



Journal of Hunan University (Natural Sciences)

Vol. 52 No. 12
December 2025

Available online at
<https://joununs.com>



ELSEVIER
Scopus



Clarivate
WEB OF SCIENCE

Open Access Article

 <https://doi.org/10.55463/issn.1674-2974.52.12.12>

Navigating Scholarly Networks: A Study of Research Sharing Practices among Faculty and Researchers

Md. Mahmudul Hasan*¹ , Parul Parvin²

¹ Lecturer, Department of Information Science and Library Management,
Asian University of Bangladesh,

² Lecturer, Department of Information Science and Library Management,
Asian University of Bangladesh,

* Corresponding author: dumahmud9011@gmail.com

Article history

Received: November 13, 2025

Revised: December 20, 2025

Accepted: January 7, 2026

Published: January 30, 2026

Abstract: Research-based social networking sites (RSNs) have become integral platforms within the global scholarly ecosystem, facilitating the dissemination of research ideas as well as academic communication and collaboration. These platforms offer researchers opportunities to share publications, access scholarly resources, and establish professional networks beyond institutional and geographical boundaries. Despite their growing relevance, the extent to which faculty members and research scholars effectively engage with RSNs remains insufficiently explored.

This study aims to examine research-sharing attitudes and usage activities of faculty members and research scholars on major RSNs. Adopting a quantitative research design, data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered via a survey. The analysis focuses on users' awareness of RSNs, frequency of use, preferred platforms, perceived benefits, and key challenges associated with their adoption.

The findings indicate a general lack of awareness and familiarity with RSNs, which contributes to low levels of active engagement among users. Among the platforms examined, ResearchGate and LinkedIn emerge as the most frequently used, with ResearchGate being the primary medium for research collaboration, publication sharing, data



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Licensee JHU

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

access, and scholarly interaction. The study further identifies several perceived benefits of RSN usage, including the exchange of research ideas and experiences, exposure to emerging research tools and techniques, and support in addressing research-related problems. However, research scholars also perceive RSNs as time-consuming and express concerns regarding fake identities and inadequate internet connectivity.

The study concludes by offering practical recommendations to enhance effective RSN utilization, including improving users' awareness and digital literacy, fostering positive research-sharing attitudes, and strengthening technological infrastructure to support seamless academic communication.

Keywords: Research-Based Social Networking Sites; Academic Communication; Faculty Members; Research Scholars; Research Sharing; Digital Scholarly Collaboration; ResearchGate; LinkedIn; Academia.edu.

将可持续发展会计融入可持续财务决策以提升企业价值

摘要：以研究为基础的学术社交网络平台（Research-Based Social Networking Sites, RSNs）已成为全球学术生态系统中的重要组成部分，为研究思想的传播以及学术交流与合作提供了关键支持。这些平台使研究人员能够共享学术成果、获取研究资源，并突破机构与地域限制建立专业学术网络。尽管RSNs的重要性日益凸显，但高校教师与科研人员在这些平台上的实际使用程度及其有效性仍有待深入研究。

本研究旨在考察高校教师与科研人员在主要RSNs上的科研分享态度与使用行为。研究采用定量研究方法，通过结构化问卷开展问卷调查，系统分析用户对RSNs的认知水平、使用频率、平台偏好、感知收益以及在使用过程中面临的主要挑战。

研究结果表明，用户对RSNs的认知和熟悉程度普遍不足，这是导致其活跃度较低的主要原因。在所调查的平台中，ResearchGate 和 LinkedIn 的使用频率最高，其中 ResearchGate 主要用于科研合作、学术成果分享、数据获取以及学术交流。此外，研究还发现，RSNs 在促进研究思想与经验交流、提升对新型研究工具与技术的认知，以及协助解决科研问题等方面具有显著优势。然而，部分科研人员认为 RSNs 使用较为耗时，同时对虚假身份和互联网连接不稳定等问题表示担忧。

研究最后提出了若干实践性建议，包括加强对 RSNs 的认知与数字素养培训、提升科研分享的积极态度，以及改善网络基础设施，以促进更加高效和顺畅的学术交流。

关键词：以研究为基础的学术社交网络；学术交流；高校教师；科研人员；科研成果共享；数字化学术合作；ResearchGate；LinkedIn；Academia.edu

1. Introduction

Social networking sites are online platforms that allow users to stay connected with family, friends, colleagues, clients, or customers. They allow users to create profiles and interact with others on the web. The usage of these sites has grown rapidly, with various groups such as students, faculty members, researchers, and general people using them. However, the impact on education and research is not clear. To address this, specialized

social networking sites have been created, such as ResearchGate, Academia.edu, and LinkedIn.

Research-based social networking sites are mainly used by researchers, scientists, faculty members, and professionals. ResearchGate requires an email address at a recognized institution to become a member, and members can upload research outputs such as papers, data, patents, articles, research proposals, and methods presentations. Academia.edu is another research-based

site with no restrictions, allowing users to create profiles, upload their works, and select areas of interest. LinkedIn, a professional social networking site, also plays a role in research-based social networking sites. Professionals, academicians, and research scholars can upload their articles and share their research experiences, making students potential users. LinkedIn also allows users to upload videos, pictures, and communicate with other users.

In Bangladesh, research-based social networking sites are used by scientists, research scholars, and faculty members. However, there is no evidence to support this claim. This research aims to understand the usages and purposes of these sites, as well as the attitudes and activities of faculty members and research scholars.

1.1 Objectives

The main objectives of this research is to assess the attitudinal factors and activities in sharing article/research through research based social networking site by the faculty members and research scholars. Besides this, the study covers the following objectives:

- To know the frequency of visiting research based social networking site (RSNS);
- To assess the effectiveness of RSNS in research work;
- To investigate the purposes and motivating factors in using RSNS.
- To Know the researcher regular activities in RSNS;
- To identify the benefits in using RSNS;
- To scrutinize the different types of problems and risk factors that faced by the users.

2. Methodology

When a researcher selects a research method he/she must know why he selects these methods because it helps to evaluate the research result researcher himself. In this context the researchers had chosen survey methods for conducting this research.

2.1 Survey method

Survey method is one kind of research methods which is used for collecting data from the pre-defined groups of respondents to gain information on various topics of interest. A survey may have variety of purposes and can be carried out in many depending on the objective to be achieved and methodology chosen. In a survey method the data is obtained through a standardized procedure whose purpose is to ensure that all the respondents is able to answer the question. For the better outcome of research the questionnaire that is set for the researcher must be avoid biased options.

2.2 Data collection techniques

The gathering of data may range from a simple observation to a large scale survey in any defined population. There are many data collection techniques. The success of any research depends on the techniques of data collection. The technique which the researchers followed in this research is discussed below:

2.3 Questionnaire

Collecting data through a questionnaire is a popular technique particularly in case of big studies. A questionnaire consists of a number of question printed or typed in a define form or order. It is formulated based on the research objective. Through a questionnaire data can be collected in two ways. One way is mailed the questionnaire to the selected respondents and the other is to give the questionnaire directly to the respondents. To fulfill the objectives of the study, a detailed, structured questionnaire was prepared and distributed among the faculty members and research scholar of two public universities in Dhaka district. The researchers distributed 200 questionnaires to the faculty members and research scholars of Dhaka University (DU) and Bangladesh University of Engineering & Technology (BUET) but received 78 filled up questionnaire with a response rate of 39%. Among the 78 questionnaire, 63 questionnaire were valid i.e. they are being used RSNS which yields 80.76% of the total respondents.

2.4 Purposive sampling

For this research work the researchers had selected purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is also known by different names such as non-probability sampling, deliberate sampling and judgment sampling. In this type of sampling, items for the sample are selected purposively by the researcher and his/her choice concerning the items remains supreme. For this research work the researchers purposively selected some faculty members and research scholar of two selected public university as most of them are not using RSNS.

2.5 Data analysis and presentation method

The researchers had analyzed data with the help of SPSS and MS Excel software. The collected data were analyzed, sorted, summarized, calculated, edited, tabulated and classified according to the objective of this study. The researchers had represented this data into different type of table. So, the result would be easy to understand.

2.6 Research area

Research area indicates the place where the research work will be done or took place. For this research the researchers selected two public Universities of Dhaka as research area. These are Dhaka University (DU) and Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET).

2.7 Dhaka University (DU)

For the smoothness of the research work the researchers had purposively selected some faculty members and research scholar of Dhaka University as sampling. Because, one researcher was a student of Dhaka University and it easy for me to collect data from them. The researchers collected data from 30 faculty members of 14 departments. Among 30 faculty members 25 validly fill up the questionnaire and other 5 respondents said they do not use research based social networking site. The researchers also collected data from 17 research scholar of Dhaka University. Among 17 research scholar 13 validly fill up the questionnaire and other 4 respondents said they do not use research based social networking sites.

2.8 Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET)

The researchers also selected some faculty members of Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET) as sampling. The researchers collected data from 31 faculty members of 7 departments purposively. Among 31 faculty members 25 validly fill up the

questionnaire and other 6 said that they do not use research based social networking site.

The researchers analyzed data with the help of MS excel (2013) software. The collected data were analyzed, sorted, summarized, calculated, edited, tabulated and classified according to the objective of this study. The researchers represented this data into different type of table. So, the result would be easy to understand. To analyze and represent the collected data, the researchers had used SPSS, MS word and MS Excel software.

Document review is the process of examine books, written article, reports etc. of a relevant topic. It helps to identify data sources that other researcher have used. With the help of document review researcher know more about the topic and its clear the concept of relevant topic. The research topic is “Resource sharing attitude and activities among faculty members and research scholars through Research based Social networking Site: a study”. According to our topic the researchers review many document on research based social networking site like ResearchGate, Academia.edu and LinkedIn. These articles help me to know more about the aspect of using these sites.

3. Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of systematically applying statistical and/or logical techniques to describe and illustrate, condense and recap, and evaluate data. The

purpose of data analysis is to discover useful information, informing conclusion and support decision making.

Table-1: University wise Respondents (Developed by the authors)

Name of University	Category	Number	Percentage
Dhaka University (DU)	Faculty Members	25	39.68%
	Research Scholars	13	20.63%
Bangladesh University of Engineering & Technology (BUET)	Faculty Members	25	39.68%
Total		63	100%

This table shows the university wise responses of the respondents. Among 63 respondents, 25 faculty members (39.68%) and 13 research scholars (20.63%)

are from DU. On the other hand rest of the 25 faculty members (39.68%) are from BUET.

Table -2: Frequency to visit RSNS

Types of RSNS	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
ResearchGate	31.75	4.76	25.40	14.29	23.81	3.06	1.56
LinkedIn	34.92	4.76	14.29	28.57	17.46	3.11	1.57
Academia.edu	49.21	3.17	15.87	23.81	7.94	3.62	1.49

N.B.1=Always, 2=Very often, 3=Sometimes, 4=Rarely, 5=Never

The data of table 2 indicates the frequency of visiting research based social networking site. Among three RSNS maximum number of user of Academia.edu (49.21%) response that they “never” visit Academia.edu

and 23.81% of the respondent response that they visit Academia.edu “very often”. On the other hand 34.92% of the total respondent response that they “never” visit LinkedIn and 28.57% of the respondent response that

they visit LinkedIn “very often”. Therefore, the users of ResearchGate (31.75%) of the respondents response that they never visit but 25.40% of the respondents response that they visit ResearchGate “sometimes”.

In the case of frequency of research based social networking site the lowest mean value indicates the possibility to be “Always” most. Reversely the highest mean value indicates the possibility to be “Never” most. The mean value for the frequency of visiting ResearchGate is the lowest (M=3.06) which indicates

“Sometimes” in the likert scale and the second lowest mean value for LinkedIn is M=3.11 which also indicates “Sometimes”. The highest mean value for Academia.edu is M=3.62 which clearly indicates “Rarely” in the likert scale. The SD value for the Academia.edu is the lowest (1.49) which signifies less variability of data. Whereas the SD value for the LinkedIn is the highest (1.57) which also indicates the data point more spreading out over large number of data.

Table -3: Effectiveness of RSNS in research (Developed by the authors)

Types of RSNS	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
ResearchGate	30.16	4.76	11.11	20.63	33.33	2.78	1.67
LinkedIn	39.68	6.35	20.63	26.98	6.35	3.46	1.41
Academia.edu	50.79	1.59	20.63	15.87	11.11	3.65	1.50

N.B.1=very effective, 2=Effective, 3=Fairly effective, 4=Slightly effective, 5=Not effective

The table 3 shows the effectiveness of RSNS in research work. Most of the user of ResearchGate (33.33%) of the respondents response that it is “very effective”, 20.63% of the respondents response that it is “effective” and 30.16% of the respondents response that it is “not effective”. On the other hand 26.98% LinkedIn user response that it is “effective”, 20.63% of the respondents response that “fairly effective” and 39.68% of the respondents response that it is “not effective”. But half of the users of Academia.edu (50.79%) response that it is “not effective”. Only 15.87% of the respondents response that it is “effective” and 20.63% of the respondents response that it is “fairly effective”. In this table mean and standard deviation of the responses are calculated according to the following scores: 1.00- Very

effective, 2.00- Effective, 3.00- Fairly effective, 4.00- Slightly effective and 5.00- Not effective. The participant of the survey reported with the lowest mean value for effectiveness of ResearchGate is M=2.78 which means “Fairly effective” and the second lowest mean score for effectiveness of LinkedIn is M=3.46 also means “Fairly effective” in the likert scale. The highest value of mean for effectiveness of Academia.edu is M=3.65 which means “Slightly effective” in the likert scale. In the present study the SD value for LinkedIn is the lowest (1.41) which signifies less variability of data. Whereas the SD value for ResearchGate is the highest (1.67) which indicates the data point more spreading out over large number of data.

Table -4: Purposes in using RG (Developed by the authors)

Purposes in using RG	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Connect and collaborate with other researchers	0.00	1.59	34.92	28.57	34.92	2.03	0.88
To share and access scientific output, knowledge and expertise	1.59	0.00	39.68	28.57	30.16	2.14	0.91
To find solution of research problem	1.59	3.17	49.21	25.40	20.63	2.40	0.91
Share publication, access others and publish data	0.00	0.00	44.44	19.05	36.51	2.08	0.90
Export profile as CV	4.76	6.35	71.43	11.11	6.35	2.92	0.79
Ask and reply to question	3.17	9.52	60.32	14.29	12.70	2.76	0.91
Get starts about views, downloads and citations of the research	1.59	1.59	53.97	23.81	19.05	2.43	0.87
Following and discussing different topics	0.00	7.94	57.14	14.29	20.63	2.52	0.91
To request for full text articles	0.00	3.17	50.79	22.22	23.81	2.33	0.88
Creating and open reviews	6.35	4.76	61.90	12.70	14.29	2.76	0.98
Finding impact point	6.35	1.59	57.14	17.46	17.46	2.62	1.01

Purposes in using RG	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Find the right job	4.76	11.11	65.08	11.11	7.94	2.94	0.86
To showcase profile	6.35	9.52	73.02	4.76	6.35	3.05	0.81
Getting live feed	6.35	4.76	66.67	12.70	9.52	2.86	0.90

N.B.1= Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

The table 4 shows that the respondents are given 14 options for indicating the purposes in using ResearchGate. The consent of respondents who are strongly agree regarding the purposes in using RG are summarized below:

- Share publication, access others and publish data (36.51%)
- Connect and collaborate with other researcher (34.92%)
- To share and access scientific output, knowledge and expertise (30.16%)
- To request for full text articles (23.81%)
- To find solution of research problem (20.63%)
- Following and discussing different topics (20.63%)

Here the lowest mean value for the purpose of using ResearchGate is “connect and collaborate with other researcher” (M=2.03) which clearly indicates “agree” in the likert scale and the second lowest mean value for the purpose is “Share publication, access others and publish data” (M=2.08) which also clearly indicates “agree” in the likert scale. The highest mean score is for *to showcase profile* (M=3.05) which indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for the purpose of ‘Export profile as CV’ is the lowest (0.79) which signifies less variability. Whereas the SD value for the purpose of “Finding impact point” is the highest (1.01) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -5: Purposes in using LI (Developed by the authors)

Purposes in using LI	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Connect and collaborate with other researchers	1.59	4.76	47.62	30.16	15.87	2.46	0.88
To share and access scientific output, knowledge and expertise	3.17	1.59	57.14	30.16	7.94	2.62	0.79
To find solution of research problem	4.76	4.76	60.32	22.22	7.94	2.76	0.86
Share publication, access others and publish data	3.17	1.59	68.25	20.63	6.35	2.75	0.74
Export profile as CV	6.35	4.76	74.60	4.76	9.52	2.94	0.86
Ask and reply to question	4.76	3.17	82.54	4.76	4.76	2.98	0.68
Get starts about views, downloads and citations of the research	6.35	6.35	69.84	11.11	6.35	2.95	0.83
Following and discussing different topics	4.76	3.17	71.43	12.70	7.94	2.84	0.81
To request for full text articles	4.76	1.59	80.95	4.76	7.94	2.90	0.76
Creating and open reviews	3.17	3.17	73.02	9.52	11.11	2.78	0.81
Finding impact point	6.35	4.76	73.02	6.35	9.52	2.92	0.87
Find the right job	6.35	3.17	69.84	9.52	11.11	2.84	0.90
To showcase profile	6.35	3.17	69.84	4.76	15.87	2.79	0.97
Getting live feed	6.35	3.17	71.43	11.11	7.94	2.89	0.84

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

The table 5 shows the consent of respondents who are agreed regarding the purposes in using LI summarized below:

- Connect and collaborate with other researcher (30.16%)
- To share and access scientific output, knowledge and expertise (30.16%)
- To find solution of research problem (22.22%)
- Share publication, access others and publish data (20.63)

The lowest mean score for the purpose of using LinkedIn is “Connect and collaborate with other researcher” (M=2.46) which indicates “Agreed” and the second lowest mean value for the purpose is “To share and access scientific output, knowledge and expertise” (M=2.62) which indicates “Undecided”. The highest mean score for purpose is “Ask and reply to question” (M=2.98) which also indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for the purpose of ‘Ask and reply to questions’ is the lowest (0.68) which signifies less variability whereas the SD value for the purpose of ‘ To showcase profile’ (0.97) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -6: Purposes in using Academia.edu (A.edu) (Developed by the authors)

Purposes in using A.edu	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Connect and collaborate with other researchers	0.00	3.17	60.32	15.87	20.63	2.46	0.86
To share and access scientific output, knowledge and expertise	0.00	1.59	66.67	11.11	20.63	2.49	0.84
To find solution of research problem	1.59	1.59	63.49	17.46	15.87	2.56	0.84
Share publication, access others and publish data	0.00	0.00	66.67	12.70	20.63	2.46	0.82
Export profile as CV	7.94	3.17	79.37	6.35	3.17	3.06	0.74
Ask and reply to question	4.84	3.23	79.03	8.06	4.84	2.95	0.71
Get starts about views, downloads and citations of the research	1.59	0.00	71.43	15.87	11.11	2.65	0.74
Following and discussing different topics	0.00	0.00	73.02	19.05	7.94	2.65	0.63
To request for full text articles	0.00	1.59	77.78	14.29	6.35	2.75	0.59
Creating and open reviews	0.00	4.76	84.13	4.76	6.35	2.87	0.58
Finding impact point	1.59	1.59	84.13	4.76	7.94	2.84	0.65
Find the right job	1.59	4.76	84.13	7.94	1.59	2.97	0.51
To showcase profile	1.61	6.45	82.26	4.84	4.84	3.43	0.61
Getting live feed	1.59	4.76	82.54	4.76	6.35	2.90	0.64

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

The table 6 shows the consent of respondents who are strongly agreed regarding the purposes in using Academia.edu summarized below:

- Connect and collaborate with other researcher (20.63%)
- To share and access scientific output, knowledge and expertise (20.63%)
- Share publication, access others and publish data (20.63)
- To find solution of research problem (15.87%)

The lowest mean score for the purpose in using Academia.edu is “Connect and collaborate with other

researcher and Share publication, access others and publish data” (M=2.46) which indicates “Agree” and the second lowest mean score for the purpose is “share and access scientific output, knowledge and expertise” (M=2.49) which also indicates “Agree”. The highest mean score for the usage purpose is “to showcase profile” (M=3.43) which indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for the purpose of ‘Following and discussing different topics’ is the lowest (0.63) which signifies less variability whereas the SD value for the purpose of ask and reply to questions (3.85) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -7: Motivating factors in using RG (Developed by the authors)

Motivating factors in using RG	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Helps in research and learning	0.00	1.59	34.92	19.05	44.44	1.94	0.93
Collation of resources	0.00	0.00	46.03	31.75	22.22	2.24	0.80
Collaborative and peer-to-peer learning	1.59	1.59	65.08	14.29	17.46	2.56	0.86
Developing web skills	3.17	4.76	68.25	14.29	9.52	2.78	0.81
Virtual meeting with co-research scholars	3.17	1.59	55.56	23.81	15.87	2.52	0.90
Completing research work swiftly	3.17	1.59	52.38	25.40	17.46	2.48	0.91
Developing an e-portfolio for future employment	3.17	4.76	65.08	9.52	17.46	2.67	0.93

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

The table 7 shows the factors that motivates the user for using ResearchGate. A good number of respondents (44.44%) are strongly agreed that they use ResearchGate because it “*helps in research and learning*” and 31.75% of the respondents are agreed that that they use for “*collation of resources*”. The lowest mean score of the respondents’ opinion (1.94) affirmed that “Helps in

research and learning” are the crucial motivating factor in using RG. The respondents asserted with a mean score of 2.78 that is undecided for “Developing web skills”. The SD value for “collation of resources” is the lowest (0.80) which signifies less variability whereas the SD value for “helps in research and learning and developing an e-portfolio for future employment” (0.93) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -8: Motivating factors in using Academia.edu (A.edu) (Developed by the authors)

Motivating factors in using A.edu	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Helps in research and learning	4.76	3.17	68.25	9.52	14.29	2.75	0.92
Collation of resources	4.76	0.00	71.43	9.52	14.29	2.71	0.89
Collaborative and peer-to-peer learning	3.17	7.94	61.90	19.05	7.94	2.79	0.83
Developing web skills	3.17	1.59	68.25	22.22	4.76	2.76	0.71
Virtual meeting with co-research scholars	4.76	3.17	63.49	15.87	12.70	2.71	0.91
Completing research work swiftly	4.76	6.35	71.43	11.11	6.35	2.92	0.79
Developing an e-portfolio for future employment	6.35	4.76	65.08	14.29	9.52	2.84	0.90

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

The table 8 shows that only few percent of Academia.edu user (14.29%) response that it “*helps in research and learning*” and “*collation of resources*”. On the other hand 22.22% of the respondents agree that “*developing web skill*” motivates them in using Academia.edu. The highest score in the case of strongly disagree scale is 6.35% which is for “*developing an e-portfolio*” as the motivating factors in using A.edu The lowest mean value for motivating factors in using

Academia.edu is “collation of resources and virtual meeting with co-research scholars” (M=2.71) which means “Undecided”. The highest mean value for motivating factors is “*completing research work swiftly*” (M=2.92) which also means “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for ‘developing web skill’ is the lowest (0.71) which signifies less variability. Whereas the SD value for ‘helps in research and learning (0.92) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -9: Motivating factors in using LinkedIn (LI) (Developed by the authors)

