



**Researchers' attitudes towards the use of social networking sites**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Documentation</i>
Manuscript ID	JD-04-2017-0051.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Social Networking, Data Re-Use, Researcher, Behaviour, Attitudes, Profile

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Abstract**

**Purpose:** The aim of this study is to better understand why many researchers do not have a profile on social networking sites (SNS), and whether this is the result of conscious decisions.

**Design/Methodology:** Thematic analysis was conducted on a large qualitative data set from researchers across three levels of seniority, four countries and four disciplines to explore their attitudes towards and experiences with SNS.

**Findings:** The study found much greater scepticism towards adopting SNS than previously reported. Reasons behind researchers' scepticism range from SNS being unimportant for their work to not belonging to their culture or habits. Some even felt that a profile presented people negatively and might harm their career. These concerns were mostly expressed by junior and midlevel researchers showing that the largest opponents to SNS may unexpectedly be younger researchers.

**Research limitations:** A limitation of this study was that the authors did not conduct the interviews, and therefore reframing or adding questions to specifically unpack comments related to attitudes, feelings or the use of SNS in academia was not possible.

**Originality/value:** By studying implicit attitudes and experiences, this study shows that instead of being ignorant of SNS profiles, some researchers actively opt for a non-use of profiles on SNS.

## Introduction

Today, academic standing **may be** linked to online standing: a researcher's online presence is an important channel for dissemination of expertise and achievements (Genoni *et al.*, 2005; Mas-Bleda and Aguillo, 2013). Many researchers feel it is important to have a strong online presence in addition to having high quality publications in order to make a scientific impact. Researchers use these sites "to build, promote, and measure reputation" (Nicholas *et al.*, 2015, p. 171), and to gain and maintain an "online academic identity" (Jordan, 2014, para. 2). Researchers reported that the use of social media increases the chances of their research being noticed (Weller, 2015) and they use, for example, *Twitter* as a professional medium for sharing and discussing publications. The more marketing researchers do, the more likely, it seems, that their research is noticed and cited (Eysenbach, 2011). Hyland (2011, p. 288) goes so far as to call it "almost obligatory for academics to maintain some kind of online presence".

Social networking sites (SNS) are the main venue where people establish their online presence through the creation of professional or personal profiles; many of them hosting several millions of users of various professional backgrounds, including researchers. The large number of users also attracts many researchers to make SNS and the use of SNS the object of their study. While not all researchers have an academic profile on SNS, there is "a sizeable number of scholars, even scholars who did not use platforms or only use them occasionally, who feels that emerging mechanisms and platforms will be the future and especially important for young scholars building a career. There is a sense that their time is coming" (Nicholas *et al.*, 2015, p. 178).

The general consensus indicates that the future researcher will have an academic profile on a SNS. Studies describe researchers without an academic profile as the ones who "have fallen behind" (Mas-Bleda *et al.*, 2014, p. 350), who show a "general lack of awareness and understanding" (Abrizah *et al.*, 2014, p. 257) and who "have much to learn" (Fiske, 2014, p. 441). These descriptions imply that whilst all researchers are not there yet, they should eventually be.

Today's researchers have to constantly make decisions on how to best promote their academic careers: where is the best publication venue for the next article, who is a trustworthy partner for a project, where is the best conference venue to find new partners, which grant proposals might be successful – all within the constraints of time. If having an academic profile on SNS were indeed a successful and worthwhile way to promote academic careers, would researchers not pursue this line more strongly? Or put otherwise: are researchers really not there yet, or have they decided that they do not want to be there?

This article uses qualitative data to analyze researchers' attitudes towards and experiences with academic profiles on SNS. By looking explicitly at the wording researchers use when talking about academic profiles and SNS, we aim to discover whether researchers are indeed "behind the curve" and should be using academic profiles on SNS more for their academic careers or whether, on the other

1  
2  
3 hand, researchers have made conscious decisions not to pursue this type of profile on SNS. The article  
4 will thus help inform developers in their design process of future SNS, particularly for academics.  
5

6 The article is organized as follows: we first define SNS, and present an overview of research practices  
7 on academic use of SNS, structured according to their method of data collection: content analyses,  
8 questionnaires and qualitative interviews. We then describe our method and sample. The results  
9 section presents findings on researchers' experiences and feelings towards having an academic profile  
10 on SNS.  
11

### 12 **Definition of social networking sites**

13  
14 Social networking sites (SNS) are “web-based services that allow individuals to (1) construct a public  
15 or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they  
16 share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within  
17 the system” (Boyd and Ellison, 2007, p. 211). Some SNS are specifically aimed at the scientific  
18 community, for example *Academia.edu*. They provide additional features like sharing research papers,  
19 collaborating with colleagues or tracking citations. For these specialized sites, the term academic  
20 social networking sites (ASNS) is often used (Gruzd and Goertzen, 2013; Jeng *et al.*, 2015). In what  
21 follows, we use the more general term SNS to include both academic and non-academic sites in our  
22 analysis, and we use the term “profile” only to refer to academic profiles, i.e. profiles for professional  
23 academic use.  
24

25  
26 Different kinds of SNS are used in academia. Researchers use classic SNS like *Facebook*, *Myspace* or  
27 *Google+* for professional purposes although they are not primarily aimed at them. As a microblogging  
28 service, *Twitter* differs from classic SNS, but conceptual borders are blurred as academics also use  
29 *Twitter* for similar purposes. Other networks are aimed at professionals but not exclusively at  
30 researchers, such as *LinkedIn* or *XING*, both launched in 2003. The former was acquired by Microsoft  
31 in 2016, reaching more than 467 million members in over 200 countries in 2017 (LinkedIn, 2017). The  
32 German online network *XING* reached over 12 million registered users in 2017 (XING, 2017). More  
33 recently, specialized ASNS directly addressing the research community such as *ResearchGate*,  
34 *Academia.edu*, *ImpactStory* and *Google Scholar Citations* have been developed. *ResearchGate* and  
35 *Academia.edu* were both launched in 2008, and permit researchers to upload papers and connect with  
36 other scholars. *Academia.edu* had more than 49 million users signed up in 2017 (Academia.edu,  
37 2017), while the German network *ResearchGate* reports over 12 million users from 193 different  
38 countries (ResearchGate, 2017). *Google Scholar Citations* and *ImpactStory* focus more on individual  
39 users, their research output and scientific impact, and less on connecting and communicating. Finally,  
40 reference management tools like *Mendeley*, *CiteULike* or *Zotero* often provide social functions and the  
41 opportunity to construct a profile. Williams and Woodacre (2016) provide a more in-depth description  
42 of some of these sites. This indicates a great variety of SNS that academics could use to create their  
43 own profile.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 With an ever-growing number of SNS, a researcher's profile has become "an ubiquitous feature of  
4 scholarly life" (Hyland, 2011, p. 287). With the promises made by and the growing use of these sites,  
5 SNS have become a highly studied topic of interest. Related studies focus on scholarly impact  
6 measurements and altmetrics (e.g. Hoffmann *et al.*, 2014; Li and Gillet, 2013; Mohammadi and  
7 Thelwall, 2014), or on different components or technical functions of particular or various networks  
8 (e.g. Codina, 2009; de Oliveira *et al.*, 2011; Rohani and Ow, 2011). Previous studies examining users'  
9 attitudes towards SNS or the non-use of these sites exist, but concentrate mainly on non-academic  
10 usage (e.g., Hargittai, 2007; Lüders & Brandtzæg, 2017; Ryan & Xenos, 2011).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 We have identified three distinct approaches to studying the use of SNS in academia: content analyses,  
17 questionnaires and qualitative interviews. We have classified studies according to their method of data  
18 collection because the choice of method influences what type of data can be collected and what results  
19 could be gained.  
20  
21

