



# “People Need a Strategy:”

## Exploring Attitudes of and Support Roles for Scholarly Identity Work Among Academic Librarians

*Marie L. Radford, Vanessa Kitzie, Stephanie Mikitish, Diana Floegel, and Lynn Silipigni Connaway\**

Academics are increasingly using a variety of digital platforms, including social networking sites (SNS), to create and manage their scholarly identities (SI). Profiles on SI platforms can promote academics’ professional reputations and increase research impact.<sup>1</sup> Among the most popular platforms are Academia.edu, with 72+ million members<sup>2</sup> and ResearchGate, with 15+ million members.<sup>3</sup> Academics who do not actively use these tools still have online profiles manually created by sites like Google Scholar where their work is discoverable and accessible. As a result, academic identities are increasingly “bound up in how you appear” on SI platforms, and there is an increased need among academics to navigate and control a “blurring of workflow, outputs, and identity” about themselves.<sup>4</sup> However, academics face several challenges related to SI management, including concerns over the quality and credibility of the work available on the sites,<sup>5</sup> the practice among certain platforms of selling user information,<sup>6</sup> and misrepresentation of scholarly accomplishments due to poorly maintained profiles and misattributions of work to authors with similar names.<sup>7</sup> Based on their existing skillsets, academic librarians are uniquely poised to address these challenges, and some have already begun to do so.<sup>8</sup> While work exists that documents practical challenges of, and strategies for, SI management, it tends to be practical, rather than empirical, and it considers academic librarians and academics separately. Informed by semi-structured interviews with 30 faculty members, PhD students, and academic librarians, this research addresses these gaps by comparing how academic librarians respond to the challenges of their SI management and that of their users’. Findings identify current SI strategies and challenges, and inform suggestions for how academic librarians can increase SI support across platforms.

### **Literature Review: SI Purposes, Tools, and Use**

The purpose and uses of SI platforms have changed over the last decade. These platforms include academic social networks,<sup>9</sup> scholarly or other types of social media sites,<sup>10</sup> and SNS.<sup>11</sup> Some provide functions that can be used on multiple sites, such as the Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID) registry, which provides researchers with a unique number that disambiguates them and links them with their respective works.<sup>12</sup> Initially, digital tools and SNS sites allowed researchers to list and sometimes provide access to scholarship. Examples of

---

\* Marie L. Radford, Chair & Professor, Department of Library & Information Science Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey [mradford@rutgers.edu](mailto:mradford@rutgers.edu). Vanessa Kitzie, Assistant Professor, School of Library & Information Science, College of Information & Communications, University of South Carolina [kitzie@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:kitzie@mailbox.sc.edu). Stephanie Mikitish, User Engagement and Assessment Librarian Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey [mikitish@scarletmail.rutgers.edu](mailto:mikitish@scarletmail.rutgers.edu). Diana Floegel, PhD Student, Department of Library & Information Science Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey [diana.floegel@rutgers.edu](mailto:diana.floegel@rutgers.edu). Lynn Silipigni Connaway, Director of Library Trends and User Research, OCLC [connawal@oclc.org](mailto:connawal@oclc.org).

SI platforms that fall under this description include Facebook and research repositories/tools like Zotero and Bibsonomy.<sup>13</sup> In 2008, Academia.edu and ResearchGate launched, allowing researchers to network with others and disseminate their work<sup>14</sup> with sharing norms and mechanisms that vary by platform. For instance, ResearchGate encourages self-archiving and private distribution of scholarship among members,<sup>15</sup> while Academia.edu encourages the posting of pre-publication versions of scholarship.<sup>16</sup> This shift to Web 2.0 features within SI platforms contributed to an increase in citation rates; users who employed a platform’s relational norms and features (e.g., networking, self-promotion, and collaboration) were cited at least three times as often as those who used non-2.0 features like publishing findings.<sup>17</sup> Considering the importance of networking and sharing, this study defines SI platforms as any digital tool or SNS that facilitates scholars’ efforts to build, measure, and promote their professional reputation and research impact.<sup>18</sup>

The changes in SI platforms and their uses reflect their growing importance among scholars. While earlier research noted that such platforms, particularly SNS like Twitter, could “seem frivolous and pointless to academics,”<sup>19</sup> a proliferation of researcher profiles on these sites<sup>20</sup> suggests that users view them as “newer, more accessible form of curricula vitae, which usually incorporates an individual’s persona or personal brand.”<sup>21</sup> Research on SI platforms varies in scope, purposes, users, and usage. In terms of scope, research varies depending on the number of tools covered, from single<sup>22</sup> to multiple.<sup>23</sup> Scholars use SI platforms to showcase a variety of scholarly achievements, connect with other researchers, assess impact, and develop new modes of communication.<sup>24</sup> Research on SI incorporates a variety of participant demographics, disciplines, countries, and participant statuses (e.g., faculty, student).

Most SI studies focus on non-library users whose academic disciplines may influence how they interact with SI platforms.<sup>25</sup> Humanities and social science scholars generally use Academia.edu<sup>26</sup> while natural and physical scientists tend to use ResearchGate.<sup>27</sup> Although one earlier study suggested that young researchers could benefit from SNS use,<sup>28</sup> other research reported that scholars expressed several concerns with using SNS/SI platforms. These concerns include effort needed to maintain profiles;<sup>29</sup> confusion regarding how tools reflect scholarly reputation;<sup>30</sup> the business practices of certain tools, including selling of user information<sup>31</sup> and pay-per-click marketing;<sup>32</sup> and difficulty distinguishing among works of scholars with similar names.<sup>33</sup>

The proliferation of SI platforms and their range of capabilities and varying norms based on discipline, career stage, and institution makes it difficult to recommend one platform or definitive set of guidelines. Instead, effective strategies for SI platforms are contextual and therefore problematic to discern among academics, without the time or other resources to develop effective approaches. This study explores this challenge by investigating academic librarian practice and potential support for SI management and addresses the following research questions:

RQ 1. What, if any, practices do academic librarians engage in to assist Ph.D. students and faculty with managing SI?

RQ 2. How can SI-related assistance become a larger part of academic librarians’ offerings to Ph.D. students and faculty?

## Methodology

Following IRB approval from Rutgers University, the research team employed a stratified sampling methodology to recruit 30 participants (10 academic librarians, 10 faculty, and 10 Ph.D. students). The research team posted a recruitment notice to the Association of College and Research Libraries’ (ACRL) Scholarly Communication (SCHOLCOMM) listserv and the Communication, Research, and Theory Network (CRTNET) listservs. Respondents completed a pre-screening survey that collected demographic information and established whether they used at least three SI tools.

The 30 semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted during two months from December 2017 through January 2018. Informed by prior research, interview questions addressed the motivations, benefits, and drawbacks of SI tool use, as well as how academic libraries could support SI practice.<sup>34</sup> Questions slightly varied by whether the participant was a librarian or not (see Appendix A). In particular, academic librarians were asked about how they created, promoted, and advanced their own SI and that of others; their attitudes regarding SI platforms; and suggestions for developing SI-related assistance in academic libraries. Each interview took approximately an hour, during which interviewers transcribed notes and direct quotations into a Google form. Participants received a \$30 Amazon gift card. To preserve confidentiality, we assigned each participant a random number used to identify them in the interview and the analysis.

The constant comparisons method<sup>35</sup> was used to code the interview notes via NVivo, a qualitative analysis software program. Higher-level (etic) codes were derived from related literature while lower-level (emic) codes inductively emerged from the data.<sup>36</sup> Etic codes were informed by prior SI literature as well as Goffman's<sup>37</sup> impression management framework, which Batenburg and Barties<sup>38</sup> describe as being "performed when an individual controls information about the self to influence the impression that is formed about them in the minds of others". The team calculated inter-coder agreement at 100% after identification, discussion, and resolution of coding differences.<sup>39</sup>

## Results

Table 1 presents demographics for the 30 participants, who were affiliated with institutions in the United States and Canada. Two thirds of all participants identified as female (N=20,66%), and Caucasian/White (n=19,63%). The 10 librarian participants were employed at

**TABLE 1**  
**Participant demographics**

Gender	N=30 (%)	Race/Ethnicity	N (%)	Age	N (%)
Female	20 (67%)	Caucasian/White	19 (63%)	26-34	16 (53%)
Male	9 (30%)	African American/Black	3 (10%)	35-44	5 (17%)
Nonbinary	1 (3%)	Asian	3 (10%)	45-54	3 (10%)
		Hispanic	2 (7%)	55-64	3 (10%)
		White/Latinx	1 (3%)	65+	3 (10%)
		Unknown	2 (7%)		