Motivating factors for LI	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Helps in research and learning	0.00	0.00	58.73	14.29	26.98	2.32	0.88
Collation of resources	0.00	1.59	57.14	20.63	20.63	2.40	0.83
Collaborative and peer-to-peer learning	0.00	3.17	76.19	9.52	11.11	2.71	0.71
Developing web skills	0.00	0.00	76.19	12.70	11.11	2.65	0.68

Virtual meeting with co-research scholars	0.00	1.61	75.81	14.52	8.06	2.71	0.64
Completing research work swiftly	0.00	3.17	60.32	20.63	15.87	2.51	0.80
Developing an e-portfolio for future employment	0.00	3.17	87.30	4.76	4.76	2.89	0.51

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

Only 26.98% of the respondents are strongly agreed that it “helps in research and learning” and 20.63% of the respondents agree for “collation of knowledge” and “complete research work swiftly”. It is mentionable that none of the LinkedIn user give opinion as strongly disagree. The lowest mean value for motivating factors in using LinkedIn is “helps in research and learning” (M=2.32) which indicates “Agreed” and the second lowest mean value for motivating factors is “collation of

resources”(M=2.40) which also indicates “Agreed” in the likert scale. The highest mean value for motivating factors is “developing an e-portfolio for future employment” (M=2.89) which indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for “Developing an e-portfolio for future employment” is the lowest (0.51) which signifies less variability whereas the SD value for “helps in research and learning” (0.88) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -10: Benefits in using ResearchGate (RG) (Developed by the authors)

Benefits in using RG	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Share research ideas and experience	1.59	1.59	39.68	22.22	34.92	2.13	0.98
Easy communication (video, calls, message)	1.59	3.17	53.97	23.81	17.46	2.48	0.88
Fining solution of research problem	1.59	0.00	50.79	23.81	23.81	2.32	0.89
Knowledge about new research tools and techniques	0.00	3.17	41.27	28.57	26.98	2.21	0.88
New experience in e-learning	1.59	0.00	52.38	28.57	17.46	2.40	0.83
Professional advice from peer/groups	4.76	1.59	63.49	17.46	12.70	2.68	0.89
Real-time communication	0.00	1.59	53.97	25.40	19.05	2.38	0.81
Increase citation	1.59	1.59	49.21	28.57	19.05	2.38	0.87
Finding place in research consultancy	0.00	1.59	58.73	20.63	19.05	2.43	0.82
International collaborative project	1.59	4.76	57.14	15.87	20.63	2.51	0.93

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

The respondents were asked about the benefits of using ResearchGate. The highest percentage of the respondent (34.92%) commented as strongly agree for “share research ideas and experience”. While 28.57% of the respondents agreed for “knowledge about new research tools and techniques”, and “new experience in e-learning and increase citation”. The lowest mean value of this table for the benefits in using ResearchGate is to “share research ideas and experience” (M=2.13) which

yield to “Agree” in lickert scale. But the highest mean value for “professional advice for peer/groups” (M=2.68) which indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for “Real time communication” is the lowest (0.81) which signifies less variability. Whereas the SD value for “share research ideas and experience” (0.98) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -11: Benefits in using A.edu (Developed by the authors)

Benefits of using A.edu	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Share research ideas and experience	1.59	3.17	66.67	11.11	17.46	2.60	0.87
Easy communication (video, calls, message)	3.17	0.00	66.67	9.52	20.63	2.56	0.93
Fining solution of research problem	4.76	3.17	68.25	15.87	7.94	2.81	0.82
Knowledge about new research tools and techniques	3.17	9.52	68.25	11.11	7.94	2.89	0.81
New experience in e-learning	4.76	4.76	66.67	22.22	1.59	2.89	0.72
Professional advice from peer/groups	1.59	3.17	76.19	7.94	11.11	2.76	0.76

Real-time communication	3.17	0.00	68.25	11.11	17.46	2.60	0.89
Increase citation	3.17	1.59	82.54	11.11	1.59	2.94	0.56
Finding place in research consultancy	3.17	9.52	71.43	7.94	7.94	2.92	0.79
International collaborative project	4.76	1.59	80.95	4.76	7.94	2.90	0.76

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

About 21% user are strongly agreed that easy communication (video, calls, and message) is the benefit in using Academia.edu and 22.22% are agreed for new experience in e-learning. The lowest mean value (M=2.56) of this table is for easy communication (video, calls, message) which indicates “Undecided”. The

highest value of mean is 2.94 for increase citation indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for “Increase citation” is the lowest (0.56) which signifies less variability whereas the SD value for “easy communication (video, calls, and message)” is the highest (0.93) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -12: Benefits in using LinkedIn (LI) (Developed by the authors)

Benefits in using LI	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Share research ideas and experience	0.00	0.00	61.90	12.70	25.40	2.37	0.87
Easy communication (video, calls, message)	1.59	1.59	71.43	17.46	7.94	2.71	0.71
Fining solution of research problem	0.00	0.00	58.73	22.22	19.05	2.40	0.79
Knowledge about new research tools and techniques	0.00	1.59	65.08	14.29	19.05	2.49	0.82
New experience in e-learning	0.00	0.00	69.84	22.22	7.94	2.62	0.63
Professional advice from peer/groups	0.00	3.17	68.25	12.70	15.87	2.59	0.80
Real-time communication	0.00	0.00	66.67	19.05	14.29	2.52	0.74
Increase citation	0.00	0.00	74.60	12.70	12.70	2.62	0.71
Finding place in research consultancy	0.00	0.00	73.02	9.52	17.46	2.56	0.78
International collaborative project	1.59	1.59	73.02	6.35	17.46	2.63	0.85

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

Only 25.40% of the respondents strongly agree for share research ideas and experience in using LI and 22.22% respondents agree for finding solution for research problem and new experience in e-learning through LI. The lowest mean value of this table is 2.37 for share ideas and experience indicates “Agree” in the likert scale. The highest value of mean is 2.71 for easy

communication (video, calls, and message) indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for “New experience in e-learning” is the lowest (0.63) which signifies less variability. Whereas the SD value for “share research ideas and experience” is the highest (0.87) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -13: Regular activities in RG (Developed by the authors)

Regular activities in RG	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Regular communicating with researcher around the world	1.59	0.00	44.44	23.81	30.16	2.19	0.93
Regular visiting and updating my profile information	3.17	3.17	49.21	30.16	14.29	2.51	0.90
posting my research article papers	3.17	3.17	55.56	22.22	15.87	2.56	0.91
Reading comments and reviews any research publication	1.59	1.59	57.14	20.63	19.05	2.46	0.88
Read articles and reviewing paper posted by others	3.17	0.00	46.03	15.87	34.92	2.21	1.03
Answering question posted in my area of interest	0.00	6.35	57.14	22.22	14.29	2.56	0.82
Sending my papers to fellow users on request	1.59	1.59	60.32	17.46	19.05	2.49	0.88
Search for job opportunity	6.35	9.52	68.25	6.35	9.52	2.97	0.90

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

A good number of respondents (34.92%) are strongly agreed for read articles and reviewing paper posted by others. The second highest value is 30.16% for regular communication with researcher around the world which indicates strongly agree in Likert scale. The mean value for *regular communication with researcher around the world* is lowest (M=2.19) which clearly indicates “Agree” in Likert scale. The mean score for searching a

job is highest (M=2.97) which indicates “Undecided” in the mean value. In the present study SD value for “answering question posted in area of interest” is the lowest (0.82) which signifies less variability over the values. Whereas the SD value for “read articles and reviewing paper posted by others” is the highest (1.03) which indicates the data point more spreading out over large number of data.

Table -14: Regular activities in A.edu (Developed by the authors)

Regular activities in A.edu	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Regular communicating with researcher around the world	1.59	0.00	69.84	12.70	15.87	2.59	0.82
Regular visiting and updating my profile information	3.17	1.59	71.43	15.87	7.94	2.76	0.76
posting my research article papers	4.76	1.59	76.19	17.46	0.00	2.94	0.62
Reading comments and reviews any research publication	1.59	1.59	79.37	14.29	3.17	2.84	0.57
Read articles and reviewing paper posted by others	1.59	1.59	69.84	15.87	11.11	2.67	0.76
Answering question posted in my area of interest	3.17	1.59	80.95	7.94	6.35	2.87	0.68
Sending my papers to fellow users on request	3.17	1.59	84.13	4.76	6.35	2.90	0.67
Search for job opportunity	3.17	3.17	71.43	11.11	11.11	2.76	0.82

N.B.1=strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

The table 14 shows that about 16% of the RG respondents strongly agree for regular communicating with researcher around the world and 17.46% respondents agree for posting research article papers. The mean value for regular communication with researcher around the world is lowest (M=2.59) which clearly indicates “Undecided” and posting research article paper is highest (M=2.94) which also indicates

“Undecided” in the likert scale. In this study SD value for “reading comments and reviews any research publication” is the lowest (0.57) which signifies less variability over the values and highest value (0.82) for regular communicating with researcher around the world and search for job opportunity also signifies less variability over the values.

Table -15: Regular activities in LI (Developed by the authors)

Regular activities in LI	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Regular communicating with researcher around the world	0.00	1.59	65.08	15.87	17.46	2.51	0.80
Regular visiting and updating my profile information	0.00	4.76	74.60	14.29	6.35	2.78	0.63
posting my research article papers	0.00	4.76	68.25	15.87	11.11	2.67	0.74
Reading comments and reviews any research publication	0.00	1.59	65.08	20.63	12.70	2.56	0.74
Read articles and reviewing paper posted by others	0.00	0.00	63.49	12.70	23.81	2.40	0.85
Answering question posted in my area of interest	0.00	1.59	79.37	14.29	4.76	2.78	0.55
Sending my papers to fellow users on request	3.17	3.17	71.43	14.29	7.94	2.79	0.77
Search for job opportunity	3.17	4.76	82.54	6.35	3.17	2.98	0.61

N.B.1=strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5= Strongly disagree

Only 23.81% of the respondents strongly agree for read articles and reviewing paper posted by others and

17.46% for regular communication with researcher around the world. The mean value for read articles and

reviewing paper posted by others is lowest ($M=2.40$) which clearly indicates “Agree” in the likert scale. The score for search for job opportunity is highest ($M=2.98$) which also indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. In this study SD value for “answering question posted in

my area of interest” is the lowest (0.55) which signifies less variability over the values. On the other hand the highest value (0.77) for sending my paper to fellow users on request also signifies less variability over the values.

Table -16: Problems facing while using RSNS (Developed by the authors)

Problems while facing RSNS	RG		A.edu		LI	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Time consuming	2.46	1.00	2.67	0.86	2.67	0.78
Addiction to SNS	3.10	0.76	2.98	0.77	3.08	0.70
Fake identity	2.76	0.80	2.46	1.00	2.73	0.63
Poor internet connectivity	2.54	0.82	2.43	0.98	2.59	0.80
Scam practiced by cyber crooks	2.71	0.58	2.81	0.67	2.84	0.63
Unnecessary stress	2.78	0.58	2.92	0.63	2.90	0.59
Invitation from SNS	2.92	0.66	2.87	0.66	2.94	0.54
Lack of technical know how	2.89	0.74	3.06	0.78	2.94	0.59
No access to SNS in university campus	3.33	1.03	3.37	0.96	3.27	0.87
Gossiping freely in an open environment	3.11	0.79	3.05	0.58	3.02	0.52
Poor information literacy about SNS	3.08	0.87	3.11	0.79	3.02	0.55

N.B.1=strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

This table shows the different types of problems that hinder user in using RSNS. In this regard time consuming is think one of the major problem in using RSNS which are agreed by the RG users only (2.46). Similarly fake identity 2.46 and poor internet connectivity 2.43 are also think one of the major

problem in using RSNS that are agreed by the A.edu users. LI users kept themselves Undecided in commenting for any problems that are faced by them when they using RSNS. RG users and A.edu users are agreed for some problems but for other problems they also kept themselves undecided in commenting.

Table -17: Risks factors associated with RSNS (Developed by the authors)

Risks Factors	RG		A.edu		LI	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Data security	2.44	0.88	2.73	0.81	2.78	0.63
No authentic information	2.65	0.83	3.00	0.76	2.98	0.68
Lack of privacy	2.73	0.81	2.76	0.73	2.90	0.53
Cyber crime	2.62	0.87	2.60	0.85	2.63	0.75
Unauthorized access	2.79	0.79	2.78	0.73	2.84	0.41
Cyber bullying	2.73	0.72	2.78	0.75	2.86	0.50
Critique	2.75	0.84	2.78	0.75	2.79	0.51

N.B.1=strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

This table discusses about the risks factors that are associated with RSNS. Among three RSNS user, only RG users (2.44) are agreed that data security is one of the major risk factor that is associated with RSNS. LI

users and A.edu users kept themselves undecided in commenting on this issue. In this table maximum number of users of all three RSNS kept themselves undecided in commenting.

Table -18: Benefits in using ResearchGate (RG) (Developed by the authors)

Benefits in using RG	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Share research ideas and experience	1.59	1.59	39.68	22.22	34.92	2.13	0.98
Easy communication (video, calls, message)	1.59	3.17	53.97	23.81	17.46	2.48	0.88
Finishing solution of research problem	1.59	0.00	50.79	23.81	23.81	2.32	0.89
Knowledge about new research tools and techniques	0.00	3.17	41.27	28.57	26.98	2.21	0.88
New experience in e-learning	1.59	0.00	52.38	28.57	17.46	2.40	0.83
Professional advice from peer/groups	4.76	1.59	63.49	17.46	12.70	2.68	0.89
Real-time communication	0.00	1.59	53.97	25.40	19.05	2.38	0.81
Increase citation	1.59	1.59	49.21	28.57	19.05	2.38	0.87
Finding place in research consultancy	0.00	1.59	58.73	20.63	19.05	2.43	0.82
International collaborative project	1.59	4.76	57.14	15.87	20.63	2.51	0.93

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

The respondents were asked about the benefits of using ResearchGate. The highest percentage of the respondent (34.92%) commented as strongly agree for “share research ideas and experience”. While 28.57% of the respondents agreed for “knowledge about new research tools and techniques”, and “new experience in e-learning and increase citation”. The lowest mean value of this table for the benefits in using ResearchGate is to

“share research ideas and experience” (M=2.13) which yield to “Agree” in likert scale. But the highest mean value for “professional advice for peer/groups” (M=2.68) which indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for “Real time communication” is the lowest (0.81) which signifies less variability. Whereas the SD value for “share research ideas and experience” (0.98) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -19: Benefits in using A.edu (Developed by the authors)

Benefits of using A.edu	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Share research ideas and experience	1.59	3.17	66.67	11.11	17.46	2.60	0.87
Easy communication (video, calls, message)	3.17	0.00	66.67	9.52	20.63	2.56	0.93
Finishing solution of research problem	4.76	3.17	68.25	15.87	7.94	2.81	0.82
Knowledge about new research tools and techniques	3.17	9.52	68.25	11.11	7.94	2.89	0.81
New experience in e-learning	4.76	4.76	66.67	22.22	1.59	2.89	0.72
Professional advice from peer/groups	1.59	3.17	76.19	7.94	11.11	2.76	0.76
Real-time communication	3.17	0.00	68.25	11.11	17.46	2.60	0.89
Increase citation	3.17	1.59	82.54	11.11	1.59	2.94	0.56
Finding place in research consultancy	3.17	9.52	71.43	7.94	7.94	2.92	0.79
International collaborative project	4.76	1.59	80.95	4.76	7.94	2.90	0.76

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

About 21% user are strongly agreed that easy communication (video, calls, and message) is the benefit in using Academia.edu and 22.22% are agreed for new experience in e-learning. The lowest mean value (M=2.56) of this table is for easy communication (video, calls, message) which indicates “Undecided”. The

highest value of mean is 2.94 for increase citation indicates “Undecided” in the likert scale. The SD value for “Increase citation” is the lowest (0.56) which signifies less variability whereas the SD value for “easy communication (video, calls, and message)” is the highest (0.93) which indicates more spread out of data.

Table -20: Benefits in using LinkedIn (LI) (Developed by the authors)

Benefits in using LI	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	SD
Share research ideas and experience	0.00	0.00	61.90	12.70	25.40	2.37	0.87
Easy communication (video, calls, message)	1.59	1.59	71.43	17.46	7.94	2.71	0.71
Fining solution of research problem	0.00	0.00	58.73	22.22	19.05	2.40	0.79
Knowledge about new research tools and techniques	0.00	1.59	65.08	14.29	19.05	2.49	0.82
New experience in e-learning	0.00	0.00	69.84	22.22	7.94	2.62	0.63
Professional advice from peer/groups	0.00	3.17	68.25	12.70	15.87	2.59	0.80
Real-time communication	0.00	0.00	66.67	19.05	14.29	2.52	0.74
Increase citation	0.00	0.00	74.60	12.70	12.70	2.62	0.71
Finding place in research consultancy	0.00	0.00	73.02	9.52	17.46	2.56	0.78
International collaborative project	1.59	1.59	73.02	6.35	17.46	2.63	0.85

N.B.1=Strongly agree, 2=Agree, 3=Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly disagree

Only 25.40% of the respondents strongly agree for share research ideas and experience in using LI and 22.22% respondents agree for finding solution for research problem and new experience in e-learning through LI. The lowest mean value of this table is 2.37 for share ideas and experience indicates "Agree" in the likert scale. The highest value of mean is 2.71 for easy

communication (video, calls, and message) indicates "Undecided" in the likert scale. The SD value for "New experience in e-learning" is the lowest (0.63) which signifies less variability. Whereas the SD value for "share research ideas and experience" is the highest (0.87) which indicates more spread out of data.

4. Findings

As regard to the responses of the respondents, the study reveals the following major findings:

1. From this study it is observe that among 63 respondents, 25 faculty members (39.68%) and 13 research scholars (20.63%) are from DU. Rest of the 25 faculty members (39.68%) are from BUET.
2. The study clarify that a good number of linkedIn user (28.57%) of the respondents visit LinkedIn very often and 23.81% of the respondents always visit ResearchGate. But 25.40% of the respondents response that they visit ResearchGate sometimes.
3. From this study it is elucidate that most of the user of ResearchGate (33.33%) of the respondents response that it is very effective for their research work and 26.98% of the user of LinkedIn response that it is effective. But a maximum number of Academia.edu user (50.79%) response that it is not effective for their research work.
4. Most of the user of ResearchGate (36.51%) of the respondents strongly agree for the purpose of using ResearchGate is to share publication, access others and publish data and 34.92% of the respondents strongly agree for connect and collaborate with others. While only 6.35% strongly disagree for creating an open reviews, finding impact point, to showcase profile and getting live feed.
5. The study shows that 30.16% of LinkedIn user strongly agree for the purpose of using RSNS is to connect and collaborate with other user and the other is to share and access scientific output, knowledge and experience. Whereas only 6.35% respondents strongly disagree for the purposes of export profile as a CV, get starts about views, downloads and citation of research, finding impact point, find the right job, to showcase profile and getting live feed.
6. The study reveals that 20.63% Academia.edu user strongly agree for the purposes of using RSNS are to connect and collaborate with other researcher, to share access scientific output, knowledge and expertise and share publication, access others and publish data. On the other hand 19.05% of the respondents agree that they use Academia.edu for the purpose of following and discussing different topics. Only 7.49% of the respondents strongly disagree for the purpose of export profile as CV.
7. A good number of user of ResearchGate (44.44%) of the respondents strongly agree for the factor that motivates them in using ResearchGate is it helps in research and learning. Other factor that motivates them in using RSNS is collation of knowledge that are agree by the 31.75% respondents. Whereas only 3.17% of the respondents strongly disagree for the factors developing web skill, virtual meeting with co-research scholar, completing research work

- swiftly and for developing e-portfolio for future employment.
8. It is observe that a few percent of Academia.edu user (14.29%) of the respondents strongly agree for the factors that motivates them in using RSNS are it helps in research and learning and collation of resources. While 22.22% of the respondents agree for the factor that it helps in developing web skill. On the other hand 6.35% of the respondents strongly disagree for the factor developing an e-portfolio.
 9. The study demonstrates that 26.98% LinkedIn user strongly agree for the factor that motivates them in using LinkedIn is it helps in research and learning and 20.63% of the respondents agree for the factors are collation of knowledge and complete research work swiftly. It is mentionable that none of the LinkedIn user give any opinion as strongly disagree for any factors.
 10. The study clarify that 34.92% ResearchGate user strongly agree for the benefits of using ResearchGate is it helps in share research ideas and experience. On the other hand 28.57% of the respondents agree for the benefits of using ResearchGate are knowledge about new research tools and techniques, new experience in e-learning and increase citation. Only 4.76% of the respondents strongly disagree for the benefits professional advice from peer/groups.
 11. It is observe that 20.63% user strongly agree that easy communication (video, calls, messages) are benefits in using Academia.edu. Whereas 22.22% of the respondents agree for new experience in e-learning. Only 4.76% of the respondents strongly disagree for the benefits of using Acaemia.edu are finding solution of research problem, new experience in e-learning and international collaborative project.
 12. The study reveals that 25.40% of the respondents strongly agree for the benefits of using LinkedIn is it helps in share research ideas and experience. While 22.22% of the respondents agree for finding solution of research problem and new experience in e-learning. On the contrary 1.59% of the respondents strongly disagree for easy communication (video, calls, message) and international collaborative project.
 13. The study reveals that a good number of ResearchGate user (34.92%) strongly agree for their regular activities in ResearchGate are read articles and reviewing paper posted by others. On the other hand 30.16% of the respondents also strongly agree for regular communication with researcher around the world.
 14. The study demonstrates that most of the Academia.edu user are not active. Because only 15.57% respondents strongly agree for regular communication with researcher around the world. While 17.46% respondents agree that they regular post their research article in Academia.edu.
 15. In this study it is observed that 23.81% of the respondents strongly agree for read articles and reviewing paper posted by others as their regular activities. On the other hand 17.46% respondents agree for regular communication with researcher around the world. Only 3.17% respondents strongly disagree for search for job opportunity and sending my research paper to fellow users on request.
 16. This study reveals different problematic issues which hinder the respondents in using RSNS. In this context time consuming is one of the problematic issue that are agree by the RG users only (2.46). Similarly poor internet connectivity also create problem in using RSNS that are agree by the A.edu users only (2.43).
 17. This study shows the risk factors that are associated with RSNS. In this regard only RG users (2.44) agree that data security is one of the main risk factor that is associated with RSNS.
 18. The study clarify that 34.92% ResearchGate user strongly agree for the benefits of using ResearchGate is it helps in share research ideas and experience. On the other hand 28.57% of the respondents agree for the benefits of using ResearchGate are knowledge about new research tools and techniques, new experience in e-learning and increase citation. Only 4.76% of the respondents strongly disagree for the benefits professional advice from peer/groups.
 19. It is observe that 20.63% user strongly agree that easy communication (video, calls, messages) are benefits in using Academia.edu. Whereas 22.22% of the respondents agree for new experience in e-learning. Only 4.76% of the respondents strongly disagree for the benefits of using Acaemia.edu are finding solution of research problem, new experience in e-learning and international collaborative project.
 20. The study reveals that 25.40% of the respondents strongly agree for the benefits of using LinkedIn is it helps in share research ideas and experience. While 22.22% of the respondents agree for finding solution of research problem and new experience in e-learning. On the contrary 1.59% of the respondents strongly disagree for easy

communication (video, calls, message) and international collaborative project.

5. Recommendations

Research based social networking sites play an important role to conduct any research work swiftly. It has become a common place for the researcher to share their research ideas and knowledge. It helps to find out the solution of research problem by sharing problems with other researcher. It can be said as an international collaborative project. Because researcher of all over the world can easily connect through this sites. It is very popular because user can easily share their research ideas, knowledge, research paper and many more things. Here are some recommendations that may increase the benefits and solve the problems of using research based social networking sites.

A. Acquire knowledge about RSNS

It is find out that most of the user are not well aware about RSNS. So it is important to know about ins and outs of this site before opening an account in any research based social networking site. Because without knowing its function one cannot understand the importance of it. Overall knowledge about RSNS can help the user to know how much it's important for their research work. That may help to complete their research work swiftly.

B. Clear the purposes of using RSNS

Most of the respondents kept themselves undecided in commenting about the purposes of using RSNS. Because the purposes of using RSNS are not clear to them. But is very important to know in which purposes they can use RSNS. It may clear the purposes of using RSNS and may increase the user of RSNS.

C. Increase sharing attitude

It is observe that there are lack of sharing attitude among the RSNS user. They read or download others research paper but they don't upload their research work. Even many of them don't know which content they may upload in this site. By sharing research paper or other works they can connect to other researcher around the world. They have to understand this fact.

D. Promoting research based social networking site

This research work is conducted on two public universities faculty members and research scholars. If the authority of this institution take initiatives for the promoting of RSNS it may increase the user of RSNS. Now a days using of social networking sites are increasing tremendously all over the world. In our country it is not different. Everyday a lot of new users open an account on social networking sites. Because they know about the functions and benefits of this sites. They know through this site they can connect with their

The user of ResearchGate have the opportunity to earn impact point and RG Score. If the authority take into consideration that the impact point and RG Score is count for the promotion of faculty members. It also take into consideration that this score also carry a good marks for the researcher. Then the faculty members and research scholars must use these sites.

E. Motivation from the other user

It is found that RSNS are used by faculty members and research scholars .But the percentage of user of RSNS are not satisfactory. The percentage of RSNS user can be increased if the user of RSNS are motivates their colleagues and friends. They can motivates them by telling about the functions and benefits of using RSNS. They also motivates them by telling about how much these sites are effective for completing any research work.

F. Careful about accepting friend request

Fake identity is one of the big issue for spoil the authenticity of anyone personal information and research work. This type of ID at first send a friend request and after the accepting of friend request they collect one's personal information. They use this information without any authorization, to commit a crime or defraud to other person. So, it is very important to be careful before accepting any friend request.

G. Increase Knowledge about search parameters

There are various types of search parameters consist for searching any document. But in this research it is observe that most of the user of RSNS used only title search. It means they are unknown about the other search parameters. It is very essential to know about these search parameters because some of them help the user to search exact information from vast information.

H. Ensure speedy internet connection

Internet is one of the major factors for connecting with any online service. For using RSNS speedy internet connection is very essential. Most of the faculty members and research scholars use RSNS from the campus. They use Wi-Fi or broadband connection. But the speed of this connection are not satisfactory. Sometimes poor internet connectivity hinder the use of RSNS. So, concerning this issue, the authority must take initiatives to provide speedy internet connection.

6. Conclusion

family, friends, colleagues and other person all over the world. They can send message, calls, videos and picture through this site. For this reasons SNSs are very popular in Bangladesh like other countries. Research based social networking sites (RSNS) are such types of sites where researchers can share their research ideas and

knowledge along with some features of SNS. These sites are very popular all over the world. But in our country these sites are not pretty popular in researchers. Even who are the user of this sites are also still in dark in the level of use. Moreover not a single work has been done before about this topic.

This research topic was selected to make an analysis of the research sharing attitudes and activities through three RSNS like ResearchGate, Academia.edu and LinkedIn. The main objectives of this research is to assess the attitudinal factors and activities in sharing articles/research through research based social networking site by the faculty members and research scholars. To conduct this study the researchers selected some faculty members and research scholars of two public university of Dhaka district. A questionnaire was provided among them to know the research sharing attitudes and their activities in RSNSs. For this purpose a quantitative approach of research have been adopted.

Research based social networking sites are used by the researchers and faculty members to connect to other researchers and to share and follow research. RSNSs help in research and learning and also help to share ideas and experience. RSNSs help the user to access scholarly content and boosting their critical thinking. It increases the visibility of their contribution in research work. RSNSs help to increase the intellectual capabilities by sharing research experience and discussing different topic.

Research based social networking sites are considered as a one-stop solution to the research scholars who want to make their work more visible. However RSNSs bring all the user at one place to share and update the knowledge. The study reveals that there are various benefits associated with RSNSs which may show positive tendency in adopting RSNSs by the research scholars and faculty members. This study also reveals some problems that are associated with RSNSs. It is found that time consuming, fake identity and poor internet connectivity are common problem associated with use of RSNSs.

The findings of the study clearly shows that lack of knowledge about RSNSs is an effective factor of not using RSNSs. The user must have the knowledge about privacy settings and security issue that may help them to contribute more in research without any hindrance. From this study it is observed that potential use of research based social networking site can improve the capability of the researcher which may help them to compete with other developing countries researcher.

This research is a significant because it is one of the earliest work on RSNSs in Bangladesh perspective. This work may glimpse on the current level of use of RSNSs

by the faculty members and research scholars of two public universities of Dhaka district. Like other study, this study also has some limitations. But the overall study may guide the faculty members and research scholars to identify popular RSNSs for building more scholar connections.

Declarations

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, Md. Mahmudul Hasan and Parul Parvin; methodology, Md. Mahmudul Hasan and Parul Parvin; software, Md. Mahmudul Hasan; validation, Md. Mahmudul Hasan and Parul Parvin; formal analysis, Md. Mahmudul Hasan; investigation, Md. Mahmudul Hasan, Parul Parvin; resources, Parul Parvin; data curation, Md. Mahmudul Hasan and Parul Parvin; writing—original draft preparation, Md. Mahmudul Hasan; writing—review and editing, Md. Mahmudul Hasan and Parul Parvin; visualization, Parul Parvin; supervision, Md. Mahmudul Hasan; project administration, Md. Mahmudul Hasan;. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Data Availability Statement

The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding authors

Funding

Funding information is not available.

Informed Consent Statement

“Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.”

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this manuscript. In addition, the ethical issues, including plagiarism, informed consent, misconduct, data fabrication and/or falsification, double publication and/or submission, and redundancies have been completely observed by the authors.

References

- [1] Florenthal, B. (2015). Applying uses and gratification theory of students' LinkedIn usage. *Young Consumers*, 16(2), 17–35.
- [2] Ali, M. Y., & Richardson, J. (2017). Pakistani LIS scholars' altmetrics in ResearchGate. *Program*, 51(2), 152–169.
- [3] Shrivastava, R., & Mohajan, P. (2017). An altmetrics analysis of ResearchGate profiles of physics researchers: A study of the University of Delhi (India). *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 18(1), 52–66.

- [4] Muscanell, N., & Utz, S. (2017). Social networking for scientists: An analysis of how and why academics use ResearchGate. *Online Information Review*, 41(5), 744–759.
- [5] Ortega, J. L. (2015). Disciplinary differences in the use of academic social networking sites. *Online Information Review*, 39(4), 520–536.
- [6] Srivastava, R., & Mahajan, P. (2015). Relationship among ResearchGate altmetric indicators and Scopus bibliometric indicators: The case of Panjab University, Chandigarh (India). *New Library World*, 116(9/10), 564–577.
- [7] Mahajan, P., Singh, H., & Kumar, A. (2013). Use of social networking sites by researchers in India: A comparative study of Panjab University and Kurukshetra University. *Library Review*, 62(8/9), 525–546.
- [8] Ali, M. Y., Wolski, M., & Richardson, J. (2017). Strategies for using ResearchGate to improve institutional research outcomes. *Library Review*, 66(8/9), 726–739.
- [9] Greifeneder, E., Pontis, S., Blandford, A., Attalla, H., Neal, D., & Schlebbe, S. (2018). Researchers' attitudes towards the use of social networking sites. *Journal of Documentation*, 74(1), 119–136.
- [10] Williams, A. E. (2018). Exploring the utility of Academia.edu: A SWOT analysis. *Information and Learning Science*, 119(11), 662–666.
- [11] Bhardwaj, R. K. (2017). Academic social networking sites: Comparative analysis of ResearchGate, Academia.edu, Mendeley, and Zotero. *Information and Learning Science*, 118(5/6), 298–316.
- [12] Asmi, N. A., & Margam, M. (2018). Academic social networking sites for researchers in the Central University of Delhi: A study of ResearchGate and Academia.edu. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 67(1/2), 91–108.
- [13] Singson, M., & Mohammad, A. (2017). Use of ResearchGate by research scholars of Pondicherry University: A study. *DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology*, 37(5), 366–371.
- [14] Tal, H. M., & Pieterse, E. (2017). Why do academics use social networking sites? *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 18(1).
- [15] Kim, Y. (2018). An empirical study on biological scientists' article sharing through ResearchGate: Examining attitudinal, normative, and control beliefs. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 70(5), 458–480.
- [16] Park, J. H. (2009). Differences among university students and faculty in social networking site perception and use: Implications for academic library services. *The Electronic Library*, 28(3), 417–431.
- [17] Asaolu, A. O. (2015). Use of social networking sites for academic research and collaboration: A study of Covenant University academic staff. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 5(3).
- [18] Florenthal, B. (2015). Applying the uses and gratification approach. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 16(4), 362–369.
- [19] Li, X., Cox, A., & Wang, Z. (2018). How do social network sites support product users' knowledge construction? A study on LinkedIn. *Online Information Review*, 42(3), 304–323.
- [20] Nández, G., & Borrego, Á. (2013). Use of social networks for academic purposes: A case study. *The Electronic Library*, 31(6), 781–791.
- [21] Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: New Age International.
- [22] Surendran, A. Quantitative research: Definition, methods, types and examples.
- [23] Retrieved from <http://www.questionpro.com>
- [24] Kenton, W. (2019, May 10). Social networking. Retrieved from <http://www.investopedia.com>
- [25] <https://datascience.codata.org/articles/dsj-2019-028>
- [26] <https://academic.oup.com/spp/advance-article/doi/10.1093/scipol/scaf041/8240628>
- [27] <http://www.designsociety.org>
- [28] <https://campuspress.yale.edu>
- [29] <http://www.quora.com>
- [30] <http://www.mecs-press.org>
- [31] <https://en.m.wikipedia.org>

参考文献:

- [1] Florenthal, B. (2015)。学生使用 LinkedIn 的用途与满足理论应用研究。《Young Consumers》，16(2)，17–35。
- [2] Ali, M. Y., & Richardson, J. (2017)。巴基斯坦图书情报学学者在 ResearchGate 上的替代计量指标研究。《Program》，51(2)，152–169。
- [3] Shrivastava, R., & Mahajan, P. (2017)。物理学研究人员 ResearchGate 个人主页的替代计量分析——以印度德里大学为例。《Performance Measurement and Metrics》，18(1)，52–66。
- [4] Muscanell, N., & Utz, S. (2017)。科学家的社交网络：学者使用 ResearchGate 的方式与动因分析。《Online Information Review》，41(5)，744–759。
- [5] Ortega, J. L. (2015)。学科差异视角下学术社交网络平台的使用情况。《Online Information Review》，39(4)，520–536。
- [6] Srivastava, R., & Mahajan, P. (2015)。ResearchGate 替代计量指标与 Scopus 文献计量指标之间的关系——以印度昌迪加尔旁遮普大学为例。《New Library World》，116(9/10)，564–577。

- [7] Mahajan, P., Singh, H., & Kumar, A. (2013)。印度研究人员对社交网络网站的使用：旁遮普大学与库鲁克舍特拉大学的比较研究。《Library Review》，62(8/9)，525–546。
- [8] Ali, M. Y., Wolski, M., & Richardson, J. (2017)。利用 ResearchGate 提升机构科研绩效的策略。《Library Review》，66(8/9)，726–739。
- [9] Greifeneder, E., Pontis, S., Blandford, A., Attalla, H., Neal, D., & Schlebbe, S. (2018)。研究人员对使用社交网络网站的态度研究。《Journal of Documentation》，74(1)，119–136。
- [10] Williams, A. E. (2018)。Academia.edu 的效用分析：SWOT 视角。《Information and Learning Science》，119(11)，662–666。
- [11] Bhardwaj, R. K. (2017)。学术社交网络平台的比较分析：ResearchGate、Academia.edu、Mendeley 与 Zotero。《Information and Learning Science》，118(5/6)，298–316。
- [12] Asmi, N. A., & Margam, M. (2018)。德里中央大学研究人员使用学术社交网络平台的研究——以 ResearchGate 和 Academia.edu 为例。《Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication》，67(1/2)，91–108。
- [13] Singson, M., & Mohammad, A. (2017)。本地治里大学研究生使用 ResearchGate 的情况研究。《DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology》，37(5)，366–371。
- [14] Tal, H. M., & Pieterse, E. (2017)。学者为何使用社交网络网站？《International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning》，18(1)。
- [15] Kim, Y. (2018)。生物科学家通过 ResearchGate 共享论文的实证研究：态度、规范与控制信念分析。《Aslib Journal of Information Management》，70(5)，458–480。
- [16] Park, J. H. (2009)。大学生与教师在社交网络网站认知与使用方面的差异及其对高校图书馆服务的启示。《The Electronic Library》，28(3)，417–431。
- [17] Asaolu, A. O. (2015)。学术研究与合作中社交网络网站的使用——以 Covenant 大学教师为例。《Information and Knowledge Management》，5(3)。
- [18] Florenthal, B. (2015)。用途与满足理论的应用研究。《Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal》，16(4)，362–369。
- [19] Li, X., Cox, A., & Wang, Z. (2018)。社交网络网站如何支持用户的知识建构？以 LinkedIn 为例。《Online Information Review》，42(3)，304–323。
- [20] Nández, G., & Borrego, Á. (2013)。社交网络

在学术用途中的应用：案例研究。《The Electronic Library》，31(6)，781–791。

- [21] Kothari, C. R. (2004)。《研究方法论：方法与技术》（第2版）。新德里：New Age International。
- [22] Surendran, A. 《定量研究：定义、方法、类型与示例》。
- [23] 取自：<http://www.questionpro.com>
- [24] Kenton, W. (2019年5月10日)。社交网络。取自：<http://www.investopedia.com>
- [25] <https://datascience.codata.org/articles/dsj-2019-028>
- [26] <https://academic.oup.com/spp/advance-article/doi/10.1093/scipol/scaf041/8240628>
- [27] <http://www.designsociety.org>
- [28] <https://campuspress.yale.edu>
- [29] <http://www.quora.com>
- [30] <http://www.mecs-press.org>
- [31] <https://en.m.wikipedia.org>

Manuscript Information

Word count: 11,786 words (excluding references).

Peer-Review Record

Fast-track status: Not fast-tracked.

First-round reviews received: 3 reports.

Revision cycles completed: 3 rounds.

Final version submitted: January 7, 2026

Disclaimer / Publisher's Note

The statements, opinions, and data contained in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the *Journal of Hunan University (Natural Sciences)* or its editorial team. The journal and its editors disclaim any responsibility for injury to persons or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content of this article.