Studies in humain and social sciences - university of Jijel **ISSN : 2661-7331**
Volume 08- Issue 03- (2025) p-p 10 -29 **EISSN : 3769-2773**

أعمال الملتقى الوطني: واقع تقاسم المعرفة عند الباحث العلمي في الجامعة الجزائرية
قسم علوم الإعلام والإتصال. جامعة جيجل. 06 ماي 2024

Scientific Forums as a Tool for Algerian PhD Students to knowledge sharing.

ZAIDI HADJ AISSA[1*], BELHOUT TAYEB[2]
[1]Amar Telidji University of Laghouat (Algeria) ha.zaidi@lagh-univ.dz
[2]Mouloud Mammeri University of TiziOuzou(Algeria)
BELHOUT TAYEB@lagh-univ.dz

Abstract: This study seeks to investigate the relationship between academic conferences and the sharing of knowledge among academics, as viewed by doctorate students enrolled at Amar Thelidji University in Laghouat during the academic years of 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. The inquiry is approached from the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu's notion of scientific capital, which views persons as having two types of scientific capital: institutional and personal. Attending conferences is considered a catalyst for enhancing personal capital, which in turn facilitates the acquisition and sharing of knowledge. On the other hand, PhD students who have low levels of institutional capital often show reduced involvement in scientific conferences, leading to less sharing of knowledge. The primary inquiry examined in this investigation is if there exists a correlation between engagement in scientific conferences and the dissemination of knowledge among researchers. In order to answer this topic, a descriptive methodology was used, which involved using a questionnaire consisting of 27 statements to gather data from a group of 60 doctorate students. The study's findings suggest a correlation between the variables.

Keywords: Scientific conferences, Sharing knowledge, PhD Student, Scientific capital.

*The senderauthor.

1. INTRODUCTION: Scientific forums play a crucial role as central hubs within the complex realm of academic discourse, facilitating the convergence and circulation of scholarly ideas. Never theless, beyond the surface level of equality exhibited by these forums, there exist in tricate power dynamics and social hierarchies that greatly impact the capacity of PhD students to assert their competence. This research examines the complex difficulties encountered by PhD students when engaging in scientific forums, whether in physical or virtual settings.

Scientific capital, which includes arrange of intellectual resources that individuals employ to build their competence and fur ther their scholarly objectives. Private scientific capital refers to the acquisition of specialized knowledge and skills by individuals via extensive research, study, and intellectual involvement. Institutional scientific capital encomp as sestheam algamation of reputation, recognition, and institution allinkages that bestow legitimacy and exposureup on academics.(Ienna,2023)

Observation can provide valu ablein sights into the dynamics inside scientific forums. These places play avital role in enabling gtheinter changeand verification of knowledge, acting as major hubsin the network of academic communication. However, beneath the cooperative exterior is an intricate inter play of interactions, where individuals compete fo rack now ledgment and authority withintheacademichierarchy. The distribution of institutional and private scientific capitals hapes the dynamics of participation, dictating which voices are amplified, which ideas are appreciated, and which contributions are discarded.

PhD students may find it specially challenging to navigate this terrain. Scientific forums providegreat opportunities for sharing knowledge and making connections, but they canalso be challenging for new participants. The acquisition of scientific resources, whether by institutions or individuals, is typically lengthyandunequal, putting PhD applicants at aclear disadvantage in comparison to establi she dspecialists .Furthe more, the unspoken rules and structuresofpowerwithinscientificcommunitiesmightreinforcecurrentsocia lrankings, excluding the view points of up-and-coming researchers and restricting the range of perspectives.

Considering these difficulties, it is imperative to carryout acomprehensive examination of the influence of scientific forums on the generation and distribution of scholarly information. By analyzing the interaction between institutional and private scientific resources in these settings, we can acquire a better understanding of the factors that either support or hinder the flow of knowledge among PhD students.

2.Problematic:

Nevertheless,therelationshipbetweenscientificforums,whethertheyare realordigital,andthesharingofknowledgeamongdoctoralcandidatesisacomp lexproblemthatdeservesfurtherinvestigation.Althoughtheseforumsprovide doctoratestudentswithchancestopresenttheirresearchandinteractwiththeaca demiccommunity,theyalsopresentdifficultieswithpowerrelations,obstacles toentry,andtheavailabilityofmentorshipandsupport.Isthereacorrelationbet weenPhDstudents'participationinscientificconferencesandtheknowledgesh aringamongAlgerianresearchersattheUniversityofLaghouat?

2.1.Subquestions:

- Do Algerian PhD students perceive significant differences in knowledges haring among researchers based on theirs pecialization?
- Do Algerian doctoral students perceive significant differences in knowledges haring among researchers according to their preferred type of scientific conferences (online or physical)?

3.Hypotheses:

3.1.MainHypothesis:

Fromtheviewpointofdoctoralstudents,thereexistsastatisticallysignific antcorrelationbetweenparticipationinconferencesandthesharingofknowled geamongAlgerianresearchers."

3.2.SubHypotheses:

Statisticallysignificantdifferencesexistinthenatureofknowledgeexcha ngeamongAlgerianresearchers,asseenbydoctoratestudents,basedontheirfie ldofstudy,whetheritbeinscientific-technicalorliterary-socialsciences.

Statisticallysignificantdifferencesexistinthenatureofknowledgeexcha ngeamongAlgerianscientists,asseenbyPhDstudents,basedontheirchosenmo deofscientificconferences(eitherphysicallypresentoronline).

4. Study’sobjectives: Thisstudyaimsto:

Analyze the viewpoints of Algerian doctorate students regarding the sharing of knowledge among scholars, specifically in their field of specialization, whether it be in scientific-technical or literary-social sciences.

Examine the perspectives of Algerian doctoral students on the dissemination of knowledge among researchers through different types of scientific conferences, whether they are held virtually or in physical settings.

Examine the correlation between the participation of Algerian PhD students in scientific conferences and their perceived level of information sharing among professionals.

Identify the potential factors that influence the differences in information dissemination among Algerian researchers, such as power dynamics, availability of resources, and opportunities for mentorship.

Understand the challenges faced by Algerian PhD students when they take part in scientific conferences and the resulting impact on the exchange of knowledge and academic collaboration.

Provide a detailed examination and propose recommendations for enhancing the sharing of information among researchers in Algeria, with a particular focus on the importance of scientific forums and engagement in conferences.

5. Related previousstudies:

5.1.Hani, Sayed Mahmoud, & Ali Makhlouf, Knowledge sharing and its role in building relationships between students and faculty members at the Egyptian University "analytical study" 2023.

This study sought to analyze the conceptual and philosophical framework of knowledge sharing and its impact on fostering relationships between students and faculty members at the Egyptian University. This study focuses on the faculty members in Egyptian institutions and the strategies employed to facilitate knowledge exchange among them. To investigate this, a descriptive technique was adopted. The research found that promoting knowledge sharing plays a crucial role in fostering relationships between students and faculty members at the Egyptian University. This can be utilized to enhance the connection between students and faculty during knowledge sharing sessions. By highlighting the significance and characteristics of knowledge sharing, faculty members are encouraged to engage in effective communication and collaboration, thereby fostering cooperation among them. Furthermore, it facilitates the exchange of knowledge among individuals. (Hani et al., 2023)

5.2.KhamqaniAntara,KhaledRajam,Theimpactofknowledgesharingintheperformanceofuniversityprofessor,acasestudyofasampleoftheprofessorsofOuarglaUniversity,2022.

This study aimed to assess the influence of information sharing on the performance of university professors at the University of KasdiMerbahOuargla. The questionnaire served as a crucial instrument for gathering information. The study found that there is a significant amount of knowledge sharing among the teachers at the University of KasdiMerbahOuargla. The study also discovered a strong positive relationship between knowledge sharing and the performance of university professors. As a result, the study recommends that research be published on the university's website to enhance knowledge sharing. (Khamqani & Rajam, 2022)

5.3.Omar Durrah, MoazGharib, AmalBaomar,The Role of organizational Culture in Improving the Process of Knowledge Sharing among Faculty Members at Dhofar University 2018.

The aim of this study was to ascertain the influence of organizational culture on enhancing the knowledge sharing process among faculty members at Dhofar University. Additionally, it sought to determine the effects of various dimensions of organizational culture (Trust, Ideological Conflict, Creativity, and Risk) on knowledge sharing. The study sample consisted of 107 academic members employed at Dhofar University. This study utilized the descriptive analytical method and employed multiple regression analysis to evaluate the data and test the hypotheses. The study findings indicated that the organizational culture's dimensions had a high degree of meaning. Among these dimensions, the trust dimension was the most recognized by the faculty members, followed by the ideological conflict dimension, and then the creativity and risk dimension.

The findings indicated a high level of knowledge exchange among academic members at the University of Dhofar. The findings also demonstrated a substantial impact of all aspects of corporate culture (Trust, Ideological Conflict, Creativity, and Risk) on the act of sharing information. Suggestions have been given to strengthen the understanding of organizational culture in the university and improve the exchange of knowledge among faculty members at Dh of ar University. (Durrah et al., 2018)

6.Concepts of Study:

6.1.Knowledge sharing:

Knowledges haring is the act of exchanging ideas, in sights, experiences, and knowledge amongst individuals or groups. Education is the process of transferring knowledge from one individual to another with the goal of enhancing the overall understanding and skills with in a society, organization, or community. Knowledges haring encompasses arange of methods, such as verbalex change, written records, interactive conversations, joint end eavors, and the utilization of digital platforms.(Diab, 2021)

6.2.Scientific Forums:

Ascience forum is adigital or physical platform where individuals withaninterestinsciencecanengageinthesharingofideas,information,andexpertise.Scienceforumsprovideasaplatformforscientists,researchers,students,andenthusiastsfromdifferentscientificfieldstoengageindiscussionsandworktogetheronscientificsubjects.(Dittmar&Eilks,2020)

6.2.1.Online Forums:

Within an internet based science forum, individual shave the opportunity to engage in conversations and pose in quiries pertaining to particular scientific disciplines or subjects.

Individualshavetheabilitytoexchangetheirpersonalthoughtsanddiscoveries andobtaininputfromothers.Additionally,theycanacquireknowledgeregardi ngthemostrecentadvancementsandinvestigationsintheirspecificfieldsofinte rest.(Dittmar&Eilks,2020)

6.2.2.Physical Scientific Forums:

Physical science forums, such as scientific conferences, seminars, and workshops, serveas platforms for researchers and specialists to show case their work and discoveries, exchangein for mation, and engagein collaborative projects. Participants have the opportunity to engagein networking activities, acquire knowledge about emerging technologies and methodologies, and create professional contacts with peersin theirre spective industries.(Dittmar&Eilks,2020).

7.Theoroticalframeworkofstudy:

7.1.Définitionofscientificforums:

The study of a scientific conference frequently focuses on analyzing the methods of sharing knowledge and presenting research findings, while the exploration of its role in knowledge construction and the formation of academic identities is less common. Researchers studying scientific conferences focus on its social, emotional, and cognitive aspects. They consider this field of academic practice as a valuable source of knowledge about the state of research and the higher education system.

Researchers in the field of higher education find the current situation unsatisfactory. They view scientific conferences as a unique subject of study that should be examined independently, without considering the broader trends impacting higher education institutions today, such as globalization, and the integration of technology in academia.(Henderson&Burford,2017).

7.2.Face-to-faceconferencesvsvirtualconferences:

According to Maire et al. (2018), face-to-face conferences have a significant benefit. They are valued by higher education institutions and scientific funders because they demonstrate that academics are interested in collaborating with both national and international partners. This collaboration is seen through joint applications for fellowships, project submissions, and co-authored publications. Participating in face-to-face conferences is highly recommended as it provides a favorable environment for networking and establishing connections. highlights three key advantages for participants of face-to-face conferences:

Participation in scientific events fosters a sense of community among participants who share common interests;

Collaborative discussions on research topics can lead to fresh perspectives and innovative solutions to existing problems, promoting the creation of synergies.

Attending conferences and engaging in peer gatherings can enhance job satisfaction and hence improve the performance of academics.

According to Hixson, scientific conferences offer valuable opportunities for academics to share their research findings, engage in collaborative discussions, and establish connections that can lead to new projects, publications, and funding. These benefits cannot be fully replicated by virtual online meetings. The reference is from Mair et al. (2018).

The authors humorously highlight that the interactions between lecturers often take place in physical spaces such as corridors, coffee breaks, and social events. These types of interactions are not possible in virtual conferences, as they do not facilitate this kind of communication. As the authors amusingly state, "You cannot enjoy a virtual drink!" (Oester et al., 2017, p.7).

Nevertheless, this kind of conferences has faced criticism over its environmental impact, participant expenses, travel time, accessibility, and safety concerns due to limited funding (Mair et al., 2018).In addition, the participants' personality qualities are incorporated into these parameters. For instance, individuals who are more introverted and have limited proficiency in the English language, often due to cultural, gender, or racial factors, face particular challenges in maximizing the benefits of in-person conferences (Sousa & Clark, 2017).

Technological advancements have led to a rise in online conferences. While they first imitated traditional synchronous conferences, online conferences now have the ability to give unique perspectives in terms of technology, science, and social aspects. The author contends that online conferences are strategically created to leverage the various benefits offered by digital communication technologies, such as the ability to communicate across different time zones and geographical locations, the opportunity for thoughtful and introspective participation, and the access to a diverse network of international and regional colleagues and specialists (Carr, 2016, p. 96).

7.3.KnowledgeSharinginLearningCommunities:

Learning communities have become influential drivers of collaborative and engaging learning experiences in the ever-changing field of education. The core principle of these communities is the dissemination of knowledge.

Knowledge sharing is the act of exchanging ideas, insights, experiences, and knowledge amongst individuals or groups. Education is the process of transferring knowledge from one individual to another with the goal of enhancing the overall understanding and skills within a society, organization, or community.

Knowledge sharing encompasses a range of methods, such as verbal communication, written documentation, interactive conversations, collaborative projects, and the utilization of digital platforms (Zamiri and Baqutayan 2012).

Knowledge sharing is an active and evolving process that drives the acquisition of knowledge, cooperation, and advancement. Communication is a fundamental aspect of human connection and is crucial for personal and societal progress in diverse fields.

Knowledge sharing is essential for the vitality of learning communities. According to Asrar-ul-Haq and Anwar (2016), it changes these areas from inactive surroundings into lively centers where ideas are shared without restriction, and learners actively add to the shared knowledge.

Within a learning community, knowledge is not limited to written materials or spoken presentations; it is a dynamic and active entity that is influenced by the many viewpoints and personal encounters of its members (students). The impact of information sharing among learning communities extends well beyond the immediate participants. As learners disseminate their enhanced comprehension to the wider society, a cascading impact takes place. The sharing of knowledge enhances global awareness and connectivity (Shen 2015).

Knowledge sharing is a vital component that connects learning groups, forming intricate patterns in the tapestry of education. These communities are transformed into dynamic ecosystems where the combined knowledge of learners provides a reservoir of information that goes beyond the individual capacity of the learners (Yilmaz 2017). The process of learning transforms from an individual pursuit to a collective exploration, where the combined knowledge serves as a guiding light towards a better-informed and enlightened future. The progress of technology offers promising prospects for the future of information dissemination in educational communities (Hall and Goody 2007).

Artificial intelligence, virtual reality, and other developing technologies have the potential to improve collaborative learning by offering new opportunities for interaction and exploration. As learning communities progress, the techniques and technologies used for sharing information must adjust and broaden.

By integrating conventional collaborative techniques with cutting-edge technology-driven approaches, educators have the ability to establish dynamic learning environments that empower learners. The crucial factor is to acknowledge the wide range of applicable methodologies and technology and adapt them to the specific requirements of each learning community. This approach promotes a

culture in which knowledge is generated, exchanged, and consistently enhanced (Stachová et al., 2020).

7.4. Aspects of knowledge sharing:

The major facets of information sharing, as identified by Farhan and Muhaimin in 2019, are as follows:

7.4.1.**Transfer of knowledge**: refers to the process of exchanging understandings, insights, and experiences from one entity to another through communication. Information can be transmitted through different mediums, including verbal discussions, formal presentations, written papers, or multimedia platforms.

7.4.2. **Collaboration and Interaction**: Collaboration is an essential element of sharing knowledge. Individuals or organizations convene to exchange their specialized knowledge, viewpoints, and concepts. Interaction enables a fluid and active flow of knowledge, enabling individuals to acquire knowledge from one another.

7.4.3. **Tacit and Explicit Knowledge**: Knowledge can be classified into tacit and explicit forms. Tacit knowledge is frequently subjective, derived from personal encounters and discernments. Explicit knowledge is information that is documented and can be communicated clearly and directly. Knowledge sharing involves the exchange of both implicit (tacit) and explicit information.

7.4.4. **Learning and Development**: The act of sharing knowledge is strongly connected to the process of acquiring new knowledge and skills. By exchanging knowledge, individuals, companies, and communities can improve their comprehension, expertise, and ability to solve problems. It facilitates ongoing enhancement and adjustment.

7.4.5. **Community and Organizational Growth:** Knowledge sharing has a significant role in fostering the progress of society, organizations, and communities. As information is spread and utilized, it can result in innovation, enhanced decision making, and the formation of collective intelligence.

7.4.6. **Digital Platforms and Technology:** In contemporary times, technology plays a pivotal role in the dissemination of knowledge. For instance, digital platforms, collaborative tools, and online forums offer effective methods for individuals to internationally exchange knowledge. This facilitates the dissemination of knowledge on a vast scale and at a mass level.

7.4.7. **Cultural and Social Context:** The efficacy of knowledge dissemination is impacted by cultural and social elements. Cultural and social elements are essential in influencing the dynamics of information dissemination within communities. These elements have a substantial impact on the way knowledge is spread, received, and used.

7.4.8.**Problem-Solving and creativity:** The act of sharing knowledge plays a crucial role in the process of solving problems and fostering creativity. By harnessing the combined knowledge and skills of a team, innovative solutions may be generated and problems can be tackled with greater efficiency.

7.4.9. **Documentation and Knowledge Management:** The act of recording knowledge is an essential component of sharing information. It guarantees the preservation and accessibility of insights for others. Knowledge management systems are commonly utilized to efficiently arrange and provide easy access to knowledge.

7.4.10. **Continuous progress**: is facilitated by the sharing of knowledge. Through the process of analyzing both triumphs and mistakes, people, companies, and communities can improve their methods, resulting in continuous progress and advancement.

8.Method:

8.1.Study Fields:

8.1.1. Spatial Field: This research was carried out at Amar Thelidji University's, Algeria.

8.1.2. Temporal Field: This research was conducted from March 24, 2024 to April 7, 2024. The exploratory research and the final study were both conducted during the study period.

8.2. Exploratory study:

We conducted an exploratory study on a sample of 30 people from the study community. The objective was to improve the instruments used for research. The researcher may construct the measuring instruments for the phenomena under study on a sample of roughly 30 people before applying them to the complete or final study population**.** (Pranas , Jolita , & Regina , 2018)

8.3.Data Collection Instrument& Method:

We employed the descriptive method in this work, which is one of the different phases of descriptive-analytical methodology. It was the best method to tackle the research topic and related inquiries. This strategy was chosen based on previous studies that had employed it. To answer questions and validate hypotheses, the correlational technique involves gathering information and assessing the phenomenon using scientific research methodologies and instruments. (Angers, 2006, pp. 106-107).

To construct the study questionnaire, we did the following:

Identified the axis of each variable based on the study's objectives, hypotheses, previous studies on each variable, and the theoretical literature on the variables.

Each variable contained a set of axes, and each axis included a set of items. The variables and their axis were as follows:

Scientific forums participation: included 12items.

Knowledge sharing: This variable included 12 statements.

The decisions on the items were based on the theoretical literature of the variable and previous studies.

The questionnaire for each variable was designed with choices rated from 1 to 3 according to the Likert method, as shown in the table:

Table (1) presents the questionnaire key for the study variables (by researchers):

Choice	Degree
Disagree	1
Agree to some extent	2
Agree	3

Table (2): Estimated Response levels: (by researchers):

Choice	Estimated Level
Disagree	1-1,66
Agree to some extent	1,67-2,32
Agree	2,33-3

These values were obtained by subtracting the smallest value (1) from the largest value (3) on the adopted scale and dividing the result by the number of alternatives (3). The result is 0.66, which is then added to 1, and the process is repeated until reaching the largest value on the adopted scale, which is 3.

Psychometric Properties of the Study Instrument:

Study of the Reliability and Self-Validity of the Research Instrument:

The instrument's validity corresponds to how effectively the instrument corresponds to measuring the component it is designed to measure. The reliability of the questionnaire, on the other hand, refers to the stability of the results and lack of substantial changes if the

questionnaire is redistributed to the sample persons multiple times during different times.

The questionnaire's reliability was determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha, and the self-validity coefficient was derived as the squared root of Cronbach's alpha.

The results are shown in the following table:

Table (3): Shows the stability and self-reliability coefficients for the study instrument (prepared by the researchers)

Axis	Sample Size	Number of Statements	Cronbach's Alpha	Self-Validity
Scientific forums participation	30	12	0.853	0.923
Knowledge sharing	30	12	0.823	0.907

The above table shows that the stability coefficient for all axis exceeds the minimum threshold, with a value of 0.853 for the scientific forum's participation axis, while it is 0.823 for the axis of Knowledge sharing. This indicates that the questionnaire items are characterized by stable results, and the findings can be generalized within the study.

As estimated, the self-reliability coefficient for the axis of scientific forum's participation was 0.923 and for Knowledge sharing was 0.907, indicating a high level of accuracy, even though it may be considered weaker than other forms of reliability. (Nunnally, 1994, pp. 264-265)

Table number (4) demonstrates the values of stability for the study variables using the Split-Half method (prepared by the researchers).

Axis	**Items**	**Cronbach's Alfa**	**Spearman brown Coefficient**	**Gutman split Half coefficient**	**Correlation between Forms**
Scientific forums participation	6	0.770	0.827	0.827	0.705
	6	0.737	0.827		
Knowledge sharing	6	0.714	0.809	0.805	0.679
	6	0.696	0.809		

From the above table, it is observed that there is a difference between the stability coefficients in the first and second halves of various study variables and axis. Additionally, the variance does not equate in both halves of the variables. Therefore, the stability coefficient for these

variables through the Split-Half method is the Gutman coefficient. (Guttman, 1945, pp. 258-259)

This coefficient was estimated to be 0.827 for Scientific forums participation and 0.805 for Knowledge sharing.

Population and Sample of the Study:

Study Population:

The study population consists of 71 male and female PhD Students registered at AmmarThelidji University in Laghouat during academic years 2021/2022 & 2022/2023.

Final Study Sample:

To determine the size of the final study sample, the researchers relied on Stephen Thompson's equation, as follows:

$$n = \frac{N\ x\ p\ (1-p)}{[N-1x(d^2/z^2)] + p(1-p)}$$

Where: n = Sample size N = Population size Z = Critical value corresponding to the significance level of 0.05 (equal to 1.96) d = Error rate, set at 0.05 p = Proportion of the characteristic, set at 0.50 . (Sahrawi & Bousalb., 2016, p. 73)

By applying the above equation, the study sample size (n) is calculated as:

$$n = \frac{71\ x\ 0.50\ (1-0.5)}{[71-1x(0.05^2/1.96^2)] + 0.5(1-0.5)} = 60{,}05$$

Thus, the final sample size of our study is 161.

Characteristics of the Study Sample:

Table number (5) presents the distribution of the study sample individuals based on social characteristics (prepared by the researchers).

Gender	**frequency**	**Percentage**
Male	39	65,0%
Female	21	35,0%
Total	60	100.00%
Specialty	**frequency**	**Percentage**
Social Sciences & Literature	38	63,3%
Technical sciences & Nature	22	36,7%
Total	60	100.00%
Forum's Types preferred	**frequency**	**Percentage**
Physical	20	33,3%
Online	15	25,0%
Both	25	41,7%
Total	60	100.00%

From the above table, the study sample, comprising PhD students, exhibits a gender disparity, with 65% male and 35% female representation. In addition, a significant proportion of students 63.3% are enrolled in the Social Sciences & Literature field, while 36.7% are studying Technical Sciences & Nature. When it comes to forum preferences, 33.3% of people prefer physical forums, 25% prefer online platforms, and a significant majority 41.7% prefer both, showing a need for flexibility in communication. To gain a better understanding of the features and preferences of the sample, additional analyses could investigate potential correlations between these factors. For example, it would be interesting to examine if there are any differences in forum preferences based on gender or specialty.

Statistical Methods: A variety of statistical tools were utilized to determine the characteristics of the study sample and analyze the responses of the individuals to the study variables. These tools included percentages, means, standard deviations, and statistical tests included in the R^2 correlation Pearson, T test two independents samples, and one-way ANOVA calculating variance.

9. Presentation, Analysis, and Interpretation of Hypotheses Results:

9.1. Presentation, Analysis, and Discussion of the Main Hypothesis:

Table number (6) demonstrates the correlation between participation in scientific forums and sharing knowledge from the viewpoint of the sample individuals (prepared by the researchers).

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation		Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
Scientific forums participation	2,45	0,410	0	0,360**	0,005
Knowledge sharing	2,42	0,389			

The above table displays data regarding the correlation between engagement in scientific forums and the inclination to share knowledge among the individuals in the sample. The average score for scientific forum involvement is 2.45, with a standard deviation of 0.410. Similarly, the average score for knowledge sharing is 2.42, with a standard deviation of 0.389. The Pearson correlation coefficient between these two variables is 0.360, indicating a statistically significant relationship at the 0.005 level (two-tailed). The data suggests a moderate positive link between engagement in scientific forums and the inclination to share information among the individuals in the sample. Put simply, those who participate more actively in scientific forums are more likely to have a propensity for sharing their expertise. This discovery implies that participating in scientific conversations and interactions can promote a culture of sharing information among the individuals in the study group. Nevertheless, additional investigation may be necessary to examine the fundamental mechanisms that influence this correlation and establish causation.

9.2. Presentation, Analysis, and Discussion of the 1st sub Hypothesis:

Table number (7) demonstrates the differences in Knowledge Sharing between PhD Students based on their field of study (prepared by the researchers).

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Levene's Variances	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Social		2,45	0,38	0,008	0,930	0,86	41,62	0,390

Sciences &Literature	8					8	7	
Technical sciences & Nature	2	2,36	0,40					

The table above displays the findings for the Social Sciences & Literature group, which consists of 38 individuals. The mean score for sharing knowledge in this group is 2.45, with a standard deviation of 0.38. In the Technical Sciences &Nature group (n=22), the average score for sharing knowledge is 2.36, with a standard deviation of 0.40. The Levene's test results (F=0.008) suggest that there is no statistically significant difference in variances (sig=0.930). The comparison between these two groups yields a "t" statistic and has 41,627 degrees of freedom. The significance level, or p-value, is 0.390 for a two-tailed test.

9.3. Presentation, Analysis, and Discussion of the 2nd sub Hypothesis:

Table number (7) demonstrates the differences in Knowledge Sharing between PhD Students based on their chosen mode of scientific conferences (prepared by the researchers).

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Physical	20	2,43	0,37
Online	15	2,39	0,39
Both	25	2,42	0,41
Total	60	2,42	0,38

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	0,017	2	0,008	0,053	0,948
Within Groups	8,954	57	0,157		
Total	8,970	59			

This table presented depicts the diversity in knowledge dissemination among PhD students based on their preferred method of scientific conferences: Physical, Online, or Both. The descriptive statistics show that the mean knowledge sharing scores for Physical conferences is 2.43 with a standard deviation of 0.37, for Online conferences is 2.39 with a standard deviation of 0.39, and for Both is 2.42 with a standard deviation of 0.41. The sample sizes for each group are 20, 15, and 25, respectively. The ANOVA analysis reveals that there is no statistically significant variation in knowledge sharing scores among the different groups. This is supported by a Between Groups Sum of Squares

of 0.017, 2 degrees of freedom, and a p-value of 0.948. This indicates that the specific format of scientific conferences, whether they are held in person, online, or a combination of both, does not have a major effect on the way PhD students share knowledge.

10. Discuss:

We can interpret the results in relation to both private and institutional forms of capital. Bourdieu posited the notion that individuals amass several types of capital, such as economic, social, and cultural capital, which enhance their social standing and influence within society. In scientific pursuits, Bourdieu's theory posits that individuals accumulate scientific capital by actively participating in intellectual undertakings, such as engaging in scientific forums and conferences, and demonstrating their capacity to disseminate knowledge.

The findings suggest a strong positive link between involvement in scientific forums and knowledge sharing among PhD students, supporting the main premise. This is consistent with Bourdieu's theory, as engaging in scientific forums is a way for individuals to acquire social capital. By participating, they can connect with other researchers, share ideas, and improve their standing within the academic community. Moreover, the inclination to distribute knowledge indicates people' possession of cultural capital, showcasing their intellectual proficiency and expertise in their area of study.

Regarding the first sub-hypothesis that investigates disparities in knowledge sharing based on the subject of study (Social Sciences & Literature vs. Technical Sciences & Nature), the findings indicate that there is no notable difference in knowledge sharing behavior between these two groups. This discovery indicates that PhD students, regardless of their academic field, demonstrate comparable inclinations when it comes to sharing knowledge. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that Bourdieu's theory recognizes the presence of separate domains within academia, each characterized by its own specific standards and behaviors. Hence, although this study did not find any notable disparities, future investigations could delve into the influence of disciplinary variations on information sharing practices among PhD students.

The findings suggest that the modality of scientific conferences (physical, online, or both) does not have a substantial impact on the

information sharing behavior of PhD students, as it relates to the second sub-hypothesis. From a Bourdieusian standpoint, this could indicate the widening availability of scientific information due to technological progress, specifically the internet. PhD students can accumulate scientific capital by engaging in intellectual interchange and knowledge dissemination, regardless of how they participate in conferences. When applying these findings to the situation in Algeria, it is crucial to take into account the unique socio-cultural and institutional environment in which scientific activities take place in the country. Variables such as the availability of resources, institutional backing for scholarly investigation, and cultural conventions about the dissemination of knowledge can impact the way Bourdieu's theory is observed in the academic environment of Algeria. Hence, future research endeavors could investigate the functioning of the idea of scientific capital specifically in the distinctive setting of Algerian academia, thereby elucidating the intricacies of knowledge generation and distribution in the nation.

11.Conclusion:

This research examines the intricacies of PhD students' participation in scientific forums, including both physical and virtual platforms, with a particular emphasis on the Algerian setting. It recognizes the crucial function that these forums provide as central points for the sharing and validation of knowledge within academic communities. Nevertheless, it also emphasizes the fundamental power dynamics and social hierarchies that could impede the complete involvement and exchange of knowledge among PhD students, specifically in the Algerian environment.

This research offers significant and useful information for policymakers, educators, and stakeholders in the Algerian academic community. To improve the accessibility, inclusivity, and effectiveness of scientific forums, it is important to comprehend the difficulties encountered by PhD students and the factors that impact information exchange. Suggestions may involve offering guidance and assistance to young researchers, promoting collaboration across different fields, and utilizing digital platforms to encourage the sharing of knowledge.

Ultimately, this study adds to the overall discussion on the exchange of information within academic communities and provides a basis for further investigations into the workings of scientific forums in Algeria.

By acknowledging and tackling the intricacies of power dynamics, availability of resources, and institutional backing, we may work towards creating a fairer and more cooperative environment for the creation and sharing of scholarly material.

12-Bibliography:

-Dittmar, J., & Eilks, I. (2020). Internet Forums in Class: Innovation for Science Education by Focusing on Social Media. Action Research and Innovation in Science Education, 3, 3-11. https://doi.org/10.51724/arise.28

-Durrah, O., Gharib, M., & Baomar, A. (2018). The Role of Organizational Culture in Improving the Process of Knowledge Sharing among Faculty Members at Dhofar University. 40, 9-37.

Hani, F. M. A. E., Sayed Mahmoud, Y., & Ali Makhlouf, S. (2023). 5-1-Hani Fawzi Mohamed Abu Elkheir, Youced Sayed Mahmoud, Samiha, Ali Makhlouf, Knowledge sharing and its role in building relationships between students and faculty members at the Egyptian University "analytical study". Journal of Feyoum's University for psychological and educational sciences., 17(6), 240-272.

-Ienna, G. (2023). Bourdieu and the Social History of Scientific Reason. In M. L. Condé & M. Salomon (Eds.), Handbook for the Historiography of Science (pp. 145-171). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27510-4_7

-Khamqani, A., & Rajam, K. (2022). The impact of knowledge sharing in the performance of university professor, a case study of a sample of the professors of Ouargla University. Journal of economic and administrative researchs, 16(01), 645-664.

Henderson,E.F.,&Burford,J.(2017).WelcometoConferenceInference. ConferenceInferencehttps://conferenceinference.wordpress.com/2017/01/30/first-blog-post/

-Angers, M. (2006). *Maurice Angers, Methodology of Scientific Research in The Human Race Practical Exercises.* (S. Saboune , B. sahraoui , & k. bouchref , Trads.) Algeria: Dar Kasaba publishing.

Diab, Y. (2021). The Concept of Knowledge Sharing in Organizations (Studying the Personal and Organizational Factors and Their Effect on Knowledge Management). *Management Studies and Economic Systems (MSES)* , 91–100.

Guttman, L. (1945). A basis for Analyzing Test-Retest Reliability. *Psychometrika , 10*.

Hani, F. M., Sayed Mahmoud, Y., & Ali Makhlouf, S. (2023). 5-1-Hani Fawzi Mohamed Abu Elkheir, Youced Sayed Mahmoud, Samiha, Ali Makhlouf, Knowledge sharing and its role in building relationships between students and faculty members at the Egyptian University "analytical study". *Journal of Feyoum's University for psychological and educational sciences. , 17* (6), 240-272.

Khamqani, A., & Rajam, K. (2022). The impact of knowledge sharing in the performance of university professor, a case study of a sample of the professors of Ouargla University. *Journal of economic and administrative researchs , 16* (01), 645-664.

Nunnally, J. a. (1994). *The Assessment of Reliability. Psychometric Theory, , 248-292.* (éd. 3). (MacGrawHill.INC, Éd.) United States of America: Library of congres cataloging - in - publication data.

Pranas , Ž., Jolita , V., & Regina , A. (2018, april 18). Exploratory Research. *intechopen* .

Sahrawi, A., & Bousalb., A. (2016). Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and Treatment of Scale Validity in Psychological and Educational Research, The General Factor Model of Administrative Management Relationships in Educational Institutions. *Journal of Psychological and Educational Sciences , 2*, 61-91.".

Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design.* (éd. SAGE Publications, Inc.). California, California, USA: Thaousand Oaks.