



Resistance and Power in Irish Higher Education: ORCID and the Monitored University

Frank Houghton^{a,*}, Allen Foster^b

^a Technological University of the Shannon, Social Sciences ConneXions, TUS, Limerick, Ireland

^b 3.20, Penbryn Building 5, University of Aberystwyth, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

ORCID
Scholarly publishing
Academic identity
Research monitoring
Higher education
Librarianship

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Created in 2012 ORCID now enjoys global status as a Persistent Identifier (PID) in the academic community. The international literature has been generally positive towards this new piece of research infrastructure, particularly based on its obvious potential to aid name disambiguation. However, a small number of commentators have highlighted negative issues with ORCID, as well as the way in which they are increasing mandated by publishers, funders, and even employers. This research sought to critically evaluate perceptions of ORCID in the Technological University (TU)/Institute of Technology (IoT) sector in Ireland.

Methodology: This study adopted a mixed methods approach involving an online survey with academics in Ireland's TU/IoT sector and a survey of senior librarians. Reflexive thematic analysis was used to explore the qualitative data collected via open-ended questions.

Findings: The results indicate that most lecturers have only minimally engaged with ORCID. Thematic analysis of responses from faculty identified six distinct themes. The majority of themes identified were negative towards ORCID, with many lecturers appearing unsure about its purpose, having only registered for ORCID because of external pressure. Faculty were also concerned that ORCID could facilitate external monitoring, as well as them being resistant to the effort involved in keeping an ORCID profile up to date. ORCID was also seen as a potential source of danger, although some lecturers had started to use their ORCID profile to promote their work. Perceptions amongst librarians were very different, with librarians notably more in favour of ORCID. Three themes were identified: name disambiguation, facilitation of linkages with other IT systems, and future potential.

Originality: The paper offers a critical analysis of ORCID adoption in Ireland based on perceptions amongst two stakeholder groups, academics and librarians.

Introduction

ORCID is the acronym for Open Researcher and Contributor Identifier. An ORCID Identifier (ID) is a 16 digit persistent identifier (Granshaw, 2019). This persistent identifier currently links to individualised web-pages that feature details on a range of activities (Sprague, 2017). It is focused on research only and it should be noted that teaching/lecturing is not currently included. An important feature of ORCID is its apparent global success. Launched in 2012 ORCID has risen to over twenty million user records by late 2022 (Info.Orcid, 2022). It is now supported by a significant number of consortia across a number of countries, and enjoys support from research funding agencies, governments, and publishers. This study examines how academics and librarians in Irish higher education engage with ORCID. Drawing on surveys

of >120 lecturers and library staff at Technological Universities in Ireland, it evaluates what they know about ORCID, their attitudes and perceptions towards ORCID, and if and how they use it.

ORCID's strengths

ORCID's vision is of a 'world where all who participate in research, scholarship, and innovation are uniquely identified and connected to their contributions across disciplines, borders, and time' (Info.Orcid, 2023). A significant marketing claim of ORCID is that it will resolve the 'issue with Wang and Smith' (Granshaw, 2019:237).

As Meadows (2016) notes more than half the population of Korea share the same five last names. Similar issues have been noted in Vietnam and China (Granshaw, 2019; Qiu, 2008; Thomas et al., 2015).

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: Frank.Houghton@TUS.ie (F. Houghton), aef@aber.ac.uk (A. Foster).

Table 1
Naming issues for academic writers.

<p>Shared names. More than one researcher – often in the same field and/or institution – may have the same name.</p> <p>Different versions of a name. For example, the use of a full name versus initials. A particular issue here may be middle names which may be inconsistently used or initialised.</p> <p>Transliteration. Transliteration names can be hard to match. Transliteration can be conducted differently, particularly over time as conventions evolve and change.</p> <p>Accents and other diacritics. These are notoriously hard to express consistently as digital characters.</p> <p>Name changes. These can occur because of marriage, re-marriage, divorce, gender transitioning, or simply by choice.</p> <p>Multiple family names. Cultural differences in naming can mean that some individuals may routinely use up to four last names. This is particularly evident in Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries.</p>
--

(Table adapted from the work of Meadows (2016).)

Table 1 details the many naming issues that can occur throughout an academic career. In a similar vein Leopold (2016) has noted that the most common names in the US (J Smith) and China (W Zhang) were linked on PubMed to approximately 25,000 manuscripts each. In the UK and Ireland it would often generally be assumed that the last name Smith is very common. There are approximately five million Smiths globally. However, Smith is rare in a global context, only ranking as the 123rd most common last name.

Explorations examining problems in standard naming conventions have explored a range of cultures and countries (Marusic, 2016; Raventhiran, 2016; Supak-Smolcic et al., 2016). It is important to note that this disambiguity issue is not randomly distributed. Granshaw (2019) has noted it is inequitably experienced by certain groups, including women, and authors from non-English speaking countries. Systems such as PubMed for example have long struggled with diversity in naming conventions (Houghton, 2016). ORCID's primary strength as a unique identifier is therefore of potential benefit to the groups Granshaw (2019) identified.

ORCID strengths have also been described as simplicity (Hernandez de la Rosa et al., 2017), and that it is zero cost to organisations and end users (Craft, 2020), unlike other proprietary subscription-based platforms (Powell et al., 2019). The benefits of ORCID in terms of linkages for different groups have also been outlined by JISC (2015) and although other publishers and grant funding agencies personal identifiers exist Quinn (2022:1) notes that ORCID is the 'only persistent digital identifier for individuals that meets requirements set out in the January 2021 National Security Presidential Memorandum (NSPM-33) and subsequent guidance on implementing NSPM-33'.

Other advantages of ORCID include its auto-update functionality (Meadows, 2016), and related to this from a resource perspective are its potential efficiencies. A positive review of the cost-benefits of the introduction of ORCID into a sample of UK higher education institutions has been completed by JISC (2015). From a research infrastructure perspective, it should be noted that Haak et al. (2012) have also reported the potential benefits of ORCID in relation to an improved understanding of knowledge flows in relation to research collaboration. Others have explored the potential of ORCID for 'good' and have proposed new ORCID functionality that would benefit transgender populations specifically, but also those escaping domestic violence and trauma (Gaskins & McClain, 2021).

Critiques of ORCID

ORCID has received very positive reviews, yet a small but vocal cadre of critics do exist (Choras & Jaroszewska, 2020; Teixeira da Silva, 2017, 2020, 2021a, 2021b, 2022a, 2022b, 2022c). Despite name ambiguity being cited as the biggest problem, Choras & Jaroszewska (2020: 492) rhetorically ask 'is this a real problem [?] and continue to state that 'it is not clear how many researchers have this kind of problem and no numbers (e.

g., percentages) are known'. Ritter (2021) similarly questions this assumption. Choras and Jaroszewska (2020) go on to discuss how other scientific databases already adequately deal with this problem. Teixeira da Silva (2017, 2020, 2021b, 2022a) has written extensively on a host of issues relating to ORCID IDs, including academic freedom and the free choice of publication venue by authors. However, the most significant opposition to the ORCID project is undoubtedly centred on it having become a mandatory requirement when publishing in an increasing number of journals (Choras & Jaroszewska, 2020; Teixeira da Silva, 2022a, 2022b). It is not only academic publishing houses that are increasingly requiring the adoption of ORCID IDs, but universities and university systems as well (Choras & Jaroszewska, 2020; Weigert & Johnson, 2015).

While authors such as Choras and Jaroszewska (2020) are broadly in favour of using ORCID as an optional additional sign in method to journal publishing systems, they are adamantly opposed to it being a requirement. Choras and Jaroszewska (2020) present robust and compelling arguments against mandatory ORCID requirements on three separate grounds. These are: freedom of science; data protection, privacy, and profiling; and legal aspects and costs. In relation to freedom of science these authors note that this freedom is clearly enshrined in crucial UN, Council of Europe, and EU legislation and rights. Teixeira da Silva (2022b) further supports Choras & Jaroszewska by querying how journals can mandate ORCID IDs for authors when editors of some of these same journals are not required to own or clearly display them. Others object on various philosophical or political grounds to publishers requiring an ORCID ID, being referred to being objectified and processed by a number (Ritter, 2021), for others much of their concern appears to stem from this requirement not being made evident either before submission, or at the start of the submission process (Ritter, 2021).

A number of negative critiques of ORCID crucially relate to trust and academic integrity. These critiques are important as the ORCID ID system is, in-part, designed to promote trust in author identity. However, a number of issues which appear to undermine this. Problems include: (1) empty or 'ghost' ORCID accounts (Teixeira da Silva, 2021a:1; Boudry & Durand-Barthez, 2020); (2) academic integrity issues where ghost authors are supported by the patronage of senior academics; (3) sharing a single ORCID ID amongst a research group for the benefit of a cooperative 'CV' (Leopold, 2016); (4) Baglioni et al. (2022: 4–5) noted other issues contributing to the 'noise' in the ORCID system, such as source misapplications to 'link farm' and increase hits on search engines and 'overloaded ORCID records' as another misapplication of the ORCID Registry with examples of ORCID IDs for research organisations, institutes and venues. Baglioni et al. (2022) and others also highlight a number of data problems including human error, and as Reimer (2015) noted failed ORCID de-duplication processing causing user distrust. Teixeira da Silva (2021a: 1; 2022c) warns of potential 'reduce[d] trust in ORCID, and... reputational damage' if ghost ORCID accounts are not publicly cleansed from the ORCID database.

Other important critiques of ORCID relate to issues of privacy and anonymity. An important ethical issue mentioned by Ritter (2021), albeit obliquely, is that of the right to be forgotten: 'What if I would like to retire my number? Do I control that?'. The right to be forgotten is enshrined in European law as part of GDPR legislation (Erdos, 2021). A similar concern identified by Ritter (2021) is that of anonymous publications. The very real personal danger that can result from an author's writings can be seen from Socrates's cup of hemlock to the multiple stabbing of Salman Rushdie in 2022. Ritter (2021) quips 'Can I have two ORCID numbers please? One for my publications and one for my anonymous publications'. Although Ritter's polemic is both argumentative and flip-pant, the potential of ORCID to become an obstacle to anonymous publishing is clearly a potential downside. Baglioni et al. (2022:5) appropriately state that 'pseudonyms are not to be considered a misapplication of ORCID, as authors have the right to decide about their identity or multiple ones'.

The workload involved in ORCID has also been identified as off-

putting to academics (Sprague, 2017; Weigert & Johnson, 2015), particularly for those with an already established academic career (Ritter, 2021). Resistance to adopting ORCID IDs has also been noted amongst certain groups, including those about to retire or leave (Reimer, 2015). Quinn (2022: 2) has also noted disciplinary differences in rates of adoption of ORCID IDs, specifically noting it was not a priority for law faculty vis-à-vis faculty in the 'hard sciences'. Boudry & Durand-Barthez, 2020 have also noted a lack of uptake of ORCID in France. These authors also noticed an almost 10 % lower uptake in ORCID IDs amongst women compared to men.

Thomas et al. (2015) have also noted simple barriers to ORCID adoption and roll-out including simple factors, such as postgrads not checking their email, or a mistaken assumption that their ORCID invite email was a phishing email. A number of librarians engaged in ORCID outreach promotional work have also noted privacy concerns being raised by staff (Ashmore & Argabright, 2019; Reimer, 2015). Interestingly, for all the lack of privacy, another deficit of ORCID is that it does not facilitate connection between researchers (Boudry and Durand-Barthez (2020).

Several other commentaries discuss the limitations of ORCID exist. The first of these is around the issue of functionality. As Craft (2020) notes obvious deficits in ORCID including its lack of citations metrics, impact calculations, or article access. ORCID's potential use as an instrument to assist crude metrics or faculty assessment, evaluation and surveillance, particularly important in relation to trust and reliability of the data. Such concerns may be well founded. In 2013 an Executive Director of ORCID (Haak, 2013: 239) spoke openly about the use of ORCID 'to access and assess the full record for a specific individual or institution'. Allen (2015: 39) has similarly highlighted the importance of ORCID IDs in 'faculty appraisal and... researcher evaluation', a sentiment echoed elsewhere (Research Information, 2016).

Weigert and Johnson's (2015) observation of confusion over how ORCID fitted into the Open Access and Research Excellence Framework in the UK, while Ritter (2021) also highlights the issue of the cyber theft of ORCID passwords. More worryingly Vieira (2016) and Ritter (2021) note the adoption of ORCID by the large publishing houses and is being promoted by for-profit publishing, not academics. This leads via Ritter (2021) to the pertinent question of who exactly benefits most from ORCID, and should we be concerned about potential charges for ORCID in the future?

The Irish Technological University (TU)/Institute of Technology (IoT) sector

Ireland has a binary higher education sector that has for decades been highly unequal (Hazelkorn & Moynihan, 2010). In a more elite position, and catering to students that predominantly come from more affluent backgrounds, are the seven universities (Higher Education Authority, 2019). The Institutes of Technology, in contrast, have traditionally offered more applied, vocationally oriented education and training. Courses in the IoT sector range from apprenticeships up to a small number of PhDs. The IoT sector in Ireland has historically been built on an accessibility ladder approach which facilitates student advancement on a yearly basis from certificate to honours degree level over 4 years, Students in the IoT sector traditionally come from a broader social base than the university sector, and are more likely to have specific learning issues (Houghton, 2021). The IoTs were also tasked with having a more regional focus and were expected to support innovation and focus on local communities. In many ways the Irish IoT sector functioned very similar to the UK polytechnic sector before 1992 (Houghton, 2020; Lewis, 1991; Pratt, 1997). The majority of the 14 IoTs have recently amalgamated to form five larger Technological Universities mirroring similar organisations abroad (Houghton, 2020). As part of the transformation process a series of benchmarks were developed to determine eligibility for designation as a TU. In total a set of forty benchmarks were developed (Marginson, 2011). However, the vast

majority of these contained no clear metrics and hence considerable attention focused specifically on meeting the few metrics detailed. In the context of this research the important metrics relate both to the development of research and the need to develop a more international cohort of students.

Critical perspectives on technology, power, knowledge & control: Foucault & beyond

In relation to this examination a number of texts by Foucault (1970, 1972, 1977) are of obvious relevance and particularly Foucault's (1977) examination of the 'panopticon' prison originally developed by Bentham (1791, 2010) provides a critical understanding in relation to ORCID. Bentham's proposal was to architecturally design prisons in such a way that prisoners were always potentially under surveillance, but without them knowing when they were being observed (Bentham, 2010). Bentham argued that a similar approach could be used in the design of asylums, hospitals, schools, and of relevance here, factories (Gold & Gold, 2014). According to Foucault (1977) this disciplinary gaze facilitated self-discipline, self-surveillance and self-regulation. It therefore moved beyond physical and spatial structures into what might be termed both the spirit and the mind of workers (Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2023). Crossley (1993) and Giordano (2015) have extended our understanding of Foucault's gaze through an exploration of both Sartre's (1969) theory of 'the look' and Merleau-Ponty's analysis of 'the gaze' (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, 1964, 1968). In exploring 'the look' Sartre (1969) explores in more depth the impact of what Foucault (1977:200) describes minimally as the 'anxious awareness of being observed'. Sartre explores the estrangement and alienation resulting from being 'objects in the eyes of others... their... anonymous surveyors' (Crossley, 1993: 408). Merleau-Ponty' (1962: 361) work supports that of Foucault in his description of 'inaccessible' and 'inhuman gaze' which can leave an individual objectified by the gaze of the other, with our actions 'not... understood, but observed as if they were an insect's' (Crossley, 1993).

Numerous researchers have examined Foucault's contribution to our understanding of power, resistance and surveillance through an exploration of the use of various ICTs, ranging from CCTV (Hier et al., 2006) to webcams (Koskela, 2004), to telemonitoring (Dubbed, 2006). In Foucauldian terms therefore ORCID represents another disciplinary technology that is part of the ideological machinery of the neoliberal university that helps to create a culture of 'docile bodies'.

The constant surveillance enabled by technology such as ORCID facilitates several developments. These include sousveillance (Mann et al., 2002) and panopticommodification (Lyon, 2006). Sousveillance refers to a form of surveillance at ground/human height level (Mann et al., 2002), and is in contrast to classic panopticon style surveillance from above. Sousveillance has been described as a post-panoptic form of surveillance in which the public observe those in positions of power (Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2023).

However, this form of vigilant surveillance by individuals from 'below' also involves keeping a close eye on those around you, and not only those in power, as a form of civic responsibility (Dennis, 2008; Giordano, 2015). In the context of ORCID the implication therefore is that colleagues in the Academy may feel a responsibility to evaluate the records of their colleagues to help guide, shape, and keep them on track to meet expectations and their responsibilities.

However, although sousveillance is important, the performative element of self-surveillance cannot be ignored in the context of ORCID. Although this has been explored in the context of reality tv and social media (Koskela, 2004; Romele et al., 2017), the willing self-commodification in which 'people market themselves' cannot be ignored (Lyon, 2006:8). Various terms for this phenomena exist, including the participatory panopticon (Whitaker, 1999), and participatory surveillance (Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2023:21). However, the term which appears to have gained most traction is panopticommodification (Lyon, 2006). Thus, many academics may go to great lengths to market

themselves via ORCID to demonstrate their willing compliance with the norms and expectations of the neoliberal university, in which success is often measured in terms of journal article production and research revenue generation. This self-discipline and self-regulation in line with the new norms of the neoliberal academy are thus flaunted via ORCID.

Method

This research was based on an online survey applying a mixed methods approach involving quantitative analysis, alongside a more substantial section of in-depth open-ended questioning approach that falls under the broad umbrella term of qualitative research. The tension between these approaches is acknowledged (Jones & Kennedy, 2011). However, from a pragmatic perspective (Cresswell, 2007; Murphy, 1990) these differing paradigms can be used for complementary purposes (Sale et al., 2002). Two different online surveys comprised of both quantitative and open qualitative questions were used. One targeted at lecturing staff (teaching faculty), the other at senior librarians (see Appendix A).

Data analysis used SPSS and NVivo and the qualitative data analysis method adopted here is that of reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2022). Reflexive thematic analysis followed a six step process: Familiarisation with the data-set; Coding; Generation of initial themes; Development & review of themes; Refining, defining and naming of themes; Write-up (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2022). Rigour was ensured using Fereday and Muir-Cochrane's (2006) inductive-deductive approach and followed recommendations about data immersion prior to analysis (Houghton & Houghton, 2018). Themes were developed after rigorous in-depth reading of the responses. The decision to identify a theme is always a subjective evaluation. However, the relevance to the topic under investigation and strength of the sentiment and evidence were important factors in this process. A reflective log was kept facilitating the reflexivity required in the research process (Russell & Kelly, 2002).

Population, sampling and sample

Two distinct populations within Ireland's Technological University (TU)/Institute of Technology (IoT) sector were involved: Teaching faculty and Senior librarian staff. Sample identification involved a mixture of emailing people directly using publicly accessible staff email lists, as well as social media including twitter, LinkedIn, and Facebook. All faculty in the Technological University of the Shannon were invited to participate. Requests were sent to Vice-Presidents of Research in all of the other Technological Universities/IoTs asking them to forward on to staff in their organisations. Invitations to librarians were directed to Head Librarians, as well as those involved in research infrastructure development projects. The selection was not random. Invitations to participate were sent out to the sample by email.

The first survey sample was lecturing staff and academic management in the IoT/TU sector in Ireland, and the second survey sample was senior librarians in Ireland. Survey one involved 114 teaching and research faculty. Details of the breakdown of Study 1 by gender, age and type of post held are given in Table 2.

Survey two involved 12 senior library staff, of whom 83.3 % (10) were female and 16.7 % (2) were male. The majority were aged either 35–34 years (41.7 %, n = 5), or 55–64 years (33.3 %, n = 4). 16.7 % (2) of respondents were aged 45–54 years and 8.3 % (1) were in the 25–34 years category. According to institutional profiles produced by the Higher Education Authority (HEA) in Ireland the respondent base is broadly representative of the sector (Higher Education Authority, 2023).

Table 2
Participants in survey one.

Variable	Categories	Percentage (Number)
Gender	Male	46.5 % (53)
	Female	50.9 % (58)
	Prefer not to say	1.8 % (2)
	Missing	0.9 % (1)
Age Group	<25 Years	1.8 % (2)
	25–34 Years	8.8 % (10)
	35–44 Years	26.3 % (30)
	45–54 Years	39.5 % (45)
	55–64 Years	21.9 % (25)
	65 or over	0.9 % (1)
	Missing	0.9 % (1)
Post Held	Assistant Lecturer	35.1 % (40)
	Lecturer	48.2 % (55)
	Senior Lecturer/ Head of Dept./ Head of School (SL1-SL3)	13.2 % (15)
	Research based contract	2.6 % (3)
	Missing	0.9 % (1)

Results & discussion

Academic staff

Approximately three-quarters of respondents (72.8 %, n = 83) reported having heard of ORCID prior to this research project. The remaining 27.2 % (31) responded that they had not, or were unsure if they had. In Table 3 the data show that although 61.4 % (70) of academic staff reported having an ORCID ID only 6.1 % (7) reported using or updating it regularly, while the largest proportion, 35.1 % (40) reported having an ORCID ID, but have barely or never used it.

Approximately a quarter of respondents (26.3 %, n = 30) reported that they use or update their ORCID ID regularly or even occasionally. This finding may echo that of Boudry and Durand-Barthez (2020) who noted a lack of uptake of ORCID IDs in France.

Reimer (2015) explored resistance to ORCID IDs and noted only modest further uptake after the initial roll-out. Detail on this phenomena may be seen in detail in Table 4, which explores completion rates of the various components of ORCID profiles. Notably of the eight distinct components Education & Qualifications and Employment sections were 'Mostly Completed' or 'Fully Completed' as compared with biography, positions, funding, and peer reviews.

The pattern is suggestive of resistance to the time involved in populating and maintaining an ORCID ID that has been noted by several authors, including Weigert and Johnson (2015), Sprague (2017), and Ritter (2021). Chi-square analysis of the elements of Table Four, comparing Fully and Mostly Completed vs the other responses combined yielded no significant results for any element of ORCID when examined on the basis of gender, age group (<45 vs 45+), or employment grade.

The responses from open-ended questions were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis and resulted in six themes: Mystery; External Pressure; Profile; Surveillance & Metrics; Workload; and Security.

'Mystery' was the first theme and clearly indicated a general lack of understanding as to what an ORCID ID was exactly, or what its benefits

Table 3
Ownership & use of ORCID IDs by academic staff in Ireland's TU/IoT sector.

Ownership & Use of an ORCID ID	Percentage (Number)
No- and I would rather not have one	0.9 % (1)
No- and I have minimal interest in registering for one	4.4 % (5)
No- I am not really familiar with them	28.9 % (33)
No- but I do intend to register for one	3.5 % (4)
Yes- but I have barely / never used it	35.1 % (40)
Yes- and I use/ update it occasionally	20.2 % (23)
Yes- and I use/ update it regularly	6.1 % (7)
Missing	0.9 % (1)

Table 4
Completion of ORCID ID components by academic staff in Ireland's TU/IoT sector.

	No Response	Don't Know	Section Not Applicable	Not Completed	Partially Completed	Mostly Completed	Fully Completed
Biography	42.1 % (48)	5.3 % (6)	1.8 % (2)	14.9 % (17)	20.2 % (23)	9.6 % (11)	6.1 % (7)
Employment	43.0 % (49)	6.1 % (7)	0.9 % (1)	11.4 % (13)	10.5 % (12)	15.8 % (18)	12.3 % (14)
Education & Qualifications	43.9 % (50)	6.1 % (7)	0.9 % (1)	10.5 % (12)	8.8 % (10)	9.6 % (11)	20.2 % (23)
Invited Positions & Distinctions	44.7 % (51)	5.3 % (6)	7.0 % (8)	28.1 % (32)	5.3 % (6)	5.3 % (6)	4.4 % (5)
Membership & Service	43.9 % (50)	7.0 % (8)	5.3 % (6)	21.1 % (24)	6.1 % (7)	8.8 % (10)	7.9 % (9)
Funding	43.9 % (50)	4.4 % (5)	8.8 % (10)	25.4 % (29)	7.9 % (9)	7.9 % (9)	1.8 % (2)
Works (Publications etc)	43.9 % (50)	5.3 % (6)	3.5 % (4)	11.4 % (13)	13.2 % (15)	8.8 % (10)	14.0 % (16)
Peer Review	44.7 % (51)	14.0 % (16)	7.9 % (9)	21.1 % (24)	5.3 % (6)	3.5 % (4)	3.5 % (4)

were. Evidence for this theme may be seen in the following quotations:

honestly not sure what it's for.

No idea what an ORCID ID is!!

Just wondering if there is such a growing emphasis on research, how come I have never heard of it? It is not covered in any introduction to new staff or any email in relation to research opportunities for staff.

I don't know what an Orcid ID is, sorry I can't be of more help.

In his analysis of ORCID ID adoption and use Reimer (2015) noted that new staff tended to be unaware of ORCID. It appears that many staff in the TU/IoT sector in ORCID terms may effectively fall in to the category of 'new' staff in a University system, irrespective of the longevity of their employment.

'External Pressure': as a second theme emerged as respondents reported that they had signed up for an ORCID account simply because they were told to. In most cases this pressure came from within the University, however such pressure also emanated from journals. This theme is evident in the following quotes:

I use ORCID because my organisation said I had to.

We were encouraged to set them up by head of school.

It was a request from my academic department and seemed to be a requirement for the Technological University application the organisation was undergoing.

just a requirement of some publishers/journals....funders starting to ask if you have an ORCID ID.

Staff reported that their registration for an ORCID ID was centrally linked to their organisation's application for TU status. Although this theme was, not surprisingly, absent elsewhere in the literature, many commentators have noted its requirement by publishers and funders (Dunford & Rosenblum, 2018; Quinn, 2022; Research Information, 2016).

'Profile' emerged as a third theme in this research. Respondents linked ORCID IDs with profiling and publicising their research. This can clearly be seen in the excerpts below:

To publicize research.

Street credibility.

It is also about promoting your research as a brand.

Raises academic profile.

It makes me seem like a 'legitimate' academic. It publicises my work.

This factor was minimally covered in the ORCID related literature. However, it fits firmly within both the Foucauldian literature on pan-opticmodification, which explores the marketisation of the self, and neoliberal critiques of the marketization of journal articles and profile oriented nature of entrepreneurial universities.

'Surveillance and metrics': as a fourth theme emerged as some participants clearly saw the potential for ORCID to be used as a means of surveillance by employers and others.

I suppose it is a "tracking device" which captures what I do in research/publishing but does not capture the work I put into teaching and student engagement.

It sounds like a mechanism for tracking staff.

It will become a benchmarking tool.

Perhaps surveillance issues, and being pressured to 'buy into' it, forcing one into a competitive-style environment.

The potential of ORCID to be used for faculty and researcher appraisal has been noted elsewhere (Allen, 2015). What is particularly interesting in this research is how two respondents note that this surveillance may fail to track involvement in allied academic areas such as teaching, student engagement, and other academic activity, all of which are crucial in higher education and are a strength of the TU/ IoT system.

'Workload': the fifth theme identified related to the additional work caused by having an ORCID profile. Evidence of this can be seen in the following:

This is very time consuming to maintain.

Hard to get time to update,

administrative labour involved in updating them.

Another thing to remember!

Another forum to keep up to date.

The workload involved in maintaining an ORCID ID has been noted elsewhere (Weigert & Johnson, 2015). Far fewer academics seemed familiar with the 'enter once, use many times' philosophy that underpins the efficiencies claimed by ORCID (JISC, 2015).

'Security' was a final theme identified. Participants were concerned about potential vulnerabilities in the ORCID system, as well as the potential for patterns of activities and attendance to be calculated via in-depth regular updates. Evidence for these concerns is apparent in the following excerpts:

Yes, I have concerns about transparency and security of my personal data and who has access to it.

Orcid is a international non-profit and I would have some concerns about governance issues and security of personal information. What sort of assurance if any do we have about Orchid's IT governance in these days of cybersecurity threat vulnerabilities and attacks?

For women it can be a risk to publicize which conferences you will frequent on a yearly basis, especially those with stalkers [and similar unwanted attention]...This is something I am still working out, how much information to publicly publish about my whereabouts/annual conferences (I had a stalker who I can see is regularly looking at my LinkedIn page, but I can't see who looks at my ORCID profile).

Given the expansion of ORCID to incorporate other Works including conference presentations, the last quotation is highly problematic. Although settings can be set to private this defeats the purpose of ORCID. Even when ORCID settings are changed to Private the concerns raised in the first two quotes are still of relevance in a compromised

system and echo concerns elsewhere (Ashmore & Argabright, 2019; Reimer, 2015). A significant number of higher education institutions and the State Health Services in Ireland have been hit by ransomware attacks over several years with and concerns over cyber-security widespread (Moran Stritch et al., 2021; Winterburn & Houghton, 2021).

Librarians

The sample of senior librarians who completed the second survey had largely heard of ORCID (83.3 (10) prior to this survey. One respondent (8.3 %) reported that they had not, while another (8.3 %) replied that they were unsure. In response to organisational support for ORCID IDs 58.3 % (7) reported that their organisations were supporting the use of ORCID, while the remaining 41.7 % (5) were unsure. The lack of clarity on organisational stance in relation to ORCID is surprising given that all the TUs/IoTs in Ireland are members of the Irish ORCID consortium and are therefore all ostensibly supporting this project. This lack of knowledge may be the result of recent mergers and it is probable that the ORCID lead within each newly established TU may be the person with most experience and knowledge on this topic. Thus, inequalities in the distribution of knowledge within newly established TUs may at this early stage be pronounced.

Thematic analysis of the open-ended questions identified three themes: Identity; Linkages; and Exploitation.

'Identity' was noted by some respondents in various aspects of their discussion. This advantage of ORCID is one of its main selling points. Evidence for this theme can be seen in the following quotes:

It provides clarity on identity as one of the big issues is identifying researchers with the same or similar names or names in a language other than English.

It is an efficient way of identifying researchers.

the identifiers are unique so no confusion with similarly named persons.

ORCID IDs make it easier for readers/students/researchers/staff to more easily identify a person and all published work associated with them... If an academic staff member moves to another country or another organisation ORCID IDs make it easier for people to keep track of the authors work.

Numerous authors have highlighted the name disambiguation advantages of ORCID (Granshaw, 2019; Meadows, 2016). It is interesting to note that the librarians in this research gave equal weight to mobility and name similarity. Other important elements of identity previously put forward by researchers (Gaskins & McClain, 2021; Meadows, 2016), such as name changes upon marriage, divorce, remarriage, or a change in gender were not mentioned by respondents. In a country where the dominant tradition is for a woman to change her last name to that of her husbands upon marriage, and with most respondents in this sample being women, this finding was not anticipated.

'Linkages' was the second theme identified with respondents noting the ability of ORCID to link to other datasets and software. This theme may be seen in the following examples:

added an ORCID field to our repository, though it is not fully integrated in a best practice manner, due to the limitations of the software.

A particular benefit here is that it supports infrastructure like the CRediT which creates breadth in reporting on the roles people have played in research.

ORCID IDs are being promoted for use with the PURE Research Information Management System which is currently being implemented.

It allows authors to connect their ORCID id with other research identifiers such as Scopus ID and ResearcherID.

As a personal identifier ORCID was valued as an integral element in the creation of a wider research infrastructure. This advantage of ORCID

has been noted by JISC (2015) who have explored efficiencies facilitated by ORCID IDs.

'Exploitation' appeared as a concern even though ORCID is a not-for-profit venture the potential for it to be exploited for profit by publishers emerged, as one participant stated:

I know there are concerns that the end result of something like ORCID is that it supports these publishers in getting author data that might be packaged, resold etc. I think these are similar problems to any type of system like this... Google Scholar profiles etc.

Similar concerns have been raised Ritter (2021) who has voiced worries that although ORCID is free to use by researchers at present, will this remain the case?

Conclusion

This project sought to undertake a critical exploration of perceptions and use of ORCID IDs in Ireland's TU/IoT Sector. The results indicate that most faculty have only minimally completed their ORCID profiles, with little >1 in 20 keeping them up to date. Faculty were most likely to complete the employment and education & qualifications sections, with little attention to other sections of their profiles. Qualitative analysis of lecturer responses identified six themes. Most of the themes identified were negative towards ORCID. Most faculty were unclear about the purpose of ORCID (Mystery theme). This speaks to the need for librarians and those involved in developing research within the technological universities to concentrate in much more depth on the need to 'sell' the case for adopting ORCID IDs. Many academics had only registered for with ORCID because of external factors (External Pressure theme), most typically pressure from their Heads of Department. This raises interesting debates around academic freedom and neoliberal pressures to be able to claim every publication, undoubtedly to facilitate league table comparisons (Lo & Wai, 2011; Salmi & Saroyan, 2007). Many faculty were concerned that ORCID could foster external monitoring (Surveillance & Metrics theme). It is clear that ORCID was perceived, in part at least, as a technology of surveillance which is clearly in line with past neoFoucauldian analysis of similar innovations (Foucault, 1977; Koskela, 2004; Hier, Walby, and Greenberg, 2006; Dubbeld, 2006). Faculty were also highly resistant to the effort required to keep ORCID IDs up to date (Workload theme). This finding clearly echoes earlier examinations of the effort required to create and update an ORCID profile (Ritter, 2021; Sprague, 2017; Weigert & Johnson, 2015). Additional incentives may be required to encourage academics to undertake this task.

ORCID was also seen as a potential source of danger in some instances (Security theme). This element moves beyond the unsettling nature of observation as described by both Sartre's (1969) 'the look' and Merleau-Ponty's (1962, 1964, 1968) 'the gaze' into something distinctly more sinister. Stalking is increasingly recognised as an issue both within and outside of academia (Bussu et al., 2023; Mullally, 2020; Parkhill et al., 2022). Although it is possible to 'hide' elements of ORCID, this somewhat defeats its purpose. Wider societal changes are obviously required to counter such threats (Government of Ireland, 2022), and it is important to acknowledge this issue within academia (Government of Ireland, 2019; HEA Advisory Group on Ending Sexual Violence and Harassment in HEIs, 2022; MacNeela et al., 2022).

It should be noted that some faculty had started to use their ORCID profile to promote their work (Profile theme). Although some had embraced the performative and showcasing aspects of ORCID, most had not. Universities hoping for widespread adoption of ORCID may need demonstrate how it can be used to market research and publications. The adoption of standard email signatures which include ORCID may be one way to move this issue forward.

The question remains as to how any new career structure for the TU/IoT sector will focus on ORCID based publication metrics, or on more meaningful factors. Having examined the TU/IoT sector in Ireland the next section explores issues of power, knowledge and control that are

relevant to conceptualising the perception of ORCID in the findings of this study.

It is important to note that there is a fundamental difference in how ORCID is appraised between academic staff and librarians. Librarians are notably more in favour of ORCID than their academic colleagues. In total three themes were identified by librarians. Two of the themes identified were positive towards ORCID. These included the potential of ORCID to facilitate author identification (Identity theme), and the ability of ORCID to facilitate integration with other IT systems (Linkages theme). The only negative theme identified from librarians was an acknowledgement of the potential for profiteering from ORCID IDs (Exploitation). It should be noted that although all TUs and IoTs in Ireland are supporting the adoption of ORCID, over 40 % of librarians were not aware of this. Further education and training around ORCID is clearly urgently required for librarians in Ireland, as well as improved information systems and involvement in strategy.

The limitations of this study must be acknowledged. This examination involved only a modest sample of Senior Librarians and was limited to only a survey based methodology. Further research exploring these issues in-depth, ideally via semi-structured interview or focus group is strongly recommended. This study focused specifically on the TU/IoT sector in Ireland. Further research might also usefully explore if similar attitudes towards ORCID are evident in for example the Universities of Applied Science in mainland Europe.

Given the general and perhaps passive acceptance of at least the introduction of ORCID, the main challenges highlighted by this research relate to communication within research organisations across all roles about ORCID and particularly what it is, what it is aimed to achieve, and to have clarity about any benefits and weaknesses.

Funding

Not applicable - no funding was received.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Frank Houghton: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Allen Foster:** Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

Appendix A

Survey One (Built in MS Forms) Targeted at Academic Staff.

What academic grade are you? (Assistant Lecturer; Lecturer; SL1-SL3; Research based contract).

To which gender do you most identify?

What age are you? (<25 years; 25–34 years; 35–44 years; 45–54 years; 55–64 years; 65+ years).

Before commencing this survey and reading any associated emails/messaging had you heard of an ORCID identifier?

Do you have an ORCID ID? (No- and I would rather not have one; No- and I have minimal interest in registering for one; No- I am not really familiar with them;; No- but I do intend to register for one; Yes- but I have barely/never used it; Yes- and I use/update it occasionally; Yes- and I use/update it regularly.

If 'Yes' how long have you had an ORCID ID?

Is your organisation supporting the use of ORCID IDs? (Yes; Unsure; No).

If Yes, please list all of the reasons why you believe your organisation is supporting their use, as well as any comments you have on these.

What do you see as the benefits, if any, of having an ORCID ID?

What do you see as the negative points, if any, of having an ORCID ID?

Do you have any concerns about ORCID IDs and their use?

If you have an ORCID ID, have you completed the following sections?

Biography (Don't Know; Section Not Applicable: Not Completed; Partially Completed; Mostly Completed; Fully Completed).

Employment (Don't Know; Section Not Applicable: Not Completed; Partially Completed; Mostly Completed; Fully Completed).

Education & Qualifications (Don't Know; Section Not Applicable: Not Completed; Partially Completed; Mostly Completed; Fully Completed).

Invited Positions & Distinctions (Don't Know; Section Not Applicable: Not Completed; Partially Completed; Mostly Completed; Fully Completed).

Membership & Service (Don't Know; Section Not Applicable: Not Completed; Partially Completed; Mostly Completed; Fully Completed).

Funding (Don't Know; Section Not Applicable: Not Completed; Partially Completed; Mostly Completed; Fully Completed).

Works (Publications etc) (Don't Know; Section Not Applicable: Not Completed; Partially Completed; Mostly Completed; Fully Completed).

Peer Review (Don't Know; Section Not Applicable: Not Completed; Partially Completed; Mostly Completed; Fully Completed).

If you have any other comments or thoughts on ORCID IDs or their use, please share these here...

Survey Two (Built in MS Forms): Targeted at Senior Librarians.

To which gender do you most identify?

What age are you?

Before commencing this survey and reading any associated emails/messaging had you heard of an ORCID identifier?

Is your organisation supporting the use of ORCID IDs?

If Yes, please list all of the reasons why you believe your organisation is supporting their use, as well as any comments you have on these.

What do you see as the benefits, if any, of academic staff having an ORCID ID?

What do you see as the negative points, if any, of staff having an ORCID ID?

Do you have any concerns about ORCID IDs and their use?

References

- Allen, L. (2015). Connecting researchers and research – Investing in infrastructure to bring efficiencies to research. ORCID as an enabler of better research analytics. *European Science Editing*, 41(2), 38–39.
- Ashmore, B., & Argabright, L. (2019). ORCID pop-ups: Staring small to disseminate at large. *Serials Review*, 45(3), 160–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2019.1648200>
- Baglioni, M., Manghi, P., Mannocci, A., & Bardi, A. (2022). We can make a better use of ORCID: Five observed misapplications. *Data Science Journal*, 20(38), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2021-038>
- Bentham, J. (1791). *Panopticon or the inspection house* (Volume 2). London: Verso.
- Bentham, J. (2010). *The Panopticon writings*. London: Verso.
- Boudry, C., & Durand-Barthez, M. (2020). Use of author identifier services (ORCID, ResearcherID) and academic social networks (Academia.edu, ResearchGate) by the researchers of the University of Caen Normandy (France): A case study. *PLoS ONE*, 15(9), e 0238583.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis - a practical guide*. London: Sage.
- Bussu, A., Ashton, S. A., Pulina, M., & Mangiarulo, M. (2023). An explorative qualitative study of cyberbullying and cyberstalking in a higher education community. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 25, 359–385. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41300-023-00186-0>
- Choras, M., & Jaroszewska, D. (2020). The scrutinizing look on the impending proliferation of mandatory ORCID use from the perspective of data protection, privacy and freedom of science. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 45(4), 492–507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03080188.2020.1780773>
- Craft, A. R. (2020). Managing research identity: Tools for researchers and librarians. *Serials Review*, 46(1), 44–49.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design*. London: Sage.
- Crossley, N. (1993). The politics of the gaze: Between Foucault and Merleau-Ponty. *Human Studies*, 16, 399–419.

- Dennis, K. (2008). Viewpoint: Keeping a close watch—The rise of self-surveillance and the threat of digital exposure. *The Sociological Review*, 56(3), 347–357. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2008.00793.x>
- Dubbeld, L. (2006). Telemonitoring of cardiac patients: User-centred research as input for surveillance theories. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing surveillance: The panopticon and beyond* (pp. 182–205). Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Dunford, R., & Rosenblum, B. (2018). Keeping it authentic: Reconciling ORCID iDs gathered at submission with the author manuscript. *Learned Publishing*, 31, 236–240.
- Erdos, D. (2021). The ‘right to be forgotten’ beyond the EU: An analysis of wider G20 regulatory action and potential next steps. *Journal of Media Law*, 13(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17577632.2021.1884947>
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1). Article xx http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/5_1/pdf/fereday.pdf.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Random House.
- Gaskins, L. C., & McClain, C. R. (2021). Visible name changes promote inequality for transgender researchers. *PLoS Biology*, 19(3), Article e3001104. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001104>
- Giordano, K. (2015). The fetishization of the panopticon, Aleph Accessed on 15/03/2023 at: <https://aleph.humanities.ucla.edu/2015/07/26/the-fetishization-of-the-panopticon/>.
- Gold, J., & Gold, I. (2014). *Suspicious minds: How culture shapes madness*. New York: Free Press.
- Government of Ireland. (2019). *Safe, respectful, supportive and positive: Ending sexual violence and harassment in Irish higher education institutions*. Dublin: Department of Education and Skills.
- Government of Ireland. (2022). Zero tolerance: Third National Strategy on domestic, Sexual & Gender-Based Violence 2022–2026. Dublin: Government of Ireland. Accessed on 19/12/2023 at: <https://www.gov.ie/pdf/?file=https://assets.gov.ie/228480/67b6e3af-a0d2-4d70-889f-0b1e2001995b.pdf#page=null>.
- Granshaw, S. I. (2019). Research identifiers: ORCID, DOI, and the issue with Wang and Smith. *The Photogrammetric Record*, 34(167), 236–243. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phor.12290>
- Haak, L. (2013). ORCID: Connecting researchers and scholars with their works. *Insights*, 26(3), 239–243. <https://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.103>
- Haak, L., Fenner, M., Paglione, L., Pentz, E., & Ratner, H. (2012). ORCID: A system to uniquely identify researchers. *Learned Publishing*, 25, 259–264.
- Hazelkorn, E., & Moynihan, A. (2010). Ireland: The challenges of building research in a binary higher education culture. In S. Kyvik, & B. Lepori (Eds.), *The research mission of higher education institutions outside the university sector*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- HEA Advisory Group on Ending Sexual Violence and Harassment in HEIs. (2022). *Ending sexual violence and harassment in higher education institutions: Implementation plan 2022–2024*. Dublin: HEA.
- Hernandez de la Rosa, Y., Hernandez Moreno, V. J., Lima Leon, C. E., & Moreno-Martinez, F. L. (2017). Standardization of the digital author's identification as a unique and permanent register: ORCID. *CorSalud*, 9(2), 57–58.
- Hier, S. P., Walby, K., & Greenberg, J. (2006). Supplementing the panoptic paradigm: Surveillance, moral governance and CCTV. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing surveillance: The panopticon and beyond* (pp. 230–244). Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Higher Education Authority. (2019). *A spatial & socio-economic profile of higher education institutions in Ireland*. Dublin: Higher Education Authority.
- Higher Education Authority. (2023). *Higher education institution staff profiles by sex and gender*. Dublin: Higher Education Authority.
- Houghton, F. (2016). Ghosts in the machine: Just how accurate is PubMed? *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 129(1440).
- Houghton, F. (2020). Technological universities in Ireland: The new imperative. *Irish Journal of Academic Practice*, 8(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.21427/X4Z8-GA79>
- Houghton, F. (2021). The Athena SWAN process to promote gender equity in third-level education in Ireland. *South-Eastern European Journal of Public Health*, XVII. <https://doi.org/10.11576/seejph-4799>
- Houghton, F., & Houghton, S. (2018). An appraisal of thematic analysis: Warts and all. *All Ireland Journal of Teaching & Learning (AISHE-J)*, 10(2), 3521–3525.
- Info.Orcid. (2022). #ORCIDat10: Celebrating 10 years of the ORCID Galaxy. <https://info.orcid.org/orcidat10-celebrating-10-years-of-the-orcid-galaxy/#:~:text=By%20the%20end%20of%20the,there%20are%2015%20million%20records.>
- Info.Orcid. (2023). What is Orcid. <https://info.orcid.org/what-is-orcid/>.
- JISC. (2015). *Institutional ORCID implementation and cost benefit analysis report*. Bristol: JISC.
- Jones, C., & Kennedy, G. (2011). *Stepping beyond the paradigm wars: Pluralist methods for research in learning technology*, in ALT-C 2011, 18th international conference: Thriving in a colder and more challenging climