

Strategies for Enhancing the Visibility of Scientific Publications in Francophone Africa.

Abstract:

Scientific visibility has become a major concern for researchers and academic staff because of its influence on knowledge dissemination, the development of international collaborations, and academic career progression. This study aims to examine the strategies adopted by researchers and academic staff in Africa to enhance the visibility of their scientific outputs.

A descriptive quantitative survey was conducted among 216 researchers and academic staff from twelve Francophone African countries. Data were collected through an online questionnaire and analyzed using Microsoft Excel and IBM SPSS Statistics.

The main findings reveal a limited culture of research dissemination and valorization. Nearly all institutions lack dedicated sections for scientific publications on their official websites. Few respondents maintain personal websites, disseminate their work through academic social networks, publish scholarly books, or belong to national and international research networks. Scientific outreach activities, public lectures, and the sharing of publications with students, colleagues, and research teams are also very limited.

These findings suggest that the limited scientific visibility of African academic staff stems from both institutional constraints and individual dissemination practices. The study recommends implementing institutional policies to promote research outputs, strengthening researchers' digital skills, encouraging the use of international researcher identifiers and academic platforms, including ORCID, Google Scholar, and ResearchGate, and promoting participation in international scientific networks.

Keywords: scientific visibility, academic staff, scientific publications, research valorization, Francophone Africa.

Introduction

The visibility of scientific outputs has become a major concern for researchers, academic staff, and higher education institutions. In a context characterized by the internationalization of research, the digital transformation of scholarly communication, and the development of open science, publishing alone is no longer sufficient to ensure the dissemination and impact of knowledge. Scientific outputs must now be accessible, indexed, shared, and widely disseminated to increase their use, citation, and contribution to scientific progress. Scientific visibility is therefore an essential factor in academic recognition, the development of international collaborations, and the international standing of universities.

The emergence of digital platforms such as Google Scholar, ORCID, ResearchGate, Academia.edu, and open repositories has profoundly transformed knowledge dissemination practices. These tools offer researchers new opportunities to promote their work, develop their digital identities, and increase their scientific impact. In this context, UNESCO (2021) emphasizes that open science promotes the wider dissemination of research findings and helps reduce inequalities in access to knowledge.

However, researchers in Francophone Africa continue to face several constraints that limit the visibility of their scientific outputs. Inadequate institutional policies for research valorization, limited use of academic platforms, difficulties accessing indexed international journals, and insufficient integration into scientific networks constitute major obstacles to their international visibility. This situation contributes to the underrepresentation of African research in major international databases, despite the relevance of research addressing the continent's development challenges.

Furthermore, current research assessment systems increasingly emphasize scientific visibility indicators, particularly publication output, citation counts, international collaborations, and researchers' online presence. In this context, mastering scientific dissemination strategies has become an essential skill for academic staff seeking to strengthen their academic recognition and increase the impact of their work.

Despite the importance of this issue, few empirical studies have examined scientific visibility practices among researchers working in Francophone African universities. This study therefore investigates the strategies adopted by researchers and academic staff in twelve Francophone African countries to improve the visibility of their scientific outputs. Specifically, it seeks to identify their dissemination practices, use of digital platforms, participation in scientific networks, and the main factors that could strengthen research valorization. The findings are expected to contribute to a better understanding of the challenges associated with scientific visibility in Francophone Africa and to provide practical recommendations for higher education institutions and policymakers responsible for research policy.

The article is organized into five sections: a literature review, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion.

1. Literature Review

1.1. Scientific Visibility: A Major Challenge for Contemporary Research

Scientific visibility refers to the set of mechanisms through which research outputs become accessible, identifiable, discoverable, consulted, used, and cited by scientific communities and other users of knowledge. In the current context of research globalization, it is a determining factor in the international standing of researchers, laboratories, and higher education institutions. Scientific visibility therefore extends beyond the publication of research findings to include their dissemination, referencing, indexing, sharing, and uptake by different academic communities.

According to Marquet (2022), scientific publications represent the most enduring form of researchers' intellectual output. They contribute to the construction of scientific identity while supporting the collective advancement of knowledge. Publication is also a means of promoting research findings, fostering scientific collaboration, and enhancing researchers' academic recognition.

Similarly, Pinède and Dussarps (2023) emphasize that scientific visibility depends largely on the dissemination methods selected by researchers. New digital practices offer considerable opportunities to enhance visibility, particularly through open repositories, collaborative platforms, and social networking sites.

Scientific visibility also has important institutional implications. Universities are increasingly assessed on the basis of their scientific output, citation counts, international collaborations, and positions in global rankings. Greater visibility of research outputs can therefore directly contribute to strengthening an institution's academic reputation.

1.2. Digital Transformations in Scientific Communication

The digital revolution has profoundly changed the ways in which scientific knowledge is produced and disseminated. Whereas publications were once primarily available in print, digital technologies now enable research findings to be disseminated almost instantaneously worldwide.

The emergence of digital platforms has facilitated open access to scientific publications. Institutional repositories, open archives, and digital libraries now enable researchers to disseminate their work rapidly to a broad audience. This development is part of the international open science movement promoted by UNESCO (2021), which encourages the free sharing of knowledge to strengthen global scientific cooperation.

According to UNESCO's Recommendation on Open Science (2021), making scientific publications openly accessible improves their availability, facilitates their reuse, and increases their impact among researchers, policymakers, and civil society. Open science also helps reduce inequalities between developing and industrialized countries by facilitating access to research findings.

Researchers now have access to a wide range of digital tools for enhancing their visibility, including persistent digital identifiers such as ORCID; academic search engines such as Google Scholar; sharing platforms such as ResearchGate and Academia.edu; open repositories such as HAL and Zenodo; and academic and professional social networks such as LinkedIn and X (formerly Twitter).

1.3. Digital Platforms as Tools for Enhancing Scientific Visibility

The development of digital platforms is one of the major innovations in scientific communication. These platforms not only facilitate the dissemination of publications but also enable researchers to monitor their scientific impact through statistics on views, downloads, and citations.

Google Scholar remains one of the most widely used academic search engines. It automatically indexes publications available online and provides various bibliometric indicators, including citation counts and the h-index. These indicators are now widely used in academic assessment.

The ORCID identifier is another major innovation. It assigns a unique identifier to each researcher, helping to prevent confusion between individuals with similar names and to consolidate their scientific outputs. Several funding organizations and major international journals now require researchers to have an ORCID identifier.

ResearchGate and Academia.edu, meanwhile, are academic social networking platforms that facilitate publication sharing, collaboration, and exchanges among researchers. According to Allouch et al. (2021), these platforms contribute to the development of researchers' scientific reputations by increasing their visibility within international academic communities.

Open repositories such as HAL and Zenodo also allow researchers to deposit electronic versions of their publications free of charge while supporting their long-term preservation and dissemination. These platforms considerably improve the accessibility of scientific outputs, particularly in countries where subscriptions to major scholarly databases remain limited.

129 **1.4. Bibliometric and Altmetric Indicators**

130 Scientific visibility is now assessed using various quantitative indicators. Traditional
 131 bibliometric indicators primarily measure the number of publications, citation counts, journal
 132 impact factors, and the h-index proposed by Hirsch.
 133 However, these indicators have certain limitations because they do not capture all the new
 134 forms of digital knowledge dissemination. In response, alternative metrics, commonly known
 135 as *altmetrics*, have been developed to assess the attention received by publications on social
 136 media, scientific blogs, sharing platforms, and online media.
 137 Bornmann (2014) argues that altmetrics complement traditional bibliometric indicators by
 138 providing a more immediate assessment of the social dissemination of scientific publications.
 139 These indicators take into account downloads, views, shares, mentions on X, Facebook, and
 140 LinkedIn, as well as references in Wikipedia and public policy documents.
 141 These new indicators reflect a profound transformation in scientific communication, in which
 142 the impact of a publication is measured not only by academic citations but also by its
 143 dissemination among different audiences.

144 **1.5. Scientific Networks and International Collaboration**

145 Membership in scientific networks has become a major factor in researchers' visibility.
 146 National and international collaborations encourage co-publication, knowledge exchange,
 147 academic mobility, and participation in funded research projects.
 148 The work of Katz and Martin (1997), supported by subsequent bibliometric studies, indicates
 149 that internationally co-authored publications generally receive more citations than
 150 publications produced by individual researchers. Scientific networks also provide easier
 151 access to major international journals and high-profile conferences.
 152 In the African context, several regional scientific organizations play an important role in
 153 fostering collaboration. Nevertheless, many researchers remain insufficiently integrated into
 154 these networks, limiting opportunities for international cooperation and reducing the visibility
 155 of their work.
 156 Participation in symposia, congresses, and scientific conferences is also an important means
 157 of enhancing visibility. These events provide opportunities to present research findings,
 158 establish new collaborations, and strengthen researchers' scientific reputations.