**TABLE 2**  
**SI platform usage by subgroup**

Site	Librarians n=10	Faculty/Ph.D. Students n=20	Total N=30
Twitter	9 (90%)	17 (85%)	26 (87%)
Facebook	8 (80%)	12 (60%)	20 (66%)
ResearchGate	4 (40%)	16 (80%)	20 (66%)
Instagram	6 (60%)	13 (65%)	19 (63%)
Academia.edu	3 (30%)	15 (75%)	18 (60%)
ORCID	9 (90%)	6 (30%)	15 (15%)
Snapchat	2 (20%)	5 (25%)	7 (23%)
LinkedIn	2 (20%)	2 (10%)	4 (13%)
Tumblr	1 (10%)	2 (10%)	3 (10%)
(Open)VIVO	2 (20%)	0	2 (7%)
Whatsapp	0	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Personal website	0	1 (5%)	1 (3%)
Google Profile	1 (10%)	0	1 (3%)
ISNI	1 (10%)	0	1 (3%)
Podcast	1 (10%)	0	1 (3%)
Scopus	1 (10%)	0	1 (3%)
Symplectic Elements	1 (10%)	0	1 (3%)
WebID	1 (10%)	0	1 (3%)
YouTube	1 (10%)	0	1 (3%)

universities, and, in comparison to the total participants, were less diverse in gender (female n=8,80%) and ethnicity (Caucasian/White n=8,80%), but more diverse in age. Of these, two also were faculty members, and one was both a faculty member and a doctoral student. Seven (70%) librarians were tenure-track, and the remaining three (30%) were non-tenure track. While some participants had a subject specialization, the majority (n=6,60%) did not.

As presented in Table 2, faculty and Ph.D. students were twice as likely to use ResearchGate and Academia.edu as librarians.

Below, themes are reported with a focus on variation among librarian responses versus responses from other groups. To protect participants privacy, they are referred to by group (L=librarian, F=faculty, S=Ph.D. student) and participant number (e.g., L-46 is a librarian with participant number 46).

### Major Theme: Methods for Assessing Impact Using SI Tools

While a majority of all participants (N=22,73%) connected impact with using analytics/altmetrics, seven librarians (70%) addressed other ways of assessing impact, such as the perceived quality of a journal that they published in (L-11). Other librarians viewed impact as encompassing more than traditional outputs like articles and books. One librarian described impact as including advising graduate students, serving on committees, teaching, and creating/sharing educational materials (L-102). Another librarian explained how impact and SI may differ: “I think the identity is broader, and then impact is sort of like a piece of that...The impact is why it matters, or more like how you convince others that it matters” (L-01). Another noted that SI could facilitate tenure beyond metrics based on the citations of scholarly work because these platforms could help “build and maintain a national presence so other experts are aware of your work if they’re asked to review” (L-11).

### Major Theme: Motivations/Benefits of SI Work

The most often mentioned motivations/benefits of SI work across all participants were connecting with other researchers (N=26,87%) and disseminating academic activities (N=24,80%). However, there were differences between other benefits commonly identified by librarians compared to the other academics (see Table 3).

**TABLE 3**  
**Motivations and benefits reported by librarians versus Faculty/Ph.D. students**

Theme	Librarian n=10	Faculty/Ph.D. Students n=20
Collaborate with research projects/teams	5 (50%)	1 (5%)
Find research collaborators	5 (50%)	1 (5%)
Joined as researchers of interest are there	3 (30%)	1 (5%)
Facilitate getting tenure/promotion	8 (80%)	3 (15%)
Be up to date	5 (50%)	2 (10%)
Share open access materials	6 (60%)	4 (20%)
Joined as department/faculty researchers are there	3 (30%)	2 (10%)
Access conferences, academic opportunities, resources, etc.	7 (70%)	5 (25%)
Increase impact	8 (80%)	6 (30%)
Disseminate academic activities (papers published, CV, teaching materials, etc.)	10 (100%)	14 (70%)
Share/exchange materials with other researchers	5 (50%)	15 (75%)
Facilitate job search	3 (30%)	11 (55%)

These data suggest that librarians consider more opportunities for SI tools than other participants, including collaboration, sharing open access materials, and connecting with other researchers. Librarians were also more likely to tout the ability of SI platforms to increase impact and facilitate getting tenure, though this may be related to faculty participants' career level. For instance, one faculty member explained that "if [Google Scholar] had existed before I got tenure, I would have used it to increase those numbers" (F-82). On the other hand, the other participants were almost four times as likely to identify SI platforms as helping them get a job and three times as likely to identify them as helping to share/ exchange materials with other researchers.

