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Abstract: Science is of course very far from the art, nonetheless there are some aspects of science which can be compared to art. For instance, there is elitic art that prefers that art is for art only. On the other side, there is pop art, which relates smoothly to industrialism. And there is also avant garde art, which asserts that all things can be thought of as art (like mirror, glass, broken window etc). Similarly, in science some researchers believe that it is the best way to keep the ‘ordinary people’ out of the traditional scientific communication (for example, arxiv.org declares that it is exclusively scientific channels for scientists only), while on the other side people sometimes also wants to know what happens behind the wall of scientific labs.
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1. INTRODUCTION: THE ROLE OF NEW MEDIA

Enter the social media. Various forms of electronic communication and publication have entered in recent years, which sometimes are dubbed as ‘new media’ (TCSC, 2009; NFAIS, 2009; ePharma Summit, 2009). This includes, for instance, blogging, youtube, facebook, online directory, blog directory etc. Let’s consider a simple example: a decade ago, a new paper in a remote journal will take some months to be noticed by scientists (in particular via notification by the scientist himself/herself). But today, at the same day the paper appears in electronic journals, there is high likelihood that it will be disseminated simultaneously in numerous forms of new media channels, like Google, blogging directories and other indexing services.

The problem is that some scientists feel that a number of scientific works get plenty of publication coverage in this new media, while at the same time an equally ‘worthy’ paper get less publication coverage. In other words, does it mean that nowadays popularity in new media had replaced what we called before as ‘scientific value’ of paper. Of course in this regards, one can reply that there are systematic indexing system which introduces.

2. GRADE OF SCIENTIFIZATION

In order to clarify the situation, we offer an simplified analysis based on the asynchronous/synchronous communication and also ‘grade of scientifization’, which is a new notion. This grade is defined simply to enable us to rank the channel of communication, which are ‘more’ serious and which are less serious, at least from scientific viewpoint. By synchronous here we mean as method of communication which takes effect immediately (like telephone), see Table 1..

Implication of Table 1 would mean that perhaps scientific communication can accept or agree with the fast-growing social media to disseminate scientific works, if only we limits its role as ‘Grade C’, i.e. not to regard them as ‘very serious’ scientific channel. Furthermore, perhaps we can introduce a new word here ‘social archiving’, in order to reflect both the method of ‘social network’ as the essence of new media, and the scientific archiving.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/Grade</th>
<th>Grade A</th>
<th>Grade B</th>
<th>Grade C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synchronous</td>
<td>Scientific Conferences</td>
<td>Lectures, Public Seminars, Preprint Services, Indexing</td>
<td>Blogs, Online Directories, Videos, Emails, Other New Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. HOW TO MAKE SOCIAL ARCHIVE USEFUL

Scientists improve their work not only by thinking by themselves, but also by receiving comments and suggestions from their peers. Such a method of review has been established in traditional scientific communication, called as ‘peer reviewing’. But there are other forms of ‘input’ that scientists can receive from their ‘outer world’, for instance what indexing system now begin to call as ‘impact factor’, whatever the bias it may introduce.

Another type of input, although not so ‘serious’ is of course from the public itself, those people which are enthusiastic on the science, either by email, blog posting, etc. Another way is perhaps to introduce some ‘rating review’ in those blogging, just like amazon.com enables potential book readers to see what others say. In this regards the administrator may enable the comment/rating review be sent to the scientists in order for them to see how their papers may get better response.

Of course, a scientist can always choose either to take care of the ‘new media’ response, or just get rid of them, and focus on more serious review by his/her peers. Nonetheless, a balanced view may be better, in this regards the ‘periodic table of the social media elements’ can be considered too (PTSME, 2009).

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The new media has begun to embrace the communication sphere of modern society, or perhaps better, a postmodern society. Therefore new ways to interact with the common people shall be considered by the scientific societies. After all, science moves on not only by making continuous progress in its own, but also because of its interaction with the public sphere...
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