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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Visibility | • Anderson (2011)  
              • Barnes & Lescault (2011)  
              • Dutta (2010)  
              • Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy & Silvestre (2011) | • Klososky (2012)  
              • Li & Bernoff (2008)  
              • Maxwell (2012)  
              • Temin (2012) |
| Listening  | • Dutta (2010)  
              • Barnes & Lescault (2011)  
              • Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy & Silvestre (2011) | • Li & Bernoff (2008)  
              • Maxwell (2012)  
              • Patino, Pitta & Quinones (2012)  
              • Temin (2012) |
| Engagement | • Anderson (2011)  
              • Barnes & Lescault (2011)  
              • Brenner (2012)  
              • Dutta (2010)  
              • Heiberger & Junco (2011)  
              • Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy & Silvestre (2011) | • Li & Bernoff (2008)  
              • Maxwell (2012)  
              • Patino, Pitta & Quinones (2012)  
              • Porter, Donthu, MacElroy & Wydra (2011)  
              • Thomas & Thomas (2012) |
| Relationships | • Anderson (2011)  
              • Barnes & Lescault (2011)  
              • Bottles & Sherlock (2011)  
              • Brenner (2012)  
              • Dutta (2010)  
              • Heiberger & Junco (2011)  
              • Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy & Silvestre (2011) | • Klososky (2012)  
              • Li & Bernoff (2008)  
              • Moran, Seaman & Tinti-Kane (2012)  
              • Patino, Pitta & Quinones (2012)  
              • Porter, Donthu, MacElroy & Wydra (2011)  
              • Temin (2012)  
              • Thomas & Thomas (2012) |
| Trust      | • Anderson (2011)  
              • Brenner (2012)  
              • Bottles & Sherlock (2011)  
              • Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy & Silvestre (2011) | • Klososky (2012)  
              • Li & Bernoff (2008)  
              • Patino, Pitta & Quinones (2012) |
| Authenticity | • Dutta (2010)  
              • Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy & Silvestre (2011) | • Li & Bernoff (2008)  
              • Thomas & Thomas (2012) |
| Branding   | • Anderson (2011)  
              • Bottles & Sherlock (2011)  
              • Dutta (2010)  
              • Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy & Silvestre (2011) | • Li & Bernoff (2008)  
              • Maxwell (2012)  
              • Patino, Pitta & Quinones (2012)  
              • Porter, Donthu, MacElroy & Wydra (2011)  
              • Solomon (2011) |
Methodology: Content Analysis

- Conducted on 30 universities
  - Pulled from US News’s ranking lists
- Coding template used by two researchers
  - Accuracy and Objectivity
- Looked at
  - Homepage
  - Facebook
  - Twitter
  - YouTube
Results

Universities that Have and Link To an Account

- Facebook: 100% Have Profile, 97% Link to Profile on Homepage
- Twitter: 100% Have Profile, 93% Link to Profile on Homepage
- YouTube: 93% Have Profile, 85% Link to Profile on Homepage
Followers & Subscribers

### Facebook
- 7,501-10,000: 27%
- 10,001-15,000: 10%
- 20,000-30,000: 7%
- 30,001-40,000: 3%
- 50,001-60,000: 3%
- 100,001-200,000: 2%
- 1,001-2,500: 1%
- 5,000-7,500: 0.7%
- 2,501-5,000: 0.3%
- 1,001-2,500: 0.3%
- 0-100: 0.03%

### YouTube
- 7,501-10,000: 31%
- 1,001-2,500: 3%
- 2,501-5,000: 3%
- 20,000-30,000: 5%
- 50,001-60,000: 7%
- 1,001-2,500: 9%
- 501-1,000: 0.9%
- 101-500: 0.1%
- 0: 0.01%

### Twitter
- 501-1,000: 28%
- 1,001-2,500: 13%
- 2,501-5,000: 7%
- 101-500: 12%
- 100,001-200,000: 10%
- 30,001-40,000: 3%
- 40,001-50,000: 3%
- 7,501-10,000: 0.7%
- 5,001-7,500: 0.5%
- 101-500: 0.1%
- 0: 0.01%
Frequency of Posts

- Facebook
  - 54% Multiple/Day

- Twitter
  - 69% Multiple/Day

- YouTube
  - 26% Less than 1/Month
  - 26% 1-2/Month
Engagement Per Post

- **Facebook**
  - 22% 11-20 Likes
  - 77% 0-3 Comments
  - 72% 0-3 Shares

- **Twitter**
  - 78% 0 Favorites
  - 38% 0 Retweets
  - 33% 1-2 Retweets
  - 82% 0 Responses

- **YouTube**
  - 16% 51-100 Views
  - 14% 101-150 Views
  - 31% 0 Likes
  - 31% 1-2 Likes
  - 69% 0 Comments
Willingness To Listen & Respond

- 79% Not Commenting
- 92% Not Responding
- 88% Not Commenting

- 33% No Recent Posts
- 36% Commenting Not Allowed on All Videos

Platforms:
- Facebook
- Twitter
- YouTube
Branding Results

Universities with Good to Great Branding

Facebook: 68%
Twitter: 60%
YouTube: 37%
Discussion

- **Authenticity**
  - Links on the homepage
  - Consequences of not providing them

- **Visibility**
  - Nearly every university analyzed had all three sites
  - Presence not enough
  - Posting often helps increase visibility and relevancy
Discussion

- **Engagement**
  - Social media is for interaction, not just message dissemination
  - Lack of engagement found
    - Shallowest forms

- **Listening**
  - Disabling communication tools
    - Opportunity Loss
  - Public posts may be useful
Discussion

- **Relationships/Trust**
  - Not communicating beyond original posts
  - Social media is about creating relationships and networks

- **Branding**
  - Majority of universities branding well
  - YouTube sees the least amount of branding
  - Personalization increases branding and authenticity and professionalism
Conclusion

- Be where you audience is
- What a well-planned presence can do
- Most institutions are present
  - Not enough
- Engagement is lacking
- Limitations
- Further Research
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