### *Major Theme: Downsides/Drawbacks of SI Practices*

All librarians (n=10,100%) mentioned time constraints and confusion as major downsides/drawbacks to SI tools, compared to fewer faculty/students (n=6,30% for time constraints; n=3,15% for confusion). For their own SIs, librarians admitted that "keeping up is a full-time job sometimes" (L-101). The effort needed to help faculty manage their profiles was estimated to be about three full-time jobs for 450 tenure-track faculty on one campus according to L-50. Several participants felt that profile maintenance took too much effort for little reward (N=6,20%). One librarian mentioned the importance of being able to demonstrate "the proof, or evidence that that time spent will be worthwhile" (L-50) in terms of positive contributions to annual reviews or tenure.

Confusion surrounding SI platforms stemmed from not understanding particular tools, such as Twitter (L-102), or not understanding impact contributions. Librarians in particular expressed frustration with proprietary metrics. Some sites use algorithms with opaque ranking/rating mechanisms, which make comparison with more well-known metrics difficult. For instance, one librarian asked, if a researcher had "a ResearchGate score of 700, but...[a journal in which they had published] only [had] an impact score of 1, where do you put the emphasis?" (L-50). Librarians also questioned the ability of SI tools to improve more traditional metrics. L-102 called Scopus "a pain in the neck" and "painful to work with."

Another area where librarians (n=9,90%) differed from others (n=6,30%) was their concern regarding for-profit business models, with librarians expressing more concern over potential consequences. Librarians identified several negative outcomes including selling of user information (L-102). For this reason, one librarian hesitated to use ResearchGate and Academia.edu (L-50). Librarians also identified the consequence of context collapse,<sup>40</sup> a reluctance to post content that might offend certain audiences. One explained that "personal viewpoints...may overlap with professional identities" (L-11), and another felt that they should keep their opinions to themselves on Twitter (L-69).

Despite librarians expressing more SI drawbacks, they expressed the least amount of concern over potential damage to professional or personal reputations based on what they shared on SI platforms. Only three (30%) librarians mentioned this general concern, and only two (20%) indicated more specific concerns such as tracking and surveillance. In comparison, 10 academics (50%) expressed concern with reputational damage, and 5 academics (25%) were concerned with tracking/surveillance.

### *Major Theme: Results Related to "Magic Wand" Question*

Informed by prior research,<sup>41</sup> participants were asked: "If you had a magic wand and could create any service that would help faculty, doctoral students, or yourself, regarding creating and managing scholarly identity, what would that look like?" A majority (N=14,47%) wanted a way to streamline the process of updating their SI, but only librarians suggested having a proxy-maintained SI profile (n=6,60%) continually "or at least quarterly" (L-01). In contrast, one faculty member stated, "I think it's the individual's responsibility" (F-84) to maintain their SI. Some librarians envisioned an app/overlay that would update multiple sites, such as Facebook, LinkedIn, and



Google Scholar at once (L-11). Other librarians described a tool that would incorporate functions from multiple sites. One librarian touted the benefits of a WebID by explaining that “there is nothing else like this...that has your own personal space that...you are in charge of and you maintain as you move institutions” (L-102).

### *Major Theme: Library Support/Roles and Potential Opportunities for Library Support/Roles*

The librarian participants were asked to describe their institutions’ SI-related support. All 10 offered workshops that included an orientation to altmetrics and scholarly promotion landscapes and information about specific tools, and one librarian (10%) reported that their institution hosts an annual conference on SI-related topics. A majority (n=7,70%) also offered individual consultations. Other topics included: copyright (n=4,40%), open access (n=3,30%), preparing users for the tough times (n=3,30%), promoting a new SI service for beginners (n=3,30%), and goal setting (n=2,20%). Faculty were most interested in learning about copyright (n=3,30%) and Ph.D. students wanted individual consultations (n=2,20%) and an orientation to altmetrics and scholarly publishing landscapes (n=2,20%).

### **Discussion/Recommendations**

Findings suggest that assistance with SI workflow and strategizing would be welcomed by faculty and Ph.D. students and that academic librarians are open to this new role. Based on the major themes arising from analysis and addressing concerns identified in the literature, the following discussion of strategies for academic librarians to support users in managing SI efforts are offered.

