


Spanish Reading Influencers in Goodreads: Participation, Experience and Canon Proposed

Anastasio García-Roca 

Departamento de Educación, Universidad de Almería, Spain

ABSTRACT

Nobody doubts the importance of digital influencers when it comes to the selection and acquisition of new products and services. In the specific field of literary reading, literary blogs, booktubers and specialized websites that act as prescribers of reading stand out. This study presents a descriptive research model in which a multivariate analysis of the main sociodemographic characteristics, assessments, readings and activities developed by the 100 most important reading influencers in Spain was carried out. For this purpose, data were taken from the most widely used reading cataloguing platform, i.e. Goodreads. It was found to be mainly about women with a developed reading habit and with an effervescent and extensive experience in literary blogs, thematic social networks, etc. In addition, the results show that the more influencers evolve as readers the more demanding they become more in their assessments, which in turn translates into greater influence. Influencers' recognition in the platform, therefore, is subject to their reading experience, critical capacity and personal criteria. Finally, it was learned that the canon of authors and works best valued by these relevant users is heterogeneous, although works and authors related to Young Adult Literature and bestsellers predominate to a certain extent.



Received 2019-07-04

Revised 2019-09-06

Accepted 2020-01-27

Published 2020-07-15

Corresponding Author

Anastasio García-Roca,
agr638@ual.es

Departamento de Educación,
Universidad de Almería, Almería,
Spain.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2020.7.453>

Pages: 153-166

Funding: Ministerio de
Economía y Competitividad
(EDU2015 69924-R)

Distributed under
Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

Copyright: © The Author(s)

Keywords SOCIAL MEDIA, GOODREADS, INFLUENCERS, DIGITAL READING, INFORMAL LEARNING

1 INTRODUCTION

The Internet and social networks have revolutionised literary reading. Nowadays, young people and adolescents do more social reading; that is, for example, where the reception process is shared through the net. Research has shown that literary reading is shared and commented on in virtual spaces (García-Roca, 2016; Jenkins, 2006; Lluch, 2014; Torrego-González & Gutiérrez-Martín, 2018) and includes new literate practices such as writing *fanfictions* (Guerrero-Pico, 2016), sharing reviews or theorising new content, to quote but a few. As will be discussed in this work, from the selection of a book to its final assessment, these are all activities carried out on the net. Undoubtedly, the decoding process still remains an individual act, but this is only a part of the experience of receiving literary works in the digital age.

OPEN ACCESS

Faced with this reality, school is put on hold and provides, on most occasions, teaching and learning proposals that are limited to the specific field of traditional literacy regardless of students' actual interests (González, 2018; Lankshear & Knobel, 2006). Thus, the other literate practices, among them digital reading and writing, are relegated to the status of personal practices of little social, educational, or literary value.

The school canon (list of works proposed by educational centres and teachers) is totally dissociated from the actual interests of students: for example, no works of a digital nature appear in the school canon. Despite this, studies such as those carried out by Moral-Pérez, Villalustre-Martínez, and del Rosario Neira-Piñeiro (2016) show the educational potential of digital storytelling. This confrontation between vernacular and dominant or institutional practices was studied by Cassany (2013), who analysed their main respective features. The gap proves detrimental to the objectives of formal education and the promotion of reading habits, since the virtual spaces of reading affinity, as well as the activities developed in them, are unique opportunities to promote reading both at schools and in libraries (Rovira-Collado, 2015). The new reality provides new possibilities for the promotion of reading, proposals for training in reading or literary education in general.

These new literate practices or new literacies are developed in virtual meeting spaces such as forums, blogs, or social networks, which, instead of using a clear hierarchy, are based on a more or less horizontal model (all of them start from the same status). However, circumstances such as the trajectory in the community, the number and relevance of contributions or their knowledge of a particular subject matter enable users to gain prominence, visibility and popularity within the platform or community in question. They become reference groups and their experiences with products and services are read and taken into account by a large number of users who follow their activities closely and trust their judgment. In this regard, as influencers have a say in a specific population segment (e.g. video games, fashion, or literature), they have been subject to a great deal of marketing-related research (Tanase, Tessone, & Algesheimer, 2018).

In the particular field of literature, the reading influencers most frequently studied have been *booktubers* (readers who share their opinions, impressions, and reviews of their readings on *YouTube*). These video bloggers act as trusted consumer motivators, mediators, or literary critics. Furthermore, users use everyday language, with lots of adjectives and, in short, a language close to their public (Lionetti, 2017). Their social relevance has enabled them to collaborate with publishers in the promotion of new literary works. In addition, *booktubers* are young (15-to-25-year-old) people who encourage other youngsters and teenagers to read (Pérez & López, 2015). Note that this age group stands out for being the one with the greatest reading habit (FGEE, 2018), which is why it has been the centre of analyses in education-related studies (Ehret, Boegel, & Manuel-Nekouei, 2018; Vlieghe, Vandermeersche, & Soetaert, 2016). However, other specialists such as Garralón (2014) question this *booktuber* system on the grounds that too much homogeneity exists regarding tastes, criteria, titles, authors, etc.

Since not enough empirical studies have carried out an in-depth analysis of reading influencers in Spain, the need arises to explore who these users are and what they are like? More

specifically, this research was revolved around the following objectives:

- Describing the general characteristics of the most relevant Spanish reading influencers.
- Investigating the activity, experience and participation of reading influencers on *Goodreads*.
- Analysing the rating given to their readings in respect to other users.
- Exploring the canon proposed by the most influential *Goodreaders* in Spain.

2 PREVIOUS RESEARCH

This research is based on one of the conclusions drawn from the *Hábitos de Lectura y Compra de Libros 2018* (Book Reading and Purchase Habits 2018) barometer performed by the *Federación de Gremios de Editores de España* (FGEE, 2018) namely: that the selection criteria for literary works has changed in recent years. From such perspective, this study (ibid.) shows that: 60.6% of the population older than 14 who read books look for information or recommendations on new books; out of these, 31.1% go to specialised literary websites for further reading; 19% access their social networks, forums, blogs...; 5% search on the Internet as a whole; 3.8% read reviews in online newspapers; and 1% visit online stores or outlets.

The role of online pre-registration stands out, both in specific literary web pages and through social networks, forums and blogs (FGEE, 2018). In this context, the research undertaken by the *Asociación para la Investigación de Medios de Comunicación* (Spanish Association for Media Research) (2018) reveals that 47.8% accessed the Internet to seek opinions and feedback (in which they place a great deal of trust) related to products and services they bought.

Among the new reading criteria stands out the importance of the Internet in general, specialised literary web pages and social networks. Therefore, this study has focused on interest-based social networks, that is, thematic social networks where the relationship between users stems from the existence of shared affinities regardless of place of residence, sex, age, etc. (Gee & Hayes, 2012).

In this regard, it is worth highlighting the study of Zhao (2017) which shows that connections between *Goodreads* users are based on shared opinions and assessments of the same novel. In other words, they register on this social network because of their reading and writing hobby, groups being established according to literary interests.

There are plenty of reading cataloguing and social labelling communities, each one with its own different cultural rules and labelling practices (Desrochers, Laplante, Martin, Quan-Haase, & Spiteri, 2016): *Anobii*, *Lectorati*, *Leoteca*, *LibraryThing*, etc. Therefore, *Goodreads* (owned by Amazon) has been selected among all of them as the scenario for this analysis, as it is also the world's most important reading cataloguing community. The same website boasts 80 million users and 2.3 billion books, the mobile application having 10 million downloads in Google Play alone. Previous research found that the platform is mainly made up of women (Thelwall & Kousha, 2016).

Goodreads is a space to meet and discuss literature (Nuttall, 2017) where millions of users gather, united only in their fondness for reading. This eases the reception process and allows it to expand beyond the textual decoding by sharing opinions, experiences, and ratings. Throughout this process, reading and writing skills are serendipitously developed in informal education contexts (Cobo & Moravec, 2011), since users must read suggestions or assessments related to many literary works.

Appreciating the value of the collective view, readers share their assessment through a literature reflection exercise. These new scenarios additionally portray reading as a leisure activity to which an important level of social, emotional and intellectual involvement is attached (García-Roca, 2016). Therefore, this whole reality represents a unique opportunity to propose literary education activities and to boost the reading habit.

Furthermore, reading cataloguing communities are databases of opinions based on the principles of collective intelligence (Lévy, 2004). From this perspective, as seen above, the opinion and rating of other users have become quality criteria to obtain new products and service (Naik, 2012). Consequently, they are an important element in the promotion of a book that concerns all the actors involved and relates to reading:

It does not only have an impact on its users/readers, but also on all the groups of people and bodies that are somehow involved with them: authors, publishers, distributors, booksellers, reviewers, public or private institutions, public offices, etc.

(Lluch, Tabernero-Sala, & Calvo-Valios, 2015)

The boundaries that divide the traditional roles of reader, writer and literary critic on the platform are blurred, which results in new interactions between them. Users' feedback becomes relevant to other potential readers and thus constitute a matter of concern for writers.

In this context, Matthews (2016) analysed the incident involving a writer and an influencer who shared a negative review in 2012 with the aim of exploring how readers see the role of professionals in literature and which role non-professionals (readers, commentators, assessors...) consider as their own.

Despite being a priority line of research from the educational and cultural point of view, hardly any research has focused on the analysis of *Goodreads* users' ratings. The research by Kovács and Harkey (2014) studied how receiving an award or recognition influences reviews and ratings on *Goodreads*. For that purpose, their research examined thousands of reviews on *Goodreads* of 64 award-winning books between 2007 and 2011. It concluded that, since they were awarded the prize, literary works had undergone a sharp decline in text quality assessment.

This study is therefore an original contribution, since no research seems to have carried out an in-depth analysis of reading influencers, despite this being a relevant research topic. Furthermore, the achievement of objectives has important social and economic implications which are of interest to teachers, researchers, librarians, publishers, etc.

3 METHODS

This is an exploratory and quantitative study, because of the number of cases analysed and the nature of the variables. In particular, a descriptive research work served to explore the characteristics of a user group. A systematic quantitative observation of the variables studied was performed for data collection purposes. The nature of data is fundamentally quantitative —with the exception of objective c., in which I studied authors and their books but also with a numerical bias.

A purposive sampling helped to select the population, insofar as these are relevant subjects: the platform provides and advertises the 100 most active, most followed and most important users in the community. They were the most popular reviewers on *Goodreads* in 2017 (a title achieved by obtaining the highest number of votes in their reviews). Data collection took place during the first four months of 2018.

Data from their user profiles such as age, sex, city of residence, number of readings, language of the profile and reviews or followers were gathered in a thorough and comprehensive manner using a data collection sheet, subsequently triangulating those data with the social networks they have indexed, namely: *YouTube*, *Instagram*, *Twitter*, etc. Data processing and analysis were carried out using the SPSS 23 software in order to perform a multivariate analysis, to search for correlations, to find differences between groups of users, among other tasks.

The *Chrome* browser extension called 'Table Capture' served to analyse the reading canon that these users propose. This tool made it possible to extract the complete list of all the readings that the influencers have shared, after which all the listings were linked in an Excel spreadsheet. Due to the large number of indexed works, a list of 94903 cells was obtained (note that there are 100 listings and many repeated books). By filtering the data to literary works that had been read and scored by the influencers, the data volume came down to 52564.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Socio-demographic characteristics


This section will examine the general socio-demographic characteristics of the top 100 Spanish influencers in 2017. The variables include: sex, autonomous region, the language of the profile and the language used in their reviews.

The most influential users when it comes to literary reading in Spain are mainly women. In fact, 79.5% of the users whose sex could be deduced ($n=88$) are women, the remaining 20.5% corresponding to men. In terms of age (Table 1), a large dispersion of data became visible. Firstly, there are users between 16 and 56 years of age ($R=40$). However, central tendency measures coincide: the mean is slightly above 33 years old ($M=33$), the median lies at 33 ($M_e=33$), and the most frequently repeated age 34 years old. Regarding the deviation of results in their distribution with respect to the arithmetic mean, a standard deviation of 9.747 ($\sigma=9.747$) and a variance of 95 ($\sigma^2=95.002$) were observed. No significant differences appear in terms of age according to sex.