### 22 *SNS studies using content analyses*

23

24 Content analyses or similar approaches have been used to study SNS focusing either on the use of  
25 different social networks in academia or the population using these platforms. These studies have  
26 revealed on which SNS researchers have a profile, what a researcher's profile contains and what  
27 researchers offer as content on these sites. The average profile offers contact information, research  
28 interests, and current and previous positions (Hyland, 2011; Mas-Bleda and Aguillo, 2013). Fewer  
29 researchers provide a list of publications, information on education and a self-description. Teaching  
30 material or conference presentations are rarely presented. Only a small number of researchers offer  
31 information on current research projects (Mas-Bleda and Aguillo, 2013).  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Bar-Ilan *et al.* (2012), investigating researchers from the bibliometric community and their online  
37 presence in social networks, reported that 84 % of researchers in their sample had at least one  
38 institutional homepage and 70 % had a *LinkedIn* account. In contrast, only 23 % used a public *Google*  
39 *Scholar* profile and 16 % had a *Twitter* account. Mas-Bleda and Aguillo (2013) focus on the group of  
40 highly cited researchers working at European institutions and their use of SNS. While most of the  
41 researchers had an institutional website of some kind, only 28 % of them used any of the social  
42 websites examined (*Google Scholar Citations*, *Mendeley*, *Academia.edu*, *LinkedIn*, and *SlideShare*).  
43 The only non-academic site in the list, *LinkedIn*, was the most popular SNS. They conclude that  
44 overall researchers "had a low or very low presence in social sites" (Mas-Bleda and Aguillo, 2013, p.  
45 346). Their participants were in majority male (95 %) and senior researchers, which might have  
46 affected the use of SNS.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Some studies concentrate on the academic usage and/or user population of individual networks like  
55 *Academia.edu* (Menendez *et al.*, 2012; Thelwall and Kousha, 2014), *Google Scholar Citations*  
56 (Ortega, 2015a) or *Twitter* (Holmberg and Thelwall, 2014).  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Researchers have identified disciplinary differences regarding the use of SNS in academia. Mas-Bleda  
4 and Aguillo (2013) found that the use of SNS was higher in the Social Sciences (40 %), Engineering  
5 (43 %) and Health Sciences (40 %) than in the Life Sciences (30 %) and Physical Sciences (28 %).  
6 Additionally, different research disciplines seem to prefer different SNS. While most researchers on  
7 *Academia.edu* belong to the Humanities and the Social Sciences, *ResearchGate* seems to attract  
8 mainly researchers from the Food Science and Technology, Biology and Biomedicine areas (Ortega,  
9 2015b).

#### 14 *SNS studies using questionnaires*

15  
16 Studies using questionnaires investigate the use of SNS primarily through quantitative data gathered  
17 from asking closed questions to individuals. These studies focus, in particular, on the behavior of  
18 individual researchers, their personal preferences and attitudes regarding the use of SNS. While  
19 content analyses examined existing profiles to find out where researchers have profiles, questionnaires  
20 seek similar information by asking participants. Most of these previous studies focus on specific  
21 disciplines (Coppock and Davis, 2013; Haustein *et al.*, 2014; Van Noorden, 2014) or on a single  
22 country (Coppock and Davis, 2013; Madhusudhan, 2012; Manca and Ranieri, 2016; Meishar-Tal and  
23 Pieterse, 2017; Nández and Borrego, 2013; Pscheida *et al.*, 2014).

24  
25 These studies have expanded prior work by providing researchers' reasons for using and concerns  
26 towards SNS. While many researchers have profiles on multiple platforms (Nández and Borrego,  
27 2013), the preference for a specific SNS varies. Haustein *et al.* (2014), who studied researchers from  
28 the bibliometric community, report that researchers preferred *LinkedIn* (67.6 %) followed by *Google+*  
29 (43.7 %), *ResearchGate* (21.1 %) and *Academia.edu* (21.1 %). *Twitter* was used by 43.7 % and  
30 *Mendeley* by 23.9 % of their questionnaire participants. While many scholars use a wide range of  
31 SNS, the most popular ones are non-academic networks like *Facebook*, *Twitter* or *LinkedIn* (Collins *et*  
32 *al.*, 2016; Gruzd and Goertzen, 2013; Rowlands *et al.*, 2011). Results of a large survey of the *Nature*  
33 *Publishing Group* (Van Noorden, 2014) show that awareness of different networks is much higher  
34 than their regular use. For example, while more than 88 % of researchers said that they were aware of  
35 *ResearchGate* as a SNS, under half of them said that they visit it regularly (Van Noorden, 2014).

36  
37 Like studies using content analyses, studies using a questionnaire detected disciplinary differences  
38 regarding the use of specific sites. While *LinkedIn* and *ResearchGate* show higher levels of use for the  
39 Natural Sciences, Social Sciences show the highest use levels for all other platforms (Jordan, 2014).  
40 Overall, disciplinary affiliation seems to have “a significant impact on academics' motivations and  
41 practices” (Manca and Ranieri, 2017, p. 134) regarding the use of SNS.

42  
43 Researchers have various reasons to build a profile on a SNS and in consequence they also use these  
44 sites differently. Nández and Borrego (2013) report that researchers use other researchers' profiles to  
45 identify areas of research excellence and other researchers' activities, and to find collaborators for  
46 research projects. However, a quarter of all sampled researchers “claimed that they did not have any  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 particular aim in mind when they created their profile for the service; they just wanted to be there as  
4 other colleagues were” (Nández and Borrego, 2013, p. 786). Likewise, researchers aim to connect with  
5 the professional community to disseminate their research output and to improve their visibility  
6 (Elsayed, 2016; Haustein *et al.*, 2014; Nández and Borrego, 2013). Another important aspect is the use  
7 of profiles for job seeking and recruitment (Caers and Castelyns, 2011; Davison *et al.*, 2011; Nández  
8 and Borrego, 2013).

9  
10  
11  
12 The *Nature* survey showed that different SNS are used for different reasons. Respondents who had  
13 strongly taken up various SNS were asked about their activities while visiting these sites. On both  
14 *ResearchGate* and *Academia.edu* the “most-selected activity [...] was simply maintaining a profile in  
15 case someone wanted to get in touch – suggesting that many researchers regard their profiles as a way  
16 to boost their professional presence online” (Van Noorden, 2014, p. 127). Other activities mentioned  
17 were posting research related content, discovering peers, finding recommended research papers and  
18 tracking metrics. In contrast, *Twitter* users seem to be more active with a focus on activities that  
19 require a high user engagement such as following discussions or commenting on research. Jeng *et al.*  
20 (2015) focused on the network *Mendeley*, reporting that researchers primarily use it to manage  
21 documents and citations. Less than 15 % used it for social functions like “managing existing academic  
22 friends” (11 %) or “expanding professional networks” (9 %) (Jeng *et al.*, 2015).

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Researchers reported having concerns about doing specific activities through SNS, such as dissemination of research: Jamali *et al.* (2015) report that the use of SNS (45.2 %) received the lowest ratings. This could be explained by the lack of trust in such platforms (Coppock and Davis, 2013). Privacy, data security, spamming and cyber-bullying issues were also mentioned by a majority of participants as problems (Madhusudhan, 2012). The benefits of SNS do not seem clear to all scholars as some see them as a “waste of time, or even dangerous” (Coppock and Davis, 2013, p. 214). Moreover, researchers reported that it is a time-consuming burden (Jamali *et al.*, 2015) to follow each SNS because having a profile requires repetitive entering and updating of data (Murray, 2014). Due to high workload, it is no surprise that many researchers do not spend a lot of time creating and updating their own profiles (Meishar-Tal and Pieterse, 2017). Nández and Borrego (2013) report that only 13 % of their sample did monthly updates, 13 % did weekly updates, 5 % updated their profiles daily and most visits were short and below half an hour. Many researchers who have an account on *Academia.edu* do not follow other academics at all (26 %) or follow fewer than ten other researchers (56 %) (Nández and Borrego, 2013). In summary, for most researchers it is not uncertainty in dealing with SNS or ignorance that is a barrier to usage, but conscious reasons: “more people were confident about how SNS could be used, but they had simply chosen not to use them for work-related purposes” (Donelan, 2016, p. 723).

