

2020

“People Are Reading Your Work,”: Scholarly Identity and Social Networking Sites

Marie L. Radford

Rutgers University - New Brunswick/Piscataway, mradford@rutgers.edu

Vanessa Kitzie

University of South Carolina, kitzie@mailbox.sc.edu

Stephanie Mikitish

Library of Congress, smik@loc.gov

Diana Floegel

Rutgers University - New Brunswick/Piscataway, diana.floegel@rutgers.edu

Gary P. Radford

Fairleigh Dickinson University, gradford@fdu.edu

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/libsci_facpub



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#), and the [Social Media Commons](#)

Publication Info

Preprint version *Journal of Documentation*, 2020.

© 2020 OCLC

This Article is brought to you by the Library and Information Science, School of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

Author(s)

Marie L. Radford, Vanessa Kitzie, Stephanie Mikitish, Diana Floegel, Gary P. Radford, and Lynn Silipigni Connaway



“People are Reading Your Work,” Scholarly Identity and Social Networking Sites

Journal:	<i>Journal of Documentation</i>
Manuscript ID	JD-04-2019-0074.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	User studies, Academic Libraries, Social Media, Social Networking Sites, Scholarly Identity, Qualitative Methods, Impression Management, Online Presence, Interviews

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 “People are reading your work”: Scholarly identity and social networking sites
4
5

6 7 **ABSTRACT**

8 9 Purpose

10
11 Scholarly identity refers to endeavors by scholars to promote their reputation, work, and
12 networks using online platforms such as ResearchGate, Academia.edu, and Twitter. This
13 exploratory research investigates benefits and drawbacks of scholarly identity efforts and
14 avenues for potential library support.
15
16

17 18 Design/methodology/approach

19
20 Data from 30 semi-structured phone interviews with faculty, doctoral students, and
21 academic librarians were qualitatively analyzed using the constant comparative method
22 (Charmaz, 2014) and Goffman’s (1959, 1967) theoretical concept of impression
23 management.
24

25 26 Findings

27
28 Results reveal that use of online platforms enables academics to connect with others and
29 disseminate their research. Scholarly identity platforms have benefits, opportunities, and
30 offer possibilities for developing academic library support. They are also fraught with
31 drawbacks/concerns, especially related to confusion, for-profit models, and reputational
32 risk.
33

34 35 Research limitations/implications

36
37 This exploratory study involves analysis of a small number of interviews (30) with self-
38 selected social scientists from one discipline (communication) and librarians. It lacks
39 gender, race/ethnicity, and geographical diversity and focuses exclusively on individuals
40 who use social networking sites for their scholarly identity practices.
41

42 43 Social implications

44
45 Results highlight benefits and risks of scholarly identity work and the potential for adopting
46 practices that consider ethical dilemmas inherent in maintaining an online social media
47 presence. They suggest continuing to develop library support that provides strategic
48 guidance and information on legal responsibilities regarding copyright.
49

50 51 Originality/value

52
53 This research aims to understand the benefits and drawbacks of scholarly identity
54 platforms and explore what support academic libraries might offer. It investigates these
55 topics comparing perspectives of faculty, doctoral students, and librarians.
56
57
58
59
60

KEYWORDS

Social media, social networking sites, scholarly identity, qualitative methods, user studies, impression management, academic libraries, online presence, interviews

INTRODUCTION¹

This exploratory study empirically investigates the opportunities, benefits, drawbacks, and challenges of scholarly identity work in virtual environments. It also considers the role of academic librarians in supporting academics in this endeavor. Scholarly identity work represents the activities through which scholars promote their reputation, research, and networks. The notion of identity work is derived from Goffman (1959, 1967) who viewed the formation of personal identity in terms of the social process of impression management. Goffman proposed that identity is something that is made through the choices that are made in one's attempts to manage the impressions others have of us. As an extension of this idea, scholarly identity work can be seen as an impression management activity carried out by scholars and researchers for an audience of their peers. For example, how scholars choose to present themselves at a scholarly meeting, or in service and committee efforts, or in their writing, could all be considered in terms of their effectiveness to manage the impressions others may form of their competence as scholars and valued members of the research community.

Scholarly identity work is increasingly occurring online and academic networking sites are increasingly seen as a part of scholarly life (Kjelberg, Haider, and Sundin, 2016). Scholars are using digital tools like ORCID and networking sites such as Twitter, Academia.edu, and ResearchGate to manage the impressions their peers might have of them and their scholarship

¹ An earlier and shorter version of this paper was published in [redacted for blind review].

1
2
3 (Akers, Sarkozy, Wu, and Slyman, 2016; Nicholas et al., 2015; Ovadia, 2014). For example,
4
5 Academia.edu has been described as the “Facebook for academics” where users are able to
6
7 create a scholarly face to present to a specified audience of other academics. Like Facebook,
8
9 Academia.edu allows users to create a profile page describing their research interests. They are
10
11 encouraged to upload examples of their research as in progress or completed papers which can
12
13 then be accessed, read, and downloaded by scholars interested in the same or similar topics.
14
15

16
17 But curating a profile on a site like Academia.edu also requires time and the formulation
18
19 of appropriate strategies to ensure that this scholarly identity work is appropriate and effective.
20
21 Scholars often do not have the time or the knowledge to do this productively. It is here that the
22
23 academic librarian may have a significant role to play in assisting the researcher to create and
24
25 maintain an effective scholarly presence online. Based on their familiarity with academic
26
27 networking sites and their commitment to a variety of issues overlapping with scholarly identity,
28
29 such as copyright and open access, academic librarians are well-positioned to develop relevant
30
31 services for universities and faculty (Reed et al., 2016).
32
33

34
35 Given these considerations, this paper addresses the following research questions:

36
37 RQ1: What are the perceived opportunities, benefits, drawbacks, and challenges of online
38
39 scholarly identity work use among Ph.D. students, faculty, and academic librarians?

40
41 RQ2: What, if any, practices do academic librarians engage with to assist Ph.D. students &
42
43 faculty with managing online scholarly identity work?
44
45

46
47 RQ3: How can scholarly identity-related assistance become a more substantial part of academic
48
49 librarians’ services to Ph.D. students and faculty?
50
51

LITERATURE REVIEW

Benefits of Online Scholarly Identity Work

Specialized academic networking sites and other digital tools such as ORCID are designed for use by academics, and assist in creating and maintaining their scholarly identity among their peers. These digital tools and academic networking sites have several features, including author disambiguation and metrics, to promote scholarly identity efforts (Akers et al., 2016). Beyond this social and sharing capability, a site like Academia.edu allows users to collect a number of alt-metrics of those who are accessing their work, including identifying (a) the demographic and institutional profiles of users of academia.edu who have accessed their pages or papers, and (b) other authors that mention the user and items they have uploaded to the site. Such detailed feedback on the nature of the user's readership can be used to modify their online presence, not only to attract more followers, but also to establish their relative place in that particular academic community (e.g., they may be designated a "highly cited author"). Thus, academia.edu will also compile various analytics which purport to show the "impact" of the user's research, including: (a) the number of unique visitors who look at the user's papers, (b) how many times the user's papers have been downloaded, and (c) the number of pages of each paper that have been accessed and read. This information can then be used in occupational impression management within the scholar's own institution, which, in turn, may be rewarded by professional advancement (Duffy and Pooley, 2017; Megwalu, 2015; Thelwall and Kousha, 2014).

Nández and Borrego (2012) reported that academics across disciplines generally engage in a range of activities, including contacting or following other scholars and disseminating their

1
2
3 research, during scholarly identity work. The authors also found that scholarly identity efforts
4
5 heightened competition among academics because of their inclination to use quantitative
6
7 measures to define accomplishments, including productivity (Hammarfelt, de Rijcke, and
8
9 Rushforth, 2016). A majority of respondents to a survey conducted by Haustein et al. (2014a)
10
11 indicated that academic networking sites affected their professional lives both negatively (e.g.,
12
13 encouraging procrastination) and positively, (e.g., aiding organization of research material).
14
15 However, specialized academic networking sites are not the only tools scholars employ for
16
17 scholarly identity endeavors; they also appropriate affordances of more general social media
18
19 platforms such as Facebook and Twitter to promote themselves and their research (e.g., Priem
20
21 and Costello, 2010; Schmitt and Jäschke, 2017). Activity surrounding recently published articles
22
23 on academic networking sites such as Twitter may increase citations, predict citations, and
24
25 compliment citation metrics with measures of social impact (Priem and Costello, 2010;
26
27 Eysenbach, 2011; Haustein, et al. 2014b; Nabout et al., 2018). Research has identified
28
29 differences in how scholars from various fields engage in scholarly identity work. Ortega
30
31 (2015a) found that humanists and social scientists frequently used Academia.edu and connected
32
33 with other researchers, while biologists chose ResearchGate and did not make these connections
34
35 as often. Computer scientists may choose platforms such as Twitter for both information-
36
37 oriented and professional purposes (Schmitt and Jäschke, 2017).
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Extant literature also has examined how scholars behave in online environments.
45
46 Shehata, Ellis, and Foster (2017) classified three types of online scholarly communication:
47
48 formal “orthodox,” “moderate” blends of formal/informal actions, and multifaceted “heterodox.”
49
50 Academic networking sites like Twitter may play a social role in communication that challenges
51
52 academic norms (Budge, Lemon, and McPherson, 2016) and promotes professional values
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Logghe et al., 2018). Benefits such as connecting with other researchers and exchanging ideas
4 may permit participants to increase their relational closeness with scholars in their fields
5
6 (Bazarova and Choi, 2014). Scholarly communication via academic networking sites like Twitter
7
8 also may take place between academics and the public (Collins, Shiffman, and Rock, 2016; Côté
9
10 and Darling, 2018). For example, medical professionals may promote public learning in addition
11
12 to crowdsourcing new ideas, discussing and challenging emerging research, pursuing
13
14 professional development, and expanding networks (Choo et al., 2015; Panahi, Watson, and
15
16 Partridge, 2016). Online scholarly discourse may promote knowledge-sharing during academic
17
18 conferences (Gilbert and Paulin, 2015) and demonstrate the broader societal impact of
19
20 scholarship (Jackson and Spencer, 2017; Ke, Ahn, and Sugimoto, 2017). Through activities such
21
22 as posting about their academic achievements and research, participants may strategically
23
24 disclose information (Bazarova and Choi, 2014) to boost their reputations or obtain other
25
26 advantages related to tenure and promotion. Participants' scholarly identity activities may allow
27
28 them to control the information they reveal so they can craft particular identities that they may
29
30 not be able to effectively cultivate in face-to-face exchanges (Batenburg and Bartels, 2017).