Table 1 Sampling distribution according to age

Age			
Mean			33.38
Median			33.00
Standard deviation			9.747
Variance			95.002
Range			40
Minimum			16
Maximum			56
Percentile	25		25.25
	50		33.00
	75		39.00
N	Valid		56
	Lost		45

Concerning the variable ‘autonomous region of residence’, it deserves to be highlighted that users are spread throughout Spain. Despite this, certain cities actually host a larger number of influencers. Four autonomous regions stand out in this regard: Catalonia hosts 21.1% of users (n=16); the Autonomous Region of Madrid hosts 18.4%, while Andalusia and the Autonomous Region of Valencia register 17.1% and 10.5%, respectively (Figure 1).

**Figure 1** Sampling distribution according to region

Despite all users being Spanish, the *Goodreads* platform is mainly an English-speaking one. Thus, 22.2% of users have information in English in their profiles with the aim of

increasing their impact within the platform. In addition, 16.2% also publish their feedback in English.

4.2 Reads on the platform

The first influencers to be registered on *Goodreads* did so in 2008, the last ones arriving at the platform precisely in 2017 itself ($R=9$). On average, its users have 4 years of experience on the platform ($M=4$). Once again, central tendency measures coincide: the median is 4 too ($m_e=4$) and the most repeated value reaches 4. A standard deviation of 1.744 ($\sigma=1.744$) and a variance of 3.043 ($\sigma^2=3.043$) were found. Given that *Goodreads* is 12 years old and that these users were the most relevant ones in 2017, they could be categorised as relatively experienced users. In addition to this, many of the existing *Goodreads* influencers were already known users, as they administered literary blogs. A significant difference appeared between the average age of influencers who own a literary blog (35 years old) and those who do not (29 years old).

Once the general data of the users have been extracted, the time comes to analyse their activity within the platform since their registration. From this perspective, a high data dispersion level was found in certain variables because, as seen above, the range corresponding to the variable ‘times on the platform’ is very wide.

On average, the most important Spanish influencers in 2017 followed the updates of 29 authors and bookmarked 9 authors (note that 43.6% do not bookmark any writers; Table 2). In this regard, it is worth highlighting the number of works marked as read on the platform: there are users with 4 to 2185 readings. All this results in a mean of 575 works enjoyed ($\sigma=414.2$). Furthermore, 95% of users have already planned their upcoming readings and share them on the platform: on average, they have a list of 368 works ($\sigma=550.43$) to read in the near future. The high standard deviation shows the great heterogeneity in the number of upcoming readings. Finally, they share the list of books that they have abandoned for various reasons: this time 73.3% of users leave that box blank, and the others, on average, claim to have abandoned 11 works ($\sigma=13.21$). In short, they are readers of a large number of literary works: for illustrative purposes, it can be said that, on average, they have read 334555 pages ($DT=278670$).

Table 2 Absolute data on authors followed, favourite authors, works read and currently reading, and future and abandoned readings

	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance
Authors followed	97	28.94	46.229	2137.163
Favourite authors	84	8.70	33.028	1090.838
Works read	99	574.50	414.199	171561.219
Currently reading	99	2.53	2.848	8109
Future readings	99	368.07	550.434	302978.107
Abandoned readings	24	10.75	13.215	174.630

On the other hand, they read a wide range of genres and topics and share their favourite genres through their user profiles. In this regard, the most important genre is ‘romance’,

highlighted by 62% of the influencers analysed. The other most relevant genres are: fantasy (52%); young-adult (45%); stories set in the contemporary world (45%); mystery (42%); science fiction (40%); thriller (42%); suspense (39%); history (39%); and the classics (37%).

4.3 Activity and ratings on the platform

This reading habit results in comments and ratings on the platform. Being the most popular commentators on the platform in 2017 requires a high level of activity, thus ensuring that numerous readers actively follow their contributions. In this respect, these users have a mean above 557 ratings for different works (this means 96.64% of all the works they have read or abandoned; Table 3). However, there is a large dispersion of data: they have at least 133 ratings, and 2179 in the case of the most active users. This leads to a broad range ($R=2046$) and a high standard deviation ($\sigma=408.711$) and variance ($\sigma^2=166228$). Because some influencers were active for a few months while others stayed on it for several years, a statistically significant correlation exists between the number of ratings and the times on the platform ($r_p=0.322$, $p<0.001$). The ratings and the number of votes received in order to become the most important commentators in the community similarly correlate ($r_p=0.397$, $p<0.000$).