### *SNS studies using qualitative interviews*

Studies of SNS through qualitative approaches, mainly interviews, focus on collecting open-ended data from smaller groups of participants and on gaining a more holistic understanding of their use.

These studies inspect in more detail researchers' attitudes towards profiles. Hyland (2011) complements his content analysis of 100 academic homepages with ten e-mail interviews. His results show that researchers are aware that their profiles are an advertisement for themselves as well as for the department and the university. Researchers also expressed the wish to separate private and business and to keep profiles to professional activities. Only a smaller group wished to show more personal items such as hobbies, too. Harley *et al.* (2010) studied how universities and their different stakeholders value emerging forms of scholarly communication. They observed a low uptake of SNS in academia and a focus on traditional forms of communication: "The sentiment that a handshake and eye contact provide the foundation of productive collaborations was near unanimous" (Harley *et al.*, 2010, p. 16). Further, Abrizah *et al.* (2014, p. 257) reported a lack of trust in SNS, "which researchers largely saw as popularity indicators rather than anything more substantive" and Nicholas *et al.* (2015, p. 169) found that "most users were passive and did not fully engage with the social aspects of these platforms".

Existing interview studies mostly use a combination of convenience and snowball sampling (Abrizah *et al.*, 2014; Harley *et al.*, 2010). In addition, prior qualitative work has – even by qualitative research standards – a relatively small sample size (Hyland, 2011) or refers to just one country and culture (Abrizah *et al.*, 2014; Harley *et al.*, 2010). Nicholas *et al.* (2015) investigated the use and impact of SNS for different disciplines in four European countries (Computer Science in Poland, Economics in France, Humanities in Spain and Physical Science in Switzerland). The interviews were all conducted by different researchers in a local language and "because of the sensitivity of the topic" (Nicholas *et al.*, 2015, p. 173) the interview sessions were not recorded. While this qualitative study is the only one with a large sample of 97 participants from various disciplines, the lack of transcripts did not allow a robust comparative analysis away from describing it by country.

### *Summary*

Summarizing previous studies on the use of SNS:

- most previous research has been quantitative in nature, focusing on content analyses and closed questionnaires;
- today's researchers are aware of a broad range of SNS and have created profiles on these sites;
- although the usage of these platforms has grown, many researchers remain sceptical; and
- the reasons for this scepticism have only been partly explored.



Our study bridges several research gaps: it uses a large sample of qualitative interviews **across multiple countries and disciplines**, and contributes to our understanding of whether academics are fully committed to having a profile on SNS, despite their benefits.

### Method & Data Description

The present qualitative study analyzes participants' experiences of and attitudes towards having a profile on and using SNS for academic purposes. To the **best of our** knowledge, this is the first study in the field to reuse qualitative interview data for which the authors had no influence on the sample design and the interview questions. Calls for data reuse are various (Kratz and Strasser, 2015; Tenopir *et al.*, 2011), but few studies have actually reused data (Wallis *et al.*, 2013), and much less qualitative data which depend strongly on context, the questions and the skill of the interviewer. Our study shows how data reuse makes possible new and important insights, but **we also discuss** limitations.

Data sets were collected as part of the *Elsevier Connected* program, which aimed to gather feedback on several new product concepts that could improve researchers' productivity and efficiency, while also understanding and prioritizing use cases of the most frequent and pressing activities of researchers in universities. The data sets were made available without any restrictions in terms of how to conduct the analysis or where to focus on. Sensitive information about participants or the company was deleted or pseudonymized. The research questions posed here emerged from analyzing interview transcripts.

**Data gathering comprised** three rounds of interviews, prototype testing, think-aloud tests, and questionnaires (see Figure 1). Insights from this study were used to support the development of a tool that is available, in beta version, in the SNS *Mendeley* in the form of an enhanced profile.




Figure 1. Rounds 1-3 of the Elsevier development program.

#### Three interview rounds

The first round explored nine use-cases described in Jacobson (2004): these were “keeping up-to-date”, “online profiles”, “reviewing”, “reading”, “writing”, “publishing”, “connecting”, “funding”, and “storing data”. The first round was exploratory, with questions that invited participating researchers to describe their daily work activities and challenges. The second round focused on “keeping up-to-date” and “online profiles”, because participants reported these two use-cases as the ones of highest priority. Participants were asked about their online academic presence and use of profiles (e.g. Do you have a personal homepage or profile page?), what profiles they use professionally and to describe the purpose and content of their academic profiles (e.g. What do you consider to be the most important elements on the page?). During the study, interviewers referred to SNS as “profile page” “online profile” or “personal homepage”, but they did not use the term SNS at any point. The interviewers did not

1  
2  
3 explicitly probe for further components of social networks as outlined by Boyd and Ellison (2007)  
4 beyond profiles, but they also did not exclude them. The aim of the interviews was to have a starting  
5 point for discussion that was very likely shared by all participants and the component of a profile was  
6 the most likely place to start. [Anonymous \(2017\)](#) describe rounds 1 and 2 in more detail, and present  
7 findings on “keeping up-to-date”. The third round explored, among other topics, participants’  
8 interactions with a prototype similar to a SNS dashboard. Participants were asked to discuss the pros  
9 and cons of features.

10  
11 All interviews were conducted in English following detailed interview guides and were done face-to-  
12 face where possible, or through WebEx, and audio transcribed verbatim.

### 13 *Study sample and sample characteristics*

14  
15 [Data gathering](#) took place over nine months; some participants took part in all three rounds ([Figure 1](#))  
16 while others only took part in one or two rounds. The analysis reported here focuses on the 81  
17 participants (across all three rounds) who discussed their use, or non-use, of SNS. Participants came  
18 from four countries in three continents (Singapore, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United  
19 States), and from four fields of study (Social Sciences and Humanities, Medical and Health Sciences,  
20 Natural Sciences, and Engineering and Technology Sciences), representing a broad range of academic  
21 disciplines and experiences. [Participants were recruited following snowball sampling \(Miles and](#)  
22 [Huberman, 1994\) through](#) an orchestrated campaign using face-to-face contacts by universities’  
23 research offices and libraries, and by reaching out to Mendeley users from these universities.  
24 Participants were grouped into three levels of seniority: Ph.D. students (junior level), academics with a  
25 Ph.D. and up to seven years of post-doctoral experience (midlevel), and academics with a Ph.D. and  
26 more than seven years of experience (senior level). An overview of the distribution across gender,  
27 domain and seniority of the 81 participants who discussed SNS can be found in Tables 1a and 1b. The  
28 following abbreviations are used during reporting: Field of Study: Engineering & Technology (Tech),  
29 Medical & Health Sciences (Health), Natural Sciences (Natural), and Social Sciences (Social);  
30 Gender: females (f) and males (m); country: Germany (GER), Singapore (SGP), United Kingdom  
31 (UK) and United States (US).

32  
33 INSERT *Table 1a. Overview of participants’ field of study included in the analysis of this paper.*

34  
35 INSERT *Table 1b. Overview of participants’ level of seniority included in the analysis of this paper.*

### 36 *Participants’ presence on SNS*

37  
38 From the 81 participants who discussed SNS, 58 reported where they have a profile, and 23 did not  
39 report whether they have one. Of those 58 researchers, 18 reported having a single profile, of which 14  
40 [only](#) had a profile on their institutional site. 34 reported having two or three profiles, and 6 reported  
41 more than four profiles. Figure 2 gives a visual overview per participant (rows) and where they  
42 reported having simultaneous profiles (columns).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Participants	Institutional profile	ResearchGate	LinkedIn	Google Scholar Citations	Mendeley	Academia.edu	Twitter	ResearcherID	Facebook	N=
US1		●		●	●			●		4
US2		●								1
US3	●		●							2
US4		●		●						2
US5	●		●			●				3
US6	●			●						2
US7			●							1
US8				●						1
GER1	●	●		●						3
GER2	●	●	●							3
GER3	●	●				●				3
GER4	●	●								2
GER5		●	●	●						3
GER6	●	●	●						●	4
GER7	●	●								2
GER8	●	●								2
GER9	●	●								2
GER10		●		●						2
GER11	●	●	●	●						2
GER12		●	●	●	●		●		●	6
GER13		●	●							2
SGP1	●	●						●		3
SGP2		●		●						2
SGP3	●	●						●		3
SGP4	●	●	●							3
SGP5	●	●	●							2
SGP6	●	●								2
SGP7	●	●		●						2
SGP8	●	●		●						2
UK1		●	●							2
UK2	●	●								2
UK3	●	●		●			●			4
UK4		●	●							2
UK5	●	●	●							3
UK6	●	●		●						3
UK7	●	●	●							3
UK8		●	●							1
UK9		●	●		●					2
UK10	●					●				2
UK11	●	●	●				●			4
UK12		●	●		●					3
UK13	●	●	●							2
UK14	●	●	●							3
UK15	●	●		●	●	●				5
US9	●									1
US10	●									1
US11	●									1
GER14	●									1
GER15	●									1
GER16	●									1
GER17	●									1
SGP9	●									1
SGP10	●									1
SGP11	●									1
SGP12	●									1
SGP13	●									1
SGP14	●									1
UK10	●									1

N(all) = 58 N(inst) = 42 N(ResearchGate) = 32 N(LinkedIn) = 20 N(Google Scholar) = 15 N(Mendeley) = 5 N(Academia) = 4 N(Twitter) = 3 N(ResearcherID) = 3 N(Facebook) = 2  
 Figure 2. Overview of sites where 58 participants reported having profiles.

1  
2  
3 32 researchers mentioned having a profile on *ResearchGate*, followed by *LinkedIn* where 20  
4 researchers reported having a profile. *LinkedIn* was mentioned frequently in the UK (10) and in  
5 Germany (5), while researchers from Singapore (2) and the two US universities (3) made less use of  
6 *LinkedIn*. The latter was in particular a surprising result because with more than 128 million users in  
7 2016, *LinkedIn* is very popular in the US (LinkedIn, 2016). A possible explanation is that researchers  
8 did not link it to their academic world and did not feel that they should mention *LinkedIn* as a site  
9 where they have a profile. They relied more on *Google Scholar Citations*. *Mendeley*, *Twitter* and  
10 *Facebook* were mentioned by some researchers, but in much lower numbers than previous studies  
11 have indicated (e.g. Haustein *et al.*, 2014). *Academia.edu* was mentioned comparatively infrequently  
12 (4 of 58) and *XING* was not mentioned at all. Researchers reported preferring to use sites that allow  
13 the creation of specialized profile for researchers, and which therefore let them create a very specific  
14 type of profile.

### 21 *Data analysis*

22  
23 The authors of this paper, who did not conduct the interviews, coded data sets in MAXQDA using  
24 thematic analysis, “a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data”  
25 (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 79). After the generation of initial codes, insights about participants’  
26 feelings and attitudes towards, and academic professional use of, SNS emerged. In several coding  
27 rounds, themes were identified and the material coded accordingly. A total of 570 instances were  
28 coded in seven categories: SNS, use of social networking profiles, frequency of usage, aim of profiles,  
29 content of profiles, attitudes towards profiles, and use of other profiles. While participants were asked  
30 about their use of profiles, they were not asked about their attitudes towards SNS. This unusual  
31 approach to data analysis – not to analyze what has been asked but what has not been asked explicitly  
32 and discussed nevertheless – is one way to reuse qualitative data and thus to gain new insights into  
33 behaviors. The reported feelings and attitudes were spontaneously raised by the participants, i.e.  
34 without prompting or explicitly being asked for during the interviews. This indicates that issues  
35 around SNS matter to researchers, and also that they were even more likely to be expressing their true  
36 thoughts when responding spontaneously than they would if being required to create an answer to a  
37 specific question. As a result of grouping the different categories, two core themes emerged: 1)  
38 Experiences: researchers’ experiences with profiles on SNS for professional academic use, and 2)  
39 Attitudes: researchers’ feelings and attitudes towards profiles on SNS. We structure the results  
40 according to these two themes.

### 51 **Results**

#### 52 *Theme 1: Experiences with profiles on SNS for professional academic use.*

53  
54 Researchers’ main aims for having a profile are summarized below. In line with previous studies, the  
55 core aim was raising awareness within the community “of the type of research work you’re doing and  
56 what your interests are” (m, UK, junior, Health); or as one researcher succinctly stated it: “It’s more  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 like a sales pitch” (m, UK, midlevel, Health). Researchers create profiles, for example, to promote  
4 themselves to external reviewers when they are seeking tenure. The external community should be  
5 able “to know [their] background that is in terms of education. They would like to know about  
6 achievements. They would like to know about research areas” (f, UK, senior, Natural). It is therefore  
7 not surprising that researchers create profiles for job seeking: “I’m also in the academic journal  
8 market right now, so I think it’s also important to have potential employers... give them an idea of my  
9 research in general” (m, US, junior, Social). However, not all researchers have similar experiences  
10 when they rely on their profile for job seeking. While a male junior faculty member in Medical &  
11 Health Sciences from the UK reported that he had already received several job offers through his  
12 profile, another male junior faculty member remarked that “no one’s ever contacted me out of the blue  
13 to take on a job” (m, US, junior, Tech). Researchers also expressed the wish to showcase their skills in  
14 a more compelling way than through a CV or a list of publications.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 Researchers hope to create new networking opportunities, potentially finding new collaborations, by  
23 having a profile on SNS. The idea of *one-entry point* to a quick summary was frequently used by  
24 participants:  
25

26  
27 *“That’s the main purpose, to bring all the aspects of my works together into one place so when  
28 people do look me up that they can see everything that I do.”* (m, GER, midlevel, Natural)  
29

30  
31 In line with prior studies, showcasing teaching was not of great importance to researchers: “it’s  
32 basically so that people know what I’m doing and they can get my papers and so on. So mostly for  
33 research rather than for teaching” (m, SGP, midlevel, Tech). Only one male, senior UK faculty  
34 member from Natural Sciences, explicitly stated that he showcases current teaching activities. It might  
35 be that researchers display their current courses on their institutional profiles; but they did not talk  
36 about it. Many universities use tools to automatically include courses on institutional profiles and thus  
37 researchers may not experience it as something they provide actively.  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 While participants were not explicitly asked whether or how they use other researchers’ profiles, many  
43 participants reported that they use profiles to attract and check new staff members: “the only time I  
44 really look up somebody’s profile is if that’s somebody that we’re looking to hire” (m, US, junior,  
45 Tech). Participants commented on the value of being able to see other researchers’ profiles beyond  
46 their publications:  
47  
48

49  
50 *“journals are really good for keeping up on the scholarship, but there are a lot of projects  
51 [...] going on with people who are working on building web content, and it’s a little harder to  
52 find, because it doesn’t work well in a traditional journal environment”* (m, US, junior,  
53 Social).  
54

55  
56 *“I can tell this guy is really smart because he’s done XYZ universities and he’s got papers in  
57 only the best of the best”* (m, US, junior, Tech).  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 their profile most frequently, followed by Engineering & Technology Sciences and Medical & Health  
4 Sciences. Social Sciences researchers remarked unanimously that they do not do much with it.