31 32 33 34 35 36 37 *Drawbacks of Scholarly Identity Work*

38
39
40 Communication via digital tools and academic networking sites to promote one's
41
42 scholarly identity also has disadvantages and drawbacks, contributing to researcher skepticism.
43
44 Potential users may consider participation to be irrelevant, or their workplace culture may not
45
46 encourage scholarly identity-related practices (Greifeneder et al., 2017). Some scholars report
47
48 that maintaining online profiles could harm their careers if others perceive them negatively.
49
50 Additionally, research has uncovered evidence that metrics generated by academic digital tools
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and academic networking sites, such as precisely measuring citation impact, may be problematic
4
5 (Ortega, 2015b).
6

7
8 Online presences may foster “messy” identities as well as behavioral risks (Budge et al.,
9
10 2016). Perceptions of Twitter’s ability to promote scholarly communication may be idealistic,
11
12 particularly when bot activity is considered (Robinson-Garcia et al., 2017). Incentives
13
14 emphasized by academic digital tools and academic networking sites may gamify research
15
16 activities and lead to “large-scale goal displacement,” as well as dependency on often ambiguous
17
18 altmetrics (Sugimoto et al., 2017, p. 2051). Additionally, interviews conducted by Costello and
19
20 Priem (2011) revealed that some academics do not want their tweets to be archived given their
21
22 contextual nature and privacy concerns.
23
24
25

26
27 Some scholars have elaborated on this “dark side” to scholarly identity activity on
28
29 academic networking sites. For example, users of these tools can be unaware that sites like
30
31 Academia.edu do not exist for altruistic reasons. Academia.edu procured its domain name before
32
33 the .edu designation became exclusive to educational institutions, even though it is a for-profit
34
35 venture. For-profit goals foster tension between open access efforts and platform values that
36
37 advance stakeholder interests including industry partners, venture capitalists, and people within
38
39 the company (Bond, 2017; Fitzpatrick, 2015; Ruff, 2016; Wexler, 2015). As reflected in
40
41 scholarship by Huws (2014) and Newson and Menzies (2005), academics are performing work
42
43 for for-profit platforms that benefit from their data. Essentially, the tools and academic
44
45 networking sites, as well as academic institutions (which often require scholars’ online
46
47 presences) are exploiting the “free” labor academics provide via scholarly identity work. Hall
48
49 (2015) notes, “academics are laboring for it for free to help build its privately-owned for-profit
50
51 platform by providing the aggregated input, data, and attention value. We can thus see that
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 posting on Academia.edu is not ethically and politically equivalent to making research available
4 using an internationally open access repository at all” (n. p.). Concerns with for-profit models
5 and work do not only apply to academic networking sites explicitly aimed at academics (e.g.,
6 Academia.edu), because there is an increased use of social networking sites aimed at a more
7 general audience (e.g., Twitter) for establishing scholarly identity. Thus, these concerns fit under
8 a broader umbrella of ethical issues related to social media platforms in general.
9

10 *Role of Academic Librarians in Scholarly Identity Work*

11
12 Library and Information Science (LIS) researchers have identified academic libraries as
13 appropriate sites where scholars might receive information and help regarding some of the
14 drawbacks and consequences of digital tools and academic networking sites for scholarly identity
15 work (Graham, Lee, Radio, and Tarver, 2018; Moberly, Lee, Kessler, and Carrigan, 2018).
16
17 Library users have expressed the desire for more guidance with scholarly identity efforts
18 (Mikitish, 2017). Reed, McFarland, and Croft (2016) reported that academic librarians were
19 engaged in scholarly identity practices and that some have begun to provide support for others in
20 managing their online presence. Moberly et al. (2018) and Graham et al. (2018) assert that
21 librarians have the ability to provide information, strategies, and practices for scholarly identity
22 work and also to provide insight as both instructors for others and maintainers of their own
23 scholarly identities.
24
25

26
27 Academic libraries have the potential to be key players in promoting open source and
28 open science options, though their full potential has yet to be realized in areas such as advocacy
29 and provision of data repositories (Ogungbeni et al., 2018). As researchers, librarians also
30 employ these online sites as vehicles to showcase their own scholarly productivity (Brigham,
31 2016).
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 To summarize, the literature reviewed here makes two important contributions. First, it
4 identifies opportunities, benefits, challenges, and drawbacks of online scholarly identity work.
5
6 Second, it highlights the potential roles for academic librarians to leverage opportunities and
7
8 benefits while mitigating challenges and drawbacks. This study contributes to a growing body of
9
10 research by examining the perceptions of both scholars and academic librarians related to online
11
12 scholarly identity endeavors.
13
14
15

16 17 **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

18
19 Goffman's (1959, 1967) key theoretical concepts of impression management center on
20
21 reasons for self-presentation, perceptions of others, face work, and face threats. Reasons for self-
22
23 presentation entail the variety of motivations individuals might wish to communicate their
24
25 scholarly identity to others and include concepts to develop relationships, control social
26
27 outcomes and resources, and clarify one's identity for others. Perceptions of others capture the
28
29 strategies through which scholars convey their identity to others, as well as their perceived
30
31 success. Face work encompasses the strategies individuals take to ensure that the desired
32
33 scholarly identity they wish to communicate is received and interpreted correctly by their
34
35 intended audience. A key element of face work is a face threat, which is any situation that
36
37 threatens to diminish scholars' successful communication of their identity.
38
39
40
41

42 LIS research has applied Goffman's impression management frame to analyze live-chat
43
44 reference encounters (e.g., Radford and Radford, 2017; Radford, Radford, Connaway, and
45
46 DeAngelis, 2011). No literature that specifically applied Goffman's ideas to scholarly identity
47
48 efforts was identified, although scholars have applied impression management tenants to self-
49
50 disclosure on academic networking sites (Bareket-Bojmel, Moran, and Shahar, 2016; Bazarova
51
52 and Choi, 2014; Buffardi and Campbell, 2008). File (2018) used Goffman's impression
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 management frame to analyze a large corpus of tweets from a broad anonymous population. He
4 also conducted interviews with Twitter users who discussed their use of posts, retweets, and likes
5
6 to manage interpersonal relationships and identified six persona types that exhibited different
7
8 patterns of use. Online self-presentation also has been used to study hiring practices, since
9
10 individuals can choose to present themselves in positive or negative ways that affect their
11
12 professional image (Batenburg and Bartels, 2017; Chiang and Suen, 2015).
13
14
15

16 17 **METHOD**

18 19 *Participants*

20
21 Thirty semi-structured phone interviews were conducted with 10 faculty members, 10
22
23 Ph.D. students, and 10 academic librarians. Participants were recruited from an email list of a
24
25 professional organization for academic librarians, the Association of College and Research
26
27 Libraries (ACRL), and a listserv for communication scholars and other social scientists,
28
29 Communication, Research, and Theory Network (CRTNET). Faculty members and doctoral
30
31 students were selected because they represent target audiences for specialized academic
32
33 networking sites and digital tools such as ORCID or Academia.edu. A pre-screening survey
34
35 selected participants who used at least three digital tools and academic networking sites such as
36
37 ResearchGate, ORCID, and Twitter. 10 qualified participants in each group were selected for
38
39 interviews to achieve variation in years of experience and demographic characteristics.
40
41
42
43

44
45 Table 1 displays participant demographics. Most participants were women, white, and
46
47 26-34 years of age. Faculty included assistant (n=3), associate (n=2), and full professors (n=2),
48
49 as well as an assistant dean, a teaching fellow, and a special instructor. Ph.D. students were in
50
51 coursework (n=4) and post-coursework (n=6). Almost all Ph.D. students and faculty participants
52
53 were in the field of communication, which reflected the recruitment and sampling strategy. The
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 majority of academic librarians were tenured or tenure-track (n=7). Most did not have a subject
4 specialization (n=6), while others specialized in scholarly communication, life sciences, and
5
6 copyright. All participants were from institutions located in the United States and Canada.
7
8

9
10 [Table 1 goes here]
11

12 Table 2 presents the most frequent academic networking sites and digital tools that the
13 participants used. There were several additional platforms listed by fewer participants, including
14
15 SnapChat, Tumblr, WhatsApp, LinkedIn, Google Profile, YouTube, VIVO, OpenVIVO,
16
17 Symplectic Elements, ISNI, Scopus, and WebID.
18
19

20
21 [Table 2 goes here]
22

23 *Interview Protocol* 24

25
26 The research questions, theoretical framework, and themes from prior research (Kjellberg
27 et al., 2016; Nández and Borrego, 2012) informed the interview protocol (see Appendix A). The
28
29 interview protocol began with general questions about the meaning of scholarly identity and
30
31 impact, then progressed to more specific questions about ways in which participants may
32
33 establish and maintain their scholarly identity. Two elicitation techniques, a) critical incident
34
35 (Flanagan, 1954) and b) magic wand (Dervin, 1983) were used to identify benefits,
36
37 opportunities, drawbacks, and challenges of online scholarly identity work. The critical incident
38
39 technique solicited specific examples of instances in which participants engaged in successful
40
41 and unsuccessful scholarly identity-related activities, whereas the magic wand question asked
42
43 participants to envision the types of support most relevant to them when engaging in scholarly
44
45 identity work.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Procedure

Interviews lasted approximately one hour, and participants were compensated with a \$30 gift card. Each of the approximately 104 initial respondents were assigned a random number identifier to maintain confidentiality. Since this research is exploratory, a sample size of 30 was predetermined based on available resources and the desire to balance the number of participants from all three groups.

Four researchers conducted the telephone interviews, taking detailed notes on participant responses, including capture of verbatim quotes. The research team then qualitatively coded the notes using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Charmaz, 2014) and emic/etic coding (Miles and Huberman, 1994), applying high-level codes (etic) informed by the theoretical framework and literature reviewed and low-level codes (emic) inductively developed from the data. The team coded the transcripts, using NVivo software. Based on patterns found within a sample of the data, coders developed an initial typology to classify common themes. The research team refined the typology as they applied it to the remaining transcripts, expanding as needed to capture developing codes (see Appendix B). Numerical inter-coder reliability was not calculated, but the team achieved unanimous inter-coder agreement (Zhang and Wildemuth, 2005) after peer debriefing and discussion.

FINDINGS

Themes Pertaining to Benefits of Scholarly Identity Work

The themes presented below relate to the benefits of scholarly identity work based on frequency of incidence in the data and illustrated by quotations. Benefits included the ability to:

(a) connect with other researchers, (b) disseminate academic activities, (c) facilitate tenure/promotion, (d) access conferences and other educational opportunities, (e) join or

1
2
3 participate in scholarly communities, and (f) share open access materials. For the quotes below,
4 participants are identified as P (Ph.D. students), L (Librarians), or F (Faculty), followed by a
5 number assigned by a random number-generator.
6
7
8

9 10 *Connecting with Other Researchers*

11
12 Participants most frequently cited connecting with other researchers as a significant
13 benefit of scholarly identity efforts (n=27). All 10 Ph.D. students gave responses centering on
14 this theme. For example, one experienced a feeling of belonging to an academic community
15 when using these sites: “I can connect with people who share similar research interests with me
16 through those academic websites. I can see their research interests and papers. Whenever I use
17 those online tools it gives me feelings like I’m part of these people and makes me feel like I
18 belong” (P-39).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Nine librarians indicated that they use scholarly identity tools to connect with other
30 researchers. L-69 claimed that cultivating a scholarly identity was important “not because I want
31 people to perceive me in a certain way, but because it allows me to choose the people I’m
32 engaging with.” Eight faculty also reiterated this theme. F-32 claimed that he “can jump in with
33 these other people that I respect as a scholar,” which he thinks “can set you up to do more
34 impactful work.”
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Disseminating Academic Activities*

43
44 Another prominent theme related to benefits was that scholarly identity work allowed
45 participants (n=24) to promote information about their scholarly activities. For example, one
46 librarian stated that she was able to insert her scholarship into a relevant online conversation: “I
47 was able to insert that publication into the conversation that was already happening and sort of
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 say, ‘Oh! Here’s something I did that people don’t always read,’ and so I used that to insert my
4 news into the conversation” (L-50).

5
6
7
8 All librarians (n=10) felt that disseminating academic activities was a major outcome of
9 online platform use. Seven faculty agreed; F-76 said that for online scholarly identity activities,
10 “the dissemination is a little wider, a little more easily accessible.” Seven Ph.D. students also
11 reiterated this theme, as they felt that sharing their accomplishments online made their research
12 more “accessible” (P-23) and “well-received” (P-25) with “a greater impact” (P-85).

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 *Sharing and Exchanging Materials with Other Researchers*

20
21 Academic and general academic networking sites facilitated sharing and exchanging
22 materials (n=20) with both known and unknown audiences. Eight faculty members discussed this
23 scholarly identity benefit. For example, one described imaginary audience members accessing
24 his work through ResearchGate: “Whenever I have a paper that’s in press...I’ll try to put it on
25 ResearchGate so that it’s accessible...so that people can read it. People can be like, ‘There he
26 goes being productive again’” (F-32).

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
Five librarians discussed this benefit, as did seven Ph.D. students. For example, one
student explained the benefits of sharing material with a co-author on Facebook:

I read a New York Times article related to our research article and posted it to FB. He
saw the article and replied to my Facebook. The comments are very rich in terms of the
information and the context. It led to us thinking of and starting our project...posting an
article on my Facebook was helpful for us to talking about things and sharing our mutual
research interests, then agreeing to write a paper (P-39).

51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 *Facilitating Getting Tenure/Promotion*

Over one-third of those interviewed (n=11) noted that online scholarly identity work
helped to facilitate getting tenure/promotion, including eight librarians. A tenure-track librarian
explained: “The obvious motivator is tenure. We’re in a tenure system, so our impact is a big

1
2
3 part of our research statement. We're not just talking about what we're doing, but about our
4
5 impact on the profession. For tenure, I need professional reviewers, so I need a scholarly
6
7 identity" (L-11).
8
9

10 Three faculty discussed scholarly identity's role in their tenure process. Referring to
11
12 academic networking sites for scholarly identity, faculty F-82 claimed, "if it had existed before I
13
14 got tenure, I would have used it to increase those numbers." No Ph.D. students had responses
15
16 that expressed this theme; however, five claimed that maintaining an online scholarly identity
17
18 may help them get a job. Per P-85, "It can definitely help. If you have a firm identity/picture it
19
20 makes you easier to market yourself and make you attractive to potential people who want to hire
21
22 you."
23
24
25

26 Participants appear to utilize the "social" features of academic networking sites to
27
28 enhance their scholarly identity. They also widely agree that, while scholarly identity is not all-
29
30 encompassing, it is important to tenure, and can facilitate promotional processes. All participants
31
32 expressed a need to create, cultivate, and maintain scholarly identity, despite their varying
33
34 opinions on specific platforms and practices.
35
36
37

38 *Themes Pertaining to Drawbacks of Scholarly Identity Work*

39

40 Themes pertaining to drawbacks of scholarly identity work based on frequency of
41
42 incidence are presented below. The themes are: (a) time constraints, (b) concern with for-profit
43
44 models, (c) context collapse, and (d) confusion. Participants also raised concerns over damage to
45
46 reputation and privacy. Librarians were the most outspoken group on drawbacks for four of the
47
48 six themes, as described below. For two of the themes, concern over damage to reputation, and
49
50 privacy, Faculty were the most outspoken.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Time Constraints

Time constraints posed a significant drawback to scholarly identity efforts among most participants (n=16). However, the distribution of this theme among groups varied, with all librarians (n=10) reporting this drawback, but fewer faculty (n=3) and Ph.D. students (n=3). In addition to the time it takes to update their profiles, faculty also were concerned with receiving unsolicited emails (F-42) and checking digital tools and academic networking sites too frequently, which could distract from research time (F-32, F-7). F-42 noted additional concerns with future institutional intervention over how online scholarly identity work is regulated, stating: "Once institutions get involved there will be certain rules and regulations [including format, updating] it's more work basically. Then there has to be tech support and I feel that if you have to meet certain laws, but if it's not coming from within then adding one more thing to do is more like a headache to us."

The responses of the three Ph.D. students who identified time lost to online scholarly identity work as a drawback predominately focused on profile maintenance, which P-61 referred to as "an all or nothing sort of thing." P-61 seems to craft their scholarly identity based on their lack of academic networking sites use: "Better to be one of these people to be like, 'I'm not really on social media and that's not my thing' than being on social media and failing at it."

One of the 10 librarian participants noting time constraints as a significant barrier said: "Keeping up is a full-time job sometimes" (L-10). Additionally, a majority of the librarians (n=7) reported other related nuisances of online scholarly identity maintenance. These include constant reminders from academic networking sites like ResearchGate and Academia.edu (L-50, L-33, L-101, F-42), the pressure to update profiles (L-103, F-42), and difficulty tracking passwords and usernames (L-33, L-103, F-76). L-101 referred to constant reminders, such as

1
2
3 email notifications, as “Cyber seduction. It sucks you in. It is not that I make the effort to get on
4 myself, but they are sending me teasers [like] ‘So and so has posted this.’ [It is] hard to resist
5 them.”
6
7
8
9

10 Librarians who framed scholarly identity maintenance as a nuisance also focused on the
11 difficulty of maintaining profiles across several digital tools and academic networking sites. One
12 participant inquired, “Why would I need to maintain a few online presences? Wouldn't it be nice
13 to have it all in one place?” (L-102). Six librarians believed that a single unified digital tool
14 would improve their experiences.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 *Concern with For-Profit Business Models*

22
23 Half of all participants (n=15) claimed that a major drawback to scholarly identity work
24 involves supporting for-profit digital tools and academic networking sites. As was found for the
25 time constraints theme, librarians expressed the most concern (n=9), although it was also
26 mentioned by Ph.D. students (n=4), and faculty (n=2). Among faculty discussing this theme, F-
27 20 used the public space of a church as a metaphor to insinuate that academic networking sites
28 should be open access: “[I] don't like Academia.edu because they charge ... It's like being told
29 that someone has to pay for someone else to go their church.” Faculty also feel taken advantage
30 of when using for-profit services, reporting that strategies, like sending constant reminders and
31 offering enhanced profile features, can be a lure to “get you interested, [and then] ask you to pay
32 10 bucks a month” (F-84).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Ph.D. students questioned the effectiveness of these strategies and of for-profit digital
48 tools and academic networking sites themselves. For example, “I find that both ResearchGate
49 and Academia.edu tend to be a scam. Before I ever published anything, I received notifications
50 that people cited my writing, which is ridiculous. I think those two sites in particular are flawed
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and so I don't know that there's much impact" (P-71). Ph.D. students also discussed the
4 importance of access to other research and, similar to faculty, were less likely to support sites
5 with for-profit models that charged for access and other scholarly identity services, such as
6 impact-based measures.
7
8
9
10

11
12 Additional concerns that librarians had about for-profit business models were: pending
13 lawsuits (L-1, L-103), advertising (L-101), monetizing researcher labor (L-102, L-69), the degree
14 of cost to use these services (L-102, L-73), perceived competition with these services (L-11), and
15 questionable profit motivations (L-50). One reason why more librarians may have reported this
16 theme is because they provide many of the services researchers currently pay for, with less legal
17 and material detriment. Per L-103:
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Faculty may not be aware that third-party scholarly identity tools, like ResearchGate,
27 may provide a platform, but don't provide any services to you. That's why they got a
28 lawsuit. So, for us, we try to provide services [that are] similar, but we provide actual
29 services because we ensure that what the faculty shares is legal. This is through a
30 software the university has. We help faculty set up these profiles, but also do some
31 training and education. Very recently, actually last fall, my office and the University
32 office of general counsel together developed a copyright and open access presentation
33 that we inserted into different meetings for faculty, graduate students, etc. It's about 20
34 minutes. We educate faculty and students about what they need to pay attention to when
35 sharing their online identities.
36
37
38

39 *Context Collapse*

40
41 Context collapse refers to a phenomenon across social media in which people experience
42 the flattening of "multiple audiences into one" (Marwick and boyd, 2011, p. 122). For example,
43 in the physical environment, people's co-workers may never meet their friends from secondary
44 school. However, on an academic networking sites like Facebook, people from these groups
45 might engage in political arguments across a discussion thread. Seen through the lens of
46 Goffman (1967), context collapse leaves people susceptible to face threats, which they may
47 guard against by imagining an audience of "nightmare readers" such as bosses, parents, and
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 teachers (Marwick and Boyd, 2011, p. 125), and limiting their personal discourse to topics
4 deemed appropriate for all readers. Within a scholarly identity context, researchers experience
5 difficulty in determining what to say about their presentations, publications, and service activities
6 on both general and academic networking sites because of an unknown audience. Context
7 collapse was discussed most by librarians (n=7), followed by Ph.D. students (n=4), and faculty
8 (n=3).

9
10 Faculty carefully managed what information they shared on each academic networking
11 sites based on their perceived audience. For F-57, ResearchGate and Academia.edu are “boring
12 LinkedIn versions of your personality,” whereas Facebook and Twitter are tools to communicate
13 with students. However, F-57 mentioned that these distinctions between personality and platform
14 could become blurry, noting that her Twitter use “sometimes leaks into my personal life.”
15 Keeping this blurriness in mind, F-32 consistently asks before using online platforms: “Am I
16 going to be perceived as posting this as an individual or a [school] representative?”

17
18 Ph.D. students who discussed context collapse also focused on this personal/professional
19 divide. For example, P-39 recounted an experience in which she posted about a “weekend
20 getaway” on Facebook before realizing “maybe it’s not a good thing to post because my
21 professor might not think that I’m working hard.” She continued to describe context collapse
22 related to her research on HIV, which she worried might cause someone to “think I’m weird or
23 stigmatize me, or think I have HIV.” She worried that if her advisor saw that she took a weekend
24 off, or if a friend or acquaintance not familiar with her research were to see which HIV-related
25 Facebook groups she followed, it could cause damage to both her scholarly and professional
26 reputations.

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 Context collapse also could reflect more substantial cultural differences between various
4 social groups with whom an individual interacts. For instance, P-34 chooses not to use Facebook
5 because of regional differences between individuals he knows from home versus the culture of
6 academia. He stated:
7
8
9
10
11

12 Where I'm from it's blue collar and not a lot of people go to college and very few get a
13 Ph.D., so that's another reason I don't promote that fact on my Facebook page. I don't
14 want to be perceived as someone who is good at college because they don't value
15 knowledge in the same way so that's why I keep it close to the chest. And so that depends
16 on what region you're from, you're going to be viewed a certain way.
17
18

19 Ph.D. student accounts also denote that academic networking sites and other digital
20 contexts do not solely relegate context collapse. For instance, P-95 navigated her selection of
21 research topics by balancing personal interests with those of individuals from her home country,
22 Nigeria:
23
24
25
26
27

28 You talked about how scholarly identity interacts with your personal identity and your
29 cultural identity, all of these things. Even for me right now there are things and topics in
30 my field that I never would want to study because they challenge my cultural
31 assumptions and beliefs, like issues around gender equality and things. There are cultural
32 reasons why I didn't want to go into that. That's why I want to create interest areas that
33 don't challenge my cultural values and that goes into my personal beliefs and religious
34 beliefs that could be of potential impact to the research community, but I know that if I
35 go into these areas, if I write an article about gender equality in Nigeria that would go to
36 my kinsmen and family members and they would say, "Oh, so our culture is inferior?"
37
38
39

40 In this account, P-95 identifies the potential for context collapse, whether offline or online, of her
41 research, likely because academic publishing requires visibility. Thus, this threat of context
42 collapse has shaped her research agenda.
43
44
45
46

47 Like faculty and Ph.D. participants, librarians also addressed the tensions behind putting
48 significant work into distinguishing between scholarly, professional, and personal identities. L-1
49 refers to this work as the "fragmentation of how I maintain my identity publicly," and cites "not
50 having the time to keep up with it." Other participants view this overlap as inevitable, especially
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on certain platforms like Twitter: “people are on Twitter and have personal viewpoints which
4 may overlap with professional identities” (L-11).
5
6

7
8 Though L-11 seemed to partly embrace overlap among her online identities, other
9
10 librarians framed context collapse as problematic, particularly regarding its potential to offend
11 specific audiences. Aligned with Marwick and boyd’s (2011) claim that social media users often
12 share the lowest common denominator of information to avoid controversy, one librarian
13 explained, “Sometimes I try to put out something that is more about my opinions, those things
14 don't get re-tweeted or liked, so this is a sign to me that I should keep it to myself” (L-69).
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 *Confusion*

22
23
24 Thirteen participants expressed confusion over how to use digital tools and academic
25 networking sites for scholarly identity. Confusion was an issue most frequently mentioned by
26 librarians (n=10), followed by Ph.D. students (n=2), then faculty members (n=1). The lone
27 faculty member to express confusion also may have been alluding to the opacity of for-profit
28 sites’ intentions, stating that he is “suspicious of why the help button is needed” (F-76) on certain
29 platforms. Confusion experienced by Ph.D. students related to use of platform features. For
30 instance, P-23 expressed confusion over how to access articles using ResearchGate: “I think it's
31 difficult to get access to articles. I've requested articles and never heard back.”
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Much like the other themes, librarians likely had more responses because they were
43 speaking of their personal experiences as well as those of the researchers they were helping. As
44 one example, L-101 stated: “I think it can be really intimidating for some people to try and create
45 a scholarly identity using social media. It's not been particularly difficult for me, but the fact that
46 I've run so many things for various organizations implies that I have more comfort than others.”
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 Areas of confusion that librarians both personally experienced and perceived researchers to
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 experience included the number, variety, and features of digital tools and academic networking
4 sites; metrics; which digital tools and academic networking sites to use; and how to use them.
5
6 For example, L-102 said: “The landscape is now so crowded that it's difficult to choose, select,
7
8 and create a consistent and comprehensive identity. They're all over the place, those identifiers.
9
10 There are many different data and silos, and it's difficult to combine them in one place and draw
11
12 some conclusion.”
13
14
15

16 17 *Concern over Damage to Reputation* 18

19
20 Thirteen participants worried that an online scholarly identity presence could negatively
21
22 impact their professional reputations or the professional reputation of their colleagues. Unlike the
23
24 other themes in this section, faculty members expressed concern over reputational damage the
25
26 most (n=6) followed by Ph.D. students (n=4) and librarians (n=3). Among faculty, this theme
27
28 most frequently applied to pre-tenure colleagues: “Pre-tenure colleagues don't want to go on
29
30 social media, they say every single sentence they write...can be perceived in the wrong light. It's
31
32 not worth the risk. It's like the fear is stopping them, but my concern is that if they're in the habit
33
34 of not doing it, will they convert? I don't think they'll start posting” (F-20).
35
36
37

38
39 Faculty members also stated that institutional policy interacts with reputational concerns.
40
41 F-7 stated that their institution actively discourages online scholarly identity work, and therefore
42
43 these concerns are minimized. However, F-20 was concerned that their institution might start
44
45 requiring an online scholarly identity presence in the future, which would significantly impact
46
47 pre-tenure colleagues mentioned above.
48

49
50 Ph.D. students discussed reputational concerns less in the abstract (e.g., discussing what
51
52 might happen based on institutional policy change; speculating on the experiences of others) and
53
54 instead addressed the threat of damage to their own reputations. They also expressed reservations
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 regarding how many of these platforms might exacerbate what they perceived as a competitive
4 environment inherent to academia. Specifically, they were worried that their scholarly activities
5 and opinions could be subject to critique due to academic networking sites and digital tool
6 features like persistence and visibility of content. P-23 illustrates this concern:
7
8
9
10
11

12 Sometimes you are perceived as a scholar when engaging on social media as "dumbing
13 down the conversation" and you're not serious and you're oversimplifying things. I feel
14 like you can be criticized by some people for saying the wrong thing or not thinking
15 through your tweet. You didn't represent the research as accurately as you should have.
16 Academia has a critique and criticism culture so engaging in information conversations
17 that aren't verbal, face-to-face, this is out there and can be subject to further examination
18 by parties who wanted to critique you for some reason.
19
20

21 Librarians discussing reputational concerns often quantified perceived reputational
22 damage by social indicators such as the number of likes or shares on a social media post. For
23 instance, L-33 explained that he times his posts to achieve maximum impact because if you don't
24 engage in scholarly identity work, "you are perceived as a slacker, not on top of things, as out of
25 date, as not fully engaged, not confident, not professional."
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 *Privacy Concerns*

33 A final theme addressed by participants was privacy concerns (n=6). As was found in the
34 concern over damage to reputation theme, faculty expressed the majority of these concerns
35 (n=5), which often related to context collapse. For example, F-57 stated that "the idea of students
36 finding my site and trying to friend me and learning personal information about me" is
37 unsettling. Moreover, making participation on academic networking sites "compulsory is an
38 ethical issue because the tools track their posts." On the other hand, another participant noted
39 that while initially "people saw following others as quite negative like stalking" what was once
40 "creepy is now due diligence" (F-20). No Ph.D. students explicitly discussed privacy. One
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 librarian mentioned this theme, which mimicked faculty concerns, stating, “I have concerns
4 about... the amount of data you put into their platforms” (L-69).
5
6

7 *Themes Related to Library Support Roles*

8
9
10 This section identifies themes related to potential and desired library support of scholarly
11 identity creation and maintenance, illustrated by participant quotations. Participants were not
12 directly asked about how libraries could support scholarly identity practices because the
13 literature suggested that this topic was still a developing area in library instruction. The decision
14 was made not to suggest librarian intervention or specific types of support that the participants
15 may not have considered in the first place, but rather to explicitly explore the types of support
16 that was currently being provided. The development of librarian support as a theme from all
17 three participant groups suggests that librarians may serve as salient support systems among
18 participants.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 *Library Support: Librarian Themes*

31
32
33 Librarians were asked about what support they currently offer their users. All ten
34 librarians said that their institutions offered workshops for faculty and doctoral students. For
35 example, L-1 said: “We will basically do a workshop about tools and strategies for managing
36 scholarly profiles, deciding where to publish, avoiding predatory publishers, metrics/altmetrics,
37 [and] social media.” Nine librarians said that they help users by packaging content, or by helping
38 them to identify their audiences and to format their submissions for certain publications (Reed et
39 al., 2016). Librarians may be able to use their “strong knowledge about the audience of
40 journals...and give advice” (L-11). Seven offer individual consultations by appointment. One
41 librarian (L-1) noted that her institution runs a yearly conference on scholarly identity-related
42 topics. Most workshops and consultations focus on general orientations, metrics, and
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 discussions/demonstrations of digital tools and academic networking sites. Librarians seemed
4 most interested in promoting open access venues, including their institutions' repositories, as
5 well as ORCID, which is not-for-profit and supported by member organizations (ORCID, 2020).
6
7
8 However, many claimed to offer services regarding all tools and academic networking sites,
9
10 depending on their users' needs and desires.
11
12

13
14 Librarians also mentioned the importance of context and disciplinary differences in how
15 scholars engage with scholarly identity work. Participants suggested that natural sciences utilize
16 different platforms and maintain different norms than humanities scholars and social scientists.
17
18 Librarians also mentioned catering their workshops to specific user populations, including users'
19 disciplines and roles (e.g., doctoral students or faculty).
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In addition to the above themes, six librarians discussed the need first to use digital tools
27 and academic networking sites for scholarly identity before developing and teaching scholarly
28 identity services, despite their colleagues' reservations. For example, L-101 said: "It's hard to
29 teach them effectively if the person teaching doesn't use them themselves. This can be tricky for
30 tools that aren't as used in the library world to see how other people use those services and best
31 teach them."
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Library Support: Ph.D. Student Themes*

41
42 Ph.D. students' perspectives suggested potential library support roles including individual
43 consultations (n=2), orientations to altmetrics and other aspects of an online scholarly landscape
44 (n=2), and help with personal website creation (n=1). These findings suggest that librarians have
45 an opportunity to develop and promote these services to their users. To illustrate the orientation
46 to altmetrics/scholarly landscape theme, P-95 said that she would appreciate help in:
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Creating accounts in Google Scholar and ResearchGate. I wish I had known earlier in
55 my career, maybe when I started my Master's program, it would have been more helpful
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for me to use these tools earlier rather than later. I didn't have my Bachelor's degree here
4 so I had limited ideas about how to disseminate information related to your research.
5 The usage, how to actually use them for your research. I didn't have the knowledge.
6

7
8 *Library Support: Faculty Themes*
9

10 Faculty opinions were similarly dispersed in terms of library support related to scholarly
11 identity work. Faculty members stated that they wanted to learn more about open access (n=3),
12 digital tools (n=2) and copyright (n=3), as illustrated by F-57:
13
14

15
16
17 As I'm preparing to go on my sabbatical and work on a book proposal, I think how
18 difficult it is to navigate the publishing world on the book level. [For] some practices
19 about academia and scholarly work, people are less open about them than they could
20 be...Give me the truth serum they use in Harry Potter. Pull back the curtain on some of
21 the publishing practices.
22

23
24 *The Magic Wand Question*
25

26 The magic wand question was adapted from Cheuk and Dervin (2011) who found it
27 useful to ask participants "If you had a magic wand, what would you like to happen?" (p. 10).
28 Participants were asked to consider if they had a magic wand, what type of help would they most
29 desire with their scholarly identity creation and management? Three themes developed centering
30 on the desire for: (a) mentors or groups of mentors, (b) streamlined technical systems, and (c) a
31 proxy. A small number of both Ph.D. students (n=2) and faculty (n=2) wished for a mentor or
32 group of mentors. This role of mentor, or of convening mentoring groups might be taken on by
33 librarians, although this theme did not appear in their responses. The majority of the librarians
34 (n=6) most desired the ability to designate a proxy who could complete their scholarly identity
35 work (or their users' scholarly identity work). For example, one librarian said she would like
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 "someone who would just keep all of this stuff updated for me all the time" (L-1).
50

51 Across all three groups, participants said that they wanted streamlined technical systems
52 that were more user-friendly and integrated, although there were more librarians (n=6)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mentioning this desire than Ph.D. students (n=3) or faculty (n=4). When discussing a streamlined
4
5 system, librarians specifically desired automatic updates, an all-encompassing platform, social
6
7 networking features, and user-friendly attributes. For example, L-46 said:

8
9
10 Well, what I'd like is a platform that kind of rolls the services LinkedIn offers with the
11 identification ability of ORCID and the ability for it to report out to you for no fee. So
12 that you know who you're connected to, who's looked for you specifically, what searches
13 your name came up in if someone did a search on a topic. And if there's not cost involved
14 because, you know, you said, magic wand.
15

16 17 **DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

18 19 *Benefits and Drawbacks of Scholarly Identity Work*

20
21 RQ1 asked, "What are the perceived opportunities, benefits, drawbacks, and
22
23 challenges of online scholarly identity work use among Ph.D. students, faculty, and academic
24
25 librarians?" The research findings reported here indicate that participants found scholarly
26
27 identity tools to be useful in accomplishing a variety of aims. For example, they used academic
28
29 networking sites to connect with peers, disseminate their research, and share materials with other
30
31 scholars. Though academic librarians helped faculty and Ph.D. students accomplish these aims,
32
33 they also constructed their own scholarly identities to promote their work and communicate with
34
35 others in their field. Overall, participants suggested that maintaining a scholarly identity can
36
37 increase their professional impact.
38
39
40

41
42 Goffman's theoretical framework provided insights into scholarly identity practices
43
44 described by the participants in this study. All participants were found to have engaged in
45
46 impression management strategies to either promote positive face work (Goffman, 1959) or
47
48 avoid negative face threats (Goffman, 1959; 1967). The benefits and drawbacks identified by
49
50 participants suggest that they are aware that their self-presentation on academic networking sites
51
52 may affect how others perceive them. However, despite identifying several advantages of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 scholarly identity work, participants expressed significant confusion of how to select platforms
4 and leverage their advantages, skepticism toward scholarly identity work in general, and
5
6 drawbacks related to for-profit motives of specific scholarly identity platforms and the time
7
8 commitments required for each. Participants discussed several concerns related to impression
9
10 management and face work. Participants also must negotiate with significant face threats that
11
12 accompany scholarly identity activities online and offline. Participants' concern regarding
13
14 context collapse (Marwick and boyd, 2011), for example, may stem from anxiety regarding who
15
16 can see their posts and subsequently judge them. Scholarly identity activities may be risky in this
17
18 and other regards, as participants had to negotiate multiple identities simultaneously while
19
20 determining what may be "professional" versus what may harm their reputations.
21
22
23
24
25

26 The level and manner of concerns varied over the participant groups. Twice as many
27
28 faculty participants as librarian participants voiced concern regarding damage to reputation.
29
30 Faculty participants were also more likely to frame this concern in the hypothetical, such as how
31
32 they imagined use of digital tools and academic networking sites for scholarly identity would
33
34 impact the reputations of their pre-tenure colleagues or how their institutional policy might
35
36 develop regarding scholarly identity. Ph.D. students were more likely to discuss damage to their
37
38 own reputations as opposed to hypothetical scenarios, which may reflect their position relative to
39
40 employed faculty members.
41
42
43

44 As noted by two participants, some individuals may experience scholarly identity work
45
46 differently based on aspects of their identities that intersect with their scholarly pursuits. Broader
47
48 notions of privilege and power come into play regarding gender, race, nationality, and other
49
50 factors that may affect a person's ability to craft an identity that garners respect and positive
51
52 attention. One participant explained:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 I guess one of the things that I've noticed recently was, for example, at a conference that
4 I'm engaged with, almost all the invited keynotes were men. I was getting frustrated
5 because my area has a lot of women, but men tend to get more public-facing
6 presentations. That bothered me on a gender front. There are issues with minorities as
7 well, in terms of the impact of getting keynote lectures and getting an invitation. It can be
8 about who you know. R1 institutions have more money and more travel. People see each
9 other again and again, and naturally think to invite each other to other things. If you don't
10 have funding and power to get away, you're not going to get to the conference and get the
11 invite. So, it's kind of a cycle that feeds on itself that comes from prestige and funding
12 and networking, which all feeds into your scholarly identity (L-11).
13
14
15

16 Beyond these face threats, participants voiced moral and ethical quandaries regarding the closed
17 and for-profit nature of specific digital tools and academic networking sites for scholarly
18 identity.
19
20
21

22 *Academic Librarians and Scholarly Identity Work*

23
24 RQ2 asked, "What, if any, practices do academic librarians engage with to assist Ph.D.
25 students & faculty with managing online scholarly identity work?" There were some
26 commonalities, but also notable differences across the three perspectives of participant groups
27 that librarians should consider when supporting scholarly identity for faculty and Ph.D. students.
28
29 All groups noted that selection of digital tools and academic networking sites for scholarly
30 identity work depends on contextual factors. Librarians, Ph.D. students, and faculty use a variety
31 of tools and academic networking sites to serve different purposes. A participant's role, context,
32 and specific aims influenced tool and academic networking sites selection. Consistently, Twitter
33 and Facebook most commonly were used by approximately three-quarters (n=24) of participants,
34 while more faculty than librarians and Ph.D. students used ResearchGate and Academia.edu in
35 their scholarly identity work. While all librarian participants reported that their institutions
36 offered workshops on scholarly identity and that most supported faculty and Ph.D. students in
37 creating and maintaining their scholarly identity, no more than three participants indicated that
38 they desired assistance related to any sub-theme of suggested areas of academic librarian
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 support. This suggests that librarian support of scholarly identity may not be in developmental
4 stages, as suggested in the literature, but that it is becoming more prevalent, although yet under-
5 reported or that our participant group of communication faculty and Ph.D. students were less
6 aware that librarian support is available. Future studies that include these three groups may
7 suggest whether this is a discipline related phenomenon and how to effectively market librarian
8 support of scholarly identity to these academics. There was agreement across groups that benefits
9 included the ability to connect with other researchers and to disseminate academic activities.
10
11 There was an overall skepticism toward scholarly identity work, most clearly articulated by the
12 librarians who pointed out common drawbacks of time commitment, confusion over which
13 platforms to use and how to best leverage effort, and concern about for-profit motives.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Academic Librarian Strategies for Assisting Scholarly Identity Work*

27
28 RQ3 asked, “How can scholarly identity-related assistance become a more substantial
29 part of academic librarians’ services to Ph.D. students and faculty?” The findings of this study
30 suggest different strategies for librarians to support faculty and Ph.D. student scholarly identity
31 efforts. Faculty specifically requested information on different scholarly identity digital tools and
32 academic networking sites. Scholars also requested information on how to share their published
33 research while respecting copyright law. However, they did not specify how they would want
34 this information presented. Ph.D. students desired orientation to altmetrics, the scholarly
35 landscape, and information on creating personal websites. They also specifically requested
36 individual consultations on these topics. While many of the librarians reported offering
37 workshops and consultations on most of these topics, they did not discuss a differentiation
38 between the content or delivery of this information between faculty and Ph.D. students.
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 One strategy for presenting this information to Ph.D. students would be to introduce them
4
5 to the scholarly landscape, and then compare the benefits and drawbacks of different scholarly
6
7 identity digital tools and academic networking sites. Faculty members have more knowledge of
8
9 the scholarly landscape, and because they have more publications, they may be more aware of
10
11 copyright developments, especially around open access. The issue of open access may be
12
13 especially salient in the current landscape given the attention brought to Elsevier's profit-driven
14
15 practices by the University of California's decision to divorce from their services (Kell, 2019).
16
17 Ph.D. students with publications and faculty may be more receptive to one-on-one consultations
18
19 that offer practical strategies for circumventing barriers, saving time, and maintaining a
20
21 sustainable scholarly identity presence. One librarian offered the following comprehensive
22
23 strategy:
24
25
26
27

28 Find all of your numbers like ORCID, Web of Science, and Thompson, choose an email
29 address on all profiles, a picture on all profiles. Email is something you should check
30 regularly. Have a list of ways your name has appeared in author statements on any
31 publications and a list of all your publications in a citation system like Mendeley or the
32 like. Have a folder with a PDF of every publication, whether publicly available or not.
33 Create a checklist of the order in which you update your profiles whenever you publish
34 something new (L-73).
35
36

37
38 Further studies may yield more nuanced strategies for enhancing scholarly identity and
39
40 for instructing faculty and Ph.D. students in effectively maintaining their scholarly identity. The
41
42 results of this study suggest that in a one-on-one consultation, or possibly group mentoring
43
44 sessions, the librarian can recommend tools concerning the benefits and drawbacks identified in
45
46 this study and related literature. By recommending streamlined strategies, open versus closed or
47
48 for-profit platforms, and suggesting ways to minimize damage to a person's reputation, librarians
49
50 can address the significant concerns with scholarly identity digital tools and academic
51
52 networking sites.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This work is not without limitations, including lack of triangulation for data collection and analysis, as well as a small, self-selected sample exhibiting a lack of diversity in research area (all participants were social scientists), gender, race/ethnicity, geographic location, and disciplinary focus. Future research can address these limitations by conducting additional individual or focus group interviews, or large-scale surveys with researchers from other fields and in other nations to discover potential disciplinary and cultural differences. These investigations could also directly ask participants how academic librarians can support their scholarly identity efforts.

Other factors to be investigated based on research findings include determining the connection between scholarly identity practices and perceptions of quality scholarship (e.g., for tenure and promotion decisions), investigating in further detail scholarly identity barriers with a particular focus on those shaped by face work and impression management concerns, and exploring avenues for how academic librarians can provide enhanced services based on their specialized knowledge. The next phase of this work seeks to identify sustainable and ethical practices and strategies to establish and maintain scholarly identity (see also omitted for blind review) and to explore what practices are in use through analysis of academic networking sites posts.

A concurrent rise in social media use and push to engage in self-promotion of one's scholarship among academics has led to a new landscape from which to examine how academics disseminate research. Although researchers and librarians identify significant benefits and opportunities to engaging in maintenance of a scholarly identity presence, especially in virtual environments, it is irresponsible to promote scholarly identity digital tools and academic

1
2
3 networking sites without considering their potential drawbacks and challenges. This research has
4
5 taken the first step to clarify some of these drawbacks and challenges within the context of
6
7 developing scholarly identity digital tools and academic networking sites to help researchers
8
9 make informed and ethical decisions when seeking to increase their impact and reputation online.
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

Journal of Documentation

Gender	N	Race/Ethnicity	N	Age	N
Female	20	Caucasian/White	19	26-34	16
Male	9	African American/Black	3	35-44	5
Nonbinary	1	Asian	3	45-54	3
		Hispanic	2	55-64	3
		White/Latinx	1	65+	3
		Unknown	2		

Table 1. Participant demographics

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

Academic networking sites	N
Twitter	23
Facebook	22
ResearchGate	20
Instagram	19
Academia.edu	18
ORCID	15

Table 2. Participants' most frequently used academic networking sites

Journal of Documentation

REFERENCES

- Akers, K.G., Sarkozy, A., Wu, W., & Slyman, A. (2016), "ORCID author identifiers: A primer for librarians", *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, Vol. 35, no. 2: pp. 135-44.
- Bareket-Bojmel, L., Moran, S., & Shahar, G. (2016), "Strategic self-presentation on Facebook: Personal motives and audience response to online behavior", *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol 55: pp. 788-795.
- Batenburg, A., & Bartels, J. (2017), "Keeping up online appearances: How self-disclosure on Facebook affects perceived respect and likeability in the professional context", *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 74: pp. 265-76.
- Bazarova, N.N., & Choi, Y.H. (2014), "Self-disclosure in social media: Extending the functional approach to disclosure motivations and characteristics on social network sites", *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 64, no. 4: pp. 635-657.
- Bond, S. (2017, January 23), "Dear scholars, delete your account at Academia.edu", *Forbes Magazine*, available at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/drsarahbond/2017/01/23/dear-scholars-delete-your-account-at-academia-edu/#9248f722d628>
- Brigham, T.J. (2016), "Online professional profiles: Health care and library researchers show off their work", *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, Vol. 35, no. 4: pp. 440-48.
- Budge, K., Lemon, N., & McPherson, M. (2016), "Academics who tweet: 'Messy' identities in academia", *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 8, no. 2: pp. 210-221.
- Buffardi, L.E., & Campbell, W.K. (2008), "Narcissism and social networking web sites", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol, 34: pp. 1303-1314.
- Charmaz, K. (2014), *Constructing Grounded Theory* (2nd ed.). Sage: Los Angeles, CA.

- 1
2
3 Cheuk, B. & Dervin, B. (2011), "Leadership 2.0 in action: A journey from knowledge
4 management to 'knowledging'", *Knowledge Management & E-Learning: An*
5
6 *International Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 2: pp. 119-138.
7
8
9
- 10 Chiang, J. K. H., & Suen, H.Y. (2015), "Self-presentation and hiring recommendations in online
11 communities: Lessons from LinkedIn", *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 48: pp. 516-
12
13 524.
14
15
- 16 Choo, E.K., Ranney, M.L., Chan, T.M., Trueger, S., Walsh, A.E., Tegtmeyer, K., McNamara,
17
18 S.O., Choi, R.Y., & Carroll, C.L. (2015), "Twitter as a tool for communication and
19 knowledge exchange in academic medicine: A guide for skeptics and novices", *Medical*
20
21 *Teacher*, Vol. 37, No. 5: pp. 411-416.
22
23
24
- 25 Collins, K., Shiffman, D., & Rock, J. (2016), "How are scientists using social media in the
26 workplace?", *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 11, No. 10: doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0162680
27
28
29
- 30 Costello, K.L., & Priem, J. (2011), "Archiving scholars' tweets", Presented at the Annual
31
32 Conference of the Society of American Archivists, Chicago, IL, August 22-25, 2011.
33
34
- 35 Côté, I. M., & Darling, E. S. (2018), "Scientists on Twitter: Preaching to the choir or singing
36 from the rooftops?", *FACETS*, Vol. 3: pp. 682-694.
37
38
39
- 40 Dervin, B. (1983), "An overview of sense-making research: Concepts, methods, and results",
41
42 paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association,
43
44 May, Dallas, TX, available at:
45
46
47 <https://faculty.washington.edu/wpratt/MEBI598/Methods/An%20Overview%20of%20Sense-Making%20Research%201983a.htm>
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Duffy, B.E. & Pooley, J.D. (2017), “‘Facebook for academics’: The convergence of self-
4 branding and social media logic on Academia.edu”, *Social Media and Society*, Vol. 3,
5 No. 1: pp. 1-11.
6
7
8
9
10 Eysenbach, G. (2011), “Can tweets predict citations? Metrics of social impact based on Twitter
11 and correlation with traditional metrics of scientific impact”, *Journal of Medical Internet*
12 *Research*, Vol, 13, No. 4: available at: <http://www.jmir.org/2011/4/e123/>
13
14
15
16
17 File, C. (2018), *Impression Formation and Identity Management in Social Media*. (Unpublished
18 doctoral dissertation). Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick,
19 New Jersey.
20
21
22
23
24 Fitzpatrick, K. (2015), “Academia, not edu”, available at:
25
26 <http://www.plannedobsolescence.net/academic-not-edu>
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Flanagan, J.C. (1954), “The critical incident technique”, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 54, No. 4:
34 pp. 327-358.
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
- Gilbert, S., & Paulin, D. (2015), “Tweet to learn: Expertise and centrality in conference Twitter networks”, Presented at the 48th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Kauai, HI, January 5-8, 2015.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Aldine: Chicago, IL.
- Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Doubleday: New York, NY.
- Goffman, E. (1967), *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face-to-Face Behavior*. Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick, NJ.

- 1
2
3 Greifeneder, E., Points, S., Blanford, A., Attalla, H., Neal, D., & Schlebbe, K. (2017),
4
5 “Researchers’ attitudes towards the use of social networking sites”, *Journal of*
6
7 *Documentation*, Vol. 74, No. 1: pp. 119-136.
8
9
- 10 Graham, S., Lee, D.J., Radio, E., & Tarver, H. (2018), “‘Who is this?:’ Moving from authority
11
12 control to identity management.” *AALL Spectrum*, Vol. 22, No. 5: pp. 24-27.
13
14
- 15 Hall, G. (2015), “Does Academia.edu mean open access is becoming irrelevant?”, available at:
16
17 [http://www.garyhall.info/journal/2015/10/18/does-academiaedu-mean-open-access-is-](http://www.garyhall.info/journal/2015/10/18/does-academiaedu-mean-open-access-is-becoming-irrelevant.html)
18
19 [becoming-irrelevant.html](http://www.garyhall.info/journal/2015/10/18/does-academiaedu-mean-open-access-is-becoming-irrelevant.html)
20
21
- 22 Hammarfelt, B., de Rijcke, S., & Rushforth, A. D. (2016), “Quantified academic selves: The
23
24 gamification of research through social networking services”, *Information Research*, Vol.
25
26 21, No. 2, available at: <http://www.informationr.net/ir/21-2/SM1.html#.Wo14XGaZPUo>
27
28
- 29 Haustein, S., Peters, I., Bar-Ilan, J., Priem, J., Shema, H., & Terliesner, J. (2014a), “Coverage
30
31 and adoption of altmetrics sources in the bibliometric community”, *Scientometrics*, Vol.
32
33 101: pp. 1145-1163.
34
- 35 Haustein, S., Peters, I., Sugimoto, C. R., Thelwall, M., & Larivé, V. (2014b), “Tweeting
36
37 biomedicine: An analysis of tweets and citations in the biomedical literature”, *Journal of*
38
39 *the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 65, No. 4: pp. 656-669.
40
41
- 42 Huws, U. (2014), *The Cybertariat Comes of Age*. Monthly Review Press: New York, NY.
43
44
- 45 Jackson, M.D., & Spencer, S. (2017), “Engaging for a good cause: Sophia’s story and why
46
47 #BugsR4Girls”, *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, Vol. 110, No. 5: pp.
48
49 439-448.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ke, Q., Ahn, Y., & Sugimoto, C.R. (2017), "A systematic identification and analysis of scientists
4 on Twitter" *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 12, No. 4, available at:
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175368>
7
8
9
10 Kell, G. (2019). "Why UC split with publishing giant Elsevier", *University of California News*,
11 available at: [https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/why-uc-split-publishing-giant-](https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/why-uc-split-publishing-giant-elsevier)
12
13
14
15
16
17 Kjelberg, S., Haider, J., & Sundin, O. (2016), "Researchers' use of social network sites: A
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
- Logghe, H.J., Selby, L.V., Boek, M.A., Stamp, N.L., Chuen, J., & Jones, C. (2018), "The academic tweet: Twitter as a tool to advance academic surgery", *Journal of Surgical Research*, Vol. 226: pp. vii-xii.
- Marwick, A.E., & boyd, D. (2011), "I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience", *New Media and Society*, Vol. 13, No. 1: pp. 114-133.
- Megwalu, A. (2015), ResearchGate: An academic social networking site. *The Charleston Advisor*, Vol. 17, No. 1: pp. 47-51.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994), *Quantitative Data analysis: A Sourcebook*. Sage: Beverley Hills.
- Mikitish, S. (2017), *Information Engagement: How Social Science Doctoral Students Seek, Filter, Access, and Organize Information* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

- 1
2
3 Moberly, H.K., Lee, D.J., Kessler, M.D., & Carrigan, E.E. (2018), "Supporting the next
4 generation of Texas A&M University scholars", *Library Management*, Vol. 39, No. 8/9:
5 pp. 597-604.
6
7
8
9
- 10 Nabout, J.C., Teresa, F.B., Machado, K.B., Menonça do Prado, V.H., Bini, L.M., & Diniz-Filho,
11 J.A.F. (2018), "Do traditional scientometric indicators predict social media activity on
12 scientific knowledge? An analysis of the ecological literature", *Scientometrics*, Vol. 115:
13 pp. 1007-1015.
14
15
16
17
18
- 19 Nández, G., & Borrego, À. (2012), "Use of social networks for academic purposes: A case
20 study", *The Electronic Library*, Vol. 31, No. 6: pp. 781-791.
21
22
23
- 24 Newson, J. & Menzies, H. (2005), "Findings from the time, technology and academic work
25 study", Presented at the Gender, Work and Organization Conference, Keele University,
26 UK, June 22–24, 2005.
27
28
29
30
- 31 Nicholas, D., Herman, E., Jamili, H., Rodríguez-Bravo, B., Boukacem-Zeghmouri, C.,
32 Dobrowolski, T., & Pouchot, S. (2015), "New ways of building, showcasing, and
33 measuring scholarly reputation", *Learned Publishing*, Vol. 28: 169-183.
34
35
36
37
- 38 Ogunbeni, J. I., Obiamalu, A. R., Ssemambo, S., & Bazibu, C. M. (2018), "The roles of
39 academic libraries in propagating open science: A qualitative literature review",
40 *Information Development*, Vol. 34, No. 2: pp. 113-121.
41
42
43
44
- 45 ORCID. (2020), About ORCID, available at: <https://orcid.org/about/what-is-orcid/mission>
46
- 47 Ortega, J.L. (2015a), "Disciplinary differences in the use of academic social networking sites",
48 *Online Information Review*, Vol. 39, No. 4: 520-536.
49
50
- 51 Ortega, J.L. (2015b), "Relationship between altmetrics and bibliometric indicators across
52 academic sites: The case of CSIC's members", *Journal of Infometrics*, Vol. 9: pp. 39-49.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ovadia, S. (2014), "ResearchGate and Academia.edu: Academic social networks", *Behavioral &*
4
5 *Social Sciences Librarian*, Vol. 33, No. 3: pp. 165-69.
6
7
8 Priem, J., & Costello, K.L. (2010), "How and why scholars cite on Twitter", in *Proceedings of*
9
10 *the Association for Information Science and Technology Annual Meeting, Pittsburg, PA,*
11
12 *2010*, Association for Information Science and Technology, Silver Spring, MD.
13
14
15 Panahi, S., Watson, J., & Partridge, H. (2016), "Information encountering on social media and
16
17 tacit knowledge sharing", *Journal of Information Science*, Vol. 42, No. 4: pp. 539-550.
18
19
20 Radford, M.L. & Radford G.P. (2017), *Library Conversations: Applying Interpersonal*
21
22 *Communication Theory in Face-to-Face and Virtual Contexts*. ALA Editions: Chicago.
23
24
25 Radford, M.L., Radford, G.P., Connaway, L.S. & DeAngelis, J.A. (2011), "On virtual face-work:
26
27 An ethnography of communication approach to a live chat reference interaction", *The*
28
29 *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 81, No. 4: pp. 431-453.
30
31
32 Reed, K., McFarland, D., & Croft, R. (2016), "Laying the groundwork for a new library service:
33
34 Scholar-practitioner & graduate student attitudes toward altmetrics and the curation of
35
36 online profiles", *Evidence-Based Library and Information Practice*, Vol. 11, No. 2:
37
38 pp. 87-96.
39
40
41 Robinson-Garcia, N., Costas, R., Isett, K., Melkers, J., & Hicks, D. (2017), "The unbearable
42
43 emptiness of tweeting—About journal articles", *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 12, No. 8, available at:
44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0183551>
46
47
48 Ruff, C. (2016), "Scholars criticize Academia.edu proposal to charge authors for
49
50 recommendations", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, available at:
51
52 <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Scholars-Criticize/235102>
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Schmitt, M., & Jäschke, R. (2017), "What do computer scientists tweet? Analyzing the link-
4 sharing practice on Twitter", *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 12, No. 6, available at:

5
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179630>

8
9
10 Shehata, A., Ellis, D., & Foster, A.E. (2017), "Changing styles of informal academic
11 communication in the age of the web: Orthodox, moderate and heterodox responses",
12
13
14
15 *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 73, No. 5: pp. 825-842.

16
17 Sugimoto, C.R., Wok, S., Larvière, V., & Haustein, S. (2017), "Scholarly use of social media
18 and altmetrics: A review of the literature", *Journal of the Association for Information
19 Science and Technology*, Vol. 68, No. 9: pp. 2037-2062.

20
21
22
23
24 Thelwall, M. & Kousha, K. (2014), "Academia.edu: Social network or academic network?",
25
26
27
28
29
30 *Journal of the Association for Information Science & Technology*, Vol. 65, No. 4: pp.
721-731.

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
Wexler, E. (2015), "As Academic.edu grows, some scholars voice concerns", *The Chronicle of
Higher Education*, available at: [https://www.chronicle.com/article/As-Academiaedu-
Grows-Some/234414](https://www.chronicle.com/article/As-Academiaedu-Grows-Some/234414)

Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B.M. (2005), "Qualitative analysis of content", *Analysis*, Vol.1, No. 2:
pp. 1-12.

Appendix A: Interview Guide

We are interested in finding out more about your thoughts on the information practices and strategies you use to create and manage your scholarly identity. These practices and strategies include academic endeavors that allow you to promote a personal brand, build your reputation, and increase the impact of your research.

1. What does the term “scholarly identity” mean to you?
2. What does the term “scholarly impact” mean to you?
3. What do you think is the difference between these two terms?
4. What is the relationship between a scholar’s identity and their impact?
5. How has this relationship changed over time with the advent of new digital tools (such as ResearchGate, Academia.edu, etc.)?
6. How important is it to you to create and maintain your scholarly identity or personal brand? Why does it have this level of importance?
Probe, if not mentioned... How important do you think creating and maintaining a scholarly identity is to getting a job [for grad students] or getting tenure and promotion [for faculty members]?
7. [for more senior faculty members] How do you feel that expectations [from deans, chairs, mentors] have changed over time regarding creation and maintenance of scholarly identity?
8. What information practices and strategies do you engage in when creating and maintaining your scholarly identity?
9. Tell me about your use of social networking sites (SNS), such as ResearchGate, Twitter, Academia.edu, particularly regarding creating and cultivating your scholarly identity.

Probe, if not mentioned: What digital tools or resources do you use for measuring and increasing your scholarly identity?

Probe, if doesn’t use...

Tell me what would assist you in getting started with SNS for developing your scholarly identity?

Tell me what has prevented or stopped you from using SNS for developing your scholarly identity? (skip to question 15)

10. What barriers have you experienced (if any) regarding the use of social networking sites or digital platforms to create and manage your scholarly identity? How could those barriers be alleviated?

1
2
3 11. How much time and effort would you say you devote to behaviors and activities related to the
4 cultivation of your scholarly identity?
5

6 Probe, for heavy users of sites like Research Gate... How, if at all, have you changed
7 your research or publication practices based on thing you have learned about your
8 scholarly performance by using these sites?
9

10
11 12. Recall and describe a time, within the past six months, that you engaged in activities that you
12 felt were successful in creating or cultivating your scholarly identity? What stands out to you that
13 made this successful?
14

15 13. Recall and describe a time, within the past six months, that you engaged in activities that you
16 felt were unsuccessful in creating or cultivating your scholarly identity? What stands out to you
17 that made this unsuccessful?
18

19 14. Describe any help you have had in creating or cultivating your scholarly identity.
20

21 Probe...

22 Who provided this help?
23
24

25 15. If you had a magic wand and could have any type of help to create or manage your scholarly
26 identity, what would this help look like?
27

28 16. What other thoughts do you have on the topic of developing your scholarly identity that we
29 have not yet covered?
30

31 17. What other thoughts do you have on the topic of developing services relating to creating and
32 managing scholarly identity for yourself that we have not yet covered?
33

34 [Additional questions for librarians]
35
36

37 1. What is your view of current information practices for faculty, students, and librarians in
38 creating and managing their scholarly identities? Why do you hold this view?
39

40 2. What information practices and strategies do you engage in when helping doctoral students and
41 faculty to create and manage their scholarly identity?
42

43 Probe...

44 What tools or resources do you use for measuring, increasing, and communicating their
45 scholarly identity?
46
47

48 3. Describe any help that your library provides to faculty or doctoral students who are looking to
49 create or manage their scholarly identity?
50

51 4. (If none or minimal) What has prevented or stopped your library from providing (or providing
52 more, if minimal) services to faculty and doctoral students regarding creating and managing their
53 scholarly identity?
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 5. What would assist your library in getting started in providing services (or in providing more
4 service) to faculty and doctoral students regarding creating and managing their scholarly identity?
5

6 6. Now, turning to yourself as a scholar/researcher. How important is it to you to create and manage
7 your scholarly identity or personal brand? Why does it have this level of importance for you?
8

9 7. What information practices and strategies do you engage in when creating and managing your
10 scholarly identity?
11

12 Probe...

13
14 What tools or resources do you use for measuring, increasing, and communicating your
15 scholarly identity?
16

17
18 8. If you had a magic wand and could create any service that would help faculty, doctoral students,
19 or yourself, regarding creating and managing scholarly identity, what would that look like?
20

21 9. What benefits, if any, do you see for a service of this type?
22

23 Probe, if not addressed... benefits to you, your library, your college or university, your
24 faculty and doctoral students
25

26 10. What drawbacks, if any, do you see for a service of this type?
27

28 Probe, if not addressed: drawbacks to you, your library, your college or university,
29 your faculty and doctoral students
30

31 11. What other thoughts do you have on the topic of developing services relating to creating and
32 managing scholarly identity for yourself, faculty, and/or doctoral students that we have not yet
33 covered?
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

Appendix B: Codebook

Code	Emic/Etic Code	Definition
1	User characteristics	
1.1	<u>Librarian</u>	
1.1.1	<i>Tenure track librarian</i>	
1.1.2	<i>Non-tenure track librarian</i>	
1.2	<u>Faculty</u>	
1.2.1	<i>Full Professor</i>	
1.2.2	<i>Associate Professor</i>	
1.2.3	<i>Assistant Professor</i>	
1.2.4	<i>University</i>	
1.2.5	<i>Four-year college</i>	
1.2.6	<i>Other</i>	
1.3	<u>Doctoral Student</u>	
1.3.1	<i>Coursework</i>	
1.3.2	<i>Post-coursework</i>	
2	General uptake	“Understanding who is using the tools and what tools are used” (Kjellberg, Haider, Sundin, 2016, p. 225)
2.1	<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>	Participant indicates that institutional characteristics in some way shape their choice of tools to cultivate a scholarly identity. Emic (Radford et al.)
2.2	<u>Types of People</u>	Types of people that influence person’s choice of tools to cultivate a scholarly identity. Emic (Radford et al.)
2.2.1	<i>Librarians</i>	
2.2.2	<i>Faculty</i>	
2.2.3	<i>Doctoral students</i>	
2.2.4	<i>Other</i>	
3	Specific tools & cases	“Examining one particular tool” (Kjellberg, et al., 2016, p. 225)
3.1	<u>Scholarly Reputation Platforms</u>	“Either social networking websites or sites that utilize social media, usually as part of a broader portfolio of services, to build, promote, and measure reputation.” (Nicholas et al., 2015, p. 171)
3.1.1	<i>Multidisciplinary social networking platforms</i>	Examples: ResearchGate, Academia.edu (Nicholas et al., 2015, p. 171)
3.1.1.1	<i>ResearchGate</i>	
3.1.1.2	<i>Academia.edu</i>	
3.1.1.3	<i>Google Scholar</i>	
3.1.1.4	<i>Microsoft Academic</i>	
3.1.1.5	<i>ORCID</i>	
3.2	<u>SNS/SRM</u>	“social network sites/social reference managers” (Kjellberg, et al., 2016, p. 225)

3.2.1	<i>Professional SNS platforms</i>	Example: LinkedIn (Nicholas et al., 2015, p. 171)
3.2.1.1	LinkedIn	
3.2.2	<i>Microblogging</i>	(Kjellberg, et al., 2016)
3.2.2.1	Twitter	
3.2.2.2	Tumblr	
3.2.3	<i>Other SNS Platforms</i>	(Kjellberg, et al., 2016)
3.2.3.1	Facebook	
3.2.3.2	Instagram	
3.2.3.3	Snapchat	
3.2.4	<i>Blogs</i>	(Kjellberg, et al., 2016)
3.3	<i>Websites</i>	
3.3.1	<i>Personal website</i>	
3.3.2	<i>Departmental website</i>	
3.4	<i>Institution specific resources/repositories</i>	
3.4.1	<i>Open access repositories</i>	
3.4.2	<i>LibGuides</i>	
4	Assessing impact	“Using traces from digital tools for impact measures” (Kjellberg, et al., 2016, p. 225)
4.1	<i>Using Analytics/Altmetrics</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
5	Motivations & Benefits of Using Online Technologies to Create, Cultivate, & Maintain Scholarly Identity	“Practices & new modes of communication- Understanding digital communication practices by researchers.” (Kjellberg, et al., 2016, p. 225)
5.1	<i>Connect with other researchers (e.g., meeting researchers, following their activities,</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 786)
5.2	<i>Disseminate academic activities including papers published, CV, teaching materials, etc.</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 788)
5.3	<i>Follow other researcher’s activities</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 786)
5.4	<i>Signed up because other researchers from the department/faculty are there</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 786)
5.5	<i>Signed up because other researchers of interest are there</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)

5.6	<i>Find collaborators for research projects</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 786)
5.7	<i>Search for a job</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 786)
5.8	<i>Facilitate getting a job</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
5.9	<i>Facilitate getting tenure/promotion</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
5.10	<i>Join or participate in professional/scholarly communities (e.g., professional/scholarly organizations)</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
5.11	<i>To assist with teaching</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
5.12	<i>Access conferences, academic opportunities, resources, etc.</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
5.13	<i>Collaborate with research projects and teams</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 788)
5.14	<i>Increase citations</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, 788)
5.15	<i>Edit materials quickly and easily</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 788)
5.16	<i>Share/exchange materials with other researchers (e.g., crowdsourcing)</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 788)
5.17	<i>Improve time management</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 788)
5.18	<i>Be up to date</i>	(Nández & Borrego, 2012, p. 788)
5.19	<i>Outreach</i>	“Opening the door to science/research outside academia” (Kjellberg, et al., 2016, p. 225)
5.20	<i>Share open access materials</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
5.21	<i>Increase impact</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
5.22	<i>Minimizing role insecurity</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
5.23	<i>Other</i>	
6	No Perceived Need to Create, Cultivate, & Maintain Online Scholarly Identity	Emic (Radford et al.)
7	Downsides/Drawbacks of SI Practices	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.1	<i>Time constraints</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.2	<i>For-profit use</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.3	<i>Confusion</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)

7.4	<u>Heightened competition with colleagues</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.5	<u>Too much effort for too little reward</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.6	<u>Too self-promoting</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.7	<u>Context collapse</u>	(Marwick & boyd, 2011)
7.8	<u>Not all scholars are using or can use these sites</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.9	<u>May detract from interacting with people offline</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.10	<u>Contributes to role insecurity</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.11	<u>Privacy, surveillance, tracking concerns</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.12	<u>Nuisance/annoying</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.12.1	<u>Constant reminders and messages</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.12.2	<u>Pressure to update</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.12.3	<u>Tracking passwords and usernames</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
7.13	<u>Concern over damage to professional/personal reputation</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
8	SI Practices – Library Service/Roles & Potential Opportunities for Library Service/Roles	<p>“Ways in which librarians can support scholar-practitioners and graduate students with profile and altmetrics tools” (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 92). Note: Scholar-practitioners are primarily teaching faculty</p> <p>SI services that librarians are providing or could provide to users. Emic (Radford et al.)</p>
8.1	<u>Offer individual consultation</u>	Emic (Radford et al). Suggestion to offer services that are “highly personalized in nature” beyond LibGuides and other general resources on altmetrics and scholarly profiles (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 92)
8.2	<u>Offer workshop</u>	Emic (Radford et al)
8.3	<u>Organize conference</u>	Emic (Radford et al)
8.4	<u>Establish goal</u>	“Librarians can highlight the opportunities and strengths afforded by various tools, and recommend particular services based on the goal of individuals” (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 92).
8.5	<u>Tools</u>	“One of the main places where librarians can assist scholar-practitioners and students...is to go over the

		tools available and to make recommendations” (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 92).
8.6	<i>Orientation to the altmetrics and scholarly promotion landscape</i>	“Education and guidance on specific actions to take and tools to use... encouraging users in developing nuanced perceptions of social media” (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 92).
8.7	<i>Preparing users for the tough times</i>	“Making users aware of the potential downside of engaging with profile tools should be a part of any service the library provides” (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 93).
8.8	<i>Copyright</i>	“Librarians can assist by educating about Creative Commons resources and models enhancing copyright awareness on campus and reviewing work that individuals wish to release to the public” (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 93).
8.9	<i>Packaging content</i>	“Librarians can help scholar-practitioners and graduate students to identify their audience segments and to present work in ways that are most suitable for various forums” (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 93).
8.10	<i>Open Access (OA) education</i>	“Librarians may assist scholar-practitioners to assert their author rights with publishers in order to re-publish content in OA form, as well as provide education on suitable OA repositories” (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 93-94).
8.11	<i>Promoting new service</i>	“Aside from direct contact with people whose work is already represented online, librarians can approach scholar-practitioners who are working on research projects – particularly those who are in the planning stages” (Reed, McFarland, & Croft, 2016, p. 94).
8.12	<i>How to create a personal website</i>	Emic (Radford et al.)
9	Theoretical Codes – Goffman Impression Management	“Impression management is performed when an individual controls information about the self to influence the impression that is formed about them in the minds of others” (Goffman, 1959; Batenburg & Barties, 2017).
9.1	<i>Impression Management via SNS</i>	“Social media seem a perfect place for impression management: the information one shares online is easier to control (i.e., the a-synchronous nature of social media gives individuals time to think about what they want to share) than the information one reveals during interpersonal interactions” (Batenburg, & Barties, 2017, p. 266)
9.2	<i>Reasons to present oneself</i>	

9.2.1	<i>Relational development</i>	“Relational development disclosure seeks to increase relational intimacy and closeness with another person” (Bazarova & Choi, 2014, p. 638).
9.2.2	<i>Social control</i>	“Social control disclosure is used to strategically share information about self in an effort to control social outcomes and resources such as information or social benefits” (Bazarova & Choi, 2014, p. 638).
9.2.3	<i>Identity clarification</i>	“Identity clarification disclosure conveys information about one’s identity and defines one’s position for self and others” (Bazarova & Choi, 2014, p. 638).
9.2.4	<i>Self-enhancement</i>	Idealizing the self, which research shows may have little effect or negative effects on others’ perception, despite popular discourse (Back et al., 2010)
9.2.4.1	<u>Motivation for performance goals</u> (Bareket-Bojmel et al., 2016)	Individuals are concerned with demonstrating their competence relative to others (Bareket-Bojmel et al., 2016, p. 789)
9.3	<u>How oneself is perceived by others</u>	The effects of SNS self-presentation on someone’s reputation (Batenburg & Barties, 2017, p. 266)
9.3.1	<i>Positive self-enhancement</i>	The desire to increase the positivity and decrease the negativity of self-views (Bareket-Bojmel et al., 2016, p. 789)
9.3.2	<i>Positive professionalism</i>	When individuals display family values or professionalism, positive perception, including chances of being offered a job, may increase (Chiang & Suen, 2015; Batenburg & Barties, 2017, p. 267)
9.3.3	<i>Negative professionalism</i>	
9.3.3.1	<u>Overpromotion</u>	Being entirely open and honest may not be the best way to impress a professional acquaintance (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008; Batenburg & Barties, 2017, p. 267); Emphasizing SNS presence over scholarly record (Emic, Radford et al.); Overshare (Emic, Radford et al.)
9.3.3.2	<u>Posting Inappropriate material</u>	Posting inappropriate material, such as alcohol and drug use, can have negative effects, including decreased chances of being offered a job (Chiang & Suen, 2015; Batenburg & Barties, 2017, p. 267)
9.4	<u>Negotiating multiple identities simultaneously</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
9.5	<u>Role insecurity (e.g., imposter syndrome)</u>	Emic (Radford et al.)
9.6	<u>Risking face threat</u>	Concern over publicly suffering a diminished self-image (Goffman, 1967)

10	Magic Wand	Use this code for participants' responses to the "magic wand" question regarding desired tools and resources for SI management.
10.1	<i><u>Mentor or group of mentors</u></i>	Desire for a human actor or group actors (e.g., colleagues, cohort members) to assist with learning and maintaining SI practices (Emic, Radford et al.)
10.2	<i><u>Proxy</u></i>	Desire for a human actor or group of actors to complete and manage a person's SI work for them (Emic, Radford et al.)
10.3	<i><u>Streamlined Technical System</u></i>	Desire for a user-friendly and cohesive platform that offers a variety of affordances (Emic, Radford et al.)
10.3.1	<i><u>Automatic updates</u></i>	
10.3.2	<i><u>Cohesive/All-encompassing</u></i>	
10.3.3	<i><u>Social networking features</u></i>	
10.3.4	<i><u>User-friendly</u></i>	
10.4	<i><u>More resources for SI work</u></i>	Desire for more and more acceptable resources for SI work, e.g. time and money (Emic; Radford et al.)
10.5	<i><u>Transparency</u></i>	Desire to understand purveyors'/vendors' practices and motivations (Emic, Radford et al.)
10.6	<i><u>Improved personal record</u></i>	Desire to bolster or improve activities that build SI and are reported with digital tools, such as number of publications and conference attendance (Emic, Radford et al.)
10.7	<i><u>Other</u></i>	
JQ	Juicy Quote	Use this code for excellent examples for other codes