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Scholarly Profiles on Academic Network Sites

- ResearchGate
- academia.edu
- Google Scholar
- RESEARCHERID
- ORCID

What are they about?
Who actually joins them?
Which are most popular?
What features are offered?
Our investigation has been inspired by

- The University of Utrecht library webpage about profiling services, authored by Bosman and Kramer

We wanted

• To learn about the systems
• To decide, whether to offer our scholars support

• Luckily, we
  – Had necessary competences in house
  – Were given the opportunity to carry out the investigation
Data retrieval and methodology

• Automated harvesting
  – Based on queries containing institutional affiliation
  – Presumes that our researchers have stated their address on the sites

• Cleansing and dedublication of profiles
  – Based on author names
  – Based on an authoritative name list, available in CRISTin, the Current Research Information System in Norway
    • This list is restricted to researchers who authored a scientific publication (2010-2014), and does not include all employees and students at the University of Bergen.
Number of profiles

4307 publishing researchers (CRIS)

1593 with at least one profile (37%)

1 profile - 77%

2 profiles - 17%

5% + 1 researcher with five profiles
Venndiagrams visualizing size and overlap of profiles between the different network sites.

- Academia (ACA)
- ResearchGate (RG)
- ResearcherID (RID)
- ORCID
- GoogleScholar (GS)
### Who is using the platforms? – distribution by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Total (independent of age)</th>
<th>&lt;35</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>&gt;64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORCID</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RID</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who is using the platforms? - distribution by position.

Percentages are given relative to number of researchers within the same position.
Who is using the platforms? - distribution by gender.

Relative low attendance of women.
## Who is using platforms? - distribution by faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other units</th>
<th>HUM</th>
<th>LAW</th>
<th>MNT</th>
<th>MED</th>
<th>PSY</th>
<th>SSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RID</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one profile</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Law-members not on these platforms
Hum-members preferable on ACA
Academic network sites and available parameters
Parameters retrieved from the five different sites and CRIStin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>H-index</th>
<th>Publication score</th>
<th>Social activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIStin</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ProfileViews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Downloads</td>
<td>ProfileViews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RGScore</td>
<td>Followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ImpactPoints</td>
<td>Following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationViews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parameters grouped by type of indicator

- Bibliometric indicators
  - CRISTin_publications
  - RID_publications
  - ORCID_publications
  - GS_publications
  - ACA_publications
  - RG_publications
  - RID_citations
  - GS_citations
  - RG_citations
  - RID_hindex
  - GS_hindex

- Publication scores
  - RG_downloads
  - RG_Score
  - RG_ImpactPoints
  - RG_pubViews
  - ACA_profileViews
  - RG_profileViews

- Social activity
  - ACA_followers
  - RG_followers
  - ACA_following
  - RG_following
Number of publications in CRISTin
- Are strongly correlated with number of publications in the other services (except ORCID) and parameters under publication scores. ORCID is only used to create an ID, not to provide a list of publications.
- Are weakly correlated with social activity parameters.
Number of citations, h-indexes and downloads correlate strongly across services.
Thoughts about using available indicators in an evaluation context

• Even though the traditional bibliometric parameters seem to correlate well across services, content is far from complete and reliable.

• Data quality is doubtable
  – Profiles are semi-automatically fabricated, and author recognition might fail.
  – Manipulation is possible.

• We learned that social indicators (altmetrics) can’t be used as proxies for traditional indicators. Social indicators express something different.
Finally

• We believe that it is important that the library has knowledge about these services and provides assistance.

• We advise researchers to check and control their digital presence.

• We learned
  – That much of the scholarly literature is visible and available through these sites. They seem to play the role of library portals.

  – That about 40% of our researchers are there.