Making your reputation visible: views from researchers
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Reputation opens (secret) doors
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Reputation as brand

go-to person for dynamics of dryland environments

How can we better support researchers’ brands?
How do academics broadly rank activities in terms of contribution to reputation?

\( (n = 2,748) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Contributes most</th>
<th>Contributes least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting at conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning funding / grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning awards / prizes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community contribution (e.g...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating via social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with the media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercializing your research /...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“When you see the CVs of big academics, they’ve done all these things. It wasn’t a strategy – they just did them.”
“Academia is a meritocracy, but it’s also about reputation management. More senior academics might not see this, but as a junior academic – and a woman – proactively managing your reputation is really important.”
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Social media “democratizing reputation”
The role and visibility of publications
In the bubble

Impact factors don’t mean anything!

It’s about the quality of the work, not the brand of the journal.
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In reality

OMG turns out she’s not just a temp, she’s had a paper in Nature!
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To what extent do you think more could be done to increase the visibility, usage or impact of the work you publish, on or after publication? (n = 2,900)
In which of the following ways do you currently create awareness of or share materials relating to your work?

(n = 2,826)

- Conferences/meetings
- Academic networking/profile sites (e.g.,)
- Conversations with colleagues
- Institutional websites/repositories
- Email
- Social networking sites (e.g., LinkedIn, Twitter,)
- Your own blog/website
- Subject-based websites/repositories (e.g.,)
- Posts on other blogs/websites
- Discussion lists
- Multimedia sharing sites (e.g., Slideshare,..)
Actions = data = answers?
Brief background: what is Kudos?

Plain language explanations

Trackable links for sharing

Range of metrics against which to map efforts to explain and share
Open vs closed communications

**OPEN**
channels - nothing to restrict visibility of sharing of work, except time and effort in finding / following / filtering

**MEDIATED**
channels - possible, but less likely, for publisher / institution to have visibility of sharing

**CLOSED**
channels - very unlikely that publisher / institution will be connected with researcher and have visibility of sharing efforts here
Facebook is more commonly used for sharing academic work than you might expect.

# publications with share actions in Kudos
n = 4,610
Publication can be shared in more than one channel.
But links shared via LinkedIn are most likely to be clicked
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A proposed spectrum for metrics (AIDA)
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Can attention drive action? Yes!

Due to the small sample size (n<30), the results must be interpreted with caution.

### Median Increase in Full Text Downloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3 years</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>(n=1369)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>(n=3378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 8 years</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>(n=1499)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 11 years</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>(n=53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 14 years</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 years</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>(n=460)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>(n=220)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Publications Grouped by Age

- Treatment group n=4,858
- Control group, n=4,866

- There is a significant difference between the median averages of the two groups.
- There is no significant difference between the median averages of the two groups.

*Due to the small sample size (n<30), the results must be interpreted with caution.
Proactively explaining and sharing work increases downloads by 23%
thanks our survey partners