159 **1.6. Social Media and Scientific Communication**

160 Social networking platforms now play an important role in scientific communication
 161 strategies. They enable publications to reach audiences far beyond the specialists working
 162 within a particular discipline.
 163 According to Allouch et al. (2021), these platforms are profoundly changing researchers'
 164 practices by fostering new forms of scientific interaction. Researchers can share articles,
 165 announce publications, promote conferences, disseminate books, and interact directly with
 166 their peers.
 167 X is particularly useful during international conferences for disseminating key scientific
 168 presentations in real time. LinkedIn facilitates the development of professional networks,
 169 while ResearchGate supports exchanges among researchers concerning their publications.
 170 However, several studies indicate that African researchers still make relatively limited use of
 171 these digital tools, thereby restricting the international visibility of their work.

173 1.7. Challenges to Scientific Visibility in African Universities

174 Despite the opportunities offered by digital technologies, several obstacles continue to limit
 175 the scientific visibility of African academic staff. These include inadequate digital
 176 infrastructure, the cost of open-access publishing, limited proficiency in digital tools, the
 177 absence of institutional policies for research valorization, and insufficient training in scientific
 178 communication.

179 Additional constraints include the limited presence of African journals in major international
 180 bibliographic databases, weak international research collaboration, and the relatively small
 181 number of accessible institutional open repositories.

182 Several authors also point out that a culture of scientific dissemination remains
 183 underdeveloped in many African universities. Researchers often prioritize publications
 184 required for academic promotion rather than adopting strategies designed to enhance the long-
 185 term visibility of their work.

186 In light of this literature, scientific visibility appears to be a multidimensional phenomenon
 187 resulting from the interaction of individual, institutional, technological, and relational factors.
 188 It depends on the quality of scientific outputs, the communication strategies adopted by
 189 researchers and academic staff, the use of digital platforms, membership in scientific
 190 networks, participation in conferences, and institutional policies for research valorization.

191 2. Methodology

192 This study was conducted in twelve African countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the
 193 Central African Republic, the Republic of the Congo (Congo-Brazzaville), Côte d'Ivoire,
 194 Gabon, Chad, Niger, Senegal, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Togo. It adopted a
 195 quantitative online survey approach to examine the scientific visibility practices of academic
 196 staff and researchers across these national contexts.

197 The inclusion criteria were as follows: participants had to be currently employed as academic
 198 staff or researchers and willing to complete an online questionnaire. No exclusion criteria
 199 were applied other than non-response or refusal to participate.

200 The study relied on non-probability sampling, combining purposive and snowball sampling
 201 techniques. Because no comprehensive sampling frame of academic staff and researchers was
 202 available for the countries concerned, it was not possible to construct a strictly representative
 203 random sample.

204 Participants were therefore selected on the basis of their accessibility and membership in the
 205 academic networks mobilized for the study. The questionnaire was distributed through
 206 professional channels, including academic WhatsApp groups, institutional networks, and
 207 contacts maintained by designated focal points. Peer referrals facilitated the gradual
 208 expansion of the sample, as is characteristic of snowball sampling.

209 This sampling approach made it possible to reach participants from a range of geographical
 210 and disciplinary backgrounds within the target population, although it did not guarantee strict
 211 statistical representativeness of all academic staff and researchers in the countries studied.

212 Data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered online. A substantial
 213 number of questionnaires were distributed to academic staff and researchers through various
 214 digital channels, primarily drawing on the professional and academic networks of the
 215 researchers involved in the study. The questionnaire was shared in several WhatsApp groups
 216 comprising academic staff and researchers and circulated through focal points of the African
 217 Academy of Francophone Research and Studies (ACAREF). The African Network of

Researchers and Academic Staff in Education Sciences (RACESE) also served as an important channel for distributing the data collection instrument. The target population consisted of senior academic staff and researchers holding senior or Category B positions in the countries concerned. A total of 216 complete responses were obtained and retained for analysis. Data collection took place from February 4 to February 28, 2026. The data were processed using Microsoft Excel and IBM SPSS Statistics. The analysis combined descriptive quantitative methods with complementary qualitative analysis to provide a more in-depth interpretation of the findings.