Table 3 Absolute data on the participation of influencers on Goodreads

	N	Range	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance
Rating	99	2046	557.65	407.711	166228.088
Mean	99	396.89	92.723	42.63117	1817.417
Comments	99	1998	296.79	314.809	99104.808

As for the rating given by influencers to their readings (1 to 5 stars), results with low dispersion were found (Figure 2): the mean and the median is 3.7 with a relatively low standard deviation ($\sigma=0.306$) and variance ($\sigma^2=0.094$). Therefore, results follow a normal distribution. These users are arguably competent readers because of their extensive intertextual knowledge. Is there any difference between the ratings awarded by influencers and those provided by other readers? The most experienced users tend to be more demanding when rating their readings: a difference of 0.23 appears in the mean of ratings awarded by the community and influencers ($\sigma=0.283$).

In this regard, a statistically significant negative correlation exists between the number of books read and the average rating awarded to their readings ($r_p=-0.326$, $p<0.001$). That is to say, as the number of works read increases, the rating of their new readings decreases: i.e. they become more demanding. Thus, the users with the lowest average rating for their readings are those who have more followers ($r_p=-0.673$, $p<0.001$). This is particularly relevant since it shows that, if the reading intertext of influencers increases, so does their level of exigence and, accordingly, the number of followers.




Figure 2 Correlation between the number of works read and their evaluation

4.4 Proposed reading canon

Sometimes users justify, qualify or complement their rating of works through reviews. Thus, 53.22% of ratings are followed by some kind of comment. However, comments more frequently refer to lower ratings, seeking to question their score.

Finally, their activity related to reading and writing is not confined to reading cataloguing. In fact, they produce different contents: a large number of influencers administer a literary blog (35.7%) or a thematic website (56%) exclusively focused on their passion: reading. In this regard, it is worth highlighting that 10.2% of the most influential *Goodreads* users are also content producers on *YouTube* and belong to the platform of video bloggers who are passionate about reading —known as *Booktubers*. To conclude, 10.2% of the users analysed, as well as reviewers, assessors or commentators, have authored works published in the traditional way.

Finally, an approximation was made of the canon proposed by these users (Table 4). We firstly extracted the list of the most famous authors most often referenced by the main reading influencers in Spain, for which purpose the already read works were taken into account (N=52566) —and the ‘future readings’ discarded. In this sense, the most highly rated author (number of votes) was Suzanne Collins —read and assessed by 53 of the 100 influencers under study— followed by Jane Austen (49 ratings), J.K. Rowling (46) and Rainbow Rowel (45). Most importantly, they are all internationally renowned authors and bestsellers. From this perspective, only one Spanish writer — Carlos Ruiz Zafón— appeared on the top 10.

In terms of average rating, these readers’ ratings are slightly lower than those provided by other *Goodreads* users. A certain degree of disparity arises between the general assessment of *Goodreads* users and influencers in relation to authors such as John Green (44 tenths below), Stephenie Meyer (45 tenths) and Dan Brown (48 tenths).

Table 4 Most cited authors

	Different Influencers who quote it	Times that has been cited some of his works	Average rating of the influencers	Average rating in Goodreads	Average number of ratings
Suzanne Collins	53	148	4.06	4.23	10246568
Jane Austen	49	133	4.09	4.04	5202256
J. K. Rowling	46	345	4.38	4.42	21213706
Rainbow Rowell	45	104	3.87	3.99	1657461
John Green	44	83	3.61	4.05	5698713
Stephen King	42	238	3.79	3.99	12188171
Carlos Ruiz Zafón	42	102	3.92	4	625012
Stephenie Meyer	41	146	3.2	3.64	9571095
Colleen Hoover	40	147	3.97	4.27	1676408
Dan Brown	39	99	3.31	3.79	6149713

As shown in the table above, a higher number of ratings does not necessarily ensure a higher score. Hence our decision to extract a list of authors with at least one five-star work according to the users analysed (Table 5). In this sense, J.K. Rowling stands out as the author with the greatest number of influencers rating some of her works as perfect. Authors such as Suzanne Collins and Jane Austen are not only the most widely read, but also the best valued. This list includes fewer known authors than the previous table. And once again, there is only one Spanish writer: Anna Casanovas.

In general, despite being the favourite authors of influencers, the latter give them a slightly lower rating than the other users. In particular, it is worth noting that Charlotte Brontë receives much better evaluations from influencers than from the other users (with a difference of 46 tenths).