5  
6 Not all researchers seem to like this new academia demanding a profile to be present in a networked  
7 environment. Researchers from the hard sciences – Engineering & Technology, Medical & Health  
8 Sciences and Natural Science – experience it as “spamming” (m, GER, midlevel, Tech) and a “waste  
9 of time” (m, GER, senior, Natural), and Social Science researchers describe it as “gossiping” (f, GER,  
10 junior, Social). While more male researchers describe profiles as spamming, more females felt it was  
11 like gossiping and “measuring people” (f, US, midlevel, Natural). One junior female reported:

12  
13  
14  
15  
16 *“it tricks me, like the intent is to be like this person has a lot of followers so they are important*  
17 *and I actually don’t want to see that because I wanted to (find) without their kind of popularity*  
18 *influencing me.”* (f, US, junior, Social)

19  
20  
21 The effectiveness of SNS as a way for advertising oneself is clearly disputed. Researchers were  
22 concerned that people are judged by their number of followers:


23  
24  
25 *“You open somebody’s page and, like, oh, they don’t have many followers, so they’re probably*  
26 *not very important, so I don’t have to worry about them”* (f, US, midlevel, Natural).

27  
28 They are also aware that the profile itself does not automatically lead to collaboration with the most  
29 cited researchers: *“I want to follow famous people, but [...] famous people don’t want to follow me”* (f,  
30 SGP, midlevel, Tech). They feel that *“right now [...] collaboration mainly happens through personal*  
31 *interaction, not on the social networking sites”* (m, US, senior, Tech).

32  
33  
34  
35 Hyland (2011) reported that researchers expressed the wish to separate private and business on their  
36 profiles and this finding was supported by the present data. Researchers want to have the *“papers and*  
37 *publications and the people and groups, [they] want them to be in two different places”* (f, SGP,  
38 junior, Tech). Information on profiles is experienced as *“so public”* (m, US, junior, Natural) and  
39 researchers *“feel a little bit too exposed”* by these sites (m, GER, midlevel, Natural). This feeling of  
40 exposure was also manifested for displaying current reviewing activities. A UK researcher said that he  
41 *“wouldn’t really be that comfortable saying [he] review[s] for this specific journal and putting it out*  
42 *in public”* (m, UK, midlevel, Natural) and a junior faculty member stated that listing current reviewer  
43 activities will lead to *“some awkward phone calls [in] the scientific community”* (f, SGP, junior,  
44 Tech).

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 SNS seem to belong to a different world than that of academia. Researchers are concerned that they  
51 *“really have no time looking for what is happening in other people’s social life”* (m, US, senior,  
52 Health) and that they are *“not very curious in the personal affairs of people, their positions and stuff*  
53 *like that”* (m, GER, senior, Social). It was not so much that researchers reported negative attitudes  
54 towards SNS as that they felt that these sites were part of a different world: *“I don’t have like a Twitter*  
55 *account, I’m really unique there”* (m, US, senior, Natural), *“I don’t do a whole lot of social network*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *type stuff*” (m, US, junior, Tech) or “*I do not use too much social network*” (f, GER, senior, Natural).  
4 As previously mentioned, a large group of researchers stressed a lack of active presence on SNS. We  
5 grouped profile-related attitude extracts from the 60 participants (16 junior, 21 midlevel and 23 senior  
6 researchers) into four attitude categories (Figure 3): 1) *profiles on SNS are or can be useful for me*:  
7 quotes reporting positive, useful experiences with profiles on SNS or where participants expect that  
8 profiles will be useful. 2) *Profiles on SNS are not important enough for me*: quotes describing profiles  
9 as a low priority or worse as spamming. 3) *Profiles on SNS don't work for me*: quotes describing  
10 cultural and habitual reasons for not using profiles on SNS. 4) *Profiles on SNS may hurt my career*:  
11 quotes expressing some form of clear rejection towards profiles on SNS. Figure 3 shows the likelihood  
12 of uptake of academic profiles on SNS and differences between seniority levels.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18



42 *Figure 3. Likelihood of uptake of academic profiles on SNS from group 1 very likely (left side) to group 4 highly*  
43 *unlikely (right side) grouped by level of seniority.*  
44

45  
46 Figure 3 reads from left to right showing high likelihood of uptake of profiles on SNS on the left side  
47 to a very unlikely uptake on the right side. Group 1 participants already see a personal benefit in using  
48 SNS: either they already use them or, with the right tool, are very likely to start using them. A female  
49 junior researcher said that she liked it  
50  
51

52 *“when people [...] have so a little thing at the end but it's a little bit of access to who they are,*  
53 *so, like a run marathons or some kind of hobby or feature whether -- are they humans”* (f, US,  
54 junior, Social).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Group 2 participants do not reject profiles fundamentally; they just do not consider them important  
4 enough to spend time on them. With the right tool and the right benefit, they might be convinced that a  
5 profile on SNS will be useful. This is for example reflected in the statement of a midlevel researcher  
6 who said that he does not  
7  
8

9  
10 *“have enough time during the day to get all [his] writing and [his] proposals done, to then*  
11 *spend hours updating research profiles”* (m, US, midlevel, Natural).  
12

13 SNS will have a more difficult time persuading Group 3 participants because profiles on SNS do not  
14 fit in their practice nor belong to their culture; and changing culture and habits can be hard (Coppock  
15 and Davis, 2013). A junior researcher called it *“like gossiping but for people in different stages of*  
16 *career”* (f, GER, junior, Social).  
17  
18

19 Group 4 participants are most likely to reject having a profile on SNS, because they already fear for or  
20 have experienced negative effects with them. For example a junior researcher called his Google  
21 Scholar profile *“so public”* (m, US, junior, Natural) and a midlevel researcher painted the scenario  
22 that  
23  
24

25  
26 *“Let’s say, I forgot to click follow my good friend cum supervisor, he’ll be pissed at me for my*  
27 *entire career”* (m, SGP, midlevel, Tech).  
28

29  
30 Figure 3 suggests that there may be differences in representativeness of seniority level across these  
31 four groups. In Group 1, the three levels of seniority are well balanced: from juniors (N = 7) to  
32 midlevel (N = 8) and senior (N = 7) researchers, they all perceive benefits using SNS. In Group 2, the  
33 midlevel (N = 6) and senior (N = 9) researchers consider SNS as not being important enough to spend  
34 time on them. With the exception of one female junior researcher from the States, juniors did not  
35 explicitly express this feeling. Group 3 represents researchers from all seniority levels again (junior  
36 (N = 6), midlevel (N = 3), senior (N = 7)). This means that cultural and habit differences are not related  
37 to age in this situation. There were also young researchers who did not feel that SNS work for them.  
38 Yet Group 4 does not contain a single quote from a senior researcher – meaning no senior researcher  
39 expressed concern about SNS being potentially damaging. This may be because senior staff feel more  
40 secure in their careers, so presence or absence on SNS is a less significant factor for them. The largest  
41 opponents to SNS may unexpectedly be younger researchers.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