3. Results

3.1. Gender of Respondents

Table 1. Distribution of respondents by gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	198	91.7
Female	18	8.3
Total	216	100.0

Source: Field survey data, February 2026.

The data in Table 1 indicate a strong predominance of male respondents (91.7%), compared with only 8.3% female respondents. This imbalance points to a potential structural disparity in access to, or participation in, academic and research positions in the contexts studied.

3.2. Scientific Visibility on University Websites

Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to whether their institution's website has a dedicated section for publications

Dedicated publication section	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	5	2.3
No	211	97.7
Total	216	100.0

Source: Field survey data, February 2026.

Table 2 shows that 97.7% of the institutions do not have a dedicated section for scientific publications on their websites. This finding highlights the limited development of institutional digital infrastructure for promoting scientific visibility.

3.3. Use of Digital Tools for Scientific Dissemination

Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to whether they disseminate scientific activities through a blog or website

Dissemination through a blog or website	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	9	4.2
No	207	95.8
Total	216	100.0

246 *Source: Field survey data, February 2026.*

247 Table 3 shows that more than 95% of respondents do not publish their scientific work on
248 blogs or websites.

249 This finding reveals a limited culture of individual digital scientific communication, despite
250 its growing importance as a standard practice in international academic systems.

251 **3.4. Ownership of a Personal Blog or Website**

252 **Table 4. Distribution of respondents according to whether they have a personal blog or**
253 **website**

Personal blog or website	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	19	8.8
No	197	91.2
Total	216	100.0

254 *Source: Field survey data, February 2026.*

255 Most respondents do not have a personal blog or website (91.2%), while only 8.8% report
256 having one.

257 **3.5. Scientific Book Publishing**

258 **Table 5. Distribution of respondents according to whether they have published a book**

Book publication	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	7	3.2
No	209	96.8
Total	216	100.0

259 *Source: Field survey data, February 2026.*

260 Table 5 indicates that 96.8% of respondents have never published a scholarly book. This
261 finding points to a low level of formal book publishing, an activity that can nevertheless be
262 important for academic careers.

263 Book publishing contributes to scientific recognition, the consolidation of research findings,
264 and authors' international visibility. This low rate may reflect structural constraints, such as

limited editorial support, publishing costs, or institutional pressure that prioritizes journal articles over books.

3.6. Integration into Scientific Networks

Table 6. Distribution of respondents according to membership in an African or international scientific network

Membership in an African or international scientific network	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	21	9.7
No	195	90.3
Total	216	100.0

Source: Field survey data, February 2026.

Table 6 shows that 90.3% of respondents do not belong to any African or international scientific network. This finding is particularly significant because such networks are important drivers of collaboration, co-publication, and scientific visibility.

3.7. Use of Academic and General Social Networking Platforms

Table 7. Distribution of respondents according to the social networking platforms they use to share their publications

Sharing their post	Yes		No		TOTAL	
	Eff.	%	Eff.	%	Eff.	%
Social media						
ResearchGate	11	5,1	205	94,9	216	100
LinkedIn	13	6,0	203	94,0	216	100
Memoireonline	24	11,1	192	88,9	216	100
Academia.edu	4	1,9	212	98,1	216	100
Hypotheses	7	3,2	209	96,8	216	100
Twitter/X	48	22,2	168	77,8	216	100
Other platforms	13	6,0	203	94,0	216	100

Source: Field survey data, February 2026.

The analysis of Table 7 reveals limited use of digital platforms for scientific dissemination. Twitter/X is the most frequently used platform (22.2%), followed by Memoireonline (11.1%), LinkedIn (6.0%), ResearchGate (5.1%), and Academia.edu (1.9%).

These findings suggest that respondents make greater use of general social networking platforms, particularly Twitter/X, than of specialized academic platforms such as ResearchGate and Academia.edu.

This pattern indicates that digital tools for enhancing scientific visibility remain underused, even though these platforms can facilitate citation, collaboration, and the international dissemination of research outputs.

3.8. Scientific Communication Activities

Table 8. Distribution of respondents according to whether they have delivered at least one conference presentation or lecture

Moderating a conference Conference venue	Yes		No		TOTAL	
	Eff.	%	Eff.	%	Eff.	%
Within their institution	24	11,1	192	88,9	216	100
In their city	8	3,7	208	96,3	216	100
Within their country	13	6	203	94	216	100
Elsewhere in Africa	6	2,8	210	97,2	216	100
Internationally	11	5,1	205	94,9	216	100

Source: Field survey data, February 2026.

Table 8 reveals limited participation in scientific communication activities. Only 11.1% of respondents have delivered a conference presentation or lecture at their institution, 5.1% have done so internationally, 3.7% in their city, and 2.8% elsewhere in Africa. These findings suggest limited scientific mobility and low visibility through academic events, despite the importance of such activities for academic recognition. The lack of regular participation in conferences restricts researchers' integration into scientific communities and reduces opportunities for collaboration.

3.9. Culture of Sharing Scientific Outputs

Table 9. Distribution of respondents according to whether they share publications with members of the university community

Sharing posts University stakeholders	Yes		No		TOTAL	
	Eff.	%	Eff.	%	Eff.	%
Students	9	4,2	207	95,8	216	100
Members of research teams	21	9,7	195	90,3	216	100
Laboratory members	27	12,5	189	87,5	216	100
Department colleagues	7	3,2	209	96,8	216	100
Faculty, school, or institute colleagues	5	2,3	211	97,7	216	100

University colleagues	8	3,7	208	96,3	216	100
Colleagues outside their university	13	6	203	94	216	100

Source: Field survey data, February 2026.

Table 9 highlights the limited sharing of scientific outputs within university structures. Few respondents share their publications with students (4.2%), departmental colleagues (3.2%), university colleagues (3.7%), or laboratory members (12.5%).

These findings indicate limited internal circulation of scientific knowledge, which may contribute to significant academic silos.

This situation is problematic because science depends on the dissemination, exchange, and collective validation of knowledge. Limited sharing also constrains student learning and weakens the collaborative dynamics of research teams.

4. Discussion

The objective of this study was to analyze the strategies adopted by African researchers and academic staff to improve the visibility of their scientific outputs. The findings reveal a limited culture of research valorization, characterized by the restricted use of institutional mechanisms and digital tools for scientific dissemination. Overall, these findings are consistent with trends identified in several international studies on scientific communication, open science, and researchers' visibility strategies.

The first major finding concerns the near-universal absence of institutional spaces dedicated to disseminating scientific publications. Nearly 98% of respondents reported that their institutions did not have a specific section for promoting academic staff publications. This finding reflects weaknesses in institutional scientific communication policies. Nevertheless, the literature emphasizes the central role universities play in enhancing researchers' visibility. According to Marquet (2022), scientific publication can fully contribute to institutional visibility only when supported by an active dissemination policy. University websites, open repositories, and institutional directories improve the accessibility of research outputs, increase their discoverability through academic search engines, and ultimately enhance their scientific impact. UNESCO's (2021) recommendations on open science also emphasize the responsibility of higher education institutions to establish infrastructures that facilitate open access to scientific knowledge.

The second major finding highlights the limited adoption of digital scientific dissemination tools by academic staff. More than 90% of respondents have neither a blog nor a personal website, while very few use scientific platforms such as ResearchGate, Academia.edu, or LinkedIn to disseminate their publications. This situation contrasts with practices in many universities in industrialized countries, where researchers' online presence has become an essential component of academic identity. Allouch et al. (2021) demonstrate that social networking platforms contribute to the construction of scientific reputation by facilitating interactions among researchers, the rapid sharing of publications, and the development of new international collaborations. Similarly, Jordan (2019) argues that digital academic profiles help increase researchers' visibility among peers, students, funding organizations, and the media.

The findings also reveal limited use of specialized academic platforms. Although ResearchGate, ORCID, Google Scholar, and Zenodo have become important tools for managing researchers' digital identities, their adoption remains limited among respondents. This low level of use may be explained by insufficient training in digital skills, limited

awareness of the benefits associated with these platforms, or inadequate institutional support. Nevertheless, several studies suggest that researchers with an ORCID identifier, a regularly updated Google Scholar profile, and an active presence on academic platforms generally achieve greater international visibility, higher levels of readership, and, over time, increased citation counts (Haak et al., 2012; Sugimoto & Larivière, 2018).

Another important finding concerns the very low level of scholarly book publishing. Only 3.2% of respondents reported having published at least one book. Although journal articles are currently the primary medium for disseminating scientific knowledge, scholarly books remain important in several disciplines, particularly in the humanities and social sciences. As Marquet (2022) points out, books can make a lasting contribution to researchers' academic recognition, especially when published by reputable scholarly publishers and widely disseminated. The low level of book publishing observed in this study may be associated with financial constraints, the high cost of academic publishing, or the lack of institutional support mechanisms for authors.

This study also highlights the limited integration of academic staff into African and international scientific networks. More than nine out of ten respondents reported that they did not belong to any structured scientific network. This finding is concerning because scientific collaboration has become one of the main drivers of academic visibility. Katz and Martin (1997), followed by Wagner and Jonkers (2017), show that publications resulting from international collaboration generally benefit from wider dissemination and greater bibliometric impact than individually authored publications. Scientific networks facilitate not only co-publication but also knowledge exchange, academic mobility, access to research equipment, and opportunities for international funding. The limited participation observed in this study may therefore help explain the relatively low visibility of African scientific outputs in major international databases.

The results further indicate that academic staff participate infrequently in scientific outreach activities, particularly through public or academic lectures. However, recent literature emphasizes the importance of communicating scientific knowledge to diverse audiences. Open science is not concerned solely with the dissemination of knowledge among specialists; it also encourages the uptake of scientific findings by policymakers, professionals, students, and civil society (UNESCO, 2021). Conferences, webinars, seminars, and science communication activities have consequently become important mechanisms for enhancing visibility while strengthening the societal impact of research.

Another major finding concerns the limited sharing of publications with students, colleagues, research teams, and laboratories. This practice reflects a culture of knowledge circulation that remains underdeveloped within university institutions. According to Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), knowledge sharing is a fundamental component of learning organizations and promotes the creation of new knowledge through interactions among stakeholders. In higher education, regular scientific exchanges contribute to collaboration, improve research quality, and foster environments conducive to scientific innovation.

Furthermore, the low rates of publication sharing through scientific social networks observed in this study are consistent with Bornmann's (2014) work, which highlights the growing importance of alternative metrics, or altmetrics, in assessing research visibility. Social media mentions, downloads, views, and shares now serve as complementary indicators to traditional citation counts. By maintaining a limited presence on these platforms, academic staff reduce opportunities for the rapid dissemination of their work and restrict their visibility among international scientific communities.

Overall, the findings suggest that the limited scientific visibility of African academic staff results not merely from insufficient research output but, more importantly, from weaknesses

in strategies for disseminating, communicating, and promoting scientific knowledge. This situation highlights the need to strengthen researchers' individual capacities while improving institutional policies. Priority measures include training in researchers' digital identities, establishing institutional repositories, encouraging the use of ORCID identifiers, developing Google Scholar and ResearchGate profiles, and promoting participation in international scientific networks. Together, these measures could contribute to the sustainable improvement of the visibility of African scientific outputs.

Finally, several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. The data are based on respondents' self-reports, which may introduce social desirability bias. In addition, the cross-sectional design does not allow changes in scientific visibility practices to be examined over time. Future research could adopt longitudinal approaches, bibliometric and altmetric analyses, or comparative studies across different African regions to develop a deeper understanding of the factors influencing researchers' scientific visibility.

Conclusion

This study aimed to analyze the strategies used to enhance the visibility of scientific outputs among researchers and academic staff in twelve Francophone African countries. The findings reveal a limited culture of research valorization, characterized by inadequate institutional dissemination mechanisms, limited use of digital academic platforms, weak integration into research networks, and restricted sharing of scientific outputs. These findings indicate that the limited visibility of African research stems from both institutional constraints and individual practices that remain insufficiently oriented toward scientific communication.

In a context in which visibility indicators play an increasingly important role in research assessment, strengthening institutional policies for promoting scientific outputs is essential. Universities would benefit from developing open repositories, creating dedicated publication sections on their websites, promoting the use of digital identifiers such as ORCID and academic platforms such as Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and Zenodo, and strengthening researchers' scientific communication skills. Encouraging international collaboration, participation in scientific networks, and scientific outreach activities is also essential to increasing the international standing of African research.

This study nevertheless has certain limitations, particularly its reliance on non-probability sampling and self-reported data, which call for caution when interpreting the findings. Future research could complement this approach through bibliometric and altmetric analyses, comparative studies across countries and disciplines, and evaluations of open science policies in African universities.

Ultimately, enhancing scientific visibility is a strategic priority for the development of higher education and research in Francophone Africa. Achieving this objective requires coordinated efforts by researchers, universities, and policymakers to make the dissemination and promotion of knowledge a genuine driver of the continent's scientific standing.

References

Adriaanse, L., Niemand, C. J. P., & Rensleigh, C. (2024). Altmetric and bibliometric indicators for academic social networks: Academia.edu & ResearchGate. *South African Journal of Information Management*, 26(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajim.v26i1.1869>

Allouch, A., Antolinos-Basso, D., Besson, F., La Valle, N., & Vuillerod, J.-B. (2021). Sociabilités, identités, visibilités : Les métiers de la recherche face aux réseaux

437 socionumériques. *Tracés. Revue de sciences humaines*, (21).
 438 <https://doi.org/10.4000/traces.13153>

439 Bornmann, L. (2014). Do altmetrics point to the broader impact of research? *Journal of*
 440 *Informetrics*, 8(4), 895–903. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2014.09.001>

441 Corsi, G., et al. (2024). Evaluating Twitter’s algorithmic amplification of low-credibility
 442 content: An observational study. *EPJ Data Science*, 13, Article 18.
 443 <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-024-00456-3>

444 Corsi, G., Hammarfelt, B., & Francke, H. (2022). Competitive exposure and existential
 445 recognition: Visibility and legitimacy on academic social networking sites. *Research*
 446 *Evaluation*, 31(4), 429–437. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvab043>

447 Duffy, B. E., & Meisner, C. (2022). Platform governance at the margins: Social media
 448 creators’ experiences with algorithmic (in)visibility. *New Media & Society*, 45(2), 1–18.
 449 <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221111923>

450 Maleki, A., & Holmberg, K. (2024). Tweeting and retweeting scientific articles: Implications
 451 for altmetrics. *Scientometrics*, 129, 6197–6220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-05127-8>

452 Marquet, P. (2022). Publication des travaux et visibilité internationale. In B. Albero & J.
 453 Thievenaz (Eds.), *Enquêter dans les métiers de l’humain : Traité de méthodologie de la*
 454 *recherche en sciences de l’éducation et de la formation* (pp. 151–171). ESF Sciences
 455 Humaines. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rp.alber.2022.03.0151>

456 Olive, R., Townsend, S., & Phillips, M. G. (2022). “Not everything that can be counted
 457 counts”: Searching for the value of metrics and altmetrics in sociology of sport journals.
 458 *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 58(3), 1–20.
 459 <https://doi.org/10.1177/10126902221107467>

460 ORCID. (2023). *ORCID and persistent identifiers for researchers*. <https://orcid.org>

461 Pinède, N., & Dussarps, C. (2023). Quelle mise en visibilité des méthodologies de recherche
 462 en SIC ? *Revue française des sciences de l’information et de la communication*, (26).
 463 <https://doi.org/10.4000/rfsic.14280>

464 Sugimoto, C. R., & Larivière, V. (2018). *Measuring research: What everyone needs to know*.
 465 Oxford University Press.

466 Sumba Nacipucha, N., Sánchez-Bayón, A., Cueva Estrada, J., & Valencia-Arias, A. (2024).
 467 Social networks as a strategy to improve the visibility of scientific journals. *Cogent Social*
 468 *Sciences*, 10(1), Article 2306715. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2306715>

469 Taylor, M. (2020). *Open access books in the humanities and social sciences: An open access*
 470 *altmetric advantage*. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.10442>

471 UNESCO. (2021). *UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science*. UNESCO.

472 Vászárhelyi, O., & Horvát, E.-Á. (2023). Who benefits from altmetrics? The effect of team
473 gender composition on the link between online visibility and citation impact. arXiv.
474 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.00405>

475

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR