The Moral Imagination in an Era of "Gaming Academia": Implications of Emerging Reputational Issues in Scholarly Activities for Knowledge Organization Practices

Jo Ann Oravec

Hyland Hall, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, Whitewater Wisconsin USA,
<oravecj@uww.edu>

Jo Ann Oravec is a professor of information technology in the College of Business and Economics at the University of Wisconsin at Whitewater. She received her MBA, MS, MA, and PhD at UW-Madison. She chaired the Privacy Council of the State of Wisconsin, the nation's first state-level council dealing with information technology and privacy. She is author of *Virtual Individuals, Virtual Groups: Human Dimensions of Groupware and Computer Networking*. She has written extensively on privacy, American studies, futurism, online reputational systems, artificial intelligence, and emerging technologies. She has held visiting fellow positions at both Cambridge and Oxford.

Oravec, Jo Ann. **The Moral Imagination in an Era of "Gaming Academia": Implications of Emerging Reputational Issues in Scholarly Activities for Knowledge Organization Practices.** *Knowledge Organization. 42(5)*, 316-323. 24 references.

Abstract: Many participants in higher education build academic reputations in conjunction with their research initiatives (and subsequent citations) along with their teaching efforts. An assortment of reputational considerations related to scholarly publication and teaching is emerging in part as a result of availability of various Internet search and analysis applications. Examinations of ghostwriting efforts, citation circles, and dubious authorship assignments (such as "gift" authorship) are becoming easier to conduct even for individuals outside of the institutions involved. Although questionable publication and teaching practices have been reported for a number of years, the ability to monitor what is going on in a wide assortment of academic contexts has just recently emerged with widely-available tools such as Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and Ratemyprofessors.com. Forms of plagiarism have also been made more readily detectable through various technological applications. This paper addresses ethical issues involved in these potentially-problematic scholarly practices. It also explores ethical dimensions of an assortment of transparency-related university, professional organization, and third-party initiatives that analyze academic activity. It frames the notion of the "moral imagination" in terms of specific efforts to "game" academics, initiatives undertaken possibly for personal reputational gain on the part of higher education participants or increases in institutional rankings.

Received: 25 July 2015; Accepted 25 July 2015

Keywords: academic, faculty, gaming, research, productivity, higher education, transparency

1.0 Introduction

The word "gaming" in the title of this paper has many couplings with information science and technology; in the paragraphs to come it will largely refer to efforts to influence how research efforts and teaching reviews are displayed to particular audiences and how various search and analysis programs (such as Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and Ratemyprofessors.com) deliver results. Some of the practices discussed in this paper have generally met with strong moral indignation, such as the plagiarism of textual or graphic material; however, some defenders have emerged of these practices as well, for example, comparing plagiarism to the remixing of music and to oral traditions

(as outlined in Oravec 1996). Other practices have been less severely criticized and sometimes even strongly defended, including "gift" authorship, often accorded to individuals who have leadership roles in academic contexts. Some of these scholarly issues focus on the activities and reputations of individual scholars while others more specifically deal with the authenticity and integrity of organizations and institutions as a whole.

An assortment of ethical concerns relating to fairness is raised by these practices. These concerns are often rooted in rank and economic status, dimensions that may indeed serve to stimulate the moral imagination. For example, students as academic participants are often treated harshly by institutions when ghostwriting and plagiarism are detected, whereas a number of faculty members openly hire individuals to contribute substantially to their materials. Should the activities of students be placed under different standards and treated more harshly than faculty and staff? Should faculty members with the economic wherewithal to pay a ghostwriter to refurbish articles be accorded the same credit for these articles as those individuals who wrote without assistance? The requirement (instituted by professional organizations) that some sort of narrative that describes the contribution of the ghostwriters to be appended to the publications in question may mitigate some of these issues and provide means for more cogent intellectual histories. However, discourse on such strategies is quite limited in relation to the extensive and growing literature on student plagiarism (the latter exemplified in Heitman and Litewka 2011); a few of the proposed mitigation measures are discussed in later sections (as well as in Altbach 2015).

The issues involved in the analysis of academic production are complex and extraordinarily detailed case studies are often required to capture the nuances involved; in this paper, three fictionalized scenarios will be provided that are linked to specific cases. Often, it is not feasible to generate detailed, nonfiction case studies about those individuals who are currently working as academics because of the legal and financial issues with which the cases are associated. The issues are also of specific importance for knowledge organization initiatives, which often seek to analyze and disseminate research efforts in consistent and reliable fashions. Academic reputations can play critical roles in the recognition and promotions of individual academics as well as the statuses of their research groups and sponsoring organizations. Ghostwriting can play a role in these reputational efforts: it has been a common practice in many political and literary circles for centuries (Caruth 2014). Should individuals who are involved in knowledge organization and archiving somehow denote ghostwriting, citation circles, plagiarism, and problematic authorship when storing and disseminating materials? For example, should a form of "asterisk" be placed on apparently ghostwritten work in the way that the records and awards given to athletes who are caught using steroids are sometimes given an asterisk? Individuals who administer research efforts, organize knowledge documentation and storage systems, and otherwise view research production from higher levels can be especially involved in the problems of developing professional best practices for knowledge organization in questionable and ethically complex circumstances. However, as portrayed in an upcoming scenario, some administrators have apparently chosen not to investigate issues that may indeed reflect negatively on the research efforts of their faculty and staff and thus on the reputation of their institutions as a whole. Researchers themselves have brought to light various troubling situations of colleagues gaining credit for work they apparently did not do and of the research itself being framed in inappropriate ways. Through the past decades, a number of academics have worked tirelessly to control plagiarism, research falsification, and related practices that may endanger the integrity of academics, often at great cost to their own careers (Posner 2002). Some have asserted a moral obligation to do so, asserting that egregious cases of plagiarism and research malpractice have injured the graduate students or other associates of the academics involved. Other academics have paid little attention to these concerns, focusing primarily on their own research efforts.

The activities of ghostwriting, problematic assignment of authorship, plagiarism, and citation circles present complicated challenges to the integrity of research. The obligations of individuals and professional groups are complex, especially given the substantial consequences to careers and livelihoods of these problematic activities. A form of "tragedy of the academic commons" can occur when individuals do not have the motivation or interest to report violations and voice concerns. However, the interests of higher education organizations may often be less than optimal as they avoid or ignore challenges to the work of prized researchers. The selective punishment of individuals for certain publication and research violations (such as plagiarism) who are otherwise targeted by individuals or institutions is indeed often more the strategy for handling these matters than a fair and systematic approach. These practices can have substantial impact on how students are educated about the moral dimensions of academic research and about scholarly life as a whole, producing a continuing influence on intellectual undertakings.

2.0 Higher Education Institutions and Transparency Issues in Context

Higher education establishments in the United States and Canada are being placed under tight scrutiny in terms of

their efficiency and effectiveness by the public agencies and private organizations that provide their sustenance (Schrecker 2010). These entities are also competing for the approval and attention of the public, as are other social institutions such as health care, transportation, and corrections. As explored in this paper, many aspects of teaching performance, research production, and student expression have been made more transparent to various audiences as new technological applications are infused into efforts to rate educational instruction and analyze the impact of academic publications. Some reviews of faculty as well as student activity have moved from the departmental meeting and faculty office to online systems in which analyses can be conducted without extensive personal contact or substantive, content-oriented discourse with the subjects involved. This change in evaluation methods can entail shifts in power to administrators and external agencies and away from faculty members themselves as professionals and content experts, shifts that can result in new efficiencies but also substantial modifications in the character of academic interaction.

With these expansions in transparency of academic efforts, the aims of maintaining some level of autonomy for faculty, staff, and students in their interactions can present new levels of complexity. For example, varieties of "participatory transparency" (forms of personal relationship with large-scale information systems) are pulling faculty members, academic staff, and students into engaging with online systems in which their efforts are framed for public consumption by third-party corporate concerns outside of their institutions and often with priorities other than academics. Some of these individuals may have disquiet about or opposition to the use of these systems, or perhaps have creative ideas relating to their design and application.

Many academic institutions have accumulated large databases of teaching and research-related information, some of which is shared with higher education accreditation boards such as the AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business). An assortment of for-profit, third-party concerns have also entered the mix. Genres of website platforms that can be labeled as "symbiotic academic platforms" (some of which will be portrayed in this paper) have arisen in which massive amounts of data are accumulated about the teaching and research efforts of scholars. Often the symbiosis is beneficial in some form to both the higher education institutions and to the third party that runs the website; sometimes, only one party benefits from the arrangement as profit is gained but little of academic value is obtained.

Faculty, staff, and students must make their own decisions about how they will relate to the initiatives described in this paper—whether to be compliant and participate with them, ignore them, or perhaps attempt to game them. A fourth option, that of working to modify these systems by voicing dissenting opinions and creative ideas, is indeed also a possibility although the chances of having some real impact can be small. Consider the following scenario portraying how a faculty member is building a tentative relationship with the publication analysis platform Google Scholar:

> **Scenario 1:** Tracy Evans is an untenured assistant professor at a Midwestern university that emphasizes both teaching and research. He has been told by the dean of his college to create a Google Scholar profile and ensure that the articles that are linked to him are done so appropriately. Scholar is described by Google in its "about" section (https://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/about.html) as providing means for individuals to "Search all scholarly literature from one convenient place" and "check who's citing your publications, create a public author profile." Tracy has been told that the information provided in Google Scholar will help the institution gain prominence in terms of research, and that Tracy's profile may be integrated into other measures of academic production for faculty evaluation purposes. Tracy goes online to Google Scholar and finds a number of problems associated with his citations (some of which are linked to the fact that his name is quite common among academics); he puts three hours of unpaid labor into his profile. Terry becomes concerned about the copyright issues involved in his uploads of several published articles to his profile. At the end of these three hours of work, Tracy decides to add a photograph to his profile, one taken at a conference seven years ago.

Consider another scenario in which a faculty member is apparently drawn, albeit reluctantly, into participation with a third-party website (Ratemyprofessors.com) that is squarely in the academic symbiosis genre. This platform, begun in 1999, organizes and displays anonymous student commentary about educational performance. It is the largest and possibly most well-known student review site, with over eighty thousand colleges and universities listed and more than one million student reviews:

> **Scenario 2:** Janice Stevens is a professor at another Midwestern college, one with a strong teaching emphasis. Someone who identified him or herself as a student made a comment about Janice's recent teaching performance on the website Ratemyprofessors.com. The comment identified a particular male student with severe disabilities by name and stated that Janice spent too much time handling his needs as opposed to the needs

of the class as a whole. Janice was told about this comment by a student who was alarmed about it. Janice responded to the Ratemyprofessors.com comment with a short rebuttal that was posted online at the website. It stated her displeasure at having an individual student identified without his expressed permission in her faculty critique. Janice had second thoughts about making this comment at all because in order to submit the rebuttal she had to register with the site and she did not want to appear interested in the anonymous materials it provided.

The two scenarios above outline how faculty members at least are afforded some discretion in how they are presented on these respective platforms, although the individuals do not have the leeway to remove discourse about themselves and their academic efforts entirely. They are being drawn into participation with the mechanisms through which their own performances are being made transparent, in effect doing online "face construction" (as in the Google Scholar case) and "face saving" (as in the Ratemyprofessors.com example). Faculty members are indeed given some opportunities to "clean up" the publications associated with them (Google Scholar), respond to student critics (Ratemyprofessors.com), upload published articles (Academia.edu), and even add a personal photograph to a profile (ResearchGate, Google Scholar, and Microsoft Academic Search), participating at some small level with the mechanisms through which their academic work and persona are processed. Uploading published articles, one of the options just mentioned, can indeed involve some copyright issues, but the brunt of subsequent litigation (if any) would probably fall on the faculty member who placed the articles online and not the third-party platform that merely holds them.

Rather than "publish or perish," the emerging academic mantra could well become "update or stagnate" as faculty members find that some of the primary conduits from their work to the people who can benefit from it are through systems controlled by such corporate entities as Google, ResearchGate, and Microsoft. The third party owners of the websites involved gain by obtaining the free labor of many academics (such as the three hours that Tracy Evans put into cleaning up his Google Scholar profile in the above scenario). For teaching, the pressure to engage in participatory transparency could also be intense: many students are indeed learning about faculty and staff members' educational approaches for the first time through Ratemyprofessors.com. Faculty who do not choose to establish and maintain a relationship with these sites (and thus do not openly engage in participatory transparency) can indeed be associated with some erroneous and sketchy profiles; they may also leave serious critiques of their teaching or research without a ready response. With even reticent and tentative participation they are also imparting some legitimacy to the systems with which they engage by acknowledging them and linking them with whatever academic celebrity they themselves have. However, the scenarios just outlined and many other accounts reflect how minor a role individual faculty members have in these systems and how small their level of discretion.

Individual faculty members certainly have the right to design and maintain their own systems for analysis of faculty publications or teaching, but the prospects of these systems competing with Google Scholar (or Microsoft Academic Search, etc.) are miniscule. Some intellectual disciplines have indeed developed their own venues, such as PhilPapers.org for academic philosophy publications, which can be better tuned to the requirements of certain fields of study. However, the need for individual faculty and staff members to make decisions as whether to be complicit with such systems as Google Scholar, to ignore them, to game them, or to voice their concerns is increasing as these systems gain prominence in higher education. The "exit, voice, and loyalty" options provided by Albert O. Hirschman (1970) certainly have provided some insight and direction here; however, in the scenarios we are discussing "exit" is impossible (whatever you do, your academic work will be portrayed) and gaming is indeed becoming a tempting prospect. The choices of be complicit, ignore, game, or be vocal about these systems can be made less daunting for individuals in colleges and universities that recognize the value of academic autonomy and support their faculty, students, and staff in their choices for intellectual expression.

3.0 Participatory Surveillance vs. Participatory Transparency

"Participatory surveillance" relates to an assortment of technological trends that involve individuals intimately and personally in the surveillance of which they are objects (Oravec 1993, 1996). Many of the subjects of surveillance build relationships with a variety of forms of non-covert surveillance (surveillance of which they have some level of awareness). For example, subjects of surveillance often adopt a "surveillance face" in order to appear a certain way to the gaze of the camera that follows their pathways through an airport or shopping mall; the approach follows some of the theoretical work of sociologist Erving Goffman (1959) in the presentation of self. In a comparable manner, "participatory transparency" practices are emerging in the era of big data-driven transparency tools. With participatory transparency, participants can indeed be in synch with the notion of transparency and even some of its processes; the idea of displaying one's work to the pub-

lic can indeed be appealing, especially in the case of those faculty who aspire to be "public intellectuals" (Posner 2002) and maintain a form of academic celebrity rooted in their ideas and public persona. However, many of the aspects of participatory surveillance differ from those of participatory transparency: with surveillance, there are imbalances in the surveillor-surveilled relationship and special purposes involving the "gaze" of the surveillor of which one may be unclear or with which one does not want to be involved. There is indeed considerable overlap between participatory surveillance and participatory transparency, however, as some of the systems that are framed as providing transparency migrate toward more specific surveillance roles, possibly even targeting certain individuals or groups.

Increases of transparency in higher education can be problematic to those whose efforts are becoming transparent, as previously described; they also can place burdens on those who receive the information rendered by the systems involved. Consider the scenario below that describes some of the challenges that transparency in terms of research production may provide for higher education:

> **Scenario 3:** Henry Stevens is a provost at a Midwestern university that emphasizes research. He is highly involved with the presentation of his organization as a world-class research institution. He has done some analysis of his faculty's recent publication output using Google Scholar and ResearchGate. He has determined that there may be a number of "citation circles" in his university, with authors citing each other primarily to gain higher research rankings. He has also observed that several individuals he knows are seldom involved in publishing have been given authorship to some publications, possibly through a "gift authorship" arrangement. He is concerned about talking with the individuals involved for fear of seeming that he has "snooped" on their academic performance. Henry is particularly concerned that some of the new candidates for job positions have utilized journals that are on rosters of "predatory" journals and have been listed as authors in research efforts for which that they may not have had a substantial role.

Problems emerge for higher education with this increased transparency, as captured in the above scenario: for instance, faculty members could have had suspicions about the citation circles in which their colleagues collaborated in order to increase the number of times their work was cited; some of the systems discussed in this paper would aid in documenting such practices. Issues of inappropriate assignment of co-authorships (including the "ghostwriting" of journal articles), use of predatory journals, problematic peer-reviewing methodologies, research misconduct, and even the direct purchase of articles are receiving special attention by higher education administrators and governmental agencies as well as observers of academic arenas because of these new technological capabilities they are provided. Some of the systems described in this paper (including "symbiotic academic platforms") may present enticing opportunities to do some innovative "gaming," with potential ways to increase citation counts or otherwise inflate one's academic reputation and status. As a way of countering these gaming potentials, some editors of the *British Medical Journal* (2013) proposed that a "declaration of transparency" be presented for each research article, a statement that details who stands as the primary author and what roles the secondary authors played in development of the manuscript. Gaming can occur with teaching-related systems as well: at Ratemyprofessors.com, faculty members can easily inflate positive ratings by posing as a student. An added concern is that the biases inherent in many of the systems through which academic life becomes transparent can further diminish potentials for fairness toward certain fields and disciplines of academic endeavor in which citations are gleaned in different numbers and levels. Smaller fields with fewer major publication outlets and more single-authored publications may find themselves disadvantaged as administrators rank order faculty members in terms of their article production and citation accumulation.

As related in the previous scenario, the means for establishing transparency that are emerging can often disturb sensitive, tacit understandings among faculty members, staff, and administrators. The imposition of online transparency mechanisms upon organizations that have survived through the decades through understated professional interactions may be problematic. The prospect can be alarming of administrators and agency heads scrolling through rosters of publications and student evaluation results looking for various trends and rewarding individuals on the basis of the number of citations or level of student ratings they accumulate, possibly in a kind of "academic *Moneyball*" (Lewis 2004). The book *Moneyball* portrayed an approach to baseball built around the analysis of statistics, locating "bargain" players whose on-field performance was possibly out-of-step with their salaries. Comparisons between big-money sports and academics may not be so far afield. The considerable economic value of academic paper citations has been noted for decades (Diamond 1986). The gaming of citation statistics and other problematic forms of academic conduct have long been factors in academic life, but have become more salient with online capabilities (Oravec 2004, Heyneman 2014). Universities and colleges often have administrative systems in place that were designed in the past centuries; they may not be equipped for

the extreme transparency (and enhanced capabilities for gaming) of the kinds outlined in this paper. The character of intellectual and academic life may shift as individuals are framed and subsequently define themselves and others in terms of the systems' output.

Unpacking the basic notion of "transparency" within higher education requires some sensitivity to the context of academic and intellectual traditions. Transparency can be posited as one of the basic facets of educational activity, for example, in revealing and sharing the steps through which individuals reach decisions and form judgments as well as acquire the cognitive means to engage in decision making and value determinations. Transparency that largely records superficial traces of academic interaction can provide new challenges and exacerbate current concerns in higher education, however. For example, faculty members may indeed choose not to participate in some of these systems (such as Google Scholar), although their work will be portrayed and thus they will still have some level of participation, albeit passive (and with the information about them often riddled with errors). Artists who produce paintings may certainly complain if their works are presented in exhibitions with inappropriately sized or colored frames. Many faculty members in effect are having their own creative works framed in ways that may not be in keeping with their own perspectives or those of their academic disciplines.

Many of the focuses of accountability and transparency efforts in higher education have centered on teaching, often involving student evaluations. However problematic and sometimes enigmatic, student evaluation results have dominated the means through which teaching performance is viewed in many US and Canadian institutions (Bok 2003). In many higher education contexts, student evaluations of teaching from systems conducted by the institution are available for each instructor in easily-accessible formats for analysis by potential students or the public at large, much in the way that nutritional information is provided at fast food restaurants. Informal attempts at increasing transparency in teaching contexts, such as students and academic watchdogs capturing and disseminating controversial lecture material with smartphone cameras, have also increased (Schmidt 2011). Utilization of websites such as Ratemyprofessors.com has also expanded, providing platforms for dissemination of anonymous student reflections on teaching quality. Social media are often being integrated into higher education data analysis efforts as well: as these media depict an individual's associations with other individuals and groups, detailed accounts of political and social activities become readily available, expanding the scope of profiling and social network analysis initiatives involving students, faculty, and staff.

Nearly everyone in academic life is affected by these transparency issues, with students perhaps at special peril as their often more amateur efforts are made increasingly transparent with potential injury to future career prospects. The era in which faculty peers would convene in closed session for the analysis of the research performances of students and colleagues could well be supplemented if not replaced by more automatic strategies. For example, since research publications are a major factor in promotion and tenure as well as grant money allocations, academic participants are increasingly called upon to analyze the publication outputs of their colleagues both within and beyond their individual institutions. Search capabilities provided by Google Scholar and ResearchGate have expanded the means through which individual and group research production can be reviewed and analyzed, with even more precise and detailed analyses of research efforts (including pre-publication stages) soon on the horizon.

Increases in the transparency of higher education can provide challenges as well as benefits as academic participants attempt to make sense of the onslaught of information and analytical capabilities that are available to them relating to intimate aspects of teaching output and research publication development. Concerns about the quality of academic productions originating from settings in which ghostwriting and articles-for-hire are reportedly more widely and openly conducted have already affected academic interactions by overloading journal editors and publishers as well as burdening administrators who are required to make determinations about bringing individuals to campus for fellowships and teaching positions. Editors of some US-based journals have reportedly been faced with the prospect of evaluating articles that were written and sold to faculty members for the equivalent of forty-five dollars each or which were otherwise plagiarized or ghostwritten (Wong 2010, Hvistendahl 2013). Transparency efforts may expose such harmful trends (and an assortment of others), a prospect that may be pleasing to many academics but can have severe repercussions. Installation of university- or government-sponsored "collaboration cops" who monitor academic collaborations and related paper productions for authenticity may serve to disturb delicate interactions between and among researchers.

4.0 Some Conclusions and Reflections

Academic publications are sometimes compared to snapshots at a horse race, providing a momentary glimpse of a more elaborate and often nuanced set of intellectual and social processes. Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and related platforms in effect provide kinds of moving pictures, documenting interactions over time, imposing challenges through the heightened potential for external re-

view of intellectual production of faculty and staff. In a comparable way, Ratemyprofessors.com and comparable websites capture a few reflections about a tiny portion of faculty members' interactions with students. Snapshots and movies are problematic in what they capture (and what they fail to record). Many online platforms (such as Google Scholar and ResearchGate) are producing intricate portraits of research and publication activity, emphasizing elicitation and analysis of data as well as the support of creative production (Oravec 2013). These platforms operate outside of higher education institutions, and generally are out-of-reach of individual faculty, students, and staff who desire to make comments and suggestions as to their structure and format. An "academic dashboard" mentality is emerging fueled by the availability of Google Scholar and ResearchGate in which individual academics can be easily ranked in terms of knowledge production. The provost who is described in a previous scenario clearly desires an easy way to make administrative determinations, one that is buttressed with the often-espoused academic value of transparency.

The transparency issues discussed in this paper are in sync with a culture of consumerism in higher education. In many Western societies, consumers generally expect that they will be given substantial information about how the items or services they obtain were produced. The notions of education as a "commodity" and students as "consumers" often employed in recent decades in higher educational institutions have had considerable impact on educational discourse (Bok 2003). They have strong linkages to current initiatives in terms of "big data" research and analytic efforts, many of which were fine-tuned for marketing and commercial contexts. Jacobs (2009, 36) provides the following "meta-definition" of big data: "data whose size forces us to look beyond the tried-and-true methods that are prevalent at that time". A managerial mentality that privileges certain measures of efficiency and accountability has often displaced more sensitive and nuanced evaluation approaches both in rhetoric and in reality, and the prospects for big data-style analysis are apparently in synch with this perspective. The trends toward efficiency and accountability began long before the advent of big data and symbiotic academic platforms: Strathern's (2000, xi) "audit society" notions illuminate how higher educational institutions took on many of the perspectives and administrative patterns of corporate and governmental entities over the past several decades. Strathern states that "We are all increasingly subjected to auditing, and alongside that, subject to accountability for our behavior and actions. Audit cultures pervade in the workplace, our governmental and public institutions as well as academia". Turk (2010, 51) portrays the "Canadian Corporate/Academic Complex" as countering the aims of academic freedom by installing the sorts of auditing infrastructure outlined by Strathern.

The precedents for the use of third-party commercial firms in the establishment of specific forms of educational transparency are growing; for example, Turnitin is used in both K-12 and higher education for the detection of student plagiarism despite many legal cases that present it with intellectual property challenges (Klein 2011). Turnitin retains the student papers that are submitted to it for plagiarism checks in a database despite a number of protests about the potential copyright infringement of those students' materials. The very notion of "higher educational institutions" is changing as these entities are coupling more closely with various outsourcers and third-party organizations to accomplish certain activities (such as the analysis of faculty research and teaching). The amalgamated institutions that are wrought can have a confusing assortment of legal and social responsibilities. Other changes are occurring that can alter the prospects for academic discourse concerning online academic analysis and transparency: most higher educational institutions have increasingly fewer individuals with tenure and utilize more adjuncts and staff both in teaching and research initiatives, hence there are fewer individuals who can speak out openly about these issues (Schrecker 2010). Many of these institutions also have built larger and more powerful administrations, which can alter the balance of power and shift institutional perspectives (Bok 2003). These administrations are becoming equipped with the technological review and dissemination systems described in this paper, supplementing if not replacing the more personal and nuanced academic approaches of the face-to-face departmental review meeting.

The "right to be forgotten," a critical part of European Union approaches to information collection and dissemination, may eventually emerge as a factor in discourse on academic analysis and evaluation websites as individual academics determine that they do not want to be associated with certain online information systems (Rosen 2012). Some variety of "voice" should be available to enable dissent about specific information held in the kinds of systems described in this paper (as well as about the systems as a whole). As more of our academic research and intellectual lives are captured online (from "office cams" to twenty-four hour online lifelogs), the challenges of providing means for dissent and autonomous personal expressions will become more pressing.

References

Altbach, Philip. 2015. "The Tyranny of Citations." *International Higher Education* 43: 3-5.

Bok, Derek. 2003. *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

British Medical Journal (BMJ), 2013. "Declaration of Transparency for Each Research Article." 347. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.f4796

Caruth, Gail. 2014. "Academic Dishonesty: The Question of Authorship." *International Journal of Scholarly Academic Intellectual Diversity* 16, no. 1: 1-16.

Diamond Jr, Arthur. M. 1986. "What is a Citation Worth?" *Journal of Human Resources* 21: 200-215.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

Heitman, Elizabeth and Sergio Litewka. 2011. "International Perspectives on Plagiarism and Considerations for Teaching International Trainees." *Urologic Oncology* 29: 104–108.

Heyneman, Stephen. (2014). "How Corruption Puts Higher Education at Risk." *International Higher Education* 75: 3-5.

Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hvistendahl, Mara. 2013. "China's Publication Bazaar." *Science* 342, no. 6162: 1035–1039. doi: 10.1126/science.342.6162.1035.

Jacobs, Adam. 2009. "The Pathologies of Big Data." *Communications of the ACM* 52, no. 8: 36-44.

Klein, Deanna. 2011. "Why Learners Choose Plagiarism: A Review of the Literature." *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects* 7: 97-110.

Lewis, Michael. 2004. *Moneyball: The Art of Winning an Unfair Game*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Oravec, Jo Ann. 1993. "Secret Sharers: Consensual and Participatory Surveillance Concerns in the Context of Network-based Computer Systems." *ACM SIGOIS Bulletin* 14, no 1: 32-40.

Oravec, Jo Ann. 1996. *Virtual Individuals, Virtual Groups: Human Dimensions of Groupware and Computer Networking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oravec, Jo Ann. 2004. "The Transparent Knowledge Worker: Weblogs and Reputation Mechanisms in KM Systems." *International Journal of Technology Management* 28: 767-75.

Oravec, Jo Ann. 2013. "Gaming Google: Some Ethical Issues Involving Online Reputation Management." *Journal of Business Ethics Education* 10: 61-81.

Posner, Richard. 2002. *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rosen, Jeffery. 2012. "The Right to be Forgotten." *Stanford Law Review Online*, *64*, 88.

Schmidt, Peter. 2011. "Videos 'Ripped' from Online Course Footage bring Threats to Instructors." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 57, no. 36: A29.

Schrecker, Ellen. 2010. *The Lost Soul of Higher Education: Corporatization, the Assault on Academic Freedom, and the End of the American University*. New York: New Press.

Strathern, Marilyn. 2000. *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics, and the Academy*. New York: Psychology Press.

Turk, James. 2010. "The Canadian Corporate-academic Complex." *Academe* 96, no. 6: 51-52.

Wong, Gillian. 2010. "In China, Academic Cheating is Rampant." *The Boston Globe* (April 11). Accessed July 1, 2015. http://www.boston.com/news/education/higher/articles/2010/04/11/in_china_academic_cheating_is_rampant.