#### *Effort-related Concerns*

Several SI platform usage studies found that academics were concerned with the amount of effort needed to maintain profiles.<sup>42</sup> While all librarians mentioned the time needed to maintain profiles and confusion regarding SI platform choice as downsides of SI practices, relatively few academics did. When coupled with the wider range of SI platforms that librarians were using compared to the others, it is possible that librarians maintain more SI profiles than the average academic in order to provide guidance on how to use them. As one librarian explained:

*Everyone feels overworked and feels we need to stop doing things, but nobody agrees on what to stop, so we keep doing things and don't [drop] anything. This is one of those things people are afraid to add or reluctant to add. Some don't have the time or don't want to learn. They think it's too complicated and don't like math, so they throw all the questions to me. (L-46).*

Although the librarians might have gone out of their way to maintain several profiles, they recommended that their users only “focus on one or two so [they] have time to complete them and keep them up to date, that’s my strategy. Not focusing on the amount, but on the quality...If you have too many and they aren’t well-maintained, that may hurt you” (L-103).

Librarians have knowledge about SI platforms and are able to frame the benefits/drawbacks of these tools based on where scholars from each field congregate<sup>43</sup> and how disciplines measures impact. One librarian noted, “every discipline has different norms. [In] humanities it’s not that important to have a ton of citations, but in the sciences it is. Social sciences are sort of in the middle” (L-01). Another advises faculty and Ph.D. students that “it’s important to find the [right scholarly] community and engage with the community where they are already” (L-50).

At the same time, librarian participants were less likely to have profiles on Academia.edu and ResearchGate, while most faculty and Ph.D. students only had profiles on these platforms. While librarians may not join these sites because of their distaste for-profit business models, this lack of use does not change the fact that academics are on these sites. One librarian explained this disparity in use: “it’s clearly just that people in the library world don’t seem to use [commercial SI sites]...I think it’s important for people that work in libraries to use these services themselves before they can really teach them” (L-101). According to Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás,<sup>44</sup> it is important to ensure that at least one librarian can assist users in setting up a basic profile and adding publications; librarians can also distribute the burden of keeping abreast of SI platform changes. By strategically assigning librarians to create and maintain profiles on different platforms, library systems can reduce the burden on individual librarians to maintain too many profiles while ensuring that users will be able to find at least one expert on each platform.

Based on the discussion above, the following two recommendations address the effort needed to support SI creation and maintenance:

- Know your audience and have a general understanding of where scholars in certain fields are creating and maintaining SI profiles.
- Know benefits/drawbacks of different tools. Consider designating at least one expert for major platforms.

### *Uncertainty-related Concerns*

SI tools have social, professional, and hosting benefits that librarians seem to be more aware of than faculty and Ph.D. students. Results suggest that librarians can help users address uncertainty related concerns regarding SI platforms including how platform metrics compare to traditional bibliographic measures<sup>45</sup> and alt-metrics.<sup>46</sup> One way to introduce academics to SI platforms is to help them realize that they often have profiles automatically created for them<sup>47</sup> on different sites (e.g., Google Scholar, Amazon when publishing a book). L-73 outlined the following strategy for academic SI work:

- Collect all your identifiers (names/numbers) across profiles and get an ORCID number.
- Claim Google Scholar, Microsoft, and Amazon profiles as these are automatically generated.
- Choose one email address for all profiles and check it regularly.
- Create a list of your publications in a citation management system (e.g., Mendeley, RefWorks) and a folder of the publications in PDF format.
- Make a conscious decision to create a profile on ResearchGate or Academia.edu based on where other scholars in your field have profiles.
- Maintain a list of your profiles so that when you publish you will know where to update.

Other librarians emphasized the importance of having an SI strategy. One librarian explained that a generic strategy that could be posted on a LibGuide, was not enough. L-11 explained, “I think a multi-modal approach is best. Some people want basic instructions, and others want hands-on experience. I try to give people multiple points of access and different ways to engage to figure out what’s best for them.”

Another strategy for introducing users to SI platforms is to make them aware of their full range of benefits. While other academics were aware of the ease in which social connections can be made on SI platforms, librarians were more likely to specify that they can be used to locate and work with collaborators. Librarians were more likely to connect a well-maintained SI profile to improving annual reviews and attracting external reviewers for tenure and promotion. Finally, SI profiles are increasingly becoming places to host non-traditional results and content, such as “data sets, codes, negative results, grey literature, blogs, and annotations.”<sup>48</sup> Based on the above discussion, the recommended practices are:

- Investigate faculty and Ph.D. student concerns and areas where their perceptions of SI tools may differ.
- Understand and be prepared to discuss benefits of SI tools beyond (alt)metrics.

### *Confusion Related Concerns*

The final concern was confusion and misunderstanding regarding copyright restrictions when sharing scholarly research.<sup>49</sup> Fifteen percent (n=3) of the faculty and Ph.D. students suggested that librarians could inform them about copyright, and how it applied to the content requested by SI platforms. Fewer than half of the librarian participants offered workshops on copyright, although the literature suggests that librarians should be prepared to explain how to share work or point participants to resources such as SHERPA/RoMEO.<sup>50</sup> Based on that finding, the following recommendation is:

- Spend some time discussing copyright in SI workshops.

### **Conclusion**

This study was among the first to examine SI and its relationship to scholarly impact from librarian, faculty, and Ph.D. student perspectives. However, it has limitations. The sample was self-selected and small, and all participants were affiliated with institutions in North America. It also lacked diversity in terms of participant gender and race/ethnicity. However, participants were pre-screened for diversity of experience. Future work should incorporate a larger and more diverse pool of librarian and non-librarian faculty and Ph.D. students across different fields to refine the conceptualization of SI and the purpose, reputation, and use of management tools.

Despite limitations, results indicate that faculty and Ph.D. students think of SI management as a personal responsibility, whereas librarians believe it is a collective responsibility. This suggests that a cultural shift is needed because academics may not be ready to take advantage of support. Findings found differences in both benefits and drawbacks to SI work as perceived by librarians. This is noteworthy because librarians need to understand the unique experiences of different user populations to effectively support them. Librarians can also introduce additional benefits/drawbacks that academics have not considered. Thus, this study is unique and valuable in that it makes a direct comparison between user groups and their perceptions, which allowed the offer of targeted recommendations, rather than the broader suggestions found in previous work. These recommendations lay a foundation for more informed and thoughtful librarian support roles, which will become increasingly important as platform adoption expands. As participant L-73 noted, “It’s not that people needed directions, the issue is people need a strategy.” The academic librarian participants were all up to taking on this challenge for assisting users in workflow issues surrounding SI work.



# Appendix A. Interview Questions

## Librarian Interview Questions

1. What is your view of current information practices for faculty, students, and librarians in creating and managing their scholarly identities? Why do you hold this view?
2. What information practices and strategies do you engage in when helping doctoral students and faculty to create and manage their scholarly identity? (Probe: What tools or resources do you use for measuring, increasing, and communicating their scholarly identity?)
3. Describe any help that your library provides to faculty or doctoral students who are looking to create or manage their scholarly identity?
4. (If none or minimal) What has prevented or stopped your library from providing (or providing more, if minimal) services to faculty and doctoral students regarding creating and managing their scholarly identity?
5. What would assist your library in getting started in providing services (or in providing more service) to faculty and doctoral students regarding creating and managing their scholarly identity?
6. Now, turning to yourself as a scholar/researcher. How important is it to you to create and manage your scholarly identity or personal brand? Why does it have this level of importance for you?
7. What information practices and strategies do you engage in when creating and managing your scholarly identity? (Probe: What tools or resources do you use for measuring, increasing, and communicating your scholarly identity?)
8. If you had a magic wand and could create any service that would help faculty, doctoral students, or yourself, regarding creating and managing scholarly identity, what would that look like?
9. What benefits, if any, do you see for a service of this type? (Probe, if not addressed: benefits to you, your library, your college or university, your faculty and doctoral students)
10. What drawbacks, if any, do you see for a service of this type? (Probe, if not addressed: drawbacks to you, your library, your college or university, your faculty and doctoral students)
11. What other thoughts do you have on the topic of developing services relating to creating and managing scholarly identity for yourself, faculty, and/or doctoral students that we have not yet covered?

## Faculty and Doctoral Student Questions

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?
11. How much time and effort would you say you devote to behaviors and activities related to the cultivation of your scholarly identity? (Probe, for heavy users of sites like Research Gate: How, if at all, have you changed your research or publication practices based on thing you have learned about your scholarly performance by using these sites?)
12. Recall and describe a time, within the past six months, that you engaged in activities that you felt were successful in creating or cultivating your scholarly identity? What stands out to you that made this successful?
13. Recall and describe a time, within the past six months, that you engaged in activities that you felt were unsuccessful in creating or cultivating your scholarly identity? What stands out to you that made this unsuccessful?
14. Describe any help you have had in creating or cultivating your scholarly identity. (Probe: Who provided this help?)
15. If you had a magic wand and could have any type of help to create or manage your scholarly identity, what would this help look like?
16. What other thoughts do you have on the topic of developing your scholarly identity that we have not yet covered?
17. What other thoughts do you have on the topic of developing services relating to creating and managing scholarly identity for yourself that we have not yet covered?

## Endnotes

1. Tara Bringham, "Online Professional Profiles: Health Care and Library Researchers Show Off Their Work," *Medical Reference Services Quarterly* 35, no. 4 (2016): 440-448.
2. "Academia.edu," Academia.edu, accessed January 18, 2019, <https://www.academia.edu/>.
3. "ResearchGate," ResearchGate, Accessed January 18, 2018, <https://www.researchgate.net/>.
4. Lorcan Dempsey, "Collections, the Network, and Library Collaboration," (presentation, Rutgers University Libraries, New Brunswick, NJ, January 31, 2019).
5. Katherine Mangan, "Social Networks for Academics Proliferate, Despite Some Doubts," *Chronicle of Higher Education* 58, no. 35 (2012): 1-7.
6. Ann E. Williams and Melissa A. Woodacre, "The Possibilities and Perils of Academic Social Networking Sites," *Online Information Review* 40, no. 2 (2016): 282-294.
7. Judit Ward, William Bejarano, and Anikó Dudás, "Scholarly Social Media Profiles and Libraries: A Review," *Liber Quarterly* 24, no. 4 (2015): 174-204.
8. Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, "Scholarly Social Media"; Katherine Reed, Dana McFarland, and Rosie Croft, "Laying the Groundwork for a New Library Service: Scholar-Practitioner & Graduate Student Attitudes Toward Altmetrics and the Curation of Online Profiles," *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 11, no. 2 (2016): 87-96.
9. Gemma Nández and Ángel Borrego, "Use of Social Networks for Academic Purposes: A Case Study," *The Electronic Library* 31, no. 6 (2013): 781-791.; Mike Thelwall and Kayvan Kousha, "Academia.edu: Social Network or Academic Network?," *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 65, no. 4 (2014): 721-731.; José Luis Ortega, "Disciplinary Differences in the Use of Academic Social Networking Sites," *Online Information Review* 39, no. 4 (2015): 520-536.
10. Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, "Scholarly Social Media"; Williams and Woodacre, "The Possibilities"
11. Steven Ovidia, "ResearchGate and Academia.edu: Academic Social Networks," *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 33, no. 3 (2014): 165-169.; Sara Kjellberg, Jutta Haider, and Olof Sundin, "Researchers' Use of Social Network Sites: A Scoping Review," *Library & Information Science Research* 38 (2016): 224-234.; Elke Greifeneder, Sheila Pontis, Ann Blandford, Hesham Attalla, David Neal, and Kirsten Schlebbe, "Researchers' Attitudes Towards the Use of Social Networking Sites," *Journal of Documentation* 74, no. 1 (2017): 119-136.
12. Katherine G. Akers, Alexandra Sarkozy, Wendy Wu, and Alison Slyman, "ORICD Author Identifiers: A Primer for Librarians," *Medical Reference Services Quarterly* 35, no. 2 (2016): 135-144.
13. Thelwall and Kousha, "Academia.edu"
14. Mangan, "Social Networks"; Greifeneder et al., "Researchers' Attitudes"
15. Anamika Megwalu, "ResearchGate: An Academic Social Networking Site," *The Charleston Advisor* 17, no. 1 (2015): 47-51.
16. Ovidia, "ResearchGate and Academia.edu"
17. Anatoliy Gruzd and Melissa Goertzen, "Wired Academia: Why Social Science Scholars Are Using Social Media," In *Proceedings of the 2013 46th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, Hawaii, January 7-10, 2013, 3332-3341. (Washington, DC: IEEE, 2013).
18. David Nicholas, Eti Herman, Hamid Jamali, Blanca Rodríguez-Bravo, Chderifa Boukacem-Zeghmouri, Tom Dobrowolski, and Stephanie Pouchot, "New Ways of Building, Showcasing, and Measuring Scholarly Reputation," *Learned Publishing* 28 (2015): 169-183.; Bringham, "Online Professional Profiles"
19. Ovidia, "ResearchGate and Academia.edu," 165.
20. Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, "Scholarly Social Media"
21. Bringham, "Online Professional Profiles," 441.
22. Megwalu, "ResearchGate"
23. Ovidia, "ResearchGate and Academia.edu"; Bringham, "Online Professional Profiles"
24. Kjellberg, Haider, and Sundin, "Researchers' Use"
25. Amalia Más-Bleda and Isidro F. Aguillo, "Can a Personal Website Be Useful as an Information Source to Assess Individual Scientists? The Case of European Highly Cited Researchers," *Scientometrics* 96, no. 1 (2013): 51-67.
26. Nández and Borrego, "Use of Social Networks"; Ortega, "Disciplinary Differences"
27. Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, "Scholarly Social Media"; David Nicholas, Anthony Watkinson, Cherifa Boukacem-Zeghmouri, Blanca Rodríguez-Bravo, Jie Xu, Abdullah Abrizah, Marzena Świgoń, and Eti Herman, "Early Career Researchers: Scholarly Behaviour and the Prospect of Change," *Learned Publishing* 30 (2017): 157-166.; Ortega, "Disciplinary Differences"
28. Nicholas et al., "New Ways of Building"
29. Mangan, "Social Networks for Academics"; Gruzd and Goertzen, "Wired Academia"; Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, "Scholarly Social Media"; Bringham, "Online Professional Profiles"; Reed, McFarland, and Croft, "Laying the Groundwork"
30. Thelwall and Kousha, "Academia.edu"; Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, "Scholarly Social Media"; Megwalu, "ResearchGate"; Reed, McFarland, and Croft, "Laying the Groundwork"; Williams and Woodacre, "The Possibilities and Perils"; Greifeneder et al., "Researchers' Attitudes"
31. Williams and Woodacre, "The Possibilities and Perils"; Greifeneder et al., "Researchers' Attitudes"
32. Megwalu, "ResearchGate"
33. Bringham, "Online Professional Profiles"

