

# Mapping the Dissemination of the Theory of Social Representations via Academic Social Networks

**Annamaria Silvana de Rosa**

*Sapienza University of Rome, Italy*

**Laura Dryjanska**

*Sapienza University of Rome, Italy*

**Elena Bocci**

*Sapienza University of Rome, Italy*

## INTRODUCTION

Academic social networks are forms of Internet service, which facilitate the management of relations among scientists, sharing resources for publications, and in some case data, research results and multimedia sources. This chapter concentrates on what are the benefits of academic social networks, how to analyze their impact in spreading knowledge and why they are important. In particular, it aims at mapping the presence of publications using the case study of the theory of social representations in three academic social networks: Academia.edu, ResearchGate and Mendeley.

*Academia.edu* was founded in September 2008 by Richard Price, who did a PhD at Oxford in philosophy. After finishing his PhD, he founded Academia.edu, which is a platform for academics around the world to connect and share research, which in October 2016 had more than 43 million members. He spotted the need for the platform when doing his PhD. Once freely registered, a user can set his or her profile and fill in their publication list, upload papers and enlist field(s) of interest, finding at the same time researchers with a matching profile. Then, it is possible to follow what academics in the field are working on,

i.e. the latest papers they are publishing, the talks they are giving or the blog posts and status updates they are writing. An important tool that Academia.edu offers is the statistic of one's downloads and page views; it also allows the researcher to know what keywords people use to search for them on Google (Giglia, 2011).

*Research Gate*, founded in 2008 by physicians Dr. Ijad Madisch (Boston) and Dr. Sören Hofmayer (Berlin), and computer scientist Horst Fickenscher (Berlin), is aimed at creating a working and discovering network among scientists, "Discover", "Communicate" and "Collaborate" are its main purposes (Giglia, 2011). In October 2016 it had more than 11 million members.

London-based *Mendeley*, founded in 2009 by three German PhD students (Victor Henning, Jan Reichelt and Paul Föckler), in October 2016 was used by around 2.5 million researchers worldwide to discover, share and annotate research papers (as a reference manager), and to network and collaborate with other academics (Giglia, 2011). Mendeley has two components: a desktop program and a web-based storage space, which can be used independently or synchronized (MacMillan, 2012).

The main differences among these three academic social networks can be summarized as below:

- *Academia.edu* and *ResearchGate.net* focus more on the producers of research and their networking (main function: “to be contacted”);
- While reference-sharing *Mendeley.com* sites focus on readers, helping users to share and find relevant references for their work (main function: “discover recommended papers”),

One difference still existing in October 2016 is that *Academia.edu* users can post their own papers, but *Mendeley* users can also share others' papers in their *My Library* section (Thelwall & Kousha, 2014).

Overall, it has been found that different disciplines favor different academic social networks and some authors argue that at some point there will be a “winner in the race” (van Norden, 2014). At the moment awareness among scientists of the Academic Social Networks varies, but the most well-known site tends to be Google Scholar, both among natural and social scientists, as stated by van Norden (2014).

If the Personal Social Networks have become exponentially popular among lay people by sharing personal information, snapshots on private life, CV, or even for institutions and companies aimed at their web-marketing; turning to a scholars and researchers target, the academic social networks, born in 2008, have quickly become a fundamental tool to manage, read, share, annotate and cite research papers, among tens of millions of connected users. In the era of bibliometric culture, the academic social networks – moving from the first collaborative aim of global knowledge sharing and co-producing - have also become a tool for the author's popularity. Therefore they have contributed to originate a new disciplinary field called *Altermetrics* (De Bellis, 2009, 2014), aimed at identifying new indicators for measuring their scientific impact.

This chapter first presents the literature review on the topic of Academic Social Networks, which constitutes a fairly new field of study, given their

emergence less than ten years ago. Subsequently, it focuses on the case study of the publications inspired by the theory of social representations and their presence in Academic Social Networks, exploring their characteristics (such as publication year and language) and mapping the geo-cultural contexts of the location of institutions of first authors. Follows the discussion of open networked science and bibliometric culture and possible future research directions, including further statistical analyses of existing material and switching from publications to authors as units of analysis. Finally, the conclusions concern the diffusion of the theory of social representations outside of Europe and the role of academic social networks in this process.

## BACKGROUND

Academic Social Networks have become a significant part of informal scholarly communication (Thelwall & Kousha, 2014). According to Hoffman, Lutz and Meckel (2015), they provide channels for quick dissemination of research results and interaction with both peers and lay audiences, while the open access philosophy increases their appeal (Nielsen, 2012). Academic social networks address the researchers' need to ensure that their publications are accessible and visible to a wide audience (Thelwall & Kousha, 2014). They also form a part of academic identity, akin to a business card, or serve as a personal repository (Jordan, 2016).

The established services are constantly changing, hoping to improve user experience, including the design of the user interface, which has to be attractive but also simple, providing a low barrier for newcomers (Goodwin, Jeng & He, 2014). Moreover, academic social networks allow a responsiveness and informality, unlike the formal publishing process (Ovadia, 2014).

Current trends of the research on Academic Social Networks have often concentrated on users, for example Rosenzweig, Grinstein and Ofek

11 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

[www.igi-global.com/chapter/mapping-the-dissemination-of-the-theory-of-social-representations-via-academic-social-networks/184401](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/mapping-the-dissemination-of-the-theory-of-social-representations-via-academic-social-networks/184401)

## Related Content

---

### Massive Digital Libraries (MDLs)

Andrew Philip Weiss (2018). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Fourth Edition* (pp. 5226-5236).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/massive-digital-libraries-mdls/184227](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/massive-digital-libraries-mdls/184227)

### The Importance of Systems Methodologies for Industrial and Scientific National Wealthy and Development

Miroljub Kljajic (2010). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach* (pp. 32-45).

[www.irma-international.org/article/importance-systems-methodologies-industrial-scientific/45159](http://www.irma-international.org/article/importance-systems-methodologies-industrial-scientific/45159)

### Capacity for Engineering Systems Thinking (CEST): Literature Review, Principles for Assessing and the Reliability and Validity of an Assessing Tool

Moti Frank (2009). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach* (pp. 1-14).

[www.irma-international.org/article/capacity-engineering-systems-thinking-cest/2543](http://www.irma-international.org/article/capacity-engineering-systems-thinking-cest/2543)

### Software Development Life Cycles and Methodologies: Fixing the Old and Adopting the New

Sue Conger (2011). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach* (pp. 1-22).

[www.irma-international.org/article/software-development-life-cycles-methodologies/51365](http://www.irma-international.org/article/software-development-life-cycles-methodologies/51365)

### Laws Related to Web and Digital Application Accessibility

Holly Yu (2015). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Third Edition* (pp. 3011-3020).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/laws-related-to-web-and-digital-application-accessibility/112725](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/laws-related-to-web-and-digital-application-accessibility/112725)