relationship trends between demographic information and SMP adoption characteristics.

**Policy Implementation**

**Implementation strategies.** Characteristics in the policy adoption phase also translate to the policy implementation phase, as they provide unique fodder for researchers to implement in future SMP studies that focus on stakeholders outside the student population. An example of early attempts to quantify the role of faculty or administration in the SMP conversation is outlined in a qualitative research study conducted by Bainbridge (2007). Due to its proximity at the early onset of the SM phenomenon at institutions of higher education, the interviews conducted by Bainbridge detail the connections among administrative responsibility, SMPs, and student behavior. In reference to specific SMP implementation strategies, Bainbridge indicated that proactive SMPs integrate administration and students into one community of SM users. In response to questions related to Facebook’s place on college and university campuses, students also indicated that administration should be charged with ensuring proper SM etiquette in academic or personal settings. Once again, the unique orientation of this study at the onset of the SM phenomenon provides future researchers with a unique lens through which to identify gaps in the literature that have yet to be explored. The early concerns over the role of administration in the SM landscape at institutions of higher education have waned in favor of studies on the student experience and response to SMPs. From the student perspective, administration or faculty should be held to the same standards being placed on them and further research on the SM practices of these stakeholders could support this. However, the notion of addressing perceived issues surrounding the use of SM without consulting stakeholders beyond students or
faculty members seems to be a theme echoed throughout the literature. When supported by smaller-scale, interview-based studies, these potentially influential ideas do not resonate and require integration into a more substantial model.

Contemporary literature indicates that the mechanisms that aid SMP adoption can resonate through to the implementation stage. More directly, institutional policy makers may be motivated to implement innovative policy models in response to the popularity of SM. Reflecting this trend, Wandel (2007) utilized a single survey instrument to mine the university student affairs sector to gain deeper insight into institutional awareness of the positives and negatives associated with SM and the policies implemented as a result. In reference to innovative policy models suggested by Wandel, research questions targeted the faculty/student workshop model centering on SM at several higher education institutions. More specifically, results indicated that 47.4% of institutions did not offer such an SMP workshop for students and 84.3% of institutions did not offer workshops for faculty. No data were collected specifically related to institutions administration or staff SMP workshops. Additionally, the implementation strategies noted in this study pointed to SM safety (43%), employee and student recruitment (39%), and social networking etiquette (20%) as the SMP implementation goals at the colleges and universities surveyed. Exploring not only policy characteristics but also the measures (or lack thereof) used to disseminate the policy to the broader campus community is an element that fills a gap in future SMP research, especially once considering institution administration and staff in a survey sample. Although measuring the potential impact of SMP is a useful tool for researchers and stakeholders seeking to inform their own policy decisions, expanding who is considered in the survey sample is only one step. Integrating similar questions focused on who
SMPs are, carried out in a more comprehensive survey addressing multiple institutional types, could provide better measures once the SMP evaluation process begins.

Issues surrounding what strategies may not be implemented at the current time and how the process of SMP review occurs should also be incorporated into the current narrative. The perceived connection between SMP implementation strategies and subsequent negative issues on social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram provide important insights for the improvement of the policy process overall. Chretien et al. (2010) conducted a quantitative research study on medical practitioners that specifically isolated how medical students’ affiliation with SM prior to policy implementation may have produced issues in regard to subsequent behavior. Specifically, responses to questions asking participants to rate the impact of specific SMP implementation strategies indicated that medical students had a difficult time implementing new principles into their existing SM behavior. Furthermore, participants expressed that SMPs provided sufficient guidelines but not practical examples of some acceptable “off-line” behaviors that are unacceptable in the SM environment. Once again, the sustained focus on students, particularly in pre-professional programs, outweighs any consideration for faculty, administration, and staff perspectives and experiences with the SMP or SM in general. Do these members of the higher education community share similar experiences trying to modify their behavior to conform to policy, or do they find that their lack of experience with SM precludes them from using the guidelines altogether? These types of questions can only be addressed if the research methods that inform SMP decisions become more robust.

**Implementation focus.** Serving as a supplement to the studies related to SMP implementation strategies used by higher education institutions is research showing the existence
of specific foci and identifiable goals of SMPs in a quantifiable form. These goals often exist in alignment with the needs of an identified target population. Contemporary SMP research identifies goals that reference the student population as the implementation focal point. Sanderson (2011) explored Division I athletic department SMPs using thematic document analysis. Overall, 159 policies were examined through the lens of research questions that attempted to measure who was the main focus of the SMP, whether it was the student or possible observer. The 159 SMPs in this data set identified “monitoring groups”: 80 (online predators), 67 (potential employers), and 30 (media personnel). Perhaps more pertinent to the student focus trend is the one policy out of 159 that identified a “watchdog” or “third-party” monitoring organization involved in monitoring student/administrative activity. Overall, the policies examined through the document analysis predominately identified eliminating risk from outside monitoring as the SMP focus. The current trend in SMP research (e.g., student-centered studies) may be due in part due to the general nature of SMPs across institutional departments. Research questions may be directed at evaluating the specificity or foci of institutional SMPs in order to triangulate other quantitative forms of data collection.

Current research is not totally void of SMP studies related to faculty and administration in higher education, particularly when using the implementation focus orientation. Andrews (2012) used a qualitative methodology, part case study and part interview, to identify institutional change in regard to Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube usage among administration and faculty with the purpose of revising guidelines for the use of SM. A specific focus on the guidelines associated with SMPs is coupled with follow-up questions that ask if SMPs were deemed acceptable or useful by administration/faculty at the institution surveyed. Andrews
noted that respondents suggested that SMPs must align their content and focus with existing acceptable use policies to ensure that if enforcement is necessary, it can be readily justified. Additionally, the data suggested that there needs to be a balance within the focus of SMP on the educational adaptations of SM and the differences therein between professional and personal accounts. Andrews’s research also suggested that the terms “policy” and “guidelines” are often used interchangeably by faculty and administration, which may impact the level of clarity when SMPs are implemented. The potential for conducting an SMP study through the perspective of administration and faculty is emphasized here, but additional stakeholders may be left for future consideration. Specifically, support staff in college and university departments are, with no doubt, using SM either personally or professionally and may yield significant data to shape policy and potentially impact the SMP implementation focus.

**Policy Impact**

Studies related to SMPs and their impact on stakeholders at institutions of higher education are understandably still in their infancy, as anywhere from 10% (Lederman, 2014) to 13% (Kaplan, 2010) of institutions even have a policy in place that provides at the very least guidelines for acceptable SM use. As the studies reviewed also indicate, the majority of the current literature focuses on the experiences through the policy process of the student population, with a few studies modeling qualitative and quantitative studies to capture a larger sample size, which is a consistent trend that has been addressed multiple times in the literature. SMPs in higher education should illustrate the experiences of all stakeholders, as the impact of said policies is reviewed over time. Impact literature could serve to reshape and rethink the potential core principles and foci of SMPs across all levels of the policy-making process.
Pre-professional impact. College and university programs that prepare students to enter professional careers such as medicine or law may wish to measure the reach and impact of implemented SMPs more frequently due to the high profile of each profession. Consequently, the body of SMP impact research is conducted in the professional fields. Henry and Webb (2014) used a quantitative approach via a survey questionnaire to gather information from accredited U.S. dental schools on their specific SMPs. The survey yielded responses from \( n = 22 \) dental program deans or associate deans for a response rate of 35.9%. SMPs were reported to exist in 34.8% \( (n = 8) \) of the dental schools surveyed. Interestingly, dental schools were more likely to have an SMP in place if the leading school official (dean or associate dean) had held the position for less than 5 years \( (p = .01) \). As a result, 72.7% \( (n = 16) \) discussed SM professionalism with students and 50% \( (n = 11) \) incorporated SM ethics on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram into their curriculum. Although data were self-reported, they pointed to a specific impact of SMP on administration and faculty, albeit in a professional school, to educate students about the positives and negatives of SM. Future studies may account for the difference in programs that serve high-profile professions versus those with less exposure.

Identifying observable differences in behavior following SMP implementation may also be an invaluable tool to SMP researchers. This type of research provides clear-cut evidence of possible behavior changes that illustrate the direct impact and efficacy of policy. Williams, Field, and James (2011) use qualitative analysis to develop trends related to the qualities and features of student Facebook profiles at the Florida College of Pharmacy. At three points in time—before implementation, after implementation, and at the end of the first semester of school—the profile analysis was initiated. Data from \( n = 297 \) students were collected and the
study produced fairly actionable results. Students’ Facebook walls had visibility (e.g., were not made private) for those with an account pre-semester (before the SMP and subsequent policy presentation) at 18%, 11% post-policy, down to 8% post-semester. The amount of nonprofessional links also reduced from the pre-SMP stage at 70%, down to 52% post-semester. Studies such as the one conducted by Williams et al. produced results that indicated that SMP analysis is necessary to produce optimal results for policy makers. Although pre-professional students are once again the subject, the research design produces an interesting angle to the current research on SMP impact. Gathering data on how behaviors may have changed over time with the aid of improved guidelines or lack thereof should be considered in order to expand SMP research across program, institutional, and participate type(s). The majority of interesting data points within the hyper-specialized studies that define current SMP research simply do not have the statistical power to draw definitive conclusions or inform future policy decisions.

**Anticipated versus actual policy impact.** Policy impact literature related to the efficacy of SMPs in various high education contexts reveals data that illustrate the anticipated impacts of a policy versus the actual results. Using this type of research in specific contexts could help future researchers develop instruments to aid policy makers in aligning SM governance goals with outcomes. McEachern (2011) utilized a case study methodology to analyze the experiences of two students who received practical SMP awareness training and attempted to apply this training in an organizational setting. Although the SM course at the northeastern United States institution provided students with training related to time management, writing style, and preservation of professional image, the documented experiences of the students indicate that establishing a barrier between personal and professional Facebook, Twitter, or any other type of
SM accounts is extremely difficult (McEachern, 2011). Interviews revealed that students suggested more SMPs include curricula with simulated experiences and practical knowledge. Although still focusing on the student experience, McEachern’s research method illustrated the gap between anticipated versus actual policy impact. Once again, if properly applied to all higher education stakeholders, survey items that mine the curricular and practical supplements to SMPs may provide a deeper understanding of overall efficacy.

More specifically, sectors within higher education may implement an SMP without properly explaining each aspect of the policy to its intended audience. A qualitative study using semi-structured interviews with 20 student athletes by Sanderson and Browning (2013) revealed yet another gulf between anticipated and actual SMP impact(s). Overall, Sanderson revealed that, generally, student athletes, as well as administration, were left to interpret inappropriate versus appropriate behavior on Twitter. However, tweets and content posted by athletes were monitored and violations of policy could be enforced even in this environment of “policy ambiguity” (Sanderson & Browning, 2013). The study concluded that resources such as training for students, administration, and staff would be beneficial to maintain the boundaries of behavior on Twitter and other forms of SM outlined by the SMP from policy adoption to achieve desired effects. This further underscored McEachern’s (2011) conclusions that studying the supplemental resources dedicated to SMP dissemination and education may be as important to measure as the characteristics, focus, or audience of the policy itself. Furthermore, the literature continues to add student-focused data while excluding similar measures for administration, faculty, and staff that may face similar or steeper penalties for SMP infractions.
**Impact on student attitudes.** Although the focus on student stakeholders maintains the consistent trend across SMP literature, studies referencing what specific behaviors are impacted by policy and how individuals respond can prove useful in future studies of administration, faculty, and staff. The pre-professional sector of higher education is once again referenced in a qualitative study conducted by Chretien et al. (2010), who used focus groups to analyze SM habits, posted content, and institutional policies at George Washington University Medical School. A revised SMP complimented a strategic mission spearheaded by campus leadership, in this case to inform new students of the consequences, personally and professionally, of improper use of Facebook and Twitter. A respondent noted the influence of one campus leader:

> I helped with orientation for the first year this year, and after that talk, they were all really, really scared and a lot of them went home and really went through their Facebook and changed a lot of stuff. They asked me … is this serious? What should we be doing? So I think it concerns people. (Chretien et al., 2010, p. 569)

Policy makers, in this case, were thought to have made the SMP intentionally harsh in order to motivate positive student behavior. Even so, students responded to interview questions by consistently stating that in professional schools where attaining certification is the ultimate goal, students would be able to manage their Facebook or Twitter presence with the aid of a formal policy.

Implications for future SMP studies run in two directions in reference to Chretien et al. (2010). In a similar vein to Williams et al. (2011), comparison before and after SMP was instituted. Chretien et al. (2010) asked specific questions to further understand what happens to stakeholders’ behaviors following implementation. Secondly, more focus on the flipside could
be utilized in terms of perspective. Although the focus is on student response to SMP, data could be extracted related to faculty, administrator, or campus leadership behaviors once they are charged with enforcing policy.

**Administrative impact.** In addition to the pre-professional student-centered literature related to SMP impact, there is evidence of research measuring the impacts on higher education administrative views and behaviors. A 24-component survey questionnaire was distributed to 996 medical residency program directors by Cain et al. (2010) concerning the use of social networking websites, the role of professionalism, and policies for utilizing Facebook and Twitter to recruit future students. Results of this study pointed to policy impact topics about which administrators held very strong opinions. The research indicated that 53% \((n = 230)\) of administrators agreed that SM profiles were permissible to use as admissions criteria; at the same time 52% \((n = 227)\) agreed that information posted on SM websites was in fact used to make assumptions about critical character traits that determined acceptance or rejection. More to the point of SMPs, 67% \((n = 283)\) were not even aware of whether the SMP at their institution was “active” or “official,” and 2% \((n = 8)\) could confirm that a SMP existed.

Cain et al. (2010) underscored the notion that administers, faculty, and staff at institutions of higher education may have a different context from which to understand an SMP and should be treated as a unique population. Additionally, the data lend further credence to developing instrumentation that can collect information on college or university stakeholders who enforce SMP or use SM in a professional context.
Implications

The comprehensive nature of the current literature related to SMPs in higher education in the student sphere is supplemented with noticeable gaps in the current analysis of administration, faculty, and staff operating within the same framework. It is worth noting once again that the growth of SM and the diversity of access to Web 2.0 exponentially increase the likelihood of more comprehensive policies and therefore the richness of analysis related to the process as a whole. Due to the multitude of angles covered and interdisciplinary nature of the literature review, implications for future research are framed around the overarching research questions identified earlier.

Defining Social Media and Social Media Policies

Contemporary researchers are certain to be outpaced in their ability to properly define SM in a context that is constantly changing. Creating boundaries and guidelines for users, particularly administrators, faculty, and staff, therefore, becomes increasingly difficult. The literature suggests that institutional environment plays a substantial part in the process of creating and adopting SMPs (Garber, 2011) but does little to define SM in the context of the end user. Perhaps it is more likely that a student uses Facebook or Instagram and an administrator uses LinkedIn or Twitter, but the research outlining these definitions is simply not presently sufficient to frame and study more individualistic policies. Institutional environment, as outlined above, does play a significant role in the adoption of SMPs; however the studies of the way in which SM is defined and how policy infrastructure is created with the end user in mind have operated independently and have never intersected.
More specifically, as Auer (2011) noted, the evaluation of SM’s boundaries and definitions are collected and dictated by the users, who have the capacity to frame policies and evaluate their efficacy. The combination of analytical focus on policy characteristics defined by Kind et al. (2010), the definition of terms by Kaplan (2010), and end user identification of Oden (2011) could bridge this research gap and provide greater context for administrators, faculty, and staff’s place in the SMP conversation. Unfortunately, the progression of SMP research is hindered by small-scale quantitative and qualitative studies usually focused on a highly specialized population. If this is not the case, then research is geared toward one primary focus, such as how students behave on SM or how faculty members integrate these tools into their coursework. Policy makers and subsequent research should consider instrumentation that measures levels of participation from various stakeholders to strike a balance between usage, behavior, perception, and SMP reach. Diversifying the demographics of the sample would leverage the themes identified above and measure more actionable higher education-specific data.

**Characteristics and Foci of SMPs**

Building on the identification of the role of institutional environments and the limitations of the current research to frame SMPs with a user focus, future research must also consider the individual behaviors of each of these previously overlooked stakeholder groups. For instance, Sanderson (2011) and Oden (2011) make specific references to the implementation of SMPs in collegiate athletic departments where there may be a considerably larger audience. Additionally, pre-professional programs in medicine (Cain et al., 2010; Chretien et al., 2010), pharmaceuticals (Williams et al., 2011), and marketing (McEachern, 2011) all maintain specific foci at the
student level. Henry and Webb (2014) made small strides into understanding the administrative and faculty role in SMP implementation and measurement. Conversely, when SM research focuses on the faculty role alone, there are minimal examples beyond the implications sections that provide data outside of potential privacy concerns or pedagogical strategies. Substantial amounts of research still need to be done in order to quantify the processes involved in SMP implementation and precisely who is studied. Although much SMP research is dedicated to pre-professional and athletic programs with high public profiles, the student-centric and curriculum-centric nature of their instrumentation and the limited scope suggest that a trend in “population-specific” policy versus the alternative must be assessed. Cain et al. (2010) noted that 67% of administrators did not even realize an SMP was active at their institution. Across both stages of the literature review, the limitations of excluding administration from SMP research are glaring. Effectively removing an entire component of a college or university from the SM discussion is only a detriment and needs to be addressed moving forward. If students or faculty members have the potential for indiscretions on SM, why would administrators or staff members not follow suit? What are the key SMP issues for administrators, faculty, and staff? How do they behave on SM? Who is responsible for enforcing SMPs and how does an individual’s commitment to enforcement reflect his/her own personal or professional behaviors on SM? Although broad in nature, these are topics that are yet to be explored and deserve attention in future analysis.

**Addressing personal versus professional social media behavior.** Researchers and policymakers in the future in the arena of SMPs in higher education should also be wary of the level of control or intensity asserted over administrators, faculty, and staff and the respective
impact policy has personally and professionally. Depending on institutional type, according to Turley, the “lawfulness” of institutional SMPs can come into serious question. Legal studies have proven a valuable asset in unraveling the complexity of how institutions execute policy decisions and deserve further review as the research progresses. It is one thing to understand and document institutions by type that have SMPs while simultaneously understanding their employees’ participation and behavior on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. However, having a deeper knowledge of what parameters the university has outlined as acceptable SM behavior and how they can act on those regulations in the event of negative behavior is critical. Furthermore, in instances where SMPs infringe on perceived administrative, faculty, staff or student rights, SMPs may begin to lose effectiveness (Chretien et al., 2010).

These oversteps in SMP scope are trending, as Jerry (2012) described the implications of current jurisprudence in regard to SMPs and their lawfulness in higher education. After reviewing several legal cases related to institutional SMPs coming into question, Jerry noted that colleges and universities should not fear having constituents that participate in SM on a private or professional level. However, policies must be carefully measured so that they do not prove problematic in barring specific types of speech that inhibit the basic rights of individuals in public settings. A specific speech “type” that has become a considerable concern is the SM interface of faculty–student, faculty–administrator, faculty–administrator, and so on. Delgado (2013) noted that based on rulings by the Supreme Court state legislatures and public institutional governing bodies do have the authority to regulate communication between specific parties on SM websites in the interest of the state. The boundaries for preventing personal use of SM are much more loosely defined, and many state statutes protect an individual’s right to
communicate off premises with any stakeholder associated or not associated with the college or university in any capacity (Delgado, 2013).

Jerry (2012) poignantly noted that the benefits for institutional advertising and communication that SM brings also bring the potential for conflicts with institutional mission. Practical guidance in the gray area of First Amendment “doctrine” is necessary in order for public institutions to carry out their mission while at the same time preserving a reputable image. Quantitative analysis should be implemented to explore the personal versus professional SM issue as it relates to administration, faculty, and staff.

**Agency and social media usage.** A more poignant research question may not be related to the boundaries of SMPs but the clarity and effectiveness with which their message is transferred to stakeholders, such as administration, faculty, and staff. Although the scope is limited to student populations, Williams et al. (2011) presented solid indicators of the impact of the workshop model in relaying SMP details and best practices to targeted stakeholders. However, these strategies may not address a gap in the literature that examines the level of clarity that policies currently maintain with an audience. Specifically, when the *public versus private* or *personal versus professional* SM account question is brought to the forefront, how does the current SMP narrative address it? Are individuals left confused about how to proceed, or do they ignore guidelines altogether in favor of their own standard of appropriateness? Perhaps further exploration and inclusion of agency research may serve as a crosswalk to bridge the gap.

According to Herndl and Licona (2007), an individual (e.g., student, faculty, or administrator) may simultaneously assume the role of several agencies. These agencies often
conflict with one another in the specific norms that govern the agency’s role within a given system. Thus, the theory of *constrained agency* may capture the specific dimensions that SM may blur as it relates to college or university policy. Building on Herndl and Licona’s research, the implications for students, faculty members, and administrators could be informative for the future development of SMP in higher education. Weber (2013) built on this research by conducting a qualitative text analysis of corporate SMPs and identified indicators of *constrained agency* where contradictory expectations of *personal versus professional* SM behavior became blurred. Incorporating agency, although interdisciplinary in nature, into SMP research may help to increase efficacy and policy clarity. Of course, this requires the inclusion of data and resources from the first three research questions where additional stakeholders and their characteristics are incorporated in several stages of the SMP process.

**Conclusion**

Establishing frameworks to define SM, identifying key contemporary policies and the issues associated with them, and reviewing pertinent empirical research will allow for more informed instrumentation to be developed in the short-term which may lead to more effective SM governance in the future. The aforementioned research must consider the policy analysis process as a lens to identify key issues and literature gaps while also considering the possibility for utilizing new lenses, such as *agency* research that may apply to the administrator, faculty, and staff contingent succinctly. Accessibility of SM networks such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and Instagram is only increasing as individuals are further ensconced in the age of the tablet and smartphone. Therefore, when a participant can upload a photo, video, link, or opinion remotely in seconds, what are the reasonable parameters in which institutions can enforce a SMP? Who
do these policies focus on historically and what characteristics do they share? Do higher education administrators, faculty members, and staff require customized user guidelines, and what are the implications for doing so? When it comes to college and university employees, is there an identifiable difference between acceptable personal and professional SM behavior? If so, how can this level of clarity be measured with validity? Using a more robust methodology that integrates more detailed analysis of the concepts above, I hope to provide a better understanding of SM’s place across all of higher education and improve the data that support equitable policy decisions.
Chapter III
DATA AND METHODS
Restatement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore gaps in the current literature on SM and SMP in higher education related to the experiences of faculty, administration, and staff. More specifically, the literature supported the notion that SMP research has not integrated the proper focus on stakeholder behaviors, perceptions, and experiences with an aim at collecting a large volume of data. As stated earlier, the problematic nature of having a lack of reliable data on faculty, administration, and staff usage of SM/SMPs is evident and is addressed by the current research.

Therefore, by investigating the degree to which administration, faculty, and staff use SM, the existence and details of SMPs, and the perceptions related to SM guidelines, I sought to offer a data-supported approach to understanding the extent to which SM is used among these stakeholders. This, in turn, offered further insight into how guidelines could be customized to suit specific user needs and mitigate the potential negative consequences of SM. To address the direction of the current research, the following research questions supported the data collected and methodology for analysis:

1. What are the behaviors, experiences, and perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff in regard to social media usage and social media policy at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey? Do similarities and/or differences exist between faculty, administration, and staff who use or don’t use social media and whose home institution has/does not have a social media policy in place?
2. How do the *personal* and *professional* behaviors of faculty, administration, and staff differ, *if at all*, on social media at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey?

3. What impact, *if any*, do characteristics such as gender, age, institutional type, and program/department have on social media and social media policy behaviors and perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey?

**Research Design**

In order to address the research questions, this study employed a quantitative research methodology serving as an environmental scan of the current state of SM use and SMP implementation at colleges and universities in the state of New Jersey. Data from the perspective of faculty, administration, and staff across a broad range of institutional types were required to fill the current gap in the literature; therefore a quantitative electronic survey instrument was created in order to address this need.

Collecting data on SM and SMP within higher education, which is a relatively recent development, requires a careful mixture of question type and focus in an electronic survey. Additionally, including the opportunity for respondents to expand upon specific ideas by using open-ended questions was also important to provide an additional layer of comparison between faculty, administration, and staff within the SM and SMP environment. Creswell (2013) supported these notions of quantitative research by noting that constructing a quantitative instrument/methodology requires a researcher to properly describe the environment/population
chosen, create multiple avenues for comparison within the instrumentations design, and allow the data to be actionable to (i.e., serve a purpose for) the intended audience.

Taking Creswell’s last point a bit further, my intention was to provide an in-depth scan of the current SM and SMP environment among the sample selected in the hopes that the instrument could serve as a diagnostic for future policy planning, adoption, and implementation in the future. The strategies above supported my approach as an educational researcher to take the relatively new SMP landscape, and explore beyond traditional perspectives to answer questions and support future research. Drawing a line of sight between the gaps in the literature identified, through the sample population of faculty, administration, and staff selected, to the instrumentation developed is vital to the ultimate application of any data collected and analyzed (Patton, 2002). Following this sequence outlined by Patton (2002), the first phase of this study consisted of identifying a population and sample.