34. Kjellberg, Haider, and Sundin, “Researchers’ Use”; Nández and Borrego, “Use of Social Networks”
35. Kathy Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2014).
36. Matthew B. Miles and Michael Huberman, *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1994).
37. Erving Goffman, *The presentation of self in everyday life*. (New York: Doubleday, 1959).
38. Anika Batenburg and Jos Bartels, “Keeping up online appearances: How Self-Disclosure on Facebook Affects Perceived Respect and Likability in the Professional Context,” *Computers in Human Behavior* 74 (2017): 266.
39. Yan Zhang and Barbara M. Wildemuth, “Qualitative analysis of content,” *Analysis* 1, no. 2: 1-12.
40. Alice E. Marwick and dana boyd, “I Tweet Honestly, I Tweet Passionately: Twitter Users, Context Collapse, and the Imagined Audience,” *New Media & Society* 13, no. 1 (2011): 114-133.
41. Lynn Silipigni Connaway, Timothy J. Dickey, and Marie L. Radford, ““If It is Too Inconvenient I’m Not Going After It.” Convenience as a Critical Factor in Information-Seeking Behaviors,” *Library & Information science research* 33, no. 3 (2011): 179-190.; Marie L. Radford, Lynn Silipigni Connaway, Stephanie Mikitish, Mark Alpert, Chirag Shah, and Nicole A. Cooke, “Shared Values, New Vision: Collaboration and Communities of Practice in Virtual Reference and SQA,” *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 68, no. 2 (2017): 438-449.
42. Mangan, “Social Networks for Academics”; Gruzd and Goertzen, “Wired Academia”; Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, “Scholarly Social Media”; Bringham, “Online Professional Profiles”; Reed, McFarland, and Croft, “Laying the Groundwork”
43. Ovadia, “ResearchGate and Academia.edu”
44. Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, “Scholarly Social Media”
45. Thelwall and Kousha, “Academia.edu”; Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, “Scholarly Social Media”
46. Megwalu, “ResearchGate”; Reed, McFarland, and Croft, “Laying the Groundwork”
47. Ward, Bejarano, and Dudás, “Scholarly Social Media”
48. *Ibid*, 195.
49. Williams and Woodacre, “The Possibilities and Perils”; Bringham, “Online Professional Profiles”
50. Ovadia, “ResearchGate and Academia.edu”; Megwalu, “ResearchGate”