Table 5 Best valued authors

Author	Different Influencers who rate some of his/her books with 5 stars	Times that some of his/her books have received 5 stars	Average rating by influencers	Average rating in Goodreads	Average number of ratings
J. K. Rowling	39	186	4.38	4.42	21213706
Suzanne Collins	30	63	4.06	4.23	10246568
Sarah J. Maas	28	70	4.27	4.44	2290601
George R. R. Martin	27	86	4.22	4.3	4814291
Jane Austen	26	51	4.09	4.04	5202256
J. R. R. Tolkien	23	58	4.17	4.29	7208056
Anna Casanovas	25	67	3.9	3.95	8
Charlotte Brontë	23	31	4.45	3.99	1546553
Cassandra Clare	23	88	4.16	4.29	5964232
Jennifer L. Armentrout	23	99	4.13	4.27	1569059

After extracting the list of most read and best rated authors, the most read and best valued works by the top reading influencers in Spain were analysed. On this occasion, the

first book of the homonymous saga, *The Hunger Games*, is the most read work among these users: more than half have read it. Almost every work and every author are contemporary, however, they emphasize works like *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen, published in 1813, and Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, published in 1847. On the other hand, not surprisingly, *Fifty Shades of Grey* ranks third among the most read works. It deserves to be highlighted that it has an average score of 2.89 stars out of five and a difference of 66 tenths below the opinion of other readers of *Goodreads*.

Finally, a list of works with the highest number of 'excellent' ratings on the platform was extracted. In this case, the work with the highest number of maximum scores —29 five-star ratings from different influencers— is the third part of the Harry Potter saga (*Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*). Overall, as stressed above, J. K. Rowling is the best valued author in the community.

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As shown by the results of this work, Spanish reading influencers share a number of general characteristics: most of these users reside in 4 autonomous regions (Catalonia; the Autonomous Region of Madrid; Andalusia; and the Autonomous Region of Valencia). Our findings prove that the platform is mainly female: 79.5% of influencers, which largely coincides with the results of [Thelwall and Kousha \(2016\)](#), who analysed 50000 random users (76% of whom were girls).

Regarding the age of these users, it is noteworthy that central tendency measures stand at around 33 years old. These results largely exceed those of the study carried out by [Pérez and López \(2015\)](#), who conclude that *Booktubers* (reading influencers on *YouTube*) are between 15 and 25 years old. It should be highlighted that only 10% of *Goodreads* influencers are *booktubers* too. In short, it can be inferred that both the relevant users and their followers are young women, which matches the profile of citizens with the highest percentage of leisure-time book-reading in Spain ([FGEE, 2018](#)).

As stated in this work, and in tune with the conclusions of other studies too, they are users with some experience in the community and a strong reading habit ([Lluch, 2017](#)). Therefore, both their reputation and their influence stem from their reading experience and their several-year-long history on social networks during which they have always maintained a constant and active participation. All this allows them to be considered expert readers. Rather than analysing literary texts, their reviews rely on influencers' personal experience. From this perspective, many influencers were already doing this before *Goodreads* even appeared and became popular, since they were former blog administrators. This proves what academicians like [Rovira-Collado \(2015\)](#) suggest: *Goodreads* is a natural evolution and extension of literary blogs.

Finally, one of the concerns related to influencers in general, and to reading influencers in particular, is whether they post negative reviews or just share their positive opinions. According to the data collected, these readers are more demanding than other users and rate with lower scores, even on the best-rated works. No outliers were found in the exploratory

study that could prove this thesis. Furthermore, they are readers whose evolution over time makes them become more demanding. It follows from the above that they try to be objective in their ratings according both to their intertext, interests and reading and to their literary competence in general.

In addition, these users read a large number of different authors, themes and genres. As for the reading canon that they suggest, the most referenced and best-rated authors are not necessarily the same, most of them being international contemporary writers of bestsellers in Young Adult Literature or crossover, particularly of literary sagas. Important communities of readers have been created around these works: e.g. *Potterheads* and *Divergents*, to quote but two. However, they also agree on the recommendation of lesser-known authors such as Carlos Ruiz Zafón and Anna Casanovas. They propose a canon similar to that of *Booktubers* according to Hughes (2017) findings. Their proposed canon is constantly updated as well. For example, authors such as Collen Hoover self-published their debut novel, *Slammed*, in January 2012. And works like *The Voice by Archer* (Mia Sheridan) or *A Court of Mist and Fury* (Sarah J. Maas) were published in 2016. We also find works belonging to the classical canon such as *Pride and Prejudice* (Jane Austen) and *Jane Eyre* (Charlotte Brontë), though.

The most popular and favourite authors of influencers are different from those obtained by the Spanish reading barometer in the 2017 and 2018 reports (FGEE, 2018; 2019). While our study identifies international authors of Children and Youth Literature, the barometer shows a greater presence of Spanish writers with a more adult audience, including Ildefonso Falcones, Miguel de Cervantes or Gabriel García Márquez. The same holds true in relation to the most read and purchased works.

These young adults obtain their comments, reviews or ratings in order to react to other users. Their contributions are read by thousands of people who closely follow their steps. However, staying among the top 100 influencers is a very demanding task. If the activity did not remain current and they stopped participating for a few weeks or a few months, they would simply disappear from that select list. This allows the *Goodreaders* promoted by the platform to be fully active users and to stay up to date at all times.

All the above inevitably affects the proposed canon: it is very difficult to survive on the list of main influencers over time. The pace at which users disappear and new ones appear with different ideas makes the existence of an unchanged reading canon impossible. Nonetheless, books actually exist which do not respond to ephemeral interests.

The results of this study permit to conclude that these are trusted consumer motivators as well as reading motivators: allies of formal education and also of reading and literary training. Rather than experts in literature who analyse the quality of texts (as a literary critic in the traditional sense), they are common users with a great deal of intertextual knowledge, a long trajectory in the community and a broad literary background who share their personal and subjective reading experience with other users. This aspect becomes essential for everyone involved in the promotion of reading: schools, libraries, public offices, etc.

To conclude, it is worth pointing out that the main limitation of this study lies in the fact that only the most important users belonging to a specific community of readers in a

specific country were analysed. However, this work opens up new research lines that can be further explored in the future.

- What do these users think about canonical or hegemonic readings?
- Who are the influencers that follow their activities, comments, and ratings?
- What sort of reviews do they share?

REFERENCES

- Asociación para la Investigación de Medios de Comunicación. (2018). *Encuesta AIMC a usuarios de Internet 2017*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2T0IUf5>
- Cassany, D. (2013). *Prácticas letradas contemporáneas: Claves para su desarrollo*. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación.
- Cobo, C., & Moravec, J. (2011). *El aprendizaje invisible. Hacia una ecología de la educación*. Barcelona: Publicacions i Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona.
- Desrochers, N., Laplante, A., Martin, K., Quan-Haase, A., & Spiteri, L. (2016). Illusions of a “Bond”: tagging cultural products across online platforms. *Journal of Documentation*, 72(6), 1027–1051. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-09-2015-0110>
- Ehret, C., Boegel, J., & Manuel-Nekouei, R. (2018). The Role of Affect in Adolescents’ Online Literacies: Participatory Pressures in BookTube Culture. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 62(2), 151–161. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.881>
- Federación de Gremios de Editores de España. FGEE. (2018). *Barómetro de Hábitos de Lectura y Compra de Libros 2017*. Madrid: Conecta.
- Federación de Gremios de Editores de España. FGEE. (2019). *Barómetro de Hábitos de Lectura y Compra de Libros 2018*. Madrid: Conecta.
- García-Roca, A. (2016). Prácticas lectoras en espacios de afinidad: formas participativas en la cultura digital. *Ocnos: Revista de estudios sobre lectura*, 15, 42–51. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2016.15.1.979
- Garralón, A. (2014, September 08). Retrato del reseñista adolescente. [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2w2Cw7g>
- Gee, J., & Hayes, E. (2012). Nurturing affinity spaces and game-based learning. In C. Steinkuehler, K. Squire, & S. Bara (Eds.), *Learning and Meaning in the Digital Age* (pp. 129–153). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139031127.015>
- González, L. (2018). Hábitos lectores y políticas habituales de lectura. In J. Millán (Ed.), *La lectura en España. Informe 2017* (pp. 81–91). Madrid: Federación de Gremios de Editores de España.
- Guerrero-Pico, M. (2016). Transmedia storytelling and user-generated content: A case study on crossovers. *Cuadernos.info*, 38, 183–200. <https://doi.org/10.7764/cdi.38.760>
- Hughes, M. (2017). BookTube and the Formation of the Young Adult Canon. *Book Publishing Final Research Paper*, 24. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2vkvDVQ>
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence Culture. Where old and New Media collide*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kovács, B., & Harkey, A. (2014). The Paradox of Publicity: How Awards Can Negatively Affect the Evaluation of Quality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839214523602>
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2006). *New Literacies: Everyday Practices and Classroom Learning*. New York: Open University Press.

- Lévy, P. (2004). *Inteligencia Colectiva: por una antropología del ciberespacio*. Washington DC: Organización Panamericana de la Salud.
- Lionetti, J. (2017). La próxima lectura. Modelos de recomendación de libros en línea. In J. A. Millán (Ed.), *La lectura en España. Informe 2017* (pp. 157–174). Madrid: Federación de Gremios de Editores de España.
- Lluch, G. (2014). Jóvenes y adolescentes hablan de lectura en la red. *OCNOS: Revista de estudios sobre lectura*, 11, 7–20. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2014.11.01
- Lluch, G. (2017). Los jóvenes y adolescentes comparten la lectura. In F. Cruces (Ed.), *¿Cómo leemos en la sociedad digital? Lectores, booktubers y prosumidores* (pp. 31–54). Barcelona: Ariel.
- Lluch, G., Taberero-Sala, R., & Calvo-Valios, V. (2015). Epitextos virtuales públicos como herramientas para la difusión del libro. *El Profesional de la Información*, 24(6), 797–797. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2015.nov.11>
- Matthews, J. (2016). Professionals and non professionals on Goodreads: Behavior standards for authors, reviewers, and readers. *New media & Society*, 18(10), 2305–2322. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815582141>
- Moral-Pérez, M. E. D., Villalustre-Martínez, L., & del Rosario Neira-Piñero, M. (2016). Relatos digitales: activando las competencias comunicativa, narrativa y digital en la formación inicial del profesorado. *Ocnos: Revista de estudios sobre lectura*, 15, 22–41. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2016.15.1.923
- Naik, Y. (2012). Finding Good Reads on Goodreads. Readers take RA into their own hands. *Readers' advisory*, 51(4), 319–323. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.51n4.319>
- Nuttall, L. (2017). Online readers between the camps: A Text World Theory analysis of ethical positioning in We Need to Talk About Kevin. *Language and Literature*, 26(2), 153–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947017704730>
- Pérez, C., & López, A. (2015). Los usos sociales de la lectura: del modo tradicional a otras formas colectivas de leer. In N. García et al. (Eds.), *Hacia una antropología de los lectores* (pp. 39–104). Ciudad de México: Planeta.
- Rovira-Collado, J. (2015). Investigaciones sobre lectura. *Redes sociales de lectura: del libro de caras a la LIJ 2.0*, 3, 106–122. <https://doi.org/10.37132/isl.v0i3.36>
- Tanase, R., Tessone, C. J., & Algesheimer, R. (2018). Identification of influencers through the wisdom of crowds. *PLOS ONE*, 13(7), e0200109–e0200109. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0200109>
- Thelwall, M., & Kousha, K. (2016). Goodreads: A social network site for book readers. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(4), 972–983. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23733> [10.1002/asi.23733](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23733)
- Torrego-González, A., & Gutiérrez-Martín, A. (2018). El consumo literario como experiencia compartida en entornos transmedia. El caso de El club de los incomprendidos. *Revista Mediterránea de Comunicación*, 8(2), 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.14198/MEDCOM2018.9.2.7>
- Vlieghe, J., Vandermeersche, G., & Soetaert, R. (2016). Social media in literacy education: Exploring social reading with pre-service teachers. *New Media & Society*, 18(5), 800–806. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814547683>
- Zhao, J. (2017). Modeling interest-based social networks: Superimposing Erdős-Rényi graphs over random intersection graphs. In M. Bayoumi (Ed.), *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing* (pp. 3704–3708). New Orleans: IEEE Xplore. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP.2017.7952848>