#### 48 **Limitations of the study and reuse of qualitative data**

49  
50 *This study has limitations that should be taken into consideration. The first one is that it reuses*  
51 *qualitative interview data originally collected with the aim to gather insights to inform and support the*  
52 *development of a tool available in Mendeley. This means that questions asked during interviews were*  
53 *mostly directed to explore this specific SNS and gain insights related to usability and design. In*  
54 *addition, the authors of the paper were not the ones conducting the interviews; therefore we could not*  
55 *reframe or add questions to specifically unpack comments related to attitudes, feelings or the use of*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 SNS in academia. Since part of the recruitment used Mendeley users, figure 2 shows that their profile  
4 on Mendeley was not present on researchers' minds. It is therefore likely that participants have  
5 profiles on other sites than the ones they mentioned but these leads may not have been pursued further  
6 because they were not relevant for the initial purposes of the study. The results show the profiles that  
7 were present on participants' minds.  
8  
9

10  
11 The next limitation is the sampling strategy, which used researchers who were also Mendeley users.  
12 To some extent, this could limit the applicability of our findings as they could be representative only  
13 of Mendeley users. This bias was reduced through the second recruitment approach to use informal  
14 contacts at senior university levels, which gained participants who probably normally would not  
15 partake in such a study due to lack of time – in particular the large number of senior researchers that  
16 were recruited. However, although it does not represent all academic researchers, the sample of the  
17 study was large and diverse by qualitative research standards. We believe that based on the breadth of  
18 participants' backgrounds, results would generalize well across academic disciplines and institutions,  
19 and to non-Mendeley users.  
20  
21

22  
23 Another limitation of the study is time. Particularly in this topic, new research is constantly conducted  
24 as new technology is developed and people's attitudes evolve. This manuscript was initially written in  
25 2016 with datasets collected through 2014 and 2015. The age factor is a limitation that is inherent to  
26 data reuse. Since the time when data sets were collected (2014-2015), researchers' preferences may  
27 have evolved or changed. However, many comments seem to be time agnostic and more related to  
28 working preferences which are unlikely to drastically change in a short timeframe.  
29  
30

31  
32 As with any empirical study, it would be good to see follow-up studies and further explorations that  
33 test the validity and generalizability of findings reported here. For example, validation of these  
34 findings could be gained by re-using previous datasets that reported concerns (e.g. Nicholas *et al.*,  
35 2015), focusing the analysis on seniority level or conducting new studies that focus explicitly on  
36 younger researchers.  
37  
38

### 39 40 41 42 43 **Conclusion**

44  
45 This article started out by questioning the general consensus that the future researcher will have a  
46 profile or would be interested in having one on SNS. Previous studies imply that researchers may not  
47 have fully adopted SNS, but they predict that the time has come and that researchers will soon  
48 embrace SNS for their academic work. Furthermore, the literature review revealed that content  
49 analyses and questionnaires were the dominant approaches to gather data. While the majority of  
50 publications present how and how much researchers have already adopted SNS, a few gave voice to  
51 concerns expressed by researchers. Reasons behind the concerns were lacking or not explicitly stated.  
52  
53

54  
55 Our qualitative study with a diverse sample of researchers bridges this gap and sheds light on  
56 researchers' feelings and attitudes towards SNS not explicitly and expansively explored in prior  
57 studies. We focused on better understanding whether researchers were or are not there (i.e. they have  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 or do not have a profile on SNS), or they had actively decided that they do not want to be there (i.e.  
4 they have no interest in having a profile on SNS). Our main finding is that there is much greater  
5 scepticism towards creating a profile on and regularly using SNS for academic purposes than  
6 previously reported. Researchers often have a presence on SNS, but they are not present on these sites  
7 (e.g. profiles are outdated and infrequently used, missing key information).  
8

9  
10 The analysis also revealed that the reasons behind researchers' scepticism range from SNS being  
11 unimportant for their work to not belonging to their culture or habits. Some even felt that a profile  
12 measured and tricked people negatively, and might harm their career. The differences in seniority level  
13 illustrated that the group that would be less likely to adopt SNS for academic purposes may be the  
14 junior and midlevel researchers. This finding can help inform the characteristics of future SNS and  
15 provide new directions to developers.  
16

17  
18 Based on these findings, what researchers *do* and *say* are not always consistent, as the clear difference  
19 between having a profile on SNS and actually being present in the online world indicates. While for  
20 some researchers SNS are useful tools, a significant proportion of researchers agree that SNS are not  
21 useful or do not make a difference for their work. Furthermore, just having a profile on SNS is not an  
22 indicator of being an active user or having a strong online presence in the field as many researchers do  
23 not keep profiles updated and in some cases they even forget in which SNS they have them. However,  
24 this important difference between these concepts (having a profile and being present) has not been  
25 explicitly reported in prior studies, and both concepts are often misunderstood: researchers think that  
26 just by creating a profile on SNS they *will* be automatically connected and benefit from the online  
27 community. *We recognize the limitations of this study, particularly the fact that findings were drawn  
28 from a qualitative sample of Mendeley users, but we also believe that a deeper understanding of the  
29 implications that this difference may have for academia and SNS would help better support  
30 researchers' work needs and habits.*  
31

32  
33 To conclude, we argue that researchers have not "fallen behind" (Mas-Bleda *et al.*, 2014, p. 350).  
34 Instead, many of them are already ahead and have left SNS. Researchers do not show a "general lack  
35 of awareness and understanding" (Abrizah *et al.*, 2014, p. 257) and do not "have much to learn"  
36 (Fiske, 2014, p. 441). On the contrary, many researchers *from the sample* expressed very clearly that  
37 they have made a conscious decision to leave SNS away from their world or, at least, they are not  
38 interested in using SNS more actively, because they have evaluated them and concluded that they are a  
39 waste of time, not fitting with their way of working or even being harmful. This is not a lack of  
40 understanding, but an indication of high understanding. Instead of being ignorant, some researchers  
41 actively opt for a non-use of profiles on SNS.  
42

## 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 **References**

Abrizah, A., Badawi, F., Zohorian-Fooladi, N., Nicholas, D., Jamali, H.R. and Norliya, A.K. (2014),  
"What scholarly channels and resources do authors trust to read, cite and publish in? A

1  
2  
3 Malaysian study”, in Noorhidawati, A., Abrizah, A., Diljit, S., Edzan, N.N., Sinnasamy, J.,  
4 Kiran, K., Koh, A.P., Lisdar, A.W., Mahbob, Y., Noor Harun, A.K., Pauziaah, M. and  
5 Ratnawati, M.A. (Eds.), *Library: Our Story, Our Time, Our Future: Proceedings of the*  
6 *International 5th Conference on Libraries, Information and Society (ICoLIS) 2014*, University  
7 of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 245-262.

8  
9  
10 Academia.edu (2017), “About Academia.edu”, available at: <https://www.academia.edu/about>  
11 (accessed 9 August 2017).

12  
13 Anonymous (2017), DETAILS OMITTED FOR DOUBLE-BLIND REVIEWING

14  
15 Bar-Ilan, J., Haustein, S., Peters, I., Priem, J., Shema, H. and Terliesner, J. (2012), “Beyond citations:  
16 Scholars' visibility on the social Web”, in *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on*  
17 *Science and Technology Indicators*, pp. 98-109.

18  
19 Boyd, D.M. and Ellison, N.B. (2007), “Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship”,  
20 *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 210-230.

21  
22 Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), “Using thematic analysis in psychology”, *Qualitative Research in*  
23 *Psychology*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 77-101.

24  
25 Caers, R. and Castelyns, V. (2011), “LinkedIn and Facebook in Belgium: The Influences and Biases of  
26 Social Network Sites in Recruitment and Selection Procedures”, *Social Science Computer*  
27 *Review*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 437–448.

28  
29 Codina, L. (2009), “Science 2.0: Social networks and online applications for scholars”, *Hipertext.net*,  
30 Vol. 7, available at: <https://www.upf.edu/hipertextnet/en/numero-7/ciencia-2-0.html> (accessed 9  
31 August 2017).

32  
33 Collins, K., Shiffman, D. and Rock, J. (2016), “How Are Scientists Using Social Media in the  
34 Workplace?”, *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 11 No. 10, e0162680.

35  
36 Coppock, E.G. and Davis, L. (2013), “Status of the adoption of social media in the scientific research  
37 community”, *Information Services & Use*, Vol. 33 No. 3-4, pp. 203–217.

38  
39 Davison, H.K., Maraist, C. and Bing, M.N. (2011), “Friend or Foe? : The Promise and Pitfalls of  
40 Using Social Networking Sites for HR Decisions”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 26  
41 No. 2, pp. 153–159.

42  
43 De Oliveira, J.P.M., Lopes, G.R. and Moro, M.M. (2011), “Academic Social Networks”, in de Troyer,  
44 O. *et al.* (Eds.), *Advances in Conceptual Modeling. Recent Developments and New Directions*,  
45 Springer, Berlin, Germany, pp. 2-3.

46  
47 Donelan, H. (2016), “Social media for professional development and networking opportunities in  
48 academia”, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 706–729.

49  
50 Elsayed, A.M. (2016), “The Use of Academic Social Networks among Arab Researchers: A Survey”,  
51 *Social Science Computer Review*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 378-391.

- 1  
2  
3 Eysenbach, G. (2011), "Can tweets predict citations? Metrics of social impact based on Twitter and  
4 correlation with traditional metrics of scientific impact", *Journal of Medical Internet Research*,  
5 Vol. 13 No. 4, e123.  
6  
7 Fiske, P. (2014), "Nurture your online persona", *Nature*, Vol. 516, pp. 441-442.  
8  
9 Genoni, P., Merrick, H. and Wilson, M. (2005), "The use of the Internet to activate latent ties in  
10 scholarly communities", *First Monday*, Vol. 10 No. 12, available at:  
11 <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/1301/1221>  
12 (accessed 9 August 2017).  
13  
14  
15 Gruzd, A. and Goertzen, M. (2013), "Wired Academia: Why Social Science Scholars Are Using  
16 Social Media", in *System Sciences (HICSS), 2013 46th Hawaii International Conference on*  
17 *System Sciences*, IEEE, New York, NY, pp. 3332-3341.  
18  
19 Hargittai, E. (2007), "Whose Space? Differences among users and non-users of social network sites",  
20 *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, Vol. 13 No.1, pp. 276-297.  
21  
22  
23 Harley, D., Acord, S.K., Earl-Novell, S., Lawrence, S. and King, C.J. (2010), *Assessing the Future*  
24 *Landscape of Scholarly Communication: An Exploration of Faculty Values and Needs in Seven*  
25 *Disciplines*. University of California Center for Studies in Higher Education, Berkeley, CA.  
26  
27 Haustein, S., Peters, I., Bar-Ilan, J., Priem, J., Shema, H. and Terliesner, J. (2014), "Coverage and  
28 adoption of altmetrics sources in the bibliometric community", *SCIENTOMETRICS*, Vol. 101  
29 No. 2, pp. 1145-1163.  
30  
31  
32 Hoffmann, C.P., Lutz, C. and Meckel, M. (2014), "Impact Factor 2.0: Applying Social Network  
33 Analysis to Scientific Impact Assessment", in *System Sciences (HICSS), 2014 47th Hawaii*  
34 *International Conference on System Sciences*, IEEE, New York, NY, pp. 1576-1585.  
35  
36 Holmberg, K. and Thelwall, M. (2014), "Disciplinary differences in Twitter scholarly  
37 communication", *SCIENTOMETRICS*, Vol. 101 No. 2, pp. 1027-1042.  
38  
39 Hyland, K. (2011), "The presentation of self in scholarly life: Identity and marginalization in academic  
40 homepages", *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 286-297.  
41  
42 Jacobson, I. (2004), "Use cases—Yesterday, today, and tomorrow", *Software and Systems Modeling*,  
43 Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 210-220.  
44  
45 Jamali, H.R., Nicholas, D. and Herman E. (2015), "Scholarly reputation in the digital age and the role  
46 of emerging platforms and mechanisms", *Research Evaluation*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 37-49.  
47  
48 Jeng, W., He, D. and Jiang, J. (2015), "User Participation in an Academic Social Networking Service:  
49 A Survey of Open Group Users on Mendeley", *Journal of the Association for Information*  
50 *Science and Technology*, Vol. 66 No. 5, pp. 890-904.  
51  
52  
53 Jordan, K. (2014), "Academics and their online networks: Exploring the role of academic social  
54 networking sites", *First Monday*, Vol. 19 No. 11, available at:  
55 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5210/fm.v19i11.4937> (accessed 9 August 2017).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Kratz, J.E. and Strasser, C. (2015), "Researcher Perspectives on Publication and Peer Review of  
4 Data", *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 10 No. 2, e0117619.
- 5  
6 Li, N. and Gillet, D. (2013), "Identifying Influential Scholars in Academic Social Media Platforms", in  
7 *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and*  
8 *Mining (ASONAM)*, IEEE, New York, NY, pp. 608-614.
- 9  
10 LinkedIn (2016), "LinkedIn: registered members worldwide as of 1st quarter 2016, by country (in  
11 millions)", available at: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/272783/linkedin-membership-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/272783/linkedin-membership-worldwide-by-country/)  
12 [worldwide-by-country/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/272783/linkedin-membership-worldwide-by-country/) (accessed 9 August 2017).
- 13  
14  
15 LinkedIn (2017), "About Us", available at: <https://press.linkedin.com/about-linkedin> (accessed 9  
16 August 2017).
- 17  
18 Lüders, M. and Brandtzæg, P.B. (2017), "'My children tell me it's so simple': A mixed-methods  
19 approach to understand older non-users' perceptions of Social Networking Sites", *new media &*  
20 *society*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 181-198.
- 21  
22  
23 Madhusudhan, M. (2012), "Use of social networking sites by research scholars of the University of  
24 Delhi: A study", *International Information & Library Review*, Vol. 44 No. 2, pp. 100-113.
- 25  
26 Manca, S. and Ranieri, M. (2017), "Networked Scholarship and Motivations for Social Media use in  
27 Scholarly Communication", *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed*  
28 *Learning*, Vol. 18 No. 2, available at: <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/2859>  
29 (accessed 9 August 2017).
- 30  
31  
32 Manca, S. and Ranieri, M. (2016), "'Yes for sharing, no for teaching!': Social Media in academic  
33 practices", *The Internet and Higher Education*, Vol. 29, pp. 63-74.
- 34  
35 Mas-Bleda, A. and Aguillo, I.F. (2013), "Can a personal website be useful as an information source to  
36 assess individual scientists? The case of European highly cited researchers",  
37 *SCIENTOMETRICS*, Vol. 96 No. 1, pp. 51-67.
- 38  
39  
40 Mas-Bleda, A., Thelwall, M., Kousha, K. and Aguillo, I.F. (2014), "Do highly cited researchers  
41 successfully use the social web?", *SCIENTOMETRICS*, Vol. 101 No. 1, pp. 337-356.
- 42  
43 Meishar-Tal, H. and Pieterse, E. (2017), "Why Do Academics Use Academic Social Networking  
44 Sites?" *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, Vol. 18 No. 1,  
45 available at: <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/2643> (accessed 9 August 2017).
- 46  
47  
48 Menendez, M., Angeli, A.D. and Menestrina, Z. (2012), "Exploring the Virtual Space of Academia",  
49 in Dugdale, J. et al. (Eds.), *From Research to Practice in the Design of Cooperative Systems:*  
50 *Results and Open Challenges*, Springer, London, UK, pp. 49-63.
- 51  
52 Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994), *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*,  
53 Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- 54  
55 Mohammadi, E. and Thelwall, M. (2014), "Mendeley readership altmetrics for the social sciences and  
56 humanities: Research evaluation and knowledge flows", *Journal of the Association for*  
57 *Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 65 No. 8, pp. 1627-1638.
- 58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Murray, M. (2014), "Analysis of a scholarly social networking site: The case of the dormant user", in  
4 Floyd, K.S., Rutner, P. and Gardiner, A. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual*  
5 *Conference of the Southern Association for Information Systems (SAIS)*, Paper 24.  
6  
7 Nández, G. and Borrego, Á. (2013), "Use of social networks for academic purposes: a case study",  
8 *Electronic Library*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 781–791.  
9  
10 Nicholas, D., Herman, E., Jamali, H.R., Bravo, B.R., Boukacem-Zeghmouri, C., Dobrowolski, T. and  
11 Pouchot, S. (2015), "New ways of building, showcasing, and measuring scholarly reputation",  
12 *Learned Publishing*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 169–183.  
13  
14 Ortega, J.L. (2015a), "How is an academic social site populated? A demographic study of Google  
15 Scholar Citations population", *SCIENTOMETRICS*, Vol. 104 No. 1, pp. 1-18.  
16  
17 Ortega, J.L. (2015b), "Disciplinary differences in the use of academic social networking sites", *Online*  
18 *Information Review*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 520 – 536.  
19  
20 Pscheida, D., Albrecht, S., Herbst, S., Minet, C. and Köhler, T. (2014), *Nutzung von Social Media und*  
21 *onlinebasierten Anwendungen in der Wissenschaft: Erste Ergebnisse des Science 2.0-Survey*  
22 *2013 des Leibniz-Forschungsverbunds Science 2.0*, Leibniz-Forschungsverbund, Dresden,  
23 Germany.  
24  
25 ResearchGate (2017), "About ResearchGate", available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/about>  
26 (accessed 9 August 2017).  
27  
28 Rohani, V.A. and Ow, S.H. (2011), "Eliciting Essential Requirements for Social Networks in  
29 Academic Environments", in *Computers & Informatics (ISCI), 2011 IEEE Symposium on*  
30 *Computers & Informatics*, IEEE, New York, NY, pp. 171-176.  
31  
32 Rowlands, I., Nicholas, D., Russell, B., Canty, N. and Watkinson, A. (2011), "Social media use in the  
33 research workflow", *Learned Publishing*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 183-195.  
34  
35 Ryan, T. and Xenos, S. (2011), "Who uses Facebook? An investigation into the relationship between  
36 the Big Five, shyness, narcissism, loneliness, and Facebook usage", *Computers in Human*  
37 *Behavior*, Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 1658-1664.  
38  
39 Tenopir, C., Allard, S., Douglass, K., Aydinoglu, A.U., Wu, L., Read, E. *et al.* (2011), "Data Sharing  
40 by Scientists: Practices and Perceptions", *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 6 No. 6, e21101.  
41  
42 Thelwall, M. and Kousha, K. (2014), "Academia.edu: Social Network or Academic Network?",  
43 *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 65 No. 4, pp. 721–731.  
44  
45 Van Noorden, R. (2014), "Online collaboration: Scientists and the social network", *Nature*, Vol. 512,  
46 pp. 126-129.  
47  
48 Wallis, J.C., Rolando, E. and Borgman, C.L. (2013), "If we share data, will anyone use them? Data  
49 sharing and reuse in the long tail of science and technology", *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 8 No. 7, e67332.  
50  
51 Weller, K. (2015), "Social Media and Altmetrics: An Overview of Current Alternative Approaches to  
52 Measuring Scholarly Impact", in Welpel, I.M., Wollersheim, J., Ringelhan S. and Osterloh, M.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Eds.), *Incentives and Performance. Governance of Research Organizations*, Springer  
4 International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 261–276.