**Population and Sample**

In light of the need for a large data set specifically focused on the SM and SMP environment, as well as the gaps and in the literature and themes above, the target population for this study was all faculty, administration, and staff at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey. Currently, the state of New Jersey has 169 institutions of higher education, an extremely broad swath of institutions ranging from doctorate-granting research institutions to small colleges and centers focused on religious and career pursuits (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2015). In order to address stakeholder populations within more traditionally classified colleges and universities, the Carnegie Classification methodology was implemented in order to reflect the classification and research strategies utilized by more
traditional faculty research conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), the National Survey of Professional Faculty (NSOPF), and the less traditional but more SM-focused large-scale data collection done by Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2013) aimed at higher education SM research. Additionally, only degree-granting institutions were included in the search parameters in addition to specifically searching in only the state of New Jersey. Using this methodology, 66 institutions were identified which varied by Carnegie Classification and size while excluding branch campuses that may have also had inconsistent or duplicated web-based directories. The next step in developing the list of institutions to include in the target population involved eliminating some for-profit institutions and specialized institutions (special faith/theological seminaries) due to unavailability of participant contact information. Generally, nonprofit colleges and universities did have faculty/staff accessible online while for-profit and specialized institutions did not follow the same pattern and led them to be eliminated from the list. Of the 66 institutions identified in this group at the time the study was initiated, only 48 had fully searchable online directories from which faculty, administration, and staff contact information could be acquired (Classifications Data File, 2010). More specifically, 19 were private institutions (2 for-profit, 17 not for-profit) and 29 were public institutions.

Additionally, Table 3.1 illustrates how representative the target population is of undergraduate, graduate, faculty, administrative, and staff in the state of New Jersey. The institutions within the target population represent 83% of undergraduate students, 81% of graduate students, 89% of faculty, 91% of administration, and 92% of staff. This data suggested that the 48 institutions within the target population contained the vast majority of students or employees at colleges and universities in the state of New Jersey.
Table 3.1

Percentage of Students and Employees Represented Within Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>All NJ Institutions</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>% Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>398,095</td>
<td>328,669</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>62,878</td>
<td>50,815</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>34,416</td>
<td>30,748</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>40,786</td>
<td>37,604</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Counts and percentages in this table exclude Graduate Assistants, which are included in the Fall IPEDS 2011 IPEDS Full and Part Time Staff by Primary Function/Occupational Activity table.


Institutional Demographics

Additionally, the size/setting according to Carnegie Classification institutions in the population fell into the following groups: 17 medium (4 two-year, 13 four-year), 13 small (3 two-year, 10 four-year), 11 large (8 two-year, 3 four-year), 3 special focus, 3 very large two-year, and 1 very small two-year. Expanding on institutional descriptions within the population selected using Carnegie Classification I identified 18 associate’s colleges, 11 master’s colleges and universities I, 5 baccalaureate colleges–general, 3 specialized institutions–theological seminaries/special faith, 3 doctoral/research universities–intensive, 2 doctoral/research universities–extensive, 2 baccalaureate–liberal arts, 1 master’s colleges and universities II, 1 specialized institutions–medical schools and medical centers, and 2 not classified. It is important to note that SM and SMP research to this point has not attempted to control instrumentation by institutional size, type, or sector, and the precedent does not necessarily demand it. For the purposes of providing a comprehensive analysis, I thought it was necessary to investigate how these institutional characteristics develop comparative groups worthy of further investigation.
Target Population vs. State Totals and National Averages

Table 3.2 displays how the target population of colleges and universities in terms of institutional type compares to state totals and national averages. Data submissions to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) are conducted by institutions that participate in federal student financial aid programs, which then report a standardized set of measures annually. Institutions that do not participate include smaller for-profit and specialized schools, which is important to note given the demographic data included in the following table. When compared to totals across the state of New Jersey (NCES, 2015), the target population is of a representative nature given the availability of directory information as noted before, and the accessibility of institutional websites to collect potential respondents.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private, not-for-profit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private, for-profit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


When compared to national averages across these particular groups, the representative nature of the target population could be questioned, with an average of 32 public, 31 private not-for-profit, and 25 private, for-profit institutions existing in each state. Again, the effort to maintain a parallel to state and national norms was mitigated by the accessibility of information pertaining to faculty, administration, and staff contact information from within the target population. Specifically within the private sector, where specialized institutions serving specific
groups may not necessarily provide an equitable amount of information, their existence on a state or national level may be significantly higher. More to this point, providing boundaries for the number of institutions included meant increasing the quality and focus of the questionnaire and data collection.

Finally, the proportion of 4-year to 2-year institutions within the target population did represent state totals and national averages adequately. Table 3.2 indicated that 29 four-year schools were included within the target population, compared to 19 two-year schools. This meant that 60% of the target population institutions were 4-year, whereas 65% of institutions in the state of New Jersey were 4-year and the national average of 4-year schools in each state was 63%. Future studies should note that although the identified target population may over or under represent some institutional types, the availability of contact information is a major intervening variable in the inclusion or exclusion of specific institutions types.

**Social Media Policy Demographics**

As an additional layer of preparation in constructing the database for the target population, the study also considered the existence of SMPs at target institutions as a vital piece of information when interpreting the results of future analyses. Due to the fact that SMP research is so narrow in scope, these numbers are not readily available and a low-level analysis was conducted by the researcher in order to supplement other demographics documented before distributing the survey instrument. Procedurally, each of the 48 institutions websites were searched using the following five key terms that would produce an SMP “hit”: namely, *social media policy, social media guidelines, student handbook, employee handbook, and acceptable use policy*. The results of these searches whether in the form of a PDF document, Word
document, or Web link were catalogued and saved. Conducting this type of research can also put into context the number of individuals reporting that their institution has (or does not have) an SMP and lend further context to the specificity of each policy to their particularly characteristics.

An overarching look at the existence of SMPs within the target population (Table 3.3) showed that 56% ($n = 27$) of institutions within the target population had an SMP in some form, and 44% ($n = 21$) of institutions did not have a policy at all. However, the fairly large percentage of institutions that did have SMPs showed a spike in numbers in reference to prior research, setting the number at 13% (Kaplan, 2010). Again, it must be noted that policies exist in many forms and the research conducted by Kaplan (2010) is extremely limited in capacity and future replication.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Institutions with Social Media Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the college have a *Social Media Policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Institution(s) in the “Yes” category may have a stand-alone SMP OR have one integrated into another policy manual on campus such as: student handbook, acceptable use of campus computing, specific department or program manuals, or public relations branding and communications guides.

Although the prior research on SMP existence at institutions is extremely limited, dividing these institutions by institutional type has not been done to this point. As noted in the prior research above, institutional type may have significant role in the existence and level of detail associated with SMPs. Once again, this will only provide more context to future analysis and comparisons made across subpopulations within the target population. Out of the 27 institutions that had an SMP in some form, 59% ($n = 16$) were public institutions whereas 41%
(n = 11) were private. No empirical precedent currently exists to serve as a comparison to the SMP demographic information above and below; however it can be used to distill behaviors and perceptions across faculty, administrative, and staff groupings to a more granular level.

Moving to a more holistic view of the target population in regard to SMP existence, institutional type could have an impact on whether or not a school chooses to invest resources into SM governance of any kind (see Table 3.4). Out of the public institutions within the target population, 55% (n = 16) had SMP in place in some form, whereas 45% (n = 13) of public institutions did not. A small increase occurred among private institutions who had SMPs at 58% (n = 11), whereas 42% (n = 8) did not have a policy at all. No significant difference (z = .28, p > .05) was found between public and private institutions that had an SMP in place within the target population after applying a z-test.

Table 3.4

Social Media Policies by Institutional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Has SMP in place</th>
<th>Does not have SMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Differences in proportions tested were not significant, z = 28, p > .05

To expand briefly upon the differences in SMP type and the degree to which institutions within the target population include these policies in a broad or narrow context, six categories were developed to classify each of SMPs noted. Aligning with the method used to search for the SMP on institutional Web pages, the categories were as follows (see Table 3.5): stand-alone policy, policy within a student handbook or code of conduct, policy within an administrative or employee handbook, policy as part of a department or program handbook, policy within
Table 3.5

*Percentage Social Media Policy Institutions by Policy Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stand-alone policy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within student handbook or code of conduct</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within administrative or employee handbook</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of department or program handbook</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within “acceptable use of computing” policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional branding or communications guide</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Some institutions belong to more than one category.*

“Acceptable Use of Computing” policy, and policy within an institutional branding or communications guide.

It is worth noting that some institutions may have three to four versions of an SMP in different formats, whereas some institutions prefer to have a stand-alone policy. After controlling for institutional type, there were no notable trends worth reporting so these particular sets of data can only be used in an analytical capacity. For instance, 63% (n = 16) of SMP holding institutions had a stand-alone policy varying in specificity, whereas 37% (n = 10) had small policies embedded in student handbooks or codes of conduct. Additionally, 19% (n = 5) had SMPs within administrative or employee handbooks and 15% (n = 4), as part of a department or program handbook (e.g., nursing, pharmacy). Finally, 11% (n = 3) of target population institutions had an SMP within an “Acceptable Use” policy, whereas another 15% (n = 4) focused their SM guidelines on institutional branding and communications.

Analysis of the institutions that had SMP policies in place should also attempt to quantify when these policies where (a) adopted and (b) revised. This could be a potential factor in whether or not an institution has faculty, administration, or staff that are familiar with the policy.
or even know it exists. Furthermore, given the fluid nature of SM’s evolution from month to month, policies could often be outpaced by innovation. Table 3.6 includes an overview of the 27 SMP institutions and the years in which policies were adopted and/or revised.

Table 3.6

*NOTE: Dates collected reflect information drawn from versions of policies located on institutional web pages identified by the researcher. New versions of policies may be located in other locations, and updates may have been made without being annotated on the document.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># within Survey Population</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date of Policy Adoption/Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bloomfield College</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brookdale Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Centenary College</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>County College of Morris</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cumberland County College</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drew University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fairleigh Dickinson University-College at Florham</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Georgian Court University</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Monmouth University</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Montclair State University</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New Jersey City University</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Passaic County Community College</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ramapo College of New Jersey</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rider University</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rutgers University-New Brunswick</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Salem Community College</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Stevens Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The College of New Jersey</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The College of Saint Elizabeth</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Union County College</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (Now Rutgers)</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>William Paterson University of New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perhaps standing out the most in Table 3.6 is the lack of basic details in policy materials that warrant using the *policy adoption/revision* column heading. Due to the current state of background information located within the policy documents, it is hard to distinguish these dates from one another, and in some cases policies were not dated at all. Not a single policy within the target population made the adoption and revision dates explicitly distinct and clear from one another. Therefore, a generalization had to be made at this point between the two phases of the policy-making process, which is also a limitation to the research moving forward.

It is also important to note that some dates of adoption stretch as far back as 2011. When compared to the relative dates of more recently popular SM platforms such as Instagram and Snapchat, which were founded in 2010 (Guynn, 2012) and 2011 (Colao, 2014), SMP applicability comes into question. More specifically, SMPs *could* predate the rise to popularity of some SM platforms (Instagram, 2012; Rusli & MacMillan, 2013; Snapchat, 2013) or the functionality of the devices (e.g., smartphones, tablets) they are accessed from. Predicting which fledgling SM platforms will gain popularity is not an exact science; therefore SMPs cannot be expected to be fluid on a month-to-month basis. However, scans of the SM landscape would prove effective in keeping policy current enough to deal with platforms rising from novelty to necessity.

The various ways that SMPs are presented among the 27 institutions that currently had one should yield interesting feedback from respondents within this subpopulation. These basic characteristics can also be used to interpret the degree to which individual respondents may have had familiarity with their home institution’s policy, if they even know one exists. An intriguing possibility in future analysis would be to use these baseline SMP demographics to compare
respondents who indicated their institution had an SMP to the actual data. This would mitigate against the possibility that individuals either were not aware or would not put forth the effort to locate an institutional policy prior to or during participation in this study.

In the interest of preserving the idea that this instrument would serve as an overall environmental scan of the faculty, administration, and staff SM and SMP dynamic, the survey instrument served as a vehicle to study this entire population given that contact information (e.g., e-mail addresses) was active for each individual. Additionally, I aimed to preserve the generalizable nature of the research while meeting an acceptable and representative response rate necessary to give the intended audience reason to utilize the research findings in the future.

**Target Population**

An electronic survey was distributed to the population identified in Fall 2015. Stakeholders outside of the traditional student population were organized in three employee groups, which consisted of faculty, administration, and staff. The survey was distributed to all members within population database compiled from August 2014 through June 2015. Each institution’s employee directory was searched during this period to collect individual e-mail addresses, as well as several descriptive indicators used to periodically check the characteristics of the potential survey population. These indicators included gender, college/university name, type, size/setting, Carnegie Classification, religious affiliation, city, faculty/admin/staff, academic field/department name, rank (if faculty), and highest degree. It is important to note that all demographic indicators were not available by searching college and university directories, and this varied across institutional types and size. Information such as highest degree, tenure status, and years employed in the same positions, among other data, were not
consistently provided for public consumption. Furthermore, some institutions provided this type of background information for some stakeholders (e.g., faculty) but not administration or staff. Therefore, these data were not included in the forthcoming description of the survey participants but were included as a demographic variable in the questionnaire distributed to the target population.

The following two examples in Tables 3.7 and 3.8 were compiled as comparative statistics to test the preliminary demographic testing of the target population. Data were drawn from the Fall 2011 IPEDS Full- and Part-Time Staff by Primary Function/Occupational Activity table (NCES, 2015). These were the most current data reported for the target population as of May 2015. The Fall 2011 Occupations table is based on the same 48 institutions in the target population for the study at hand. A total of 71,714 individuals fell within these parameters and served as a comparison group for the preliminary data collected on the target population. It is critical to understand two intervening factors that presented challenges for acquiring comparative statistics in some demographic categories. First and foremost, the data gathered to test the demographic characteristics of the target population were indeed preliminary and only drawn from institutional Web page directories. This information may have contained errors; may have lacked inclusion of certain faculty, administrative, or staff members; and were subject to change over time. Secondly, submission practices were far more precise in the definition and documentation of occupation, which could have led to significant differences in some data gathered on the target population thus far. Demographic characteristics, both on the individual and institutional levels, were collected from the respondents, so noting the preliminary nature of the testing was a necessity.
Defining Institutional Role

Development of the specific definitions of faculty, administration, and staff for the study at hand required attention to how large data sets such as IPEDS handle the same occupational groups in terms of role. As a preamble to describing the data for the purposes of this study, professional staff, which included executive, administrative, and managerial positions, would be included in the “Administration” category. The term “nonprofessional staff” used by the Fall 2011 IPEDS Occupations table included support/service staff and clerical and secretarial positions, among other designations. These positions were included in the “Staff” category indicated in Table 3.8. The “faculty” designation included all ranks and levels of instructional staff, collected, again, regardless of full- or part-time status. Including non-tenure instructional staff within the table parameters (NCES, 2015) paralleled the inclusion of “adjunct” professors in the target population database. According to the IPEDS reporting manual, adjunct instructional staff, which vary in status across institutional types, were defined as “non-tenure track” (NCES, 2015). Understanding how these definitions feed the categories used in the study makes understanding the congruence (or incongruence) of preliminary demographics clearer. Again, it is critical to emphasize that individual respondents were given the opportunity to report their individual role as a demographic indicator on the survey instrument, and preliminary descriptors are were also used to test the representative nature of the target population.

Target Population vs. IPEDS by Gender

The 31,752 individuals in the target population were representative of NJ institutions of higher education as a whole in terms of gender and institutional role according the IPEDS (NCES, 2015) data (see Tables 3.7 and 3.8). It is important to note that full- and part-time staff
encompassed all occupations at a selected institution among instructional/non-instructional staff. Additionally, full- and part-time staff members were included in the IPEDS table as they are included in the target population drawn from institutional directories. This was yet another level of potential subgrouping that could have yielded a level of analysis on SM and SMP demographics, behaviors, and perceptions. Of course, these data are compared to the response population later in Chapter 3.

Table 3.7

**Target Population Versus IPEDS (NJ) by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>IPEDS (NJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17,387</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14,365</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,752</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Counts and percentages in this table exclude Graduate Assistants, which are included in the Fall 2011 IPEDS Full and Part Time Staff by Primary Function/Occupational Activity table.


Within the target population, about 55% \((n = 17,387)\) of potential respondents were female, whereas 45% \((n = 14,365)\) were male. IPEDS totals for the state of New Jersey yielded 55% \((n = 39,692)\) who were female and 45% \((32,022)\) who were male. Gender served as a considerable indicator of the representative nature of both the target population and the method for collecting potential respondents being a reliable one.

**Target Population vs. IPEDS by Role**

In regard to the composition of the target population, about 40% \((n = 12,680)\) of potential respondents were faculty, whereas 8% \((n = 2,640)\) were administration and 52% \((n = 16,425)\) were staff. Moving from faculty to staff, the representative nature of the target population
remains fairly consistent. To start, in the Fall 2011 IPEDS Occupation report, 43% \((n = 30,748)\) fell within the faculty category, and 5% \((n = 3,362)\) within the administration category. Faculty data supported a representative target population given that a –3% differential exists. Although the Administration category differed by –3%, it is reasonable to say the target population was still representative in this regard. No difference in percentage among the IPEDS group and the target population existed, which indicates the representative nature of this specific subgroup.

Table 3.8

Target Population Versus IPEDS (NJ) by Role (Excludes Graduate Assistants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>IPEDS (NJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12,680</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>16,425</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,752</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. According to the Fall 2011 IPEDS Full and Part Time Staff by Primary Function/Occupational Activity definitions, “Professional Staff” would include “Executive, Administrative and Managerial” positions which would be included in the “Administration” category for the purposes of this study. “Non Professional Staff” include; “Other professionals (support/service), “Technical and paraprofessionals”, “Clerical and Secretarial”, “Skill craft”, and “Service/Maintenance” positions which would be included in the “Staff” category for the purposes of this study. Additionally, counts and percentages in this table exclude Graduate Assistants.*

Discrepancies, although small, could be explained from both the side of the target population or IPEDS report. As the descriptors collected to this point were only available on institutional Web directories, this particular population may have been under-reported given the amount of full- or part-time staff at certain institutions serving various roles. It may not have been particularly useful or necessary to have all individuals’ contact information accessible to
the general public. From the IPEDS perspective, the capacity to collect these descriptive data from all faculty and administrators, or in this case staff members, is more streamlined. In any of the three categories, there could be over- or underreporting to varying degrees.

Finally, all academic/nonacademic departments were included in this population, representing faculty, administration, and staff who serve a variety of roles at their respective institutions. In order to understand a variety of perspectives on SM and SMP across institutional types, data gathered from these subpopulations are critical. Including faculty reflected their interaction with the student population in teaching, advising, and leadership settings. As stated, there may have been differences in subgroups based on full- or part-time status of the respondent. Table 3.9 serves as a baseline of IPEDS data on full- and part-time instructional staff within the target population of 48 institutions. As of the 2013 data, 62% ($n = 18,957$) of the instructional staff within the target population was full-time, whereas 38% ($n = 11,791$) was considered part-time. Whereas this metric was controlled for in the survey, this baseline measure acted as another level of preliminary comparison once the analysis stage began.

Table 3.9

*Percentage Full- and Part-Time Instructional Staff With Faculty Status—IPEDS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>18,957</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>11,791</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,748</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration was included due to its purview in a variety of departments across institutions, its role in leadership, and in some cases its higher profile in the public eye. These factors and current SM literature support the notion that administration’s role in SM could be unique from that of the instructional/advisory role of the faculty member. Support staff in departments and programs across colleges and universities makes up perhaps the most overlooked population on campus in terms of existing SM and SMP research and therefore need to be studied to gather/compare response data. Identifying three subgroups within the target population allowed for an additional and needed layer of potential data comparison in the analysis phase, separate from other comparisons drawn from SM users/nonusers and institutions with/without SMPs.

**Instrumentation**

The participants were sent an electronic survey that consisted of 56 questions using Qualtrics Survey Research Suite in August 2015. Timing was critical in order to capture the largest amount of respondents possible; therefore, it was decided that the survey would be distributed once participants began to return from summer commitments and start planning for academic year 2015–2016. A mixture of 35 multiple-choice questions, 16 Likert-type questions, 3 multiple response items, and 2 open-ended response items composed the content of the electronic survey. Content per page of the electronic survey was evaluated and scaled to an appropriate level to encourage participation and higher response rates.

After considering the research gaps and themes distilled from the review of both SM and SMP literature, the survey instrument included items that reflect a focus on (a) basic individual and institutional demographics, (b) SM demographics, (c) SMP demographics, (d) SMP
perception, (e) SM behaviors, and (f) personal vs. professional SM dynamics. These sections of
the survey instrument addressed the gaps in the literature that are the foundation of this study:
namely, (a) limited amount of SMP research, (b) limited study of stakeholders beyond
faculty/students, (c) focus on SM and pedagogy, and (d) personal vs. professional SM use.

Additionally, another basic tenet of the survey instrument developed was the selective
use of response logic (Creswell, 2013) in order to select where and when a specific subgroup
within the overall group of respondents had access to a specific survey item. For instance, if
respondents indicated in the affirmative to the survey item asking if they in fact participated in
SM, the amount and content of the questions that particular group had access to varied. This
same strategy was implemented for respondents who answered in the affirmative when asked if
their institution had a SMP in place. However, whenever it was possible questions that SM
users/nonusers and SMP participants/nonparticipants saw remained the same so that adequate
comparisons could be drawn in reference to the themes indicated above during the analysis
phase.

Due to the fact that the current literature does not gather any higher education SM data
with a policy focus, particularly from all three of the subgroups (faculty, administration, and
staff), the survey instrument consisted of original questions drawn from general principles and
structure of prior research. Furthermore, these could only serve as general waypoints in the
capacity of guiding demographic, behavior, perception, and policy-focused items (Lenartz, 2012;
Seaman & Tinti-Kane, 2013). In no other published survey instrument were these components
integrated in any capacity, or gathered on such a large scale to address a specific target
population.
In order to ensure the analysis of subgroups within the population could be conducted effectively, several types of demographic data bookended the survey instrument. Demographic data provided a vehicle for additional levels of analysis besides those prescribed by the primary research questions or secondary questions derived through the analysis (Lenartz, 2012).

- **Baseline individual demographics:** Adapted items included from the HERI (2014) Faculty Survey in order to address pertinent background information related to faculty, administrative, and staff roles were 16 questions focused on identifying respondent role, employment status, gender, and age. Additionally, these questions asked respondents to indicate highest degree, years holding current position, race/ethnicity, academic rank if faculty, tenure status if faculty, principal activity, department or program if faculty, administrative position, administrative department if administration, staff department if staff, and staff responsibility if staff.

- **Baseline institutional demographics:** Adapted items were included from the HERI Faculty Survey as well to provide descriptive institutional data for future analysis. Three questions focused on describing the respondents’ institution in terms of institutional type, existence of SMP, classification, and religious affiliation.

Providing more insight into the higher education SM environment required the consultation of both small-scale SM studies (Bradley, 2011; Dindar & Akbulut, 2014; Foss & Olson, 2013; Lenartz, 2012; Mullen et al., 2014; Weber, 2013) and large-scale SM studies (Hampton et al., 2011; Moran et al., 2011; Seaman & Tinti-Kane, 2013). Due to the hyper focused nature of the small-scale studies on pre-professional programs, faculty/students, and
teaching implications of SM, and the persistent exclusion of SMP elements from the large scale studies, survey items were primarily used as guides to customize the SM and SMP items below.

- **SM demographics**: After it was determined whether an individual respondent used SM, seven questions focused on percentage of personal/professional use, SM access, choice of SM platform, awareness of SM websites, and devices used.

- **SM policy details**: After it was determined whether an individual respondent’s institution had an SMP, five questions focused on SMP understanding, format, audience, and characteristics.

- **SM policy perception**: This section provided 11 survey items for individuals whose institution had/did not have an SMP in place. These items specifically focused on the SMP planning process, expectations, reach, enforcement, potential impacts, monitoring, and governance.

- **SM behavior(s)**: After it was determined whether an individual respondent used SM, to build on prior research related to specific SM behavior while leveraging policy-focused questions, nine items specifically identified motivators for not participating in SM, personal/professional uses, institutional uses of SM, SM image, and controversial behaviors. Two open-ended questions were implemented in this section to gather more detailed information on the definition of “inappropriateness” in reference to SM and the personal vs. professional dynamic.

- **Personal vs. professional (constrained agency theory)**: In order to gauge the level at which personal SM behaviors/perceptions may have overlapped with professional behaviors/perceptions, two questions were incorporated to rate the level of personal vs.
professional overlap and constrained agency both outside the boundaries of SMP and within.

**Pilot Study**

The pilot of the electronic survey was initiated on July 28, 2015, and consisted of a panel of 34 participants. Convenience sampling for this panel was done in order to produce feedback from a representative group based on the target population demographics. As such, pilot participants consisted of those holding faculty, administrative, and staff positions across varying institutional types. Additionally, potential respondents represented a mix of individual demographics such as age and gender. Pilot participants were asked to take the online survey, while simultaneously completing a “Social Media Survey Pilot Questionnaire,” which provided general guidelines for evaluation. Participants were asked questions related to word choice, organization, and mechanics within the questionnaire while also being encouraged to provide their own thoughts and views along the way. Finally, participants were asked to track the time it took to complete the survey so that this could be monitored to maximize a potential respondent’s time and effort.

After considering the feedback of this group, which represented each of the three population groups targeted, the following adjustments were made to the overall structure of the survey instrument. These revisions were made and verified prior to the distribution of the survey to the target population in August 2015.

- **Display logic**: Display logic embedded in the survey was corrected to properly link to the initial demographic question that asked participants to select if they were a faculty member, administrator, or staff member to the appropriate sections of the questionnaire.
- **Race/ethnicity demographic question**: The race/ethnicity question was edited to conform with the U.S. Department of Education 2015–2016 IPEDS reporting standards (NCES, 2015).

- **Survey mechanics and type face**: The word *personal* was substituted for *private* in most cases at the suggestion of several respondents to make it more clear that personal SM was referring to an account representing an individual, which underscored the difference from professional SM more clearly and that *personal SM* was referring to an account representing an individual.

**Final Survey Distribution**

An invitation e-mail containing a link to a Qualtrics-based electronic survey was sent to the target population in August 2015 and the survey remained open for 8 weeks. The survey remained open for an extended period of time due to the limitations of software being used by the researcher, which had a 10,000 e-mail limit per week. Therefore, given that reminders were also planned as a part of the methodology, a schedule was developed wherein the target population was broken into four subgroups and a survey was sent to one group with a reminder approximately 2 weeks later. The electronic survey was distributed to 31,599 faculty members, administrators, and staff members across 48 degree-granting institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey (see Table 3.10).

**Developing the Final Target Population**

Following the initial distribution of each of the four subgroups or panels of the original target population of 31,599, several factors played a role in determining the final target population. First, within a few days of the first subpanel of potential participants being
Table 3.10

*Developing Response Rate and Completion Rate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target population (prior to identifying invalid e-mail addresses prior to distribution)</td>
<td>8/31/2015</td>
<td>31,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Target Population</td>
<td>8/31/2015</td>
<td>31,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removed institution after request</td>
<td>9/1/2015</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel #1: Failed E-Mails</td>
<td>8/31/2015</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel #1: Hard Bounces</td>
<td>8/31/2015</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel #2: Hard Bounces</td>
<td>9/8/2015</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel #3: Hard Bounces</td>
<td>9/29/2015</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel #4: Hard Bounces</td>
<td>10/20/2015</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total deductions</strong></td>
<td>11/1/2015</td>
<td>1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Target Population</strong></td>
<td>11/1/2015</td>
<td>30,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact and Cooperation Rate Calculations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Rate</td>
<td>Completed/Opened</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation Rate</td>
<td>Completed/Started</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>Completed/Final</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The Q1 qualifier indicates when a respondent not only initially entered the survey, but also answered Q1 by selecting their primary role as faculty, administration, or staff.

distributed, an institution requested to be removed from consideration in the study, which was agreed upon and resulted in the first deduction of 234 participants. Secondly, only five e-mails from all four distribution panels completely failed, meaning that the e-mail server could not identify where to deliver the message due to improper formatting or a technical error occurred. Additionally, across each of the distribution panels, what Qualtrics categorizes as “hard bounces” occurred. This means that the e-mail associated with the potential participant no longer existed as a domain or a high-security firewall existed such that e-mails did not make it to a spam filter.
Following these three steps noted in Table 3.10, the final target population rested at 30,017, meaning that \( n = 30,017 \).

**Response Rate and Response Sample**

Of the final target population \((n = 30,017)\), 22\% \((n = 6,543)\) opened the e-mail containing the survey link. Several factors can play a role in the overall open rate. Given the nature of malicious mail reaching institutions of higher education, the odds of spam filters being used by IT departments to block incoming messages from mass e-mail software such as Qualtrics is relatively high. The instances of this occurring specifically in regard to this study were unknown of course. Additionally, e-mails gathered during the collection of contact information may have been changed or timed-out due to an individual no longer working at the institution. An equally likely possibility is that in the era of the electronic survey, particularly at institutions of higher education, the e-mail could have been discarded as junk by the recipient.

More specifically, research indicated that survey research across many mediums has declined over time (Holbrook, Krosnick, & Pfent, 2007). Several factors may be influencing the movement away from survey participation, which is an interesting phenomena given that the methods to contact potential participants have become more vast and user-friendly. Perhaps the fast-paced nature of the contemporary workplace and the importance of time efficiency have contributed to this trend (Keeter, Kennedy, Dimock, Best, & Craighill, 2006). Simply put, individuals, no matter their level of expertise or exposure to a specific type of subject matter, may not be interested enough or have the time to complete a survey. As a final note, access does not always directly correlate to response. Worries about privacy and confidentiality of personal
information also increase the likelihood that potential participants could find the amount of surveys they receive to be an unnecessary nuisance (DeSilver & Keeter, 2015).

Of the 6,543 individuals who opened the e-mail containing the survey link, 30% ($n = 1,966$) started the survey, 26% ($n = 1,724$) provided a partial or completed response (by answering Q1, which asked for the respondents’ primary role at their institution), and 17% (1,103) completed the entire survey. In Table 3.10, the two types of “completion” rates that were developed and an overall response rate are provided to give a deeper look into how the final response sample was developed. Using contact rate, or the number of surveys completed/opened (American Association for Public Opinion Research [AAPOR], 2015), the contact rate equals 17%. By using the AAPOR’s (2015) definition of cooperation rate, which is the number of surveys completed/started, this resulted in a final number of 56%. Finally, the overall response rate led to the final response rate of 4%.

This response rate is notably low even for an electronic survey but is comparable to surveys of faculty SM usage conducted by Moran et al. (2011), in which their final response rate was 4% ($n = 1,920/50,000$). Follow-up studies conducted by Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2013) resulted in a higher response rate of 9% ($n = 7,969/85–88,000$). Considering that the scale of such studies, and therefore the odds of encountering the limitation of firewalls, incorrect e-mail addresses, or spam filters, should subsequently increase with this scale. Additionally, response rate or completion rate may not always be synonymous with representativeness (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000). In light of the basic demographic data included here, the response sample was for the most part representative of the target population in terms of gender, institutional type, institutional role, and employment status. The ensuing comparisons of the response sample to
the demographics of the NJ target population and United States offer more detailed insight into
the survey participants and how their characteristics can lead to valid comparisons to faculty,
administration, and staff at colleges and universities. Several of the comparisons made mirror
tables and figures located in the methodology section to create line of sight between the
methodology and analysis.

**Overall Response Sample Demographics**

Preliminary target population characteristics were acquired through the creation of a
database from 2014 to 2015 using institutional Web directories, and NJ and U.S. demographic
information was collected using the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for
Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). These
combinations of catalogued and reported data helped to make comparisons to the response
sample before analyzing survey data.

**Institutional demographics.** Participants in the electronic survey were asked in Q5 if
their respective institution was public or private. Of those who responded to the Q1 qualifier (by
choosing faculty, administration, or staff), 64% (n = 1,089) were currently employed at a public
university, whereas 36% (n = 617) worked at a private university (see Table 3.11). This differed
slightly from the target population group, where 67% (n = 21,309) worked at public institutions,
and 33% (n = 10,290) were employed at private institutions. Whereas the target population and
response sample differed slightly in this regard, the response sample was representative in regard
to institutional type.

Note that in response to this demographic question, as well as other questions on the
survey, response rates may vary. Survey questions were not forced response, meaning that
questions could be skipped or omitted. Because there is a large portion of the survey that included what would be considered “essential” questions in terms of SM behavior and SMP perception, these skipped questions did not necessarily mean the individual’s entire response was deleted from the analysis. In some cases, individuals tended to jump around the survey instrument, providing the demographic data and responses to these essential questions related to the purpose and direction of the research. If a participant answered at least 50% of the “essential” questions, it was considered a partial response (Lavrakas, 2008) and was not considered a clean “break off” due to disinterest or technical error (Callegaro & DiSogra, 2008). Consequently, in order to collect the broadest amount of data possible on SM and SMP behaviors, perceptions, and experiences, partial response data were left in the analytical sample.

A majority of the response sample belonged to doctorate-granting universities (42%, \( n = 457 \)), with 23% \( (n = 246) \) in master’s colleges or universities, 21% \( (n = 234) \) in associate’s colleges, 13% \( (n = 144) \) in baccalaureate colleges, and 1% \( (n = 14) \) at special focus or professional schools (see Table 3.12). This is certainly a limitation of the response sample in that it may not be representative of institutional classification. However, in most other capacities, the comparisons across the target population and response sample are fairly equitable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Response Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21,309</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10,290</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,599</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.11

(Response Sample: Percentage Public/Private Institutions)
Table 3.12

Response Sample: Institution Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Response Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting university</td>
<td>7,192</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s college or university</td>
<td>12,228</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate college</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate college</td>
<td>6,962</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special focus or professional school</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,348</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not classified, not in classified universe omitted from target population total as it was not a choice on the survey instrument.

The foundation of the forthcoming data analysis is the inherent differences that could exist between faculty, administration, and staff in regard to SM and SMP. Within the response sample, 48% \((n = 831)\) were faculty members, 26% \((n = 449)\) identified as administration, and 26% \((n = 444)\) were staff members. Within the survey questionnaire, data on institutional role were gathered in response to Q1, and response sample data in Table 3.13 was self-reported.

Compared to the target population data, which had 40% \((n = 12,680)\) faculty members, 8% \((n = 2,640)\) administrators, and 52% \((n = 16,425)\) staff members, the data were comparable and representative. However, the differences noted between the response sample and the IPEDS (NJ) data could be attributed to the self-reported nature of Q1. Individuals reporting as administration may actually fall into the category of staff in regard to IPEDS Human Resources reporting standards.

**Individual demographics.** Employment status was a self-reported demographic within Q2 of the survey questionnaire. Because target population data were gathered from browsing
Table 3.13

Target Population Versus IPEDS (NJ) and Response Sample by Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>IPEDS (NJ)</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Response Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>30,748</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>37,504</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71,714</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31,752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. According to the Fall 2011 IPEDS Full and Part Time Staff by Primary Function/Occupational Activity definitions, “Professional Staff” would include “Executive, Administrative and Managerial” positions which would be included in the “Administration” category for the purposes of this study. “Non Professional Staff” include; “Other professionals (support service)”, “Technical and paraprofessionals”, “Clerical and Secretarial”, “Skill craft”, and “Service Maintenance” positions which would be included in the “Staff” category for the purposes of this study. Additionally, counts and percentages in this table exclude Graduate Assistants.


institutional Web directories, the data were not collected for comparison. However, Table 3.14 illustrates the breakdown of employment status by institutional role.

Of those who responded to the Q2 of the survey \((n = 1717)\), 73% \((n = 601)\) reported as full-time faculty members, 27% \((n = 226)\) reported as part-time faculty, 98% \((n = 436)\) reported as full-time administration, 2% \((n = 10)\) reported as part-time administration, 90% \((n = 401)\) responded as full-time staff, and 10% \((n = 43)\) as part-time staff.

A majority of the response sample was female (see Table 3.15). Of those who responded to Q3, 65% \((n = 1,118)\) listed their gender as female, whereas 35% \((n = 600)\) listed their gender as male. The gender of survey respondents differed from the percentages within the IPEDS (NJ) data—55% \((n = 39,692)\) female, 45% \((n = 32,022)\) male—and the target population data 55% \((n = 17,307)\) female, 45% \((n = 14,292)\) male, which were fairly comparable to one another independent of the response sample. However, female respondents tended to participate in
Table 3.14

Response Sample: Employment Status by Institutional Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

surveys at a higher rate than male respondents, so these demographics can be thought of as representative within genders (Al-Hattami, 2012; Yun & Trumbo, 2000).

Out of those in the response sample who answered Q4 (age), 26% ($n = 437$) reported being 55–64 years of age, 25% ($n = 420$) 45–54 years of age, 19% ($n = 326$) 35–44 years of age, 16% ($n = 277$) 25–34 years of age, 13% ($n = 227$) 65 or over, and 1% ($n = 16$) 24 or under.

Given the nature of the survey revolving around SM use and SMP experiences and perceptions, the response sample could be thought of as older in age (see Table 3.16). However, it is important to consider at this stage and during the deeper analyses that academic occupations, particular members of the faculty, tend to skew toward a higher age due to the massive expansion of the instructional staff in the middle of the 20th century growing older, whereas the younger contingent entering these fields tends to be quite small (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Additionally, this tends to occur across different types of institution and fields of study (Finkelstein, 2012). Data related to staff and administrative age were harder to come by, but it is reasonable to think that since the faculty was the largest proportion of respondents, they may have produced an older response sample. Overall, there was a fair amount of balance across all age categories, which could provide insight into many experiences within this demographic in regard to the data.
Table 3.15

Target Population Versus IPEDS (NJ) and Response Sample by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>IPEDS (NJ)</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Response Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39,692</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32,022</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71,714</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Counts and percentages in this table exclude Graduate Assistants, which are included in the Fall 2011 IPEDS Full and Part Time Staff by Primary Function/Occupational Activity table.


Table 3.16

Response Sample: What Is Your Current Age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 or under</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or over</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The race of those in the IPEDS (US) and IPEDS (NJ) groups (see Table 3.18) were comparable to one another. Of those who responded to Q48 (race) on the survey questionnaire, 80% ($n = 870$) reported White Non-Hispanic, 7% ($n = 76$) reported Black or African American, 7% ($n = 71$) reported Hispanic or Latino, 4% ($n = 41$) responded Asian, 3% ($n = 30$) under 2 or more races, and 0% ($n = 1$) for both Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander and American Indian or Alaskan Native.


Table 3.17

*Response Sample Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>IPEDS (US)</th>
<th></th>
<th>IPEDS (NJ)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Response Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2,474,815</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54,643</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>362,736</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9,992</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>235,407</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>202,588</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8,005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>19,991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more races</td>
<td>32,444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,335,986</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>77,029</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It should be noted that the number of responses ($n = 1,090$) was lower than the total number of completed surveys, which means that some individuals chose not to answer the question as they were not forced-response. Additionally, data gathered for the target population did not include speculation on race/ethnicity so comparisons to IPEDS (US) and IPEDS (NJ) were selected as comparison groups. Differences in the response sample from the two comparison groups do exist in reference to race, but the demographic overall should be seen as fairly representative both locally and nationally.

**Data Analysis**

For the analysis procedure, I used a comparative analysis approach to test/compare subgroups within the response population. Again, these subgroups are facilitated by including survey items aimed at gathering data on individual, institutional, and SMP demographics. The analysis also consists of demographic controls to inform the development of subgroups to compare responses across the instrument panels of SMP details, SMP perception, SM behaviors,
and the personal vs. professional SM (constrained agency) dynamic. At this point, the study sought to serve as an environmental scan or “current state of SM and SMP in higher education”; therefore intensive detail was given to establishing useful metrics for organizing the comparative analysis. Whereas it was important to focus on a specific set of primary and secondary subgroupings across demographics and response types, I also acknowledged the investigative nature of the study and how subgroupings may reflect trends within the data itself, not necessarily dictated by precedent in the limited literature available on the topic. Balancing these foci in the comparative analysis phase was critical to produce a sound yet sufficiently investigative empirical study.

**Comparative Analysis**

Data were collected and exported to SPSS for analysis once the instrument was closed out. In order to facilitate a better transition to the analysis phase, several survey item categories required recoding to create more efficient comparisons and visualizations of descriptive data. Descriptive statistics were compiled for each of the survey items, as well as for the subgroups within the survey population. Aiding the comparison of across three large sub-groups—(a) faculty, administrative, and staff, (b) SM users/nonusers, and (c) SMP institutions/non-SMP institutions, a *comparative analysis* method was used for more in-depth analysis framed by the research questions and gaps/trends in the literature. Additionally, the three large subgroups were examined under the comparative analysis method using the individual, institutional, and SM-specific demographics included throughout the survey instrument. Frequency tables and cross-tabulations were also run to parse the subgroups clearly for further analysis and to confirm the scheme for recoding specific variables.
To ensure the effective comparison between all groups within the response data set, the Pearson chi-square test was used to test confidence in whether the differences between these subgroups did not occur due to chance. The two open-ended responses were analyzed using simple qualitative coding techniques. By independently reading faculty, administration, and staff responses, concepts for common codes were drafted to resolve decisions for the most applicable categories for reporting. Including open-ended responses helped to confirm the content of multiple-choice, multiple-response, and Likert-type responses, which composed the majority of the electronic survey while adding a point of triangulation.

Transforming the data into a medium easily processed by potential users relied heavily on displaying trends across several respondent subgroups. The individual, institutional, and SM demographic information aided in the specific identification of themes across these groups. Illustrating the comparative analysis required tables and figures that display overall summary data, as well as summary data within faculty, administration, and staff groups highlighted by the research questions.

Limitations

This study was limited by several factors, which in minimal ways could potentially affect the generalizability of the research in the future. However, steps were taken throughout the planning process in order to promote the ability of future researchers to replicate the study and implement this diagnostic on a small and large scale. Limitations related to the scope of the research, growth of SM, and policy familiarity are acknowledged and require explanation.

In order to allow the study to be generalizable to all institutional roles and/or types in the higher education sphere, a concerted effort was made to include all applicable Title IV degree-
granting institutions in the survey population from the state of New Jersey. However, narrowing
the research to a smaller sample of representative institutions or institutional types could allow
for more intensive methodologies to be used. To this point, focus groups could be used in a
mixed-methods format to explore issues raised related to SMPs and the private vs. professional
data gathered in open-ended questions within the electronic survey. Larger-scale studies such as
this could potentially lose more finite detail that previous SM research has been able to leverage
to answer research questions.

Likewise, the growth and evolution of SM platforms may impact the contemporary
nature of the research. Institutions may face new issues not presently identified by the researcher
due to new forms of SM that could be more accessible to faculty, administration, and staff. For
instance, the social networking application Yik-Yak has grown in popularity over the past year
as an anonymous messaging platform with implications for campus climate that test boundaries
of administrative control (Mitrano, 2015). Whereas the catalyst for SM growth typically resides
a younger generation of user, concentrating on what SM platforms are used by the target
population in this study was just as critical to evaluating the applicability of SMPs. Therefore,
respondents were familiar with SM platforms in use as of Fall 2015, and data gathered in this
study reflected their experiences within this environment.

In combination with the two limitations noted above, this study also depended on the
inherent familiarity of participants with their institutions SMP. Even though this is a survey item
included within the instrument (policy familiarity), the instrument also gathered data on faculty,
administration, and staff perceptions and experiences with SMPs. These are self-reported
measures in regard to the analysis the follows and are not indicators of whether the institution
actually had an SMP or not. In order to preserve the respondents’ anonymity, institutional name could not be requested, and as such comparisons to self-reported data could not be made. Additionally, at least elementary knowledge of an SMP’s existence was required to answer the more in-depth questions related to policy. Although any and all data, particularly on a larger scale study, elevated the level of SM and SMP research, dependence on respondent knowledge on these specific survey items could limit certain types of descriptive analysis.

Finally, the comparability of the target population demographics with the response sample is consistent in regard to some of the variables such as gender and institutional role, whereas other areas are not as equitable, such as institutional class. The representative nature of the sample in some cases does limit the generalizability of the study to a broader audience; however the data provided gives positive insights and addresses gaps in the current SM and SMP literature that may not have been previously addressed. Future studies can use the themes and trends identified in the analysis to focus both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to increase the generalizable nature of data moving forward.

**Position of the Researcher**

Establishing vantage point is a key in exploratory research, which attempts to coalesce several perspectives and develop an analysis based on the data. Additionally, SM and SMP research most likely positions the research within this environment, where they potentially face the same challenges as the participants (Lenartz, 2012). As stated earlier, it is important to increase the actionable nature of the research so that individuals can use the findings properly to reach their own conclusions (Creswell, 2013).
As a student of one of the institutions in the study and employee of another, I had some perspective of the SM landscape both in terms of use and policy within these environments. However, the degree to which I used SM personally had not changed since the onset of the research and remained fairly minimal. This was not due to any restriction I placed on myself due to a negative opinion of its usefulness in the personal or professional setting. I believe that the high value of using SM in positive ways at institutions of higher education should be matched by research that is concerned with SM climate and SMP environments at colleges and universities.
Chapter IV

ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to explore gaps in the current SM and SMP literature with a focus on higher education as it relates to the unique experiences of faculty, administration, and staff. By taking a more nuanced look at the degree to which these stakeholders use SM and experience the climate of SMPs, I sought to offer an approach built on quantitative data that could help to understand and support SMP decisions in the future. The methodology and subsequent analyses built on and expanded from the following three research questions:

1. What are the behaviors, experiences, and perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff in regard to social media usage and social media policy at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey? Do similarities and/or differences exist between faculty, administration, and staff who use or don’t use social media and whose home institution has/does not have a social media policy in place?

2. How do the personal and professional behaviors of faculty, administration, and staff differ, if at all, on social media at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey?

3. What impact, if any, do characteristics such as gender, age, institutional type, and program/department have on social media and social media policy behaviors and perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey?

An exploratory study using a comparative analysis was conducted from August 2015 to November 2015 using a quantitative electronic survey instrument. Using the current literature,
examples of higher education SMPs and contemporary SM issues at of higher education and exploring the questions above provided a basis for mining deeper issues and identifying themes. As stated before, the market for SM growth is boundless as technology becomes increasingly suited to constant communication. However, the challenge is to use the issues and themes generated by this study to keep pace with this growing field to meet the needs of stakeholders in higher education.

**Social Media Demographics**

To develop a clear direction for addressing RQ.1, frequency data were isolated based on demographics of SM usage among faculty, administration, and staff. At the forefront of this section was one of the building blocks of the survey questionnaire, Q6: “Do you currently participate in any form of SM for personal or professional use?” In studies by Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2013) and Lenartz (2012), mentioned previously and included in Figure 4.1, the parameters used to define and measure SM usage among a given target population varied slightly and had specific purposes toward the methodology of the given study. In reference to the response sample of this particular study, of those that responded to Q6, 88% (n = 1502) participated in some form on SM whereas 12% (n = 208) did not.

Because one of the primary objectives of this study was to collect as much data on SM and SMP related to faculty, administration, and staff in the state of New Jersey as possible, measures such as “monthly” (Seaman & Tinti-Kane, 2013) across personal and professional SM usage were avoided. Instead, display logic was used to display specific questions related to each mode of SM usage, which created differences in response rates across questions within the
sample. By creating a “gateway question” using survey logic, the goal was to gather more specific data on faculty, administration, and staff subgroups.

**Social Media Nonusers**

Among non-SM users overall, 59% \((n = 95)\) indicated that concern over privacy was a “very important” factor in in their decision not to participate in personal or professional SM (see Figure 4.2). Differences between institutional role, albeit a small sample size, were significant in Q32_1 at \(x^2(6, \ N = 160) = 12.68, \ p = .048\). The most dramatic of the differences exists in the
Figure 4.2. Q32_1: Reasons for not participating in SM.

administrative role, as 74% \((n = 25)\) of this group indicated that concern of privacy was “very important” compared to 57% \((n = 55)\) among faculty members and 52% \((n = 15)\) of staff members. Additionally, 0% of administrators reported that concerns over privacy were “not important” compared to 21% \((n = 6)\) of staff members and 8% \((n = 8)\) of faculty members feeling similarly.

More equitable across institutional roles was how the potential for confusing personal and professional accounts was ranked in terms of importance by respondents to Q32_5 (see Figure 4.3). Although 41% \((n = 64)\) of respondents overall indicated that this item was “not important,” 22% \((n = 35)\) ranked it as “important” and 19% \((n = 30)\) indicated that this was “very important.” It is also noted that administrators tend to rank this with higher levels of importance than faculty and staff, which matches the response to Q32_1. Seen here among the non-SM user
Figure 4.3. Q32.5: Factors causing non-SM participation.

group, the same concerns that may not be properly addressed in SMPs are consistent with why individuals choose not to participate in SM in the first place.

Reporting Existence of Social Media Policies

Another foundation question within the survey instrument that dictated a good portion of the analysis was Q13: “Does your institution currently have a SMP in place?” Of those who responded to the survey, 55% \( (n = 898) \) reported “Don’t know/not sure”, 34% \( (n = 567) \) reported “Yes,” and 11% \( (n = 184) \) indicated “No” (see Figure 4.4). Prior research lacks a sufficient point of comparison on SMP specific questions; however the database created to gather participant contact information did indicate whether an institution in the target population had an SMP or not. This could be used to make minimal comparisons to the response sample; however the following should be considered. Comparing the target population data to the response
**Figure 4.4.** Does your institution have an SMP in place?

A sample could be invalid because more respondents from institutions with/without SMPs could have participated in higher numbers.

In regard to the age of the SM user in the response sample (see Table 4.1), these data were actionable, as the individual demographics noted an equitable distribution across each of the five age categories within Q4. These provide an additional level of comparison with prior research on age and SM participation, where these data varied immensely from study to study. For instance, Madden (2010) indicated that in 2010, 22% of Internet users over 50 reported being engaged on a social networking site with 61% of users falling between the ages of 30 and 49 years old. In terms of personal use of SM by faculty members, Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2013) noted that almost 90% of respondents under 35 years old used SM, along with over 80% of 35–44, over 75% of ages 45–54, and over 60% of age 55 or over.
Table 4.1

Response Sample: Age by Social Media Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 or under</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or over</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=2, Chi-Square = 104.872 sig. .000 at .05 level of significance

The data from the response sample indicated that of those who responded to Q4 and Q6, the number of SM participants in each of the age categories was higher than in previous studies. In direct comparison to Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2013), of the 35–44 age group, 95% (n = 311) participated in SM compared to 80%. Additionally, the response sample certainly represented an older SM user, as those reporting in the age 55–64 category had 82% (n = 357) indicating they participated in SM compared to 60% of those age 55 and older in the study conducted by Seaman and Tinti-Kane (2013).

Of those who responded to Q8 (n = 1371), which focused on personal SM usage, 34% (n = 470) reported accessing a personal SM account 11–20 times per day (see Figure 4.5). Additionally, 26% (n = 359) reported over 20 times per day, 19% (n = 265) 5–10 times per day, 8% (n = 114) a few times per week, 7% (n = 94) once or twice per day, and finally 5% (n = 69) reported that they use SM but on a minimal basis. Given the distribution of age groups in the response sample, 60% (n = 829) of those who indicated they participated in some form of SM accessed their site of choice 11–20 times per day or more.

On the professional SM side (see Figure 4.6) the frequency of use skews slightly to the lower side; however, of those who responded to Q10 (n = 1,214), which focused on professional SM usage, 43% (n = 518) reported accessing this account 5–10 times per day. Of the remaining
Response Sample: About how many times per day do you access your personal social media account?

Figure 4.5. Frequency of personal SM use.
responses, 24% \( (n = 291) \) indicated accessing the professional SM account 11–20 times per day, 17% \( (n = 205) \) once or twice per day, 12% \( (n = 142) \) over 20 times per day, 3% \( (n = 33) \) a few times per week, and finally 2% \( (n = 25) \) used this type of SM but on a minimal basis.

Again, given the demographics noted earlier, the frequency of professional SM usage with 67% \( (n = 809) \) accessing this type of website 5–20 times per day was interesting. Furthermore, it supported the deeper objective of the study, which was to understand a continuously growing and popular form of communication among faculty, administration, and staff.

A final dimension that is critical to taking an overall look at before moving on to more in-depth analysis is the creation of SM use SMP at institution “quadrants.” What this simply means is a category was created. Quadrant 1, for example, contained all individuals who reported that
they participated in SM (Q6) and also reported that their institution had an SMP. As indicated in the limitations section above, the measures for the existence of an SMP at an institution were self-reported by the respondents and may not be accurate representations of whether an institution actually had an SMP or not, which must be considered when interpreting the data. Three subsequent quadrants were re-coded in the data to account for additional combinations of SM usage and SMP existence (see Figure 4.7). Again, it should be noted that just as in the calculations above, those who reported “Don’t know/not sure” on Q13 were pulled into the “No” category for the purposes of this recoded variable.

![Figure 4.7. SM use + SM Quadrants.](image-url)
The data above are another way of illustrating the prevalence of SM usage and SMP existence data in a combined format, which indicated that Quadrant 2 was the most popular category among those who answered both questions \((n = 1,646)\), with 56\% \((n = 924)\) falling into that category, 31\% \((n = 517)\) reporting being SM users at an institution with an SMP (Quadrant 1), 9\% \((n = 156)\) not using SM and reporting no SMP at their institution (Quadrant 4), and finally 3\% \((n = 47)\) not using SM but indicating their institution had an SMP. It should be noted that it might be assumed that non-SM users may have no need to know if their institution had an SMP or not, so these numbers could be skewed in either a positive or negative direction. However, this is a useful metric in analyzing nuanced differences across these four distinct groups.

**Analytical Approach**

Briefly revisiting the methodology, the comparisons made across the largest three subgroups within the response sample (faculty, administration, and staff) were tested using chi-square analysis. By using this method, significance tests at < .05 helped to confirm that differences across these subgroups did or did not occur due to chance. In the event that the data pointed to differences across subgroups, the chi-square was referenced as a deeper layer of analytical power. Additionally, each stage of the analysis focused on each of the three research questions as guiding posts, where trends and themes were developed progressively.

**RQ1: SM and SMP Landscape and Institutional Role**

**SM usage.** In order to progress from the more general analytics to more precise ones, perhaps further insight into SM participation among the response sample was prudent. Transitioning to SM participation across institutional role, these stakeholders did in fact use SM
at different rates. Among those who responded to Q6 (n = 1710), SM use did differ by institutional role, $x^2(2, N = 1710) = 15.18, p = .001$ (see Table 4.2). More specifically, 92% (n = 1,502) of staff members used SM, 90% (n = 400) of those reporting as administrators used SM, and 85% (n = 698) of faculty reported being SM users.

Table 4.2

**Q6: Personal and Professional Social Media Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>698</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>824</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*df=2, Pearson Chi-Square = 15.175 sig .001 at <.05 level of significance*

Respondents provided additional depth to the measure of time spent accessing personal or professional SM accounts when they were asked to indicate the percentage of time they spent on each of these types of SM. In the event that an individual responded with a ratio instead of a valid percentage, these data were converted into percentages and recoded accordingly. The percentage of participants that used personal SM over 60% of the time differed by institutional role, $x^2 (2, N = 1473) = 6.89, p = .032$ (see Table 4.3). The threshold of 60% was chosen in order to represent those who spent a substantial proportion of their time using either personal or professional SM. Selecting a lower percentage here would include individuals who assessed their allocated time equally across different types of SM.

On the other hand, respondents’ use of professional SM, while different in proportion, did not differ by institutional role, $x^2 (2, N = 1473) = 6.89, p = .032$ (see Table 4.4). However, again, it is worth noting that staff members used personal SM websites as a larger part of their
Table 4.3

**Q7: Personal Social Media Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 60% Personal SM Usage</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60% Personal SM Usage</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=2, Pearson Chi-Square = 6.894 sig .032 at <.05 level of significance

Table 4.4

**Q7: Professional Social Media Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 60% Professional SM Usage</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60% Professional SM Usage</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=2, Pearson Chi-Square = 5.279 sig .071 at <.05 level of significance

SM activity at 71% ($n = 280$) over 60% personal SM usage than faculty members at 64% ($n = 438$) and administrators 63% ($n = 250$).

Conversely, faculty members and administrators used professional SM as a larger proportion of their overall SM activity at 22% ($n = 148$) and 21% ($n = 82$), reporting over 60% professional SM usage respectively. These data provided an indication staff members again used SM, particularly personal SM at a high rate and proportion of their overall SM activity. Professional SM activity seemed to be a smaller portion of overall SM activity, but faculty members and administrators used this medium more often than staff. In terms of SMP
communication and tailoring guidelines to specific groups, the data provided a good baseline measure to work with but could also have been supplemented by frequency of use across institutional roles and personal and professional SM activity.

It is interesting to see the differences across personal and professional SM usage in terms of frequency, particularly across institutional role (see Figures 4.8 and 4.9). Level of SM frequency of use in both personal and professional modes differed significantly at $x^2 (10, N = 1371) = 36.18, p = .001$, for personal use and $x^2 (10, N = 1214) = 24.02, p = .008$, for professional. Most notable is the movement from faculty to staff in the higher-frequency groups. In terms of personal SM use, faculty members displayed the highest levels of personal SM frequency per day, at 25% ($n = 154$), 34% ($n = 215$), and 24% ($n = 148$), from 5–10 times to over 20 times per day, respectively.

![Figure 4.8. Q8: Frequency of personal SM use by institutional role.](image)
Switching to the frequency of professional SM use, the same holds true for administrators in this same range of frequencies (see Figure 4.10); however it is also interesting to note that staff members frequent a professional SM account over 20 times per day at 15% ($n = 45$). In both respects, it is difficult to know if that is a university sponsored SM page or a self-promotion tool such as LinkedIn.

Yet another area that differed significantly by institutional role was what type of SM each of these groups of stakeholders was using personally, $\chi^2$ (14, $N = 1367$) = 177.89, $p = .001$, or professionally. Regarding the platforms used most for personal SM, overall Facebook was the most popular at 91% ($n = 1250$) and was fairly stable across institutional role (see Figure 4.10). Among the types of SM included in the “Other” professional SM category were references to e-
Figure 4.10. Q9: SM platform for personal use.

mail, Google+, Tumblr, and the institution’s homepage. The major differences between roles can be seen across SM platforms such as Twitter, Instagram, Pinterest, and Snapchat.

In terms of overall trends across institutional role in regard to personal or professional SM participation, faculty members were least likely to use any of the platforms indicated in Q9 or Q11. This was an important consideration while progressing through the analysis and could be attributed to differences in individual demographics or perceptions of SM and SMP policy that guide their level and type of participation. Most interesting here is that administrators led participation in Twitter for personal use at 40% (n = 148), whereas staff led in most categories but particularly in the use of Instagram at 40% (n = 149), Pinterest at 38% (n = 142), and Snapchat 14% (n = 53). Differences across institutional role in regard to personal SM showed more potential for SMPs to be more compartmentalized for different roles within the institution.
and possibly within departments. Guidelines that may apply to a faculty member who used Facebook primarily may not necessarily reach a staff member or administrator who had a much more diverse pool of SM options to choose from.

The most popular SM site for professional use was LinkedIn at 63% \((n = 759)\), compared to over 30% of respondents using LinkedIn, according to the research conducted by Moran et al. (2011), and 33% of participants using LinkedIn in the follow-up study (Seaman & Tinti-Kane, 2013). This indicated a fairly sharp rise in the popularity of this professional platform and its frequency of use among faculty, administration, and staff. However, there was far greater variability in the use of professional SM participation than personal (see Figure 4.11). For instance, in regard to the use of LinkedIn for professional purposes, 69% \((n = 389)\) of faculty members reported using the service as opposed to 60% \((n = 200)\) of administrators and 55% \((n = 170)\) of staff members. However, the reverse was true of the use of Facebook, where administrators used this platform professionally most frequently at 65% \((n = 217)\) followed by staff members at 63% \((n = 194)\) and faculty members at 50% \((n = 281)\). Additionally, 20% \((n = 60)\) of staff members used Instagram in a professional capacity whereas only 5% \((n = 28)\) of faculty members did so.

**SMP and institutional role.** In addition to the SM landscape across the roles of faculty, administration, and staff, which seemed to point toward a diversity of use across the three major stakeholders, data surrounding the existence and details of SMP were also critical. Drawing key themes across SM participation and behaviors and SMP details and perceptions might make identifying key areas worth leveraging in future policy development. The first SMP-focused
section below focuses on the details of policy, followed by the experiences of faculty, administration, and staff within the SMP environment.

Figure 4.11. Q11: SM platform for professional use.

**SMP knowledge.** Administration was more likely to report knowledge of an SMP than faculty and, to this point, was less likely to not know of the SMP’s existence. Awareness of SMP differed significantly across institution roles at $x^2 (4, N = 1649)= 51.78, p = .001$ (see Table 4.5). Most critical to the overall analysis was the proportion of individuals in the “Don’t know/not sure” category, which overall was 54% ($n = 898$). Additionally, faculty responded in this same category at 62% ($n = 492$) and the lowest among administrators at 42% ($n = 179$). This category could be a large area of concern for policy makers and those seeking buy-in from campus stakeholders, in that if an SMP did exist, each of these roles might not even know.
Table 4.5

Q13: Does Your Institution Currently Have a Social Media Policy in Place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=4, Pearson Chi-Square = 51.777 sig .000 at <.05 level of significance

The fact that the faculty responded at the highest rate in this category was troubling given the majority of media identified faculty and student indiscretions on SM platforms, and to the direction of this analysis, staff did not fall far behind at 53% ($n = 227$). Given the data showing high rates of use among staff members, knowledge of SMP existence for this group should also have been an area of focus. Finally, administrators confirmed the existence of an SMP at their institution at the highest rate 45% ($n = 193$) among those who responded to Q13.

Although the differences between institutional roles were not quite significant, it was interesting to see if those who indicated that their institution had an SMP might know some additional basic details. In Figure 4.12, of the $n = 438$ respondents who answered Q15, which asked if the SMP was a stand-alone document, a similar pattern of uncertainty follows. Overall, 34% of those who knew their institution had an SMP could not say whether it was a stand-alone document or not, with 39% ($n = 62$) of faculty members responding in this category and 39% ($n = 51$) of staff members responding in a similar fashion. Part of effective policy communication is again garnering the buy-in of individuals who had to follow the guidelines. Although the level
of uncertainty in this category is of course going to exist, policy makers might have a vested interest in knowing how much basic knowledge of the SMP there is at the institutional level.

### Figure 4.12. Q15: SMP location.

#### SMP details.** Going a bit further in-depth in the comparisons across institutional roles,** Q16 asked respondents about who they felt was the primary audience of an SMP. Respondents to this question included those who reported that their institution had an SMP and also reported that they felt familiar with the general principles and details of the policy. Whereas respondents of this question \((n = 383)\) could select all parties that applied, two distinct trends emerged (see Figure 4.13). First and foremost, respondents tended to select their own institutional role as the primary intended audience in greater numbers.

For example, faculty \((72\%, n = 100)\) was the most popular selection among faculty, administration \((72\%, n = 97)\) the most popular among administration, and staff \((73\%, n = 81)\)
among the staff. This adhered to the tendency for individuals to self-select in a survey where they themselves were the primary audience (Downes-Le Guin, Baker, Mechling, & Ruylea, 2012). However, overall, 70% (n = 268) of participants indicated that staff were the primary audience, which might go against the traditional thinking and direction of the current literature, that students or faculty are the most in jeopardy and are therefore the primary audience (Foss & Olson, 2013; Lederman, 2014; McCoy, 2015; Wandel, 2007).

**Contributing to SMP process.** Certain scenarios within the analysis actually point to larger overall issues if all three of the institutional roles identified at this level correspond on a specific subject (see Table 4.6). Q18–Q20, which were combined for the purposes of comparing roles, asked respondents to rate the frequency with which each of the following occurred at their

![Figure 4.13. Q16: SMP intended audience.](image-url)
institution in reference to specific aspects of the SMP process. Across all items within this panel, from being included in the policy-making process to providing feedback on the SMP after implementation, all three roles indicated in large numbers that they were rarely or never included.

Table 4.6

Q18–20: Social Media Planning Among Faculty, Administration, and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty members, administrators, and staff members</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are included in the creation and planning process before a social media policy is implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide perspectives based on personal and professional use of social media to inform policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have been included in disciplinary decisions regarding social media indiscretions of faculty, administration, or staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are encouraged to provide feedback regarding the details of a social media policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Including stakeholders in the policy-making process could be seen as a key way to gain confidence in policy by these roles, resulting in buy-in and better understanding of policy. However, in reference to the policy-planning process, 59% \((n = 69)\) of staff, 48% \((n = 86)\) of faculty, and 37% \((n = 63)\) of administrators reported they were “rarely” or “never” included in this step. In the implementation phase, 79% \((n = 89)\) of staff, 60% \((n = 109)\) of administrators, and 53% \((n = 87)\) of faculty members stated that they rarely or never “have been included in disciplinary decisions regarding SM indiscretions of faculty, administration, or staff.” At two separate and distinct points within the policy process, all roles, but particularly staff and administration, indicated that they were minimally involved, further emphasizing the lack of SMP buy-in among all roles.

**SMP perceptions.** Participants were asked to give their opinions on the existence and details of SMPs by ranking the degree to which they agreed with several statements in Q21. Overall trends related to Q21 underscored the themes in media attention related to conduct on SM related to academic freedom and SMP infractions, which showed that faculty did not view SMPs in the highest regard. In fact, as illustrated in Figure 4.14, 16% \((n = 120)\) of faculty members compared to 8% \((n = 31)\) administrators and 8% \((n = 30)\) staff members strongly disagreed that “SMPs should be instituted at every institution.” This difference across roles was significant at \(x^2(8, N = 1,479)= 39.12, p = .001\).

With the exception of faculty holding more polarizing views of SMP at institutions of higher education, respondents to Q21_5 \((n = 1474)\), which focused on policy clarity, did not differ in agreeing that this played a significant role in the eventual level of effectiveness (see Figure 4.15). Overall, 68% \((n = 1007)\) agreed with this statement, with 37% \((n = 546)\) selecting
“strongly agree.” Here are two points of leverage that not only showed support for SMPs but also provided insight into how they could be most effectively implemented.

Figure 4.14. Q21_1: Implementation of SMPs.
SMP behaviors. Whereas generally there was a sense of SMP support among all faculty, administration, and staff, when individuals whose institutions had SMPs were asked in Q24 how likely they would be to take specific actions after consulting their institution’s SMP, results led one to question the overall impact of these guidelines (see Table 4.7). No significant differences exist in these measures across institutional role; however 16% (n = 53) of those responding to Q24 indicated that they would “probably not” or “definitely not” review the privacy and confidentiality guidelines associated with the SM account they used most frequently. Additionally, 17% (n = 56) indicated that they would “probably not” or “definitely not” employ the strongest privacy settings on their SM accounts after consulting the institutional SMP. Whereas a large portion of respondents indicated that they would make changes to their behavior as a result of policy, there is still a contingent that noted otherwise. Consequently, the data
Table 4.7

**Q24: Social Media Consultation**

**Please choose the level of likelihood that you would do the following after consulting your SMP.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose to secure the social media account(s) that I used most frequently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=8, Pearson chi-square= 8.962 sig .346 at <.05 level of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the privacy and confidentiality guidelines associated with the social media account(s) I used most frequently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=8, Pearson chi-square= 7.227 sig .512 at <.05 level of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ the strongest privacy settings available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=8, Pearson chi-square= 6.978 sig .539 at <.05 level of significance

showed that the reach of SMPs and the methods to increase buy-in among faculty, administration, and staff could use improvement.

Additionally, higher levels of this lack of SMP impact are evident in both Q24_5 and Q24_6 (see Figure 4.16). Overall, 20% \( (n = 63) \) of respondents reported that they would “probably not” or “definitely not” make recommendations to a colleague in regard to their security settings on SM, and 26% \( (n = 25) \) of faculty members responded similarly.

Additionally, 21% \( (n = 69) \) of participants responded “probably not” or “definitely not” when
Figure 4.16. Q24_5/Q24_6: SMP consultation.

asked if they might periodically review their own connections to maintain their personal circle of SM “friends,” with the faculty again having the highest proportion in this item at 24% \((n = 31)\).

Staff members did, however, answer “probably” to both of the items indicated in Figure 4.18, with 41% \((n = 33)\) indicating that they may be more likely to implement the suggested best practices in their institution’s SMP than faculty or staff. This is an important dynamic to understand in reference to the data, which showed support for SMP. Individuals may support SMP and specific guidelines at institutions, but those operating under such guidelines (although small in number) showed a tendency toward ambivalence about putting the guidelines to work.

Corresponding to the data above are the perceptions of different types of SM behavior in reference to SMP. More specifically, Q25 asked respondents to rate the frequency that each type of SMP infraction occurred at their specific institution. Faculty members tended to indicate that infractions ranging from low level to high level occurred more frequently in slightly larger numbers, and views on SMP infractions did have variability across institutional role (see Table
Specifically, significant differences existed in the high level SMP infraction panel at $x^2 (8, N = 349) = 18.20, p = .020$, in regard to the lower frequency of occurrence.

Table 4.8

**Q25: Social Media Policy Infractions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social media policy infractions</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>occur on a low level (i.e. inappropriate comment, picture, video or link posted and quickly deleted)</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=8, Pearson chi-square= 14.983 sig. .059 at &lt;.05 level of significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social media policy infractions</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>occur on a moderate level (i.e. threatening comments are made toward individuals or the institution, pictures/videos/links frequently posted and publicly visible and are not removed.)</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=8, Pearson chi-square= 15.140 sig. .056 at &lt;.05 level of significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social media policy infractions</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>occur on a high level (inappropriate communication occurs between institutional stakeholders VIA social media, disparaging or exclusionary remarks are made repeatedly.)</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=8, Pearson chi-square= 18.198 sig. .020 at &lt;.05 level of significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degree to which stakeholders adhere to SMP or know of their specifics is put into question, with 45% ($n = 157$) of respondents indicating that SMP infractions occur at their institution at a low level and faculty reporting 15% ($n = 22$) these types of infractions occurred “often.” Additionally, 27% ($n = 92$) of respondents indicated that moderate SMP infractions occurred “occasionally” and 15% ($n = 51$) of those who reported having an SMP at their
institution reported that high-level infractions occurred “occasionally.” Finally, 51% \( (n = 41) \) of staff indicated that high-level infractions never occurred at their institution.

Compared to faculty and staff respondents, administrators seemed to be more sensitive to the nature of the content on institutional SM accounts. This awareness could be attributed to having more responsibility for overseeing the implementation of these websites. However, faculty and staff reported that the frequency with which institutional SM accounts contain personal views is fairly high as well (see Figure 4.17). This pull between the personal and professional SM behavior resides in Q25_4, which focuses on official institutional SM accounts. Specifically, 50% \( (n = 173) \) reported that these accounts had personal views and commentary visible to the public from “occasionally” to “very often.” To this point, 18% \( (n = 22) \) of administrators indicated that this happened “often” and 11% \( (n = 14) \) reported “very often.” Even participation in professional SM accounts could prove dangerous for faculty, administration, and staff, and proper guidance from SMP could reduce the frequency of personal views being posted on institutional accounts.

Drawing a line of sight from SMP knowledge to perceptions and then to behaviors yielded notions of poor policy communication and investment in guidelines across all institutional roles. What are the potential future consequences of SM indiscretions and failure to adhere to SMPs? Q36 focused on how important SM behavior is to future employment, and among those who responded to the question \( (n = 1129) \), the results further underscored the issues noted above. Significant differences across institutional roles did exist here at \( x^2(8, N = 1129) = 36.47, p = .001 \) (see Figure 4.18). The majority of faculty respondents \( (62%, n = 360) \) indicated that SM behavior is either “somewhat important” or “not important” to future employment in
Figure 4.17. Q25_4: Behavior on institutional SM accounts.

contrast to 49% \( (n = 129) \) of staff members and 44% \( (n = 127) \) of administrators. Differences within institutional role only support the notion that efforts to communicate the more long-lasting effects of poor SM discretion may not reach specific groups.

In Figure 4.18, 28% \( (n = 165) \) of faculty members reported that SM behavior was “not important” to future employment or promotion opportunities. Given how the question was framed, this is even more alarming since their current institution was also included and individuals may have had more access to their personal SM account. Perhaps faculty members felt more secure in their current position, but staff at 20% \( (n = 53) \) and administration at 14% \( (n = 41) \) shared similar views. Acknowledging that there were adequate levels of faculty, administration, and staff who saw SM behavior as an important factor to future employment,
high levels of personal and professional SM use and low adherence to SMPs showed a point of reference in Q36 worth monitoring.

**Summary of themes and trends across RQ.1.** The analysis framed around RQ.1 identified several themes and trends overall, as well as the differences in SM and SMP behaviors, experiences, and perceptions (see Figure 4.19). Specifically, the high frequency of use across personal and professional SM that is also diverse by the type of platform used provided better insight into college and university stakeholders beyond the traditional purview of contemporary research in this field. Staff used personal SM the most frequently while having the least input into SMP decisions overall, and faculty had the most interest invested in the use of professional SM. Complementing this trend was a gradual significant difference across
institutional role in the type of SM platform used, indicating that staff participated in the widest variety and more nontraditional Web 2.0 (e.g., Pinterest, Snapchat, and Instagram).

In contrast, the high frequency and variety of SM usage across institutional role did not match the level of SMP necessary to manage this volume. A large proportion of faculty, administration, and staff either reported not having a policy at their institution or being completely unaware that one existed, with staff holding the highest percentage in this regard at 65%. Even when respondents noted being aware of a policy currently in place, a quarter indicated they were not familiar with the general principles of the policy and had rarely or never contributed to SMP discussions or enforcement decisions.

Clear issues given the significant differences across institutional role existed in properly identifying the unique nature of SM use among faculty, administration, and staff and how to properly acquire SMP “buy-in” from stakeholders. Even the participants, who are native to an SMP at their institutional and aware of its specific guidelines, rarely changed their SM behavior or privacy settings to ensure personal conduct stayed separate from professional. As the following analysis supports, the weak connection of potential consequences to SMP seemed to be a reason why real changes to behaviors may not have occurred. If personal SM behaviors are seen to have no foreseeable impact either personally or professionally, then what might be the

---

**Figure 4.19. Summary of RQ 1.**
catalyst for change? This is yet another critical aspect of the “buy-in” factor, which is to assess methods that not only have faculty, administration, and staff become more familiar with the details of policy but to encourage more active engagement.

SMPs were supported among most participants, but faculty agreed that they should be instituted in far fewer numbers than staff and administrators. Faculty concerns over academic freedom could be a contributing factor to this trend, as SMPs could tend to govern what views in any context are acceptable to express on Web 2.0. Levels of agreement were also high among faculty, administration, and staff on procedures for enforcing SMP. These data suggest a unique opportunity to use a highly active SM population at institutions toward a positive end.

Respondents indicated that whereas they did not necessarily change their personal or professional SM behaviors overall as a result of SMP, the did tend to agree in higher frequency that it would encourage them to monitor a close group of friends more closely. Identifying points of leverage to build around would increase the likelihood of more “buy-in” across institutional roles while involving parties of interest in the conversation around best practices personally and professionally on Web 2.0.

RQ1.2: Interaction of SM Usage and SMP

Orienting the data according to participants’ SM usage and whether their institution had an SMP highlighted differences in behaviors and perceptions across these demographics. To this end, at some points, the analysis refers to individuals as SMP “natives.” An SMP “native” is an individual who self-reported that his or her institution had an SMP and therefore his or her individual SM behaviors on personal and professional platforms should be interpreted in this context. This distinction helps to add an important layer to the narrative related to RQ.1 and was
facilitated by developing four SM/SMP “quadrants” (see Figure 4.20). These are essentially subgroups within the data that all participants fell into based on if they participated in SM or not and if they reported their institution having an SMP or not. Capturing SM use and SMP existence in one measure was crucial to assessing whether specific behaviors, perceptions, and experiences might shift in different environments, which would be significant to future policy development and implementation.

![SM use _ SMP Quadrants](image)

*Figure 4.20. SM use _ SMP Quadrants.*

To facilitate valid comparisons across these groups, it was important to avoid any questions within the survey that respondents arrived at via logic. More specifically, each question in this section of the analysis was seen by all survey participants regardless of level of SM use and/or existence of an SMP at their institution. Important insights can be made by analyzing across these four groups, which in some cases were significantly different. These
insights led to themes surrounding SM monitoring and personal and professional conduct. For the purposes of this research, comparisons across the first two quadrants are important as they compare SM users in two different SMP contexts. It should also be noted that comparisons to Quadrant 3 \((n = 47)\) and Quadrant 4 \((n = 156)\) were done to understand their relative size to Quadrants 1 and 2. More substantial comparisons and insights into trends can be gleaned from the juxtaposition of Quadrants 1 and 2, where the majority of participants resided in the response sample.

**SM monitoring.** Being an SMP native increased the likelihood that an individual felt that SM monitoring in both the personal and professional contexts occurred from the institutional level down to the department or program level. Among those who responded to Q27 \((n = 1231)\), which asked if participants believed their institution, department, or program monitored their personal SM activity, differences across quadrants were significant \(\chi^2(3, N = 1231) = 22.72, p = .001\). The data suggested that if an individual reported that an SMP was in place, the belief that SM monitoring occurred increased in Quadrants 1 and 3. Conversely, if participants reported that no SMP was in place, then the belief that personal SM monitoring occurred decreased (see Table 4.9).

Exact data on the amount and frequency of monitoring occurring at institutions of higher education in reference to SM did not currently exist; however SM users that had an SMP at their institution and non-SM users with SMPs at their institutions differed significantly from the rest of the group. Perhaps being more aware of SMP infractions or poor SM behavior among colleagues led individuals to believe monitoring was occurring on some level.
Table 4.9

Q27: Personal Social Media Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you believe your institution, department, or program monitors the personal social media accounts of faculty, administration, and staff?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM User + SMP at Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=3, Pearson chi-square = 22.718 sig. 0.000 at <.05 level of significance

Compared to how those who responded Q28 focused on professional SM monitoring (n = 1231), personal SM monitoring is a minor concern. Differences across quadrants were significant in reference to professional SM monitoring at \( \chi^2(3, N = 1231) = 50.54, p = .001 \) (Table 4.10). The same pattern held true of potential professional SM monitoring as it did for personal, in that if an SMP was present, the likelihood of believing monitoring existed increased.

Table 4.10

Q28: Professional Social Media Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you believe your institution, department, or program monitors the professional social media accounts of faculty, administration, and staff?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM User + SMP at Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=3, Pearson chi-square = 50.541 sig. 0.000 at <.05 level of significance
However, even SM users with institutions that did not have (or did not know they had) an SMP still believed that professional SM monitoring occurred in far higher numbers than personal (46%, $n = 341$). In Quadrant 1, 62% ($n = 201$) of respondents reported that they believed monitoring of their professional SM accounts occurred. Conversely, 71% ($n = 94$) of Quadrant 4 reported that they did not believe monitoring occurred. Whereas personal SM use by employees at institutions of higher education was high and earlier data noted the high frequency of use per day, professional SM appeared to be what was perceived to be more in the public eye here even across SM user/nonuser and SMP native/non-SMP native. Perhaps job security among these groups and level of responsibility may have put more of a premium on professional SM behavior and may have increased the belief that monitoring exists.

Comparing non-SM conduct. Among those who responded (see Table 4.11) to Q31 ($n = 1212$), which included a panel of questions about more general private and professional conduct, 81% ($n = 979$) chose either “somewhat agree” or “strongly agree” when they were faced with a statement that stated their current role required them to maintain their professional conduct in all forums to “promote the institution’s mission and values.” Once again, the differences across the four subgroups of SM use and SMP existence were significant at $\chi^2(12, N = 1212) = 39.88, p = .001$ (see Table 4.11).

In a broad sense, comparing the private and professional charts seems to support the general notion that private (or personal) behavior was not believed to be in the public sphere and was therefore under less scrutiny. In both cases, behaviors and perceptions changed if it was believed an SMP existed, and according to the data, individuals tended to subscribe to this same thought process inside and outside of the context of SM. Even though significant differences did
occur between the top tiers of agreement in Q31_1 and confirmed some of the statements made in the prior section of analysis, Q31_2 and Q31_3 (see Figure 4.21) speak to the emphasis on professional conduct more clearly. Although the differences between quadrants were significant on Q31_2 at $x^2(12, N = 1211)= 18.63, p = .001$, it is perhaps more important to see the shift in agreement level from a private perspective to a professional perspective.

**SM monitoring perception.** Participants were less likely to feel that SMPs overstepped the boundaries of freedom of speech if they reported being actively engaged in SM and that their institution had an SMP in place. Assessing SMP perceptions is critical to measuring differences in the context of SM usage that could improve the SMP strategies at colleges and universities (see Figure 4.22). Among those who responded to Q29 ($n = 1222$), SM users/non-SM users and SMP natives/non-SMP natives alike believed that governance or monitoring of personal or professional SM accounts affected freedom of speech at 65% ($n = 792$). Most intriguing in regard to this survey item was that individuals in the “SM User + SMP at Institution” group differed significantly in that only 56% ($n = 181$) believed that governance or monitoring...
infringed on freedom of speech. The difference in this group from the rest of the quadrants was significant at $\chi^2(3, N = 1222) = 14.85, p = .002.$

*Figure 4.21. Q31_2/Q31_3: Impact of inappropriate personal or professional behavior*
For individuals using SM and SMP natives, these groups responded “Yes” to this question in far lower numbers than average. Having no SMP or not participating in SM increased the likelihood of thinking governance or monitoring infringed on freedom of speech in all groups by Quadrant 1. Perhaps individuals in this group had seen the policy progress to a level where it was not seen as harmful. However, 56% \((n = 181)\) was still a significantly large portion for Quadrant 1 particularly when most policies outlined earlier did not specifically restrict certain behaviors but only provided guidelines for best practices at most. To this point, according to the recent addendum to the Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications policy (Reichman et al., 2013), traditional notions of academic freedom extend to safeguard SM behaviors as well. Since the concepts in the updated AAUP statement and the feelings of individuals in the context of SMPs are at odds with one another, this shows a critical flaw in

Figure 4.22. Q29: SM governance and freedom of speech.

For individuals using SM and SMP natives, these groups responded “Yes” to this question in far lower numbers than average. Having no SMP or not participating in SM increased the likelihood of thinking governance or monitoring infringed on freedom of speech in all groups by Quadrant 1. Perhaps individuals in this group had seen the policy progress to a level where it was not seen as harmful. However, 56% \((n = 181)\) was still a significantly large portion for Quadrant 1 particularly when most policies outlined earlier did not specifically restrict certain behaviors but only provided guidelines for best practices at most. To this point, according to the recent addendum to the Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications policy (Reichman et al., 2013), traditional notions of academic freedom extend to safeguard SM behaviors as well. Since the concepts in the updated AAUP statement and the feelings of individuals in the context of SMPs are at odds with one another, this shows a critical flaw in
acquiring belief in the purposes of SM governance. Perhaps more intriguing are those who responded in such high numbers in Quadrant 2 at 68% \((n = 502)\), which may suggest that if an SMP did not exist, it only emboldened the perception that they overstepped the boundaries associated with freedom of speech or in some cases academic freedom.

**Future employment by SM quadrants.** Data in earlier sections of the analysis suggested that respondents placed more emphasis on the potential consequences of professional behavior. By analyzing the results of Q36 which points to future employment in the context of the SM/SMP quadrants, it could show the potential impact that being an active SM user or SMP native would had on assessing the value of personal and professional SM conduct. Among the \(n = 1123\) individuals that responded to Q36, 55\% \((n = 614)\) believed that SM behavior was either “somewhat important” or “not important” (see Figure 4.23), but 42\% \((n = 54)\) of those in Quadrant 4 (Non-SM User + No SMP at Institution) reported that SM behavior had no impact on future employment.

Of course, this was due in large part to those individuals not participating in SM. According to the data, they had several valid reasons for not doing so, among them concerns over privacy. However, it is interesting to note once again that faculty, administration, and staff in Quadrant 4 could have a responsibility for evaluating SM indiscretions or future employees without any weight being given to their SM conduct or belief that it had any importance. Even though individuals in Quadrant 4 existed in a climate where they did not use SM and they
indicated not having a policy, certainly some knowledge of how it plays a role in personal and professional evaluation should be respected.

The trend upward in terms of the proportion of each group that reported that SM behavior was “not important” coincided with the existence of SMP and use of SM. Being a member of an institution with an SMP seemed to increase one’s knowledge that future employers might use SM accounts as a vetting mechanism, which meant that this might have been a means of illustrating the importance of following SM guidelines. The significant difference across the four groups at \( \chi^2(12, N = 1123) = 52.20, p = .001 \) illustrated in a specific capacity where more education, even if it was not an SMP per se, might have had positive outcomes for SM users/non-SM users alike.
Knowledge of SM controversy. The potential impact of participation in SM and the existence of SMP on awareness of SM issues either locally or abroad could be another leveraging point for those seeking to provide better information on these tools to all higher-education stakeholders. Among those who responded to this question \((n = 1121)\), 53\% \((n = 592)\) had heard of SM controversies either locally or abroad as opposed to 47\% \((n = 529)\) who had not (see Table 4.12). However, a significant difference existed (see Table 4.12) between SM/SMP quadrants at \(x^2(3, N = 1121)= 9.88, p = .020\).

Table 4.12

Q37: Knowledge of Social Media Controversy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SM User + SMP at Institution</th>
<th>SM User + NO SMP at Institution</th>
<th>NON SM User + SMP at Institution</th>
<th>NON SM User + NO SMP at Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>298</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(df=3, \text{Pearson chi-square} = 9.879, \text{sig} .020 \text{ at .05 level of significance}\)

Of those individuals who participated in SM and reported having an SMP at their institution, 58\% \((n = 173)\) indicated they had heard of controversy locally or abroad as opposed to 49\% \((n = 325)\) of those who used SM but did not think they had an SMP at their institution. Results were similar for Quadrant 4 at 59\% \((n = 75)\) indicating “yes.” Despite a far smaller sample size of 31 non-SM users, those who perceived an SMP to be at their institution reported “yes” 61\% \((n = 19)\) of the time.

The significant difference between the first two groups may have indicated that SM users and those who reported an SMP were in fact more aware of these types of behaviors and news
stories due to their exposure to some type of guideline. However, this would not explain the relatively similar proportions for Quadrant 4, which had neither SM users nor SMP natives. However, given the low response to SMPs, including the examples of poor SM etiquette in Figure 4.24 (41%), those with SMPs may not have been so drastically different from individuals at an institution without one.

### Figure 4.24. Summary of RQ 1.2.

#### Summary of themes and trends across RQ 1.2. Overall, those who had an SMP at their institution tended to favor the governance of SM, and conversely SM users without SMPs were less likely to agree that specific scenarios would imply that these guidelines be used for enforcement and differed on the audience they were intended for. When combined with the fact that more individuals in Quadrant 1 believed professional SM monitoring occurred at their institution as opposed to Quadrant 2, there seems to be a linkage between having an SMP in place and how individuals perceived their institution’s SM climate (see Figure 4.24).

However, the focus on personal and professional SM behaviors and potential consequences for inappropriate conduct differed across these groups significantly. More respondents in the SM User + SMP at Institution group believed that faculty, administration, and staff personal SM accounts were monitored along with the small number of those individuals in the Non SM User + SMP at Institution group. An even higher magnitude of significant
difference existed when it came to monitoring of professional SM, where 62% of those in Quadrant 1 believed this occurred, as opposed to 46% in Quadrant 2.

Whereas this may point to SMP impacts on professional use, it may also indicate more inherent importance in proper conduct on professional SM accounts. In such a case, a department Facebook page or faculty member’s LinkedIn profile may demand more attention to appropriate behavior, and more broadly this could mean that professional behaviors are seen as more critical to one’s job security than what might happen “away from campus” either physically or digitally. Even though this question was framed in a way that detailed behavior separate from Web 2.0, it could help to explain why participants felt professional SM accounts were far more likely to be monitored.

Overall, across institutional roles, there was a belief that governance and monitoring of SM usage affected an individual’s constitutional right to freedom of speech. To this point, only 56% of those in the SM User +SMP at Institution group believed this to be true in comparison to all other groups at or above 67%. This trend worked in the opposite direction of the points of leverage outlined earlier and instead suggested another area of concern in all settings. If institutions with SMPs were not communicating the negative consequences of poor conduct and connecting policy with practice, then faculty, administration, and staff are in danger of unknowingly impacting multiple facets of their everyday life.

RQ2: Personal versus Professional SM and SMP

Serving as a compliment to the analysis above, the second section focuses on the issues raised by RQ.2, “How do the personal and professional behaviors of faculty, administration, and staff differ, if at all, at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey?” Once again,
both positive and negative themes emerge from this focus on the analysis, which support points raised by the data above. Namely, that professional SM was seen to have more of an influence on institutional and individual reputation and the opportunities for SMPs to leverage faculty, administration, and staff behaviors to increase buy-in.

**Revisiting the non-SM user.** Those participants who reported not using SM in either the personal or professional context reported that concerns over privacy and the potential for confusing or overlapping personal and professional accounts were the biggest reasons they chose not to do so. It is critical to note that these two reasons are referenced several times throughout the forthcoming section on the typology of SM behavior and are a lens for understanding the different types of SM behavior in the personal or professional context. Even among SM users, these same concerns exist and may not be addressed in SMPs in a satisfactory enough manner to produce any type of measurable change among participants. This is precisely why it is important to assess typologies of personal and professional SM behaviors across institutional roles to more precisely develop sound SM strategies.

**Typology of personal SM behavior.** Collecting data on the frequency with which participants commented on friends’ links to news stories, articles, videos or images versus the frequency with which they commented on media posted by news agencies (Table 4.13) could give a more accurate picture of exactly how individuals use personal and professional SM. Although these scenarios seem fairly similar, each could carry different types of exposure in each of these contexts that could be more conducive to poor SM decisions or SMP infractions. First, among those who responded to Q33, which was approximately $n = 965$, no significant differences existed between the two items across institutional role. This indicated that the
frequency of different types of personal SM behavior did not vary in reference to institutional role; however overall numbers were interesting to examine in further detail.

First, of those who responded to Q33_4, 13% \((n = 121)\) reported that they commented on friends’ links to news stories, articles, videos, or images “almost every day,” whereas 26% \((n = 250)\) reported doing so “often” and 33% \((n = 314)\) responding with “occasionally.” When it comes to commenting on media posted by news agencies (e.g., New York Times, Fox News, etc.), overall 23% \((n = 218)\) of respondents reported they did so “occasionally,” 11% \((n = 107)\) chose “often,” and 6% \((n = 60)\) “almost every day.”

Making more general comments within a personal SM users circle of “friends” was more popular among respondents to Q33, whereas more public opinion comments were “rarely” or “never” made 60% \((n = 582)\) of the time overall. Until similar research is conducted, it would be unfair to say how typical these specific types of personal SM behavior are. However, it is interesting to compare the data in Table 4.13 to another item within the Q33 panel that focuses more specifically on comments related to controversial economic, political, and religious events.

Of those who responded to Q33_6 \((n = 966)\), 45% \((n = 431)\) chose that they “never” made statements on controversial events and 29% \((n = 280)\) chose that they did so “rarely.” Only 9% \((n = 91)\) overall chose that they did so “often” or “almost every day.” Whereas Figure 4.25 breaks this data out by institutional role, no significant differences existed on this survey item. It is interesting to note that whereas there was relative popularity in commenting on posted material both within a network of friends and more publicly, individuals reported that they refrained from doing so in a controversial manner.
Table 4.13

**Q33: How Social Media Is Used on a Personal Level**

**What do you use social media platforms on a personal level?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment on friends, links to news-stories, articles, videos, or images.</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost every day</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>463</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=8, Pearson chi-square=12.948 sig. .114 at <.05 level of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment on articles or videos posted by news agencies (i.e. New York Times, Fox News, etc.)</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost every day</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>464</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=8, Pearson chi-square= 3.748 sig. .879 at <.05 level of significance

**Figure 4.25. Q33 6: Statements on controversial events (Personal SM).**
Monitoring and personal SM. With respect to opportunities for SMPs to potentially gain buy-in from personal SM users, Figure 4.26 illustrates how SM monitoring already existed at least in some capacity among faculty, administration, and staff. In the response data for Q33_8, 30% \((n = 289)\) of participants stated that they “occasionally” monitored the activity of a close group of friends, family, and coworkers, 25% \((n = 245)\) chose “often” and 12% \((n = 119)\) indicated they did so “almost every day”. All told, 67% \((n = 653)\) used SM monitoring in the personal context in some capacity.

Figure 4.26. Q33_8: Monitoring SM activity of close group of friends (Personal SM).
Typology of professional SM behavior. In the opposite fashion of personal SM behavior, several of the items within Q34 were significantly different across institutional role of those who responded to the question ($n = 881–886$). Overall, it would seem that professional SM activity and behavior varied more across institutional role than the rather consistent frequency of behaviors across more personal activities. However, Q34_1 did have more of a consensus across institutional roles than most within this question, although it was nearly significant. In response to the frequency with which individuals reported using SM to collaborate with colleagues at this and other institutions, 32% ($n = 284$) did so “occasionally,” 21% ($n = 182$) “often,” and 5% ($n = 43$) reported “almost every day” (see Figure 4.27).

![Figure 4.27. Q34_1: Encouraging collaboration with colleagues (Professional SM).](image-url)
At this point, response items within the panel of questions for Q34 tended to differ significantly across institutional role as professional uses became more job specific. For instance, 16% \((n = 72)\) of faculty reported using SM “often” to connect with current students for course assignments compared to 11% \((n = 22)\) of staff and 10% \((n = 24)\) of administrators. Perhaps administration and staff responded to a question centered around the context of classroom instruction because they might have a responsibility to advise students or check their progress as part of program or department responsibilities. Although differences here were significant at \(x^2(8, N = 885) = 31.54, p = .001\), the gravity of specific professional SM behaviors toward specific roles begins to round into shape, particularly among the faculty in Figure 4.28.

\[\text{Figure 4.28. Q34_2: Connecting with current students (Professional SM)}\]
Of those who responded to Q34_3, which related to frequency of professional SM use to connect with current students for recruitment, this same tendency to coalesce around specific institutional role led to significant differences at $\chi^2(8, N = 881)= 41.36, p = .001$ (see Figure 4.29). Here 14% ($n = 33$) of administrators use SM “often” for this purpose as opposed to 9% ($n = 18$) of staff and 5% ($n = 22$) of faculty. More specifically, 7% ($n = 15$) of staff members use SM for this purpose “almost every day” compared to 5% ($n = 11$) of administration and 1% ($n = 5$) in the faculty category.

Figure 4.29. Q34_4: Connecting with prospective students (Professional SM)
Finally, this tendency to have role-specific professional SM usage is further underscored by responses recorded for Q34_9 that gravitate away from faculty and toward administration and staff for a significant difference at $x^2(8, N = 884) = 53.02, p = .001$ (see Figure 4.30). Any individual employee could advertise the institution to the general public for academic and athletic purposes; however 33% ($n = 80$) of administrators reported doing so “often” or “almost every day” compared to 25% ($n = 50$) of staff members and just 13% ($n = 55$) of faculty.

*Figure 4.30. Q34_8: Advertising the institution (Professional SM).*
In response to item in Q34, departments may in fact have specific professional SM behaviors inherent to these groups that contribute to these significant differences. This may be another important point of leverage for policy makers who want to seek buy-in on as many levels of possible. Understanding the role-specific nature of SM usage on the personal and professional end may help to customize SMPs in the future to migrate away from the one-size-fits-all schemas often used in contemporary higher education.

**Monitoring and professional SM.** In the context of professional SM usage, a low number of participants reported that they monitored the SM behaviors of current or potential future employees, according to the data. Clearly, the importance individuals placed on professional SM conduct was not synchronized with how it was assessed or tracked by those responsible for managing college and university employees. Overall, 73% \((n = 645)\) responded with “never” to the statement in Q34_6 (see Figure 4.31) and 17% \((n = 149)\) stated “rarely.”

Compared to the relatively high levels of perceived professional SM monitoring (Table 4.14), the numbers were interesting on several levels. Although significant differences did exist across institutional roles at \(x^2(2, N = 1238)= 18.40, p = .001\), overall 49% \((n = 607)\) of respondents believed that professional SM monitoring did occur at their respective institution. Staff members believed so in higher numbers at 58% \((n = 169)\) than faculty members at 43% \((n = 269)\). In Figure 4.31, 93% \((n = 405)\) of faculty members, 88% \((n = 180)\) of staff, and 87% \((n = 209)\) of administrators indicated that they themselves monitored professional SM accounts for various purposes either “rarely” or “never.”
Table 4.14

**Q28: Professional Social Media Monitoring (by Role)**

Do you believe your institution, department, or program monitors the professional social media accounts of faculty, administration, and staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*df=2, Pearson Chi-Square = 18.402 sig .000 at <.05 level of significance*

*Figure 4.31. Q34_6: How do you use social media platform(s) on a professional level?*

*Figure 4.31. Q34_6: Monitor behavior of current or future employees (Professional SM).*
Consistently, the data from multiple angles pointed toward more of an emphasis on the potential impact of professional SM indiscretions than personal, and this carried through to how individuals framed the enforcement of SMPs. Having an SM climate where stakeholders and institutional leaders alike understand the usage of SM in the personal and professional context of their employees created a definitive SMP line of sight. This line of sight would only be useful, however, if there was a certain level of SMP buy-in related to personal or professional SM usage.

In Table 4.15, institutional role was used to frame the issue of whether personal or professional SM monitoring/governance affected an individual’s constitutional right to freedom of speech. Of all participants, 69% (n = 425) of faculty responded in this manner compared to 64% (n = 186) of staff and 58% (n = 187) of administration. Differences between institutional role in regard to SM monitoring and governance were in fact significant at $\chi^2(2, N = 1230) = 9.83, p = .007$.

Table 4.15

**Q29: Social Media Governance and Freedom of Speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df=2$, Pearson Chi-Square = 9.827 sig. .007 at <.05 level of significance

**Definition between personal and professional SM.** The data and analysis acknowledged that a battle of sorts existed between personal SM and professional SM. Given the apparent undefined nature of the line between each of these forums, it seemed like the tendency for personal SM behaviors to bleed into professional ones could be a very real and
present danger for faculty, administration, and staff. Framing the data in this capacity addressed one of the primary goals of the research, which was to attempt to capture if these groups acknowledged the undefined nature of the line between personal and professional SM. Lack of significant difference across institutional roles (see Figures 4.32 and 4.33) suggested that survey participants who responded to Q40_1 \((n = 1111)\) and Q40_2 \((n = 1110)\) had a consensus on this principle. In reference to Q40_1, which gauged respondents’ level of agreement that communication on SM could blur the line between an individual’s personal and professional life, overall 78% \((n = 865)\) either “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” with this statement. Digging a bit deeper, 80% \((n = 894)\) of respondents indicated they either “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” that posting comments, pictures, and videos on personal SM accounts could be negatively affecting their professional persona.

Figure 4.32. Q40_1: Blurring line between personal and professional
The acknowledgement that a battle of sorts existed between personal SM and professional SM is something that would be exacerbated by frequency of use in each of these forums. For instance, the more staff members update their department Facebook page, intended to disseminate information to students, the more danger they are in of overlapping personal and professional SM behaviors (see Figure 4.34). Additionally, if circles of personal acquaintances are not kept separate and distinct from professional circles, there could be detrimental impact on one’s professional persona. As noted earlier, this seems to be the primary concern for SM users/nonusers and SMP natives/nonnatives alike.

Policy makers could identify this potential negative and leverage it toward properly outlining best practices to eliminate this potential constraint, possibly preventing serous SMP infractions from ever occurring in the first place. However, it should also be noted that among...
those individuals whose institution has an SMP in place and who are active on SM, a smaller proportion of them agreed that the SMP itself creates confusion between personal and professional SM conduct because no significant difference occurs across institutional role, as 14% (n = 33) indicated that this confusion existed and 86% (n = 196) reported that it did not (Table 4.16). Prior data suggested that personal views made their way onto institutional accounts and an emphasis on the importance of professional conduct to institutional image. Therefore, more research would be suggested in this area to better understand the dynamic between the two in SMP settings.

Figure 4.34. Q40_4: Distinction of personal and professional conduct
Q43: Social Media Policies Confusing Personal and Professional Conduct

Overall, do you believe that the guidelines within your institution’s social media policy create confusion, if at all, between how you are to conduct yourself on personal and professional social media websites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*df* = 2, Pearson Chi-Square = .541 sig .763 at <.05 level of significance

**Personal versus professional in SMP.** Of those who responded to the items within Q41 (*n* = 249–254), the data seemed to conflict with what was reported in Table 4.15. Only those who reported that they believed their institution had an SMP in place and felt familiar with the general principles of that policy were given the opportunity to respond to Q41, which went into further detail about the conflict between guidelines that may exist in SMPs. This conflict seems to once again support the notion that there is a confusion or constraint in personal and professional SM behavior, as well as how these two fora are portrayed in SMPs. Additionally, the lack of any significant difference between institutional roles only further emphasizes the notion that all institutional roles seem to coalesce into similar responses categories within the items in Q41. Ambivalence, or selection of “neither agree nor disagree” in Q41 could suggest that respondents may have had lack of sufficient information to answer the question appropriately or may have had a hard time deciding where to fall on the particular item. As forced response was not used in the survey instrument, reasons for ambivalence will of course never be known.

In Q41_1, which asked respondents to rank their level of agreement that an individual’s SMP touts the benefits of SM while always restricting their use, 26% (*n* = 65) “somewhat
agreed” and 6% ($n = 14$) “strongly agreed” with this statement overall (see Figure 4.35). Additionally, while not significantly different across groups, 31% ($n = 19$) of staff responded that they “somewhat agreed” as opposed to 20% ($n = 21$) of faculty. One potential reason for this could be answered by data in Q22, which connected SM behavior to institutional role. To this end, institutional roles that may more frequently be responsible for overseeing institutional, department, or program SM pages could be more aware to the perils of trying to adhere to SMPs (see Table 4.17). Therefore, the level of “constraint” in SMPs could be more impactful on their everyday responsibilities to build content on SM platforms.

![Figure 4.35. Q41_4: SMP constraint](image-url)
Table 4.17

Q22: Responsibility for Overseeing Social Media Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df=8$, Pearson chi-square $= 37.332$ sig. .000 at <.05 level of significance

A significant difference does exist here at $x^2(8, N = 1148)= 37.332, p = .001$, between institutional roles reporting that they may be responsible for overseeing an institutionally sponsored SM account. Of those responding to Q22, 20% ($n = 57$) of staff responded that they “strongly agreed” that they oversaw an institutionally sponsored SM account in the professional setting as opposed to 8% ($n = 46$) of faculty members.

More conflict between personal and professional SMP guidelines was indicated as 32% ($n = 80$) of respondents “somewhat agreed” and 6% ($n = 16$) “strongly agreed” overall with the statement that their SMP provided examples of how SM posts could be damaging while also encouraging access and transparency (see Figure 4.36).

The consensus across groups seemed to support the overlap or confusion with SMP between restriction and the openness and access that SM affords overall. This added a new dimension to the idea of constrained agency in that it was a constraint within SMP guidelines and not necessarily between personal and professional SM but between the details of the policy itself. Provided the tenants of constrained agency (Herndl & Licona, 2007), such as simultaneously assuming the same role or norms associated with multiple roles, these norms
could at times conflict within a system. In the case of SMP, the positives of having open communication and promoting this belief conflict with guidelines that are meant to protect institutional image.

Among those who acknowledged that they participated in SM in either a personal or professional context, these individuals disagreed in fairly large numbers that there were adequate steps taken to provide resources that create a positive SM environment at their institution. Given that the data from the first two items in Q41 seemed to suggest that there was a possible conflicting message in SMPs according to individuals who had SMPs at their institutions, both Q22_7 and Q22_8 (see Table 4.18) provided an overall picture of how this issue could be a potential danger to stakeholders. Overall, 36% (*n* = 412) of respondents “strongly disagreed” and 18% (*n* = 203) “somewhat disagreed” that they had access to SM training. This was in
comparison to an overall number of 25% \((n = 280)\) that either “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed.” Additionally, overall 31% \((n = 335)\) of respondents indicated that they “strongly disagreed” and 15% \((n = 168)\) “somewhat disagreed” that they had access to technical support for institutionally sponsored SM accounts, opposed by a total of 32% \((n = 364)\) who either “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statement.

**Perception of SM climate.** Several measures that could provide some insight into SM climate were included along with the data, which illustrated how personal and professional SM behaviors manifest themselves. Because the strong feelings to protect freedom of speech and the decision between minimizing SM governance or improving it is readily apparent, interpreting knowledge of SM controversy locally is an interesting exercise. Of those who responded to Q37 \((n = 1127)\), which asked participants if they had any knowledge of SM controversies locally or at another institution, 53% \((n = 596)\) answered “yes” and 47% \((n = 531)\) indicated “no.” Earlier
comparisons were done across SM quadrants; however a significant difference across institutional role did exist at $\chi^2(2, N = 1127) = 7.00, p = .030$ (see Figure 4.37).

**Figure 4.37.** Q37: Knowledge of SM controversy.

Whereas 58% ($n = 166$) of faculty answered “yes” to whether they had heard of SM controversy, only 47% ($n = 123$) of staff members answered in the same manner. This difference could be attributed to the question being available to all respondents, which included those who may have had no interest in SM and therefore less of likelihood of noticing when SM controversies occur. However, although it had a smaller sample size, the non-SM user group (see Table 4.19, Table 4.20) in terms of the faculty showed better knowledge of SM controversy than those who used SM. Specifically, only 50% ($n = 243$) of faculty members who were SM users indicated they had heard of SM controversies whereas 65% ($n = 64$) of faculty who did not use SM answered the same. Making finite assumptions here is cautioned due to the relatively
Table 4.19

Q37: Knowledge of Social Media Controversy (Social Media Users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=2, Pearson Chi-Square = 5.934 sig .051 at <.05 level of significance

Table 4.20

Q37: Knowledge of Social Media Controversy (Non-Social Media Users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th></th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=2, Pearson Chi-Square = 5.317 sig .070 at <.05 level of significance

It is interesting in regard to communicating the benefits and perils of SM through policy that a group that used SM in such high numbers was not aware of the inherent issues related to it.

Building on the data above, institutional role was used to revisit Q39, which asked respondents \(n = 1074\) if they personally knew a colleague that projected negative or inappropriate SM behavior on a personal or professional account (see Table 4.21). A significant difference did exist between roles on Q39 at \(x^2(2, N = 1074)= 18.99, p = .001\), although only 17\% \(n = 187\) respondents overall knew a colleague that projected negative or inappropriate SM
behavior. The difference here is that 26% ($n = 70$) of administrators reported knowing a colleague that displayed such behavior, whereas only 17% of staff members and 14% ($n = 75$) of faculty responded in the same way. However, there were no differences across SM usage in regard to Q39 with respect to institutional role, similar to the data on faculty respondents in Q37.

It could be that administrators held more of a responsibility for overseeing professional SM accounts or, as Table 4.21 indicates, they could have had a slightly higher frequency of monitoring SM behavior of current or future employees. Note that in addition to around half of respondents hearing of SM controversy, only 14%–26% of these same individuals knew a colleague with poor SM behavior on personal or professional accounts. This may be true but may also have had to do with how faculty, administration, and staff framed “SM inappropriateness.” Communicating best practices for using SM could possibly include gauging how people gauge behavior on these platforms and how this may be different from conventional personal or professional conduct.

**Defining appropriateness on SM.** Framing a possible distinction between personal or professional conduct in general and how these same norms apply to SM conduct could be an effective tool for SMP makers. Additionally, these data may provide context to the data above.
regarding faculty, administration, and staff knowledge of controversial SM stories at their institution and abroad and their assessment of SM conduct among peers. The open-ended text in Q42 simply asked those who responded \( n = 797 \) how they personally defined “inappropriateness” on personal or professional SM websites.

Having a fairly large sample for an open-ended question based on a definition is critical to providing context to the data above, as well as for the entire response sample. Again, a two-stage coding process was used to categorize the themes of the open-ended responses within the context of the questionnaire. Stage 1 consisted of identifying more finite themes associated with each participant response then applying a more coarse-grained approach to bucketing them into the categories used below (see Table 4.22). This process was used before the analysis of closed-ended questions, which the rest of the survey instrument consisted of to prevent the analysis from overemphasizing trends and themes.

Table 4.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inappropriateness</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defamatory/prejudicial language and beliefs</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally offensive posts/behavior/language</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Illegal conduct (fighting, nudity, excessive drinking)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprofessional/impacts institutional image</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on situation</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes controversial personal opinions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violates student/employee privacy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**n/a (provided no valid response)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts baseless in fact</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts academic freedom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>797</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*

**Illegal conduct** in a small number of cases referred to students as well as employees

**Respondent either specifically typed “n/a” or “no opinion” or the response did not apply to the question in any regard.
The overall data from participants indicated that 23% \((n = 183)\) believed inappropriateness on SM related to “defamatory/prejudicial language and beliefs.” Additionally, 19% \((n = 151)\) associated SM inappropriateness with “generally offensive posts/behavior/language” and 15% \((n = 120)\) defined it as “illegal conduct (excessive drinking, nudity, fighting).” According to the text data, the least popular definitions for appropriateness on SM were behaviors that “include controversial personal opinions” at 6% \((n = 48)\), “violate student/employee privacy” at 4% \((n = 32)\), and were “baseless in fact” at 2% \((n = 16)\). A small group defined inappropriateness as any action that “impacts academic freedom” at 1% \((n = 8)\).

There are grounds based in the data that faculty, administration, and staff who responded to Q42 had a different definition or tolerance for inappropriateness on SM than they may have had in everyday life either personally or professionally. Because 23% indicated that inappropriateness was associated with “defamatory/prejudicial language” or 15% selecting “illegal conduct,” certain behaviors that could be questioned under SMP might be overlooked. Analysis here should be coupled with caution, as respondents may not have had enough time or space to fully explain their position, but these themes do project other data points related to SM controversy and SMP climate from a different angle.

However, 19% did define this with a broader brush as “generally offensive posts/behavior/language,” an assessment that may be more akin to the broader guidelines of personal and professional conduct in the SMPs outlined above. Note that a fairly large group of participants at 12% \((n = 96)\) responded that this definition “depends on situation.” More often than not, the sentiment of this group was somewhere along the lines of “if you wouldn’t want your grandmother to see it, then you should not post it.” In some cases, increasing awareness of
what SM inappropriateness looks like might be more likely to gain both SMP buy-in and increase the likelihood of individuals self-policing within a department or program or more broadly across the institution.

Perhaps the best insight into SM climate at respondents’ colleges and universities was who faculty, administration, and staff perceived to be the primary culprits of negative SM behavior. Although there could be a tendency to select within the respondents’ own institutional role (Downes-Le Guin et al., 2012), the data showed once again how the focus, in terms of controversy, was still very much on the students and faculty. Figure 4.38 shows that even when these stakeholders indicated that they participated on several SM platforms frequently and in multiple ways depending on their role, 61% (n = 358) still believed that students ran into controversy the most, with faculty in second place at 22% (n = 128) with no significant differences across institutional role.

An interesting dichotomy also existed between this question and the fact that respondents saw staff (70%) as the intended audience for SMPs. Combinations of lack of inclusion in the SMP process and high frequency of use, made the hyper focus on students and faculty short-sighted according to the analysis.

**Summary of themes and trends across RQ.2.** Several of the themes and trends identified in the earlier stages of the analysis also come to forefront again through the lens of personal and professional SM behavior across institutional role. Significant differences did exist across role with respect to the belief that professional SM accounts are monitored, as well as if SMPs affected an individual’s right to freedom of speech. Faculty generally held this sentiment in the highest numbers, possibly due to concerns over academic freedom, but the importance to
understanding the interplay of institutional role with personal and professional SM and SMP could help to tailor policies in the future to help guide positive use without overstepping boundaries (see Figure 4.39).

However, respondents also indicated that these same boundaries often times were not clearly defined in reference to the difference between personal and professional SM behaviors or within the policies themselves. When coupled with the fact that respondents believed communication on SM could blur this boundary even further, the high frequency of Web 2.0 participation could exacerbate the issue even further. Attention should also be given to the more positive aspects of the data related to RQ.2 in order to leverage aspects of SM behavior and SMP perception toward building a positive SM climate at colleges and universities.
Whereas faculty, administration, and staff tended to have more liberal definitions of “SM inappropriateness” by associating this concept with defamatory/prejudicial language or illegal behavior, more moderate viewpoints also rose to the surface. Of course, digging deeper into what individuals valued in terms of personal and professional conduct would help to put their concepts of “SM appropriateness” into better context. However, respondents indicated that defining “SM inappropriateness” required measurement of the situation, which is a level of awareness among faculty, administration, and staff that SMPs are not often used to their advantage. Because these groups also stated they would monitor a close group of friends as a result of SMP being put into place, this could be the perfect opportunity to educate individuals on more vigilant behaviors on personal and professional SM, placing less of a burden on SMPs that could be seen as an infringement on principles of academic freedom or freedom of speech.

RQ3: The Demography of SM and SMP

Serving as the final component of the analysis, RQ.3 queried how SM and SMP behaviors and perceptions differed by gender, age, and institutional type. Additional questions were crossed with these demographics in order to highlight small trends in the data for future research. It should be noted that once questions with a larger number of response items were crossed with demographic variables of the same nature (e.g., institutional class, faculty division) the effects of Pearson’s chi-square lost their power to explain the significance in differences.
across groups. In this event, conclusions were drawn given the data available while suggesting opportunities for future study.

**Demographics and SM usage.** Of those who responded to Q6, 90% \((n = 997)\) of female participants indicated that they currently participated in SM for personal or professional use, whereas 84% \((n = 502)\) of males reported participation. SM usage was significantly different at \(\chi^2(1, N = 1705)= 13.676, p = .001\) (Table 4.23). Several other demographics could lend to properly illustrating SM climate at institutions of higher education in addition to gender. When crossed with institutional type, 89% \((n = 552)\) of those working at a private institution indicated they participated in SM as compared to 87% \((n = 944)\) of those at public institutions (Table 4.24).

Institutional class yielded no significant differences either (Figure 4.40), with 100% \((n = 14)\) of those reporting belonging to a “special focus or professional school” using SM. Furthermore, 87% \((n = 396)\) of those at doctorate-granting universities used SM, along with 87% \((n = 215)\) at master’s colleges or universities, 87% \((n = 125)\) at baccalaureate colleges, 80% \((n = 187)\) at associate’s colleges, and finally, although a small total, 100% \((n = 14)\) at special focus or professional schools. Whereas a low magnitude difference existed between institutional types, data points such as this are critical to tailoring potential policy and resources to the growth of SM so that future tests can monitor whether these data hold true across time.
Table 4.23

**Q6: Social Media Participation by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=1, Pearson chi-square = 13.676 sig .000 at <.05 level of significance

Table 4.24

**Q6: Social Media Participation by Institutional Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public</th>
<th></th>
<th>Private</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=4, Pearson chi-square = 9.622 sig .047 at <.05 level of significance
SM usage beyond institutional role. As stated earlier, drilling down beyond institutional role could be more of a pragmatic exercise than a game-changing method of analysis. Because these questions were toward the end of the survey, participants may have chosen to skip over these items or simply did not get this far to provide valid results. Furthermore, each of these questions was logic-driven and an item such as “faculty division” only captured those who responded “faculty” to Q1. More overarching trends and developments are outlined with caution given the results of chi-square data.

Of those who responded to Q6, the highest proportion of SM users were in the “humanities and arts” at 87% (n = 96), with “education” just behind at 86% (n = 61). No significant differences occurred across faculty division, and generally all groups were at or exceeding 80% reporting SM usage (Figure 4.41). Whereas the numbers did not necessarily
point toward powerful trends, these data did in a different way underscore the underlying theme that different subgroups contributed to the SM climate at an institution differently.

Contrasting the relative consistency across faculty division, differences between administrative departments were significant at $\chi^2 (6, N = 270) = 13.822, p = .032$. Due to the small total number of respondents in this administrative subgroup, more general conclusions should be made from the proportions of SM used, as indicated in Figure 4.42. The data indicated that 96% ($n = 23$) of those in “institutional advancement” used SM for personal or professional use, followed by “student services” at 94% ($n = 44$). On the opposite end of the spectrum, only 74% ($n = 20$) of those in “finance and business” used SM and 81% ($n = 75$) from “academic departments.” Within those reporting “staff,” SM usage was consistent (Figure 4.43) with administration in that 96% ($n = 22$) of those in “institutional advancement” and 89% ($n = 48$) in
Q6: Do you currently participate in any form of social media for personal or professional use?

![Bar chart showing SM use by administrative department]

Figure 4.42. SM use by administrative department
Student Services answered “yes” to Q6. However, there is not as much variability across staff department as 83% \((n = 19)\) of individuals in “institutional leadership” and 87% \((n = 13)\) in “finance and business” used SM.

SM use across faculty was fairly consistent and should still be used to inform the communication of a SM strategy if one was in place, but interesting trends did exist among the administrative and staff departments. Individuals within “institutional advancement” and “student services” tended to report that they used SM in higher numbers.

In contrast, 91% of administrative staff in “institutional leadership and planning” used SM and only 83% of staff members in the same department did the same. Making comparisons across roles here would be difficult due to the relatively low number of responses within each category. Additionally, the survey logic dictated that Q6 specifically asked about institutional...
role, and the results are presented here as such. However, differences across program and department, even in small numbers, suggested an appropriate avenue for future researchers looking to identify potential differences to better leverage SMPs. When analyzing in reference to RQ.1, it was suggested that differences within institutional role might play a role in the existence of certain SM behaviors or SMP experiences/viewpoints. Not only would role-specific SMPs be appropriate in some cases, but department-specific policies or strategies might help to make the SM climate less constrained and confusing overall.

**Frequency of SM use.** The age of respondents was also used to gain a deeper understanding of key SM and SMP behaviors. Tracking these trends over time—for instance, the equity of SM use across age groups—would dispel the school of thought that associates SM with a typically young group. To this point, a significant difference does exist $x^2 (5, N = 1364) = 115.914, p = .001$, across respondent age groups of “under 45” and “over 45” in regard to how many times per day a personal account was accessed. In the frequency of personal SM usage item, 25% ($n = 204$) of those over age 45 accessed their account 5–10 times per day compared to 10% ($n = 57$) of those under 45 years old. Additionally, 34% ($n = 187$) under age 45 frequent their personal SM account “over 20 times per day” compared to 21% ($n = 171$) over age 45 (see Figure 4.44).

Frequency of professional SM use did not have as much variance by age as personal SM use did, and differences were not significant (see Figure 4.45). This may have been due to the specific uses of professional SM and how these types of websites might be more specifically associated with job requirements. One might also say that professional SM tools such as
Figure 4.44. Q8: Frequency of personal SM use by age.
LinkedIn are more self-promotional instead of tools to communicate with a broad circle of friends in a more casual format.

Identifying the key stakeholders and focal points of SM usage at colleges and universities might be a key in determining how far guidelines must go to protect users in personal and professional settings. Thinking of demographics as the diagnostic tool to assess SM climate would be a considerable leap in the SMP-making process.

**SM point of access.** Furthermore, frequency of personal or professional SM in reference to age may also be affected by the platform used for access (Figure 4.46). The device or platform used to visit a SM website differed significantly across age group at $x^2 (4, N = 941) = 89.577, p = .001$, and the data here illustrate the interconnectivity of each demographic or subgroup with SM usage. Whereas 32% ($n = 195$) of those over age 45 used a laptop computer.
to access a SM platform, 24% \((n = 145)\) did so from a desktop computer, 12% \((n = 74)\) from a tablet, and 63% \((n = 211)\) of respondents under age 45 used a smartphone.

**Demographics of SMP perceptions.** Identifying key differences across demographics in regard to the perception and opinion of SMP could be a key component in acquiring buy-in for SM strategies at colleges and universities. The data from Q21_1, which asked participants to rank their level of agreement with SMPs being instituted at every institution, shows interesting differences across demographic groups that confirm themes both in the literature and in the analysis.

Of those who responded, differences across gender in Q21_1 were significant at \(x^2(4, N = 1474) = 19.31, p = .001\), where one can see a tendency for female respondents to agree with institution of SMPs in higher proportions than male respondents (see Figure 4.47). Specifically,
28% \( (n = 272) \) of female participants, as opposed to 25% \( (n = 129) \) of males “strongly agreed” that SMP should be instituted, along with 33% \( (n = 318) \) of females, contrasting with 28% \( (n = 145) \) of males choosing “somewhat agree.” Given that the percentage of females increased across institutional role from faculty to staff in the response sample, they may have carried more weight in the analysis of Q21_1. However, when splitting out by gender and institutional role combined, the percentages of male and females supporting the institution of SMPs held true to the overall data reported in Figure 4.47. Only male administrators outnumbered female administrators in terms of supporting the idea of instituting SMPs at institutions of higher education (see Figure 4.48), which could have been a result of higher numbers of female administrators responding to the questionnaire.

![Figure 4.47. Q21_1: SM governance by gender](image-url)
Additionally, of those who responded to Q21_1, significant differences also existed across age group at $x^2(4, N = 1472) = 29.11, p = .001$ (see Figure 4.49). Because the demographic data provided earlier showed a fairly equitable distribution across age groups, particularly on the SM-focused survey, these data could be used to better understand trends in a variety of settings. There was an observable split between age groups in regard to the institution of SMP, with 31% ($n = 295$) of those over age 45 saying they “strongly agreed” that they should be put into place as opposed to 20% ($n = 103$) of those under age 45. Consequently, 17% ($n = 91$) of respondents under age 45 “somewhat disagreed” with SMPs being put in place whereas only 11% ($n = 107$) of those in the over-45 groups shared the same opinion.

However, the frequency of SM usage across age groups must be taken into account before weighing the differences noted above. Age clearly played a considerable role in how well
Figure 4.49. Q21_1: SM governance by age.

SMP are received and how acceptable they are perceived to be, but the frequency with which individuals used SM also factored into the equation. As the frequency of use increased from once or twice per day to 11–20 times per day, the differences between age groups mellowed in reference to whether participants believed SMP should be instituted or not. This served as an example of how age cannot be the only demographic variable considered in constructing an SM strategy at institutions of higher education and that frequency of use did in fact vary across age groups.

**SMP perception and faculty division.** By using faculty division as the demographic to frame Q21_1, significant differences between these groups were found at $\chi^2 (24, N = 568) = 67.274, p = .001$ (see Figure 4.50). Within the faculty, 54% ($n = 306$) overall either “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” that SMPs should be instituted at colleges and universities, whereas
Figure 4.50. Q21_1: SM governance by faculty division.

only 31% \( (n = 176) \) overall either “somewhat disagreed” or “strongly disagreed.” The institution of SMPs has shown to be a polarizing issue across different demographics, and this same trend held true here.

Specifically, 76\% \( (n = 47) \) in the “health division” and 64\% \( (n = 46) \) in “education” either “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” that SMPs should be instituted at colleges and universities. The review of literature noted the hyper focused nature of the current SM and SMP research within these more “pre-professional” fields specifically, and perhaps this may be because they had higher frequency of use or experience with more impactful SM issues among their own students and not necessarily with their peers. In the opposite respect, 36\% \( (n = 39) \) of “humanities and arts” faculty and 32\% \( (n = 20) \) of “business” faculty either “somewhat disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement in Q21_1. Whereas the more underlying
reasons for these divisions specifically disagreeing with SMP implementation are not readily known, these data could serve as a platform for future research into department-specific SM and SMP perceptions.

**SMP perception and administrative/staff department.** Not all subgroups with the roles of faculty, administration, and staff were significantly different; however they can still add to the discussion of using demographics as a tool in understanding SM climate. With caution due to the low response rate in Q40 across a demographic that contains several categories, only minimal conclusions could be made in regard to this question and in the forthcoming section of the analysis. The tendency for the interactive departments that had more exposure to multiple stakeholders to agree with the idea of confusing personal and professional SM conduct shows in the staff population as well below; however the number of respondents in the data cannot point to substantial trends moving forward.

This could be a result of individuals being more responsible for making contacts outside the walls of the institution or managing an SM account that incurs more traffic than those who may work in “finance and business services.” Understanding these nuances in SMP support within departments could be comparatively importantly with differences in support across gender and age. Therefore, more robust data should be done specifically focusing on the faculty, administration, and staff at department/program levels to expand the base for demographic SM and SMP research.

**SM monitoring and institutional type.** As a quick aside, institutional type has for the most part been omitted from the demographic analysis due to its inability to show any significant differences with respect to most of the survey items in question. For instance, across Q27 and
Q29, which focused on SM monitoring and the constitutionality of governance, participants reporting in public and private institutions yielded very similar results (see Tables 4.25–4.27). Specifically, 22% ($n = 173$) of those reporting in public institutions and 22% ($n = 216$) of those in private institutions reported that they believed their institutions monitored the personal SM activity of faculty, administration, and staff. In terms of professional SM accounts, 48% ($n = 387$) of participants at public institutions and 50% ($n = 216$) at private institutions believed that monitoring occurred on this level.

Table 4.25

**Q27: Personal Social Media Monitoring by Institutional Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**df=1, Pearson chi-square = .011 sig. .915 at .05 level of significance**

Table 4.26

**Q28: Professional Social Media Monitoring by Institutional Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**df=1, Pearson chi-square = .412 sig. .521 at .05 level of significance**
Table 4.27

Q29: Social Media Governance and Freedom of Speech by Institutional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the governance or monitoring of personal or professional social media accounts affect, if at all, an individual’s constitutional right to freedom of speech?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df=1, Pearson chi-square = .069 sig. .792 at <.05 level of significance

Finally, and perhaps contrary to the discourse of contemporary SMP literature and news coverage, 65% ($n = 518$) of faculty, administration, and staff at public institutions and 65% ($n = 276$) at private institutions believed that the governance or monitoring of personal or professional SM accounts affected an individual’s constitutional right to freedom of speech. Because public institutions operate under the governance of state legislatures and therefore have more concerns constitutionally than private institutions in regard to SMP, a significant difference in institutional type could have been expected. These data added yet another point of reference for the creation and implementation of SMPs and gauging how well they may or may not be received at various institutional settings.

**SM monitoring and gender.** Whereas no significant differences existed in regard to belief in SM monitoring across institutional type, they did exist by gender in at least one respect. Monitoring of personal SM accounts was close to being significantly different from male to female, with 23% ($n = 183$) of females and 19% ($n = 84$) of males believing, but the gap was simply not large enough. In terms of professional SM account monitoring, the story was quite different.
Overall, more faculty, administration, and staff believed monitoring occurred on this level; however a significant difference existed across gender on Q27 at $\chi^2(4, N = 1474) = 19.31$, $p = .001$ (see Tables 4.28 and 4.29). Of the recorded responses, 53% ($n = 419$) of females believed monitoring of professional SM accounts was conducted at colleges and universities, in contrast to 42% ($n = 187$) of males. It should be noted that the relative impact of using various demographics to illustrate SM and SMP behaviors and perceptions differs depending on the central tenant of each survey question.

Table 4.28

Q27: Personal Social Media Monitoring by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df=1$, Pearson chi-square $= 2.741$ sig. .098 at <.05 level of significance

Table 4.29

Q27: Professional Social Media Monitoring by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df=1$, Pearson chi-square $= 12.043$ sig. .001 at <.05 level of significance

Demographics of the personal versus professional dynamic. Female respondents tended to perceive that privacy settings on SM websites allowed for separation of personal and
professional activity in higher proportions than male stakeholders. These differences added to the depth that demographics provided in outlining the perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff in regard to SM. To this end, in reference to Q40_3, a significant difference existed at $x^2 (4, N = 1108) = 19.31, p = .001$ (see Figure 4.51).

Figure 4.51. Q40_3: Privacy settings and separation of personal/professional SM by gender.

Of those who responded, 43% ($n = 427$) of female faculty, administration, or staff members said they “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” that privacy settings allowed this separation, as opposed to 30% ($n = 118$) of males. Consequently, 15% ($n = 57$) of male respondents “strongly disagreed” with this statement compared to 9% ($n = 65$) of females. The significant difference across gender in the response sample suggested that male faculty, administration, and staff had less faith in SM privacy settings and their ability to maintain a barrier between personal and professional use.
Significant differences also exist in Q40_3 across age group at $x^2 (4, N = 1108) = 46.915$, $p = .001$ (see Figure 4.52). Corresponding to other slices of data analyzed earlier, differences across both gender and age seemed to exist more often than any other demographic controlled for in the survey instrument, which of course should also be tested and confirmed by future SM and SMP research. A pronounced gap may be observed between the 51% ($n = 178$) respondents under age 45 who either “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” that privacy settings allow for separation of personal and professional SM and the 32% ($n = 249$) over age 45 who answered in the same fashion. Additionally, 31% ($n = 232$) of faculty, administration, and staff over age 45 selected the “neither agree nor disagree” item whereas only 16% ($n = 57$) under age 45 did the same.

Indications are that older college or university employees tended to have less faith in SM privacy settings and their ability to maintain a barrier between personal and professional use than their younger counterparts. Also, the selection of the ambivalent category could indicate a lack of feeling or knowledge about how useful privacy settings are either way, emphasizing the need for better communication of best practices and improvement of SM strategy.

**Personal vs. professional SM and faculty division.** Of particular interest to the subgroups within faculty, administration, and staff is another item within Q40 that specifically isolates the type of professional SM activity that may cause the most controversy. Q40_4 gauges level of agreement with the idea that maintaining a professional SM account increases the likelihood of confusing personal and professional conduct. Significant differences do exist
Figure 4.52. Q40_3: Privacy settings and separation of personal/professional SM by age across faculty division when it comes to the potential overlap of personal and professional SM accounts at $x^2 (24, N = 564) = 35.03, p = .048$ (see Figure 4.53). Once again, as noted earlier when assessing whether SM policies were appropriate, “health and medicine” had the highest return of faculty members who either “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” with Q40_4, at 52% ($n = 33$). The “health and medicine” group was followed by “social sciences” at 37% ($n = 41$) and “STEM” at 36% ($n = 49$), who fell into these two levels of agreement.

Conversely, 39% ($n = 42$) of “humanities and arts” faculty reported “somewhat disagree” or “strongly disagree” that maintaining a professional SM account increased potential confusion between personal and professional conduct, followed by “social sciences” at 38% ($n = 42$) and “STEM” with 38% ($n = 51$). Although the significant differences again should be is measured with caution due to how spread out the total number of responses ($n = 564$) was, a few useful
Figure 4.53. Q40_4: Distinction of personal and professional conduct by faculty division.

Observations may be made. Building on earlier data in this study, the “health and medicine” field had higher levels of caution with SM conduct, possibly due to its visibility to the public.

Current SM and SMP research supports this as well, although the high levels of agreement in the “social sciences” and “STEM” groups could not be attributed to a similar stimulus. The high level of participants who answered in the “disagree” category across all faculty divisions also shows that the potential confusion between personal and professional SM accounts is a polarizing idea. Finally, because these groups shed a bit more light into how faculty view issues with SM, this polarized sample of data suggests opportunities for growth in terms of SM awareness and best practices.

Personal vs. professional SM and administrative department. Of the administrators who responded to Q40_4 (n = 269), no significant differences existed across administrative
department. However, by transitioning to the administrative level, the small amount of data suggested a certain level of gravity toward central leadership and student-oriented offices. Of all the participating administrators, 46% \((n = 21)\) of those in “student services” either “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” that professional SM accounts could lead to confusion between personal and professional conduct. On the other end of the spectrum, 46% \((n = 11)\) of administrators in “institutional advancement” and 40% \((n = 14)\) in “institutional leadership” either “somewhat disagreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statement in Q40_4 (Figure 4.54).

![Diagram: Q40_4: Distinction of personal and professional conduct by administrative department.](image)

*Figure 4.54. Q40_4: Distinction of personal and professional conduct by administrative department.*

Overall, respondents tended to cluster around the more ambivalent choice of “neither agree nor disagree” at 30% \((n = 80)\). Respondents within the administrative department of “student services” may agree more frequently due to being one of the more interactive departments on campus with students and other employees. Furthermore, an admissions officer
or enrollment professional in charge of recruitment and dissemination of information on professional SM may have had more of a vested interest in being cognizant of personal SM behaviors spilling into professional SM conduct. Supporting an earlier remark, more SM and SMP research must be conducted to gauge climate on the divisional or department level. This would ensure that the data would be supported with reasons why some administrative departments like “institutional advancement” are fairly polarized on the issue of personal and professional SM confusion.

**Summary of themes and trends across RQ 3.** A pertinent question of why some divisions or departments agree or disagree with certain SM or SMP issues is raised and again can only be answered with more detailed and specific research methods. An exploratory study such as this is simply a diagnostic of a potential theme across faculty, administration, and staff worth pursuing but with enough promise to possibly improve the SM climate at colleges and universities while diagnosing specific issues and identifying the nuances across institutional roles within departments (see Figure 4.55). The demography of SM usage and related SMP perceptions and behaviors identified two important themes of note.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Theme or trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RQ 3: How, if at all, do SM and SMP behaviors and perceptions differ by gender, age, institutional type and program/department at institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey? | 1. Assessing SM and SMP climate  
2. Impact of exposure  
3. Development of SMP and SMP diagnostics  
4. Role nuance |

*Figure 4.55. Summary of RQ 3.*

The first was the necessity of using these measures to identify leverage points for implementing SM strategy or possibly an SMP. Because females under the age of 45 may participate in SM differently, or may have different ideas regarding the monitoring or
governance of SM, blanket policy statements or information sessions may not be enough to
enhance SM behavior. Secondly, drilling deeper into the roles and responsibilities of faculty,
administration, and staff perhaps requires different methodologies to understand what sets each
apart in how individuals use personal or professional SM. Who is responsible for a department
or program account? Do they feel they are in danger of making a misstep? Are they unsure if
the platform is being monitored, and do they believe this is permissible? Answers to all of the
above could be critical steps to leveraging the positive aspects of SM at institutions of higher
education while mitigating the negative.
Chapter V

DISCUSSION

Summary of Study

As stakeholders at institutions of higher education use SM platforms with increased frequency, both personally and professionally, the resulting pressure on SMPs to keep pace with this rapidly growing trend could present a myriad of issues. The potential positives of increased communication between faculty, administration, and staff with individuals inside and outside of the college or university is coupled with the real possibility of minor to serious SM indiscretions (Cohen, 2014; Miller, 2010; Schmidt, 2013). Contemporary SM research has largely focused on SM’s interplay with teaching and pedagogy (Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013), pre-professional programs (Foss & Olson, 2013; Mullen et al., 2014), and a limited number of institutional roles (Lenartz, 2012).

Additionally, empirical SMP research again has a lack of focus on the differences among faculty, administration, and staff in relation to policy adoption (Chretien et al., 2009; Rodgers, 2012), policy implementation (Andrews, 2012; Greysen, Kind, & Chretien, 2010), and policy impact (Williams et al., 2011). Although framing SMP policy research through the lens of policy analysis is appropriate, the scale and perspective of such research is not far-reaching enough to potentially assess SM climate in a way that would maximize the positives of SM usage while mitigating the negatives.

Chapter 3 described that current approaches to studying SM and SMP were not refined to the point where data could be leveraged to inform decision making, possibly resulting in under- or over restrictive SMPs and poor knowledge of SM climate at colleges and universities.
Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore gaps in the current literature on SM and SMP in higher education as they relate to the experiences of faculty, administration, and staff. More specifically, the literature supported the notion that SMP research had not yet integrated the proper focus on stakeholder behaviors, perceptions, and experiences with an aim at collecting a large volume of data.

By investigating the degree to which administration, faculty, and staff used SM, the existence and details of SMPs, and the perceptions related to SM guidelines, the primary goal was to offer a data-supported approach through a comparative analysis. Chapter 3 described this goal as something that would lead to increased understanding of the extent to which SM was used among these institutional roles and other demographics nascent to higher education. In order to reach this overarching goal, as well as address the three research questions noted in Chapter 3, the study employed used a quantitative research methodology serving as an environmental scan of the current state of SM use and SMP implementation at colleges and universities in the state of New Jersey.

The results of the research were presented in Chapter 4 and were framed by the three research questions. Data collected in these three stages attempted to identify differences across institutional role, SM use/SMP existence, personal versus professional behavior, and various demographics. Chapter 4 illustrated this data in tables and charts and described them in further detail related to overarching trends and themes. Additionally, Pearson’s chi-square was used to test for significant differences and confirm the level of confidence that these same differences across categories did not occur due to chance.
Summary of Key Findings

At the conclusion of each of these sections was a summary of key themes that were either unique to the research question in focus or connected to more comprehensive trends across the study as a whole. Specifically, the overarching findings that transcended each of the research questions and could have significant implications in higher education were (a) frequency of SM usage, (b) lack of SMP buy-in, and (c) SM boundaries and SMP constraint.

The research questions and subsequent data pointed toward a more overarching or essential question that encompassed the findings noted above, which was, How can researchers help develop SM strategies at colleges and universities that follow three key principles? One, policies would not paint all stakeholders with a broad brush. Two, policy makers would place a premium on providing resources at various department, program, and demographic levels. Finally, these strategies would be periodically evaluated to reassess their effectiveness and level of buy-in with stakeholders. Trickling down from the central problem identified above to the research questions driving the creation of the survey instrument, the following key findings are essential to expanding the conversation surrounding SM’s place in higher education.

Frequency of Social Media Usage

SM usage across institutional roles and age groups in higher education settings in the study’s response population is still on an upward trajectory, particularly in reference to previous studies. Overall, 88% \((n = 1,502)\) of respondents indicated they participate in some form of SM for personal or professional use. SM usage persisted at a high rate even across age groups, where 73% \((n = 165)\) of participants 65 or over reported personal or professional use. This could
be an overstatement because the sample was self-selected, meaning that those more inclined to participate or even more familiar with SM or SMPs may have responded in higher numbers.

More detailed data outlining frequency of personal and professional SM use illustrated that a large portion of faculty, administration, and staff reported accessing these platforms “11–20 times” and in some cases “over 20 times per day.” Given not only the overall SM usage but also the frequency with which it is visited by faculty, administration, and staff in both capacities, developing sound strategies through informed and robust research should be seen as a critical aspect of college and university policy planning.

**Lack of SMP “Buy-in”**

Because the central problem of the study pivots on the idea that SMPs, to this point, have not been refined as a result of sound research, it was also critical to explore the behaviors and perceptions nascent to SMP environments. Crucial to the development of the findings on lack of SMP buy-in was the concept of whether participants reported knowing their institution had an SMP or not. In response to this question, 34% (n = 567) reported thinking their institution had an SMP, and 11% (n = 184) answered “no.” Most surprising given the high frequency of SM usage in the response sample were the 55% (n = 898) of respondents who answered “don’t know/not sure.”

A strong supporting structure for the idea that a lack of SMP buy-in exists was built on data that pointed to stakeholders rarely, if ever, being involved in the SMP planning process, having the opportunity to share their own experiences on SM, or having adequate training or resources to consult in the event they need assistance on personal or professional SM. Faculty, administration, and staff also reported that governance of SM and SMP affected an individual’s
constitutional right to freedom of speech whereas at the same time stating in fairly high numbers that inappropriate SM behavior would have no impact on future employment. Finally, the development of four SM/SMP “quadrants” identified differences across institutions where respondents reported an SMP did or did not exist. Specifically, whereas participants indicated they believed professional SM monitoring occurred on a much higher level than personal, even across institutional type, the belief that monitoring occurred in any regard was higher at schools where an SMP was believed to be in place.

**SM Boundaries and SMP “Constraint”**

Another crucial element to the analysis was the data, which illustrated the ideas of a potential dangerous grey area between personal and professional SM behaviors, how institutions word SMPs, and individuals’ conception of SM “inappropriateness.” Beginning with the ladder, participants defined SM “inappropriateness” in the highest numbers as being related to “defamatory/prejudicial language and beliefs” or “generally offensive posts/behavior/language.” Although these definitions do prove that at least some SM users evaluated posts on some type of scale, these definitions deserve further exploration in future research. The importance of clarifying these definitions to users is underscored by the respondents’ feelings that communication on SM blurs the line between personal and professional life and, to a slightly lesser degree, by SMPs creating constraint between advocating the positive aspects of SM and restricting their use.

By delving deeper into the more detailed data outlined in the study, it is clear that faculty, administration, and staff are very much a part of the “social network.” The upward trajectory of the frequency of personal and professional SM continues to illustrate the evolution and
unencumbered growth of SM across many different roles and demographics in higher education. Exploring the potential avenues for future research detailed as follows will assist in the transition from the idea of SM governance to more overarching SM strategies. This transition would require that static policies that may only be referred to in the context of negativity, transform into living documents that acknowledge how woven into higher education settings SM has become.

**Reflecting on Limitations**

Upon further reflection on the limitations outlined in Chapter 3, several more arose that related to the distribution processes involved with such a large-scale survey, the resulting response/completion rate, and the generalizability of the division/department analysis. The overall goal was to build a target population to gather as much potential data as possible on SM and SMP behavior, perceptions, and experiences across institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey. To this point, the limitations outlined here may be mostly attributed to administering an online survey with the hope of creating a data set that could be generalizable to as many institutional types and demographics as possible. Although the analysis identified themes and trends that extended beyond the current horizon of SM and SMP research, future studies in this forum should consider these limitations to improve the overall quality of data collection.

First, the data pointed to a high percentage of older SM users within the response sample. Given the comparisons to earlier research done on SM usage in higher education, the percentages seemed to show not only an overall rise in the trajectory of SM use but also a corresponding rise in its popularity with users in the 65-and-over category. Having said this, the percentage of SM users is probably overrepresented within the response sample because it is in fact self-selected
Namely, participation in this electronic survey hinged on the motivation of the potential respondent to complete the survey and therefore may have depended on their inherent interest in SM.

Secondly, the proposed target population for the study was over 30,000 individuals and the maximum number of e-mails permitted by the survey software used was 10,000 per week, which created issues with maintaining consistent contact with potential survey participants and establishing a more frequent reminder schedule. This study had to employ an alternating schedule whereby participants were contacted every 2 weeks when general interest in completing the questionnaire may have lapsed. In traditional methods to contact potential respondents, such as the Dillman method, it is recommended that as many avenues as possible (e.g., mailed reminders, phone contact, paper questionnaires) should be used to increase the response rate. The thought is that varied stimuli can mitigate the trend of nonresponse or refusal (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). As Monroe and Adams (2012) described, repeated and personalized contact can help to boost response rates and identify surveys as legitimate methods to contribute to a body of research. However, in order to collect the data for the purposes of this research and due to the limitations of the software noted previously, these more traditional methods, which would require additional resources, were not used. Combined with reported declines in online survey response rates (Petchenik & Watermolen, 2011), these are legitimate and recognized limitations of the study but should not be confused with the generalizability of the research or its ability to fill gaps in contemporary SM and SMP literature.

Finally, although drilling down into the division and department levels provided an understanding of more general trends and themes, participation in these questions was not high
enough to yield actionable data. Considering the use of other demographics yielded actionable results, this was not too large of a limitation of the research. In future research, it may be prudent to take the themes and trends identified through the analysis at the division and department levels and develop a quantitative or qualitative methodology primarily focused through this lens. Although separate and distinct from the limitations anticipated prior the Chapter 4, altogether the limitations did not have any immediate impact on the analysis as a whole and would only help future researchers tackling issues in this burgeoning field of higher education research.

Implications and Future Research

Views on Professional Social Media Conduct

Professional SM behavior and implications for such behavior within the context of SMPs held much more weight, according to respondents, than personal SM. Because this was measured in a variety of ways, including their views on monitoring, relative impact on institution and personal image, and future employment, several conclusions may be made in regard to future research. More precise measurement of faculty, administration, and staff behaviors on personal and professional SM platforms should be done to better understand to what extent individuals engage in conduct that could be detrimental in either context. This could demand a more qualitative approach and involve more of a focus on specific demographics within higher education.

In reference to these more precise measures, a concerted effort to more deeply understand how faculty, administration, and staff manage professional SM pages should be undertaken. As noted in Chapter 4, it was difficult to know the frequency with which a respondent was visiting a
professional SM account in the context of managing a program or department page. Because this is a burgeoning responsibility across institutional roles and, according to the analysis, more popular in the administrative and staff ranks, SM and SMP research germane to this context could help to make SMPs more role-oriented. The schism in the typology of professional SM use from institutional promotion (department page) to more self-promotional (LinkedIn, blogging) is a clear avenue for further exploration and description.

Understanding the more underlying reasons that respondents indicated they placed more importance on their professional image could also help policy makers identify ways to properly define the difference between personal and professional SM to create a clearer SMP vision. Division, department, and program-specific data, although included in this study, could be of greater focus in future research and result in more detailed feedback. Without these data, the potential perpetuation of SMPs having no specific audience could continue. Once future researchers further emphasize the key differences in the personal and professional SM behaviors at this level, perhaps SM strategies can be more focused and equitable across a college or university.

Lack of SMP “Buy-in”

With minor exceptions across institutional role, it was apparent in the data that the issue of SMP “buy-in” is greatly affected by a number of factors that could ultimately determine the success or failure of any attempt at SM governance. First and foremost, the tendency to disagree that faculty, administration, and staff are involved in multiple stages of the SMP-making process suggests that colleges and universities have the basic issue on their hands. That is, unique SM experiences and behaviors across institutional role, gender, age, and division/department are not
considered when developing the details of a SM strategy and much less a policy aimed at governing its use. Given the data that indicate significant differences exist across these demographic characteristics, this is a critical element missing in the mix. In almost every item related to the process of SMP development, staff members indicated feeling the most left out in contributing their thoughts and experiences, making enforcement decisions, and providing basic levels of feedback on guidelines already in place. Because this group is among the most frequent users of both personal and professional SM, this oversight could have adverse effects on degree of buy-in.

Moreover, a high number of faculty, administration, and staff members indicated that even when SMPs are in place, they rarely take steps to implement any of the guidelines or strategies included to help mitigate the potential negatives of personal or professional use. Namely, privacy controls were rarely adjusted to the highest settings possible to prevent controversy from occurring in the first place and training/technical support in the use of these tools personally or professional was not readily available.

The loss of momentum from policy making to stakeholders reflecting on the basic principles in their own SM behavior illustrates the buy-in factor at work. It is critical that future researchers dig deeper into each level of policy analysis from the very beginning when SMPs are being developed, through their implementation phase, and finally to just how their effect on faculty, administration, and staff is measured. To this point, the research in these specific areas of SMP analysis is minimal and the data provide specific areas for future exploration at each of these levels. In the development phase, who specifically is involved in the process and what decides whether or not these stakeholders are qualified to build guidelines to manage SM at their
respective institution? Presumably, this type of research would have to occur in conjunction with an institution reconsidering its current SMP or creating one from scratch. Program evaluations could test how impactful an SMP is at communicating key principles to stakeholders and if the guidelines were more invested in governance than in educating individuals across the institution belong to various groups. Whereas the era of SM in higher education is still fairly new, the time for applying research principles to understanding SM and SMP environments in various contexts is present.

**SM Boundaries and SMP Constraint**

Key to any resource investment in creating a SM strategy or SMP, aside from acquiring buy-in, is making its direction and goals/objective clear to the audience. Without this clarity, which faculty, administration, and staff said is critical to effectiveness, more gray areas in terms of conduct on a personal Facebook page or department Twitter account could ensue. “Constraint” then occurs when faculty, administration, and staff are left to interpret what their place in the SM environment at the college or university is. Do they engage openly with constituents on the department Facebook page, and if so are there clear guidelines as to what is appropriate professional SM conduct? Research specifically focusing on the boundary between personal and professional SM behavior and how it is conceptualized within policies could be critical to the evolution of SMPs.

For instance, a thematic analysis of the SMPs themselves could identify consistencies in these areas and just how often SMPs tend to overlap their language when attempting to govern SM behavior. Furthermore, this type of textual analysis could be employed to compare how many SMPs warn against the dangers of SM while at the same time encouraging their use.
These same strategies could identify how policies could be at times intentionally vague, while transitioning to more specific regulations at other times. More quantitative techniques could also be employed to specifically target this trend, employing questions that ask participants to assess whether an SMP has more applicability in regard to their personal or professional life, or both. Making distinct connections between the exploratory data collected in the current study to more definitive measures over time could increase the possibility of identifying linkages between SMP details and resulting SM behaviors.

**Leveraging the Positive**

Throughout the majority of the analysis, the data highlighted themes and trends that raise concerns over the current approach to understanding and studying SM and SMP in higher education, as well as how these developments contribute to developing sound SM strategies. It is important that research does not lose sight of the opportunities to leverage positive SM behaviors in any context. Demographics provide the opportunity to identify not only how specific groups use SM and experience SMP settings but also which groups could help educate college or university overall on the unique place Web 2.0 has in higher education. Several of these “leveraging points” were highlighted in different contexts through the analysis.

Future research could focus on an entirely different level of SM and SMP research, specifically related to how this culture is created or shaped by institutional leadership. Although the analysis briefly touched upon it, do institutions have practices in place to educate faculty, administration, and staff on the most current SM platforms for those who are interested? The analysis indicated that each of these stakeholders, but particularly those in the administrative and staff ranks, were rarely included in the policy discussion when in fact they might bring fresh
perspectives in this regard. If SM education is developed to a certain extent, could questionnaires be developed to specifically focus analysis on how effective these educational practices are in relaying information to stakeholders, and are there measurable benefits? This particularly point is raised in the analysis at several points, in particular regarding how unwilling stakeholders were to change their behaviors even at institutions with SMPs in place. Additionally, are there resources for individuals to reference for troubleshooting, or in the event of a potentially contentious SM situation, is there proper support? How do institutions conceptualize SM controversies and provide examples occurring at institutions locally and abroad? Participants in the study reported low knowledge of SM controversies, as well as a general lack of avenues to troubleshoot questions related to SM usage, which lays the groundwork for more focused analyses in this sphere of SMP research. Quantitative or qualitative research methods could identify which resources or procedures tend to have the highest benefit, which provides a different angle on capturing SMP in the adoption phase and toward measuring the more practical applications of SM strategies at institutions of higher education.

In the analysis above, fewer faculty who were users of SM had heard of SM controversies than faculty who were non-SM users. Combined with the prevalence of SM usage across all institutional roles, this is a combination that could have negative results as far as SMP efficacy is concerned. As noted in the question above, institutions could take steps to conceptualize SM controversy to faculty, administration, and staff. Future researchers could dig further into whether or not this actually occurs on any level and, if so, study how measurable the benefits are of including this practice as part of the institution’s overall SM strategy. Perhaps periodically
checking in with stakeholders before, during, and after an SMP is instituted and assessing which controversies impact their SM conduct the most, if at all, could build on research methodologies implemented in more specific contexts such as medical schools (Williams et al., 2011) aimed at improving SMP efficacy.

Additionally, how are the best practices of individuals within a specific institution recognized and leveraged to encourage the growth of SM while also mitigating potential controversies? As noted above, that puts leadership in the precarious position of creating policies and guidelines that cause a certain level of constraint between personal and professional SM behavior. However, by simply allowing a wider variety of stakeholders to contribute to the policy conversation, the diversity of SM usage across a specific institution could be highlighted and additional “points of leverage” could be addressed. For instance, researchers using interviews could ask individuals from varying demographics across a college or university to define SM inappropriateness just as was done in the analysis. Follow-up questions would develop a more detailed analysis not only of how these participants define it but also of what led them to develop this definition. Are there specific controversies on SM either in their own lives or in the media that led them to come to such a conclusion and is there a connection between how an individual defines SM inappropriateness and their own behavior? The data from Q41 above provide a launching point to better develop ways to encourage individuals to actively contribute to SM climate without relying on policies that are either out of touch or have no clear line of sight.
Conclusion

The broader purpose and goal of this study was to explore gaps in the current literature on SM and SMP in higher education as it relates to the experiences of faculty, administration, and staff. Going a bit further, the current discourse supported the notion that SMP research had not integrated a proper focus on the behaviors, perceptions, and experiences of faculty, administration, and staff with an aim at collecting a large volume of data. The exploratory study using a comparative analysis approach investigated the degree to which administration, faculty, and staff used SM, the existence and details of SMPs, and perceptions related to such guidelines. Given the apparent and continued rise of SM usage, a data-supported approach was suggested to offer further insight into how guidelines could be customized to suit specific user needs, leverage positive SM conduct and perception, and mitigate negative consequences. The data collected and ensuing analysis certainly addressed this goal, as well as the three research questions from multiple perspectives to identify similarities and differences across faculty, administration, and staff and their respective demographic characteristics. Exploratory studies give credence to the principle of raising additional questions and proposing avenues for future research. Of the themes addressed in the analysis, four overarching themes emerged, including (a) frequency of SM usage, (b) lack of SMP buy-in, (c) SM boundaries and SMP constraints, and (d) opportunities to leverage SM and SMP behaviors and perceptions.

In the court of public opinion, the discourse of SM usage and SMP in higher education has had two main focal points: students and faculty. Due to the high profile of court cases centering around the constitutionality of SMPs at colleges and universities, offenses by these two groups specifically changed the complexion of research in this field to focus on the high-
profile/high-risk behaviors and the divisions/departments most likely to engage in such. More exploratory and diagnostic approaches to all forms of SM behavior and SMP experiences among a broader range of groups with the intention of improving the climate of Web 2.0 on campus had largely been ignored. Larger-scale studies (Seaman & Tinti-Kane, 2013) collected a large quantity of data; however all institutional roles were not described in large detail and the implicit direction of improving SMP was not present.

Currently, the state of SM and SMP research with a focus on higher education could be generally categorized into studies that focus on the pedagogical implications for use, high-profile programs, and negative consequences for faculty–student interactions in the postsecondary and K–12 spheres. Conversely, the analysis in Chapter 4 identified that the high level of SM usage, both personal and professional, was characterized by distinct differences in views on SM usage, behaviors, contributions to policy, and perceptions on SMP enforcement. Additionally, the data suggested that across institutional roles the larger issues of the vague line between personal and professional SM activity, complemented with SMPs that often send mixed or constrained messages, is persistent. Of course, a one-size-fits-all approach to diagnosing and preventing these issues is not the recommended course of action because significant differences across gender, age, and division/department add a variable to the mix worth the time of future researchers. Whether these differences can be ferreted out according to gender and age remains to be seen as the data suggested the age of the SM user is continuing to increase as Web 2.0 becomes more accessible across demographics. However, differences across program/department do demand more focus and could draw a clearer path from job-specific responsibilities to policy.
Overall, does the study answer the question, Are faculty, administration, and staff part of the “social network”? It would be an overly ambitious to think that a single exploratory study could make up the ground between SM practice in higher education and SM strategy/policy. The most important contribution to the analysis and exploration of SM and SMP behaviors, experiences, and perceptions of faculty, administration, and staff is to keep this question in mind as Web 2.0 evolves over time. Whereas improving the quantity and reach of higher education research in this field is paramount to soothe those who see it in a negative light, perhaps a more positive perspective is in order. Using a smartphone, tablet, or laptop/desktop computer as a gateway to communicate has almost become woven into the fabric of everyday life, and it is an oversight to think this is somehow slowed by the walls of colleges and universities. Instead of arming for battle, it may be more beneficial to accept how critical a part of our lives Web 2.0 has become and take the recommendations to leverage the positive behaviors, perceptions, and experiences with it seriously. Perhaps future research in this field will not simply ask if faculty, administration, and staff are part of the “social network” because the data shows that this is becoming an overly simplistic premise. Instead, the unencumbered growth of SM may lead to research detailing higher education employees’ evolution from SM and SMP users to transformers and capable agents of change.
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APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT
Intro Thank you for agreeing to participate in a social media focused survey distributed to employees at institutions of higher education across the state of New Jersey. Your input is critical to further understanding the multitude of ways faculty, administration, and staff use social media personally and professionally every day, as well as their views on social media policy and governance. This survey will take 10-15 minutes to complete. Definitions for key terms used throughout the survey are provided at the bottom of each page for your own reference. The information you provide will remain confidential and anonymous, and results of this survey will only be used for the purposes of my dissertation research which was outlined in further detail in the e-mail containing the survey link. I will collect and analyze all responses, which will be stored in a secure location to ensure that individual confidentiality is maintained. For questions or concerns about this survey please do not hesitate to contact me, Jonathan W. Stoessel, VIA e-mail at jonathan.stoessel@student.shu.edu.
Q1 Of the following choices, which best describes your primary role at your institution?
○ Faculty (1)
○ Administration (2)
○ Staff (3)

Q2 Choose your current employment status:
○ Full-time (1)
○ Part-time (2)

Q3 Please indicate the gender you identify with.
○ Male (1)
○ Female (2)
Q4 What is your current age?
- 24 or under (1)
- 25-34 (2)
- 35-44 (3)
- 45-54 (4)
- 55-64 (5)
- 65 or over (6)

Q5 Is your institution:
- Public (1)
- Private (2)

Q6 Do you currently participate in any form of social media for personal or professional use?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q7 Please indicate your percentage of personal social media usage versus professional social media usage:

________ Personal (i.e. account you access on your free time to communicate with family/friends) (1)

________ Professional (i.e. department social media page, career advancement, research) (2)

Q8 About how many times per day do you access your personal social media account(s)?

- A few times per week (5)
- Once or twice per day (1)
- 5-10 times (2)
- 11-20 times (3)
- Over 20 times per day (4)
- I use social media, but on a minimal basis (10)

Q9 Which social media platform(s) do you participate in for personal use? You may choose more than (1).

- Facebook (1)
- Twitter (2)
- Instagram (3)
- LinkedIn (4)
- Pinterest (5)
- Snapchat (6)
- Other (please specify) (7) ____________________
Q10 About how many times per day do you access your professional social media account(s)?
- A few times per week (5)
- Once or twice per day (1)
- 5-10 times (2)
- 11-20 times (3)
- Over 20 times per day (4)
- I use social media, but on a minimal basis (10)

Q11 Which social media platform(s) do you participate in for professional use? You may choose more than (1).
- Facebook (1)
- Twitter (2)
- Instagram (3)
- LinkedIn (4)
- Pinterest (5)
- Snapchat (6)
- Other (please specify) (7) ____________________

Q12 Which social media platform(s) are you currently aware of? You may choose more than (1).
- Facebook (1)
- Twitter (2)
- Instagram (3)
- LinkedIn (4)
- Pinterest (5)
- Snapchat (6)
- Other (please specify) (7) ____________________
Q13 Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place?
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2)
   - Don't know/not sure (3)

Answer If Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected

Q14 Do you feel that you are familiar with the general principles of the institution's, program's, or department's social media policy?
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2)

Answer If Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected
And Do you feel that you are familiar with the general principles of the institution's, program's, or... Yes Is Selected

Q15 Is your institution's social media policy a stand-alone document? This would mean the policy is separate from an "Acceptable Use Policy", "Employee Handbook", or "Code of Conduct".
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2)
   - Don't know/not sure (3)
Answer If Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected
And Do you feel that you are familiar with the general principles of the institution's, program's, or... Yes Is Selected

Q16 Based on your understanding of the social media policy, who do you feel is the primary intended audience for the policy at your institution? Select all that apply.
- Faculty (1)
- Administration (2)
- Staff (3)
- Students (4)
- Student Athletes (5)
- No specific audience (6)
- Don't know/not sure (7)

Answer If Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected
And Do you feel that you are familiar with the general principles of the institution's, program's, or... Yes Is Selected

Q17 From the list below, please select features included in your institution's, program's, or department's social media policy. Select all that apply:
- Improving privacy settings (1)
- Examples of proper social media etiquette (2)
- Examples of poor social media behavior (3)
- Using university emblems or branding on social media accounts (4)
- Definitions of social media websites and function of each (5)
- Specific penalties if guidelines are violated (6)
- Statement of rights to dismiss students, faculty, administration, or staff based on poor social media conduct (7)
- A date when the policy was updated OR is scheduled to be reviewed in the future (8)
- References to the difference between personal use and professional use (9)
- Reference to an office to contact in the event that social media issues occur (10)
- Reference to workshops or training sessions that explain the policy in further detail (11)
- Don't know/not sure (12)
Answer If Of the following choices, which best describes your primary role at your institution? Faculty Is Selected And Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected

Q18 Please respond to the following statements by rating the frequency that each occurs by using the scale below: Faculty members...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Very Often (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are included in the creation and planning process before a social media policy is implemented. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide perspectives based on personal and professional use of social media to inform policy. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have been included in disciplinary decisions regarding social media indiscretions of faculty, administration, or staff. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are encouraged to provide feedback regarding the details of a social media policy. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Answer**

If of the following choices, which best describes your primary role at your institution? Administration is selected.

And does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes is selected.

Q19 Please respond to the following statements by rating the frequency that each occurs by using the scale below: Administrators...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Very Often (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are included in the creation and planning process before a social media policy is implemented. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide perspectives based on personal and professional use of social media to inform policy. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have been included in disciplinary decisions regarding social media indiscretions of faculty, administration, or staff. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are encouraged to provide feedback regarding the details of a social media policy. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If Of the following choices, which best describes your primary role at your institution?  
Staff Is Selected  
And Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected

Q20 Please respond to the following statements by rating the frequency that each occurs by using the scale below:  
Staff members...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Very Often (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are included in the creation and planning process before a social media policy is implemented.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide perspectives based on personal and professional use of social media to inform policy.</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have been included in disciplinary decisions regarding social media indiscretions of faculty, administration, or staff.</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are encouraged to provide feedback regarding the details of a social media policy.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q21 Using the scale below, please rank the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media policies should be instituted at every institution, which govern the behavior and speech of students, faculty, administration, and staff. (1)</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media policies should be incorporated into a large policy on professional conduct and acceptable use of electronic devices at the institution. (2)</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media policies should focus on curbing potentially negative student behaviors. (3)</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media policies should focus on curbing potentially negative faculty, administration, or staff behaviors. (4)</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media policy clarity plays a significant role</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in its eventual level of effectiveness. (5)
Answer If Do you currently participate in any form of social media for private or professional use? Yes Is Selected

Q22 Using the scale below, please rank the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statements. In your specific role as a member of the faculty, an administrator, or staff member you...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are given access to social media accounts.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely run into any type of controversy in electronic communication</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of any kind (e-mail, interoffice chat, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are responsible for overseeing an institutionally sponsored social media</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are encouraged to promote the university on personal social media</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accounts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are given adequate guidelines as to what is expected and appropriate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior on personal and professional accounts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
<th>Column 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have access to social media training. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have access to technical support for institutionally sponsored social media accounts. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q23 Using the scale below, please rank the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statements. The following should be considered when a social media policy may be enforced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review if the actions were criminal in nature. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A meeting with the offender before investigating. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering information from all parties involved. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the effect of the indiscretion on individuals within the institution. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine if the indiscretion disrupted a productive working environment. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of repeat offense by the individual. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q24 Using the scale below, please choose the level of likelihood that you would do the following after consulting your institution’s social media policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Definitely not (1)</th>
<th>Probably not (2)</th>
<th>Not sure (3)</th>
<th>Probably (4)</th>
<th>Definitely (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose to secure the social media account(s) that I used most frequently. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the privacy and confidentiality guidelines associated with the social media account(s) I used most frequently. (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ the strongest privacy settings available. (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use discretion more than security settings to monitor my own behavior. (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend that a colleague or a friend improve their security settings due to visibility. (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodically review connections to maintain a close circle of social media “friends”. (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Create a separate social media account that projects a more professional image. (7)
Answer If Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected

Q25 Using the scale below, please select the frequency with which the following may occur at your institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Very Often (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media infractions occur on a low level (i.e. inappropriate comment, picture, video or link is posted and quickly deleted).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media policy infractions occur on a moderate level (i.e. threatening comments are made toward individuals or the institution, pictures/videos/links frequently posted and publicly visibly and are not removed).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media policy infractions occur on a high level (inappropriate communication occurs between institutional stakeholders VIA social media, disparaging or exclusionary remarks are made repeatedly, university reputation is potentially harmed).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official institutional social media accounts have personal views and commentary visible to the public.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infractions may be overlooked or not</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prioritized until it is too late. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q26 Using the scale below, please rank the level of importance of each of the following negative social media issues that could be potentially addressed in a social media policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Not important (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat important (2)</th>
<th>Important (3)</th>
<th>Very Important (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy indiscretions (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening posts or comments (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyberstalking (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal and psychological abuse VIA social media (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of confidential materials and information (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted images, video, personal accounts of illegal behavior (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q27 Do you believe your institution, department, or program monitors the personal social media accounts of faculty, administration, and staff?
☑ Yes (1)
☑ No (2)

Q28 Do you believe your institution, department, or program monitors the professional social media accounts of faculty, administration, and staff?
☑ Yes (1)
☑ No (2)

Q29 Does the governance or monitoring of personal OR professional social media accounts affect, if at all, an individual’s constitutional right to freedom of speech?
☑ Yes (1)
☑ No (2)
Answer If Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected
And Do you feel that you are familiar with the general principles of the institution's, program's, or... Yes Is Selected

Q30 Apart from your institution's social media policy, does your department or program have one in place that is more specific to the unique nature and expectations of your job?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q31 Using the scale below, please rank the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statements.

| My role at this institution requires me to maintain my professional conduct in all forums to promote the institution's mission and values. (1) | Strongly Disagree (1) | Somewhat Disagree (2) | Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) | Somewhat Agree (4) | Strongly Agree (5) |
| If I were to behave inappropriately in any way privately, the potential impact on the institution's image would be minimal. (2) | | | | | |
| If I were to behave inappropriately in any way professionally, the potential impact on the institution's image would be minimal. (3) | | | | | |
Answer: If you currently participate in any form of social media for private or professional use? No is selected.

Q32 Using the scale below, please rank the level of importance of each of the following factors that cause you not to participate in social media on a personal or professional level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Not Important (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Important (2)</th>
<th>Important (3)</th>
<th>Very Important (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over privacy (1)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No confidence using social media or technology (2)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary distraction (3)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not help me professionally (4)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for confusing personal and professional accounts. (5)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answer If Do you currently participate in any form of social media for personal or professional use? Yes Is Selected And Please indicate your percentage of personal social media usage versus professional social media usage: Personal (i.e. account you access on your free time to communicate with family/friends) Is Greater Than 0

Q33 How do you use social media platforms on a personal level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To communicate with friends, family, co-workers, and former classmates. (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Almost every day (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change or update your current location or &quot;status&quot; to indicate mood or life events. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post links to news-stories, articles, videos, or images. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on friends links to news-stories, articles, videos, or images. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on articles of videos posted by news agencies (i.e. New York Times, Fox News, etc.) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make statements on controversial economic, political, religious events. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal business, or the business of a colleague or friend. (7) Monitor the activity of a close group of friends, family, co-workers, and former classmates. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answer If Do you currently participate in any form of social media for personal or professional use? Yes is Selected and Please indicate your percentage of personal; social media usage versus professional social media usage: Professional (i.e. department social media page, career advancement, research) is greater than 0.

Q34 How do you use social media platform(s) on a professional level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To encourage collaboration with colleagues at this and other institutions. (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Occasionally (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Almost every day (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connect with current students for course assignments. (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect with current students for advising/counseling. (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect with prospective students for recruitment. (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect with alumni or potential donors for the purposes of institutional advancement. (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor the online behavior of current or potential future employees. (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To communicate more rapidly regarding short and long term plans and developments. (7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise the institution to the general public for academic and athletic purposes. (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit potential students by posting links for special institution events.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q35 Using the scale below, please rank the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statements. At this institution (or within my department or program) faculty, administrators and staff members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilize social media as an educative tool-for instructional purposes. (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize social media as a communicative tool-to communicate with peers within or across institutions. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize social media as a promotional tool-to promote events, important dates, or professional development etc... (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are able to effectively balance their use of personal and professional social media when necessary. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are responsible in the way they communicate with external groups VIA institutional social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accounts (if applicable). (5) Are responsible in the way they communicate with students, colleagues and leadership at this institution VIA social media accounts. (6)

Make appropriate decisions on content (commentary, photos, videos, web-links) displayed on personal social media accounts. (7)

Make appropriate decisions on content (commentary, photos, videos, web-links) displayed on professional social media accounts. (8)

Acknowledge that individual opinions are not those of the institution at which they are employed on personal or professional social media accounts. (9)

Spend an acceptable amount of time per work day on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal social media accounts. (10)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spend an acceptable amount of time per work day on professional social media accounts. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q36 How important, if at all, is social media behavior in regard to future employment or promotion opportunities at this or another institution?

- Not Important (1)
- Somewhat Important (2)
- Important (3)
- Very Important (4)
- Essential (5)

Q37 Have you heard of any controversies or negative issues related to social media and its place in higher education within the last year either locally at your institution or at another school?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Answer If Have you heard of any controversies or negative issues related to social media and its place in h... Yes Is Selected

Q38 Please indicate who runs into controversy the most, in your opinion, at institutions of higher education when it comes to negative social media behavior:

- Faculty (1)
- Administration (2)
- Staff (3)
- Students (4)
- Student-athletes (5)
Q39 Do you know a colleague at your institution that projects negative or inappropriate social media behavior on a personal or professional account?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q40 Using the scale below, please rank the level with which you agree/disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, administration, and staff communication with individuals on social media could blur the line between an individual’s personal and professional life. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, administration, and staff who post comments, pictures, and videos on personal social media accounts could be negatively affecting their professional persona. (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy settings on social media websites allow for an adequate separation between a personal and professional presence. (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a professional social media account (i.e. department Facebook page) increases the</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
likelihood of confusing personal and professional conduct. (4)
Answer: If Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected
And Do you feel that you are familiar with the general principles of the institution's, program's, or... Yes Is Selected

Q41 Using the scale below, please rank the level with which you agree/disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My institution, program or department social media policy touts the benefits of social media while also restricting their use. (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The social media policy gives examples of how social media posts could be damaging locally and abroad, while also noting the positives of access and transparency. (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines within the social media policy are obviously tailored to the unique nature of social media behavior. (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines within the policy could be applied more broadly to personal and professional conduct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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outside of social media. (4)

Guidelines within the policy for personal and professional social media expectations are separate and distinct (5)

Guidelines within the policy for personal and professional social media expectations are the same. (6)
Q42 How do you personally define "inappropriateness" as it refers to controversial comments, pictures, videos, or links on social media?
Answer If Do you currently participate in any form of social media for personal or professional use? Yes Is Selected And Does your institution currently have a social media policy in place? Yes Is Selected And Do you feel that you are familiar with the general principles of the institution's, program's, or... Yes Is Selected

Q43 Overall, do you believe that the guidelines within your institution's social media policy create confusion, if at all, between how you are to conduct yourself on personal and professional social media websites?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Answer If Overall, do you believe that the guidelines within your institution's social media policy create confusion, if at all, between how you are to conduct yourself on social media privately and professi... Yes Is Selected

Q44 Please explain why you believe this in the space provided below.
Answer: If you currently participate in any form of social media for private or professional use? Yes is selected.

Q45 Which of the following devices/platforms do you access your personal/professional social media account from the most? Please choose (1) from the list below.

- Laptop computer (1)
- Desktop computer (2)
- Tablet (iPad or Android device) (3)
- Smartphone (4)
Q46 Please mark the highest degree you currently hold.
- Bachelors (B.A., B.S., etc.) (1)
- Master's (M.A., M.S.) (2)
- M.F.A. (3)
- M.B.A. (4)
- J.D., LL.B. (5)
- M.D., D.D.S. (or equivalent) (6)
- Other professional degree beyond B.A. (D.D., D.V.M., etc.) (7)
- Ed.D. (8)
- Ph.D. (9)
- Other degree, please indicate (10) ____________________
- None (11)

Q47 How many years have you held your current position?
- Less than 1 year (1)
- 1 to 5 years (2)
- 6 to 10 years (3)
- Greater than 10 years (4)

Q48 Are you: (please choose the ONE category with which you most closely identify)
- White non-Hispanic (1)
- Black or African American (2)
- Hispanic or Latino (3)
- Asian (4)
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (5)
- American Indian or Alaskan Native (6)
- 2 or more races (7)
Answer If Of the following choices, which best describes your primary role at your institution?
Faculty Is Selected

Q49 What is your current faculty academic rank?
- Professor (1)
- Associate Professor (2)
- Assistant Professor (3)
- Lecturer (4)
- Instructor (5)
- Adjunct Professor (6)

Q50 What is your tenure status at your institution?
- Tenured (1)
- On tenure track, but not tenured (2)
- Not on tenure track, but institution has tenure system (3)
- Institution has no tenure system (4)
- Renewable contract (e.g., Adjunct) (5)

Q51 What is your primary or principal activity as a faculty member at your institution?
- Instruction/Teaching (1)
- Research (2)
- Advisement (3)
- Administration (e.g. Department Chair, Program Director, etc..) (4)
Q52 Please choose (1) major or department division which most closely applies to your faculty role from the list below:
- Humanities and Arts (1)
- Social Sciences (2)
- STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, or Mathematics) (3)
- Business (4)
- Education (5)
- Other (please specify) (6) ____________________

Q53 Which best describes your current administrative position?
- President's or Provost's Office (1)
- Office of the Dean (2)
- Department Chair or Lead Administrator (3)
- Director (e.g. Athletic Director, Director of Student Life) (4)
- Other (please specify) (5) ____________________

Q54 From the choices below, please indicate which department you maintain an administrative role within.
- Institutional Leadership and Planning (e.g. President's, Provost's, Institutional Research Offices) (1)
- Student Services (Admissions, Enrollment, Registrar) (2)
- Finance and Business Services (Bursar, Accounting, Financial Aid) (3)
- Institutional Advancement (Alumni Relations, Marketing, Gifts) (4)
- Campus Support Services (Housing, Disability Support, Student Life, Dining) (5)
- Academic Departments (6)
- Athletics (7)
Q55 What is your primary administrative responsibility?
- Leadership (1)
- Research/Reporting (2)
- Advisement (3)
- Evaluation (4)

Q56 From the choices below, please indicate which department you currently work within.
- Institutional Leadership and Planning (e.g. President's, Provost's, Institutional Research Offices) (1)
- Student Services (Admissions, Enrollment, Registrar) (2)
- Finance and Business Services (Bursar, Accounting, Financial Aid) (3)
- Institutional Advancement (Alumni Relations, Marketing, Gifts) (4)
- Campus Support Services (Housing, Disability Support, Student Life, Dining) (5)
- Academic Departments (6)
- Athletics (7)

Q57 What is your primary responsibility as a staff member at your institution?
- Leadership (1)
- Research/Reporting (2)
- Advisement (3)
- Evaluation (4)
Q58 Please choose the classification which best describes your institution from the following:

- Doctorate-granting university (1)
- Master's college or university (2)
- Baccalaureate college (3)
- Associates college (4)
- Special focus or professional school (5)

Q59 Does your institution have a religious affiliation?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q60 Have you answered all of the questions? Are you just browsing through before you complete the survey? If any of these apply to you, advancing to the next screen will automatically submit your survey.

☐ Yes, I have read and answered all of the survey items and I am ready to submit my responses. (1)