5  
6 Williams, A.E. and Woodacre, M.A. (2016), “The Possibilities and Perils of Academic Social  
7 Networking Sites”, *Online Information Review*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 282-294.

8  
9 XING (2017), „XING knackt 12 Millionen-Mitglieder-Marke“, available at:  
10 <https://corporate.xing.com/de/newsroom/pressemitteilungen/meldung/xing-knackt-12->  
11 [millionen-mitglieder-marke/](https://corporate.xing.com/de/newsroom/pressemitteilungen/meldung/xing-knackt-12-) (accessed 9 August 2017).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



(N=81)	females (N=23)	males (N=58)	Germany (N=17)	Singapore (N=15)	UK (N=16)	US (N=33)
Engineering & Technology (N=16)	4	12	0	7	2	7
Medical & Health Sciences (N=12)	4	8	2	0	7	3
Natural Sciences (N=36)	7	29	12	8	4	12
Social Sciences (N=17)	8	9	3	0	3	11

Table 1a. Overview of participants' field of study included in the analysis of this paper.

Journal of Documentation


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(N=81)	females (N=23)	males (N=58)	Germany (N=17)	Singapore (N=15)	UK (N=16)	US (N=33)
Junior (N=32)	12	20	6	4	5	17
Midlevel (N=24)	5	19	5	9	5	5
Senior (N=25)	6	19	6	2	6	11

Table 1b. Overview of participants' level of seniority included in the analysis of this paper.

Journal of Documentation



Journal of Documentation

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Participants	Institutional profile	ResearchGate	LinkedIn	Google Scholar Citations	Mendeley	Academib.edu	Twitter	ResearcherED	Facebook	Na
US1										4
US2										1
US3										1
US4										1
US5										1
US6										1
US7										1
US8										1
US9										1
GE11										1
GE12										1
GE13										1
GE14										1
GE15										1
GE16										1
GE17										1
GE18										1
GE19										1
GE110										1
GE111										1
GE112										1
GE113										1
SGP1										1
SGP2										1
SGP3										1
SGP4										1
SGP5										1
SGP6										1
SGP7										1
SGP8										1
UK1										1
UK2										1
UK3										1
UK4										1
UK5										1
UK6										1
UK7										1
UK8										1
UK9										1
UK10										1
UK11										1
UK12										1
UK13										1
UK14										1
UK15										1
US10										1
US11										1
US12										1
US13										1
US14										1
US15										1
US16										1
US17										1
US18										1
US19										1
US20										1
US21										1
US22										1
US23										1
US24										1
US25										1
US26										1
US27										1
US28										1
US29										1
US30										1
US31										1
US32										1
US33										1
US34										1
US35										1
US36										1
US37										1
US38										1
US39										1
US40										1
US41										1
US42										1
US43										1
US44										1
US45										1
US46										1
US47										1
US48										1
US49										1
US50										1
US51										1
US52										1
US53										1
US54										1
US55										1
US56										1
US57										1
US58										1
US59										1
US60										1
N(all) = 58	N(inst) = 42	N(ResearchGate) = 32	N(LinkedIn) = 20	N(Google Scholar) = 15	N(Mendeley) = 5	N(Academia) = 4	N(Twitter) = 3	N(ResearcherED) = 3	N(Facebook) = 2	

Figure 2. Overview of sites where 58 participants reported having profiles.

279x184mm (150 x 150 DPI)

Journal of Documentation



Figure 3. Likelihood of uptake of academic profiles on SNS from group 1 very likely (left side) to group 4 highly unlikely (right side) grouped by level of seniority.

123x75mm (150 x 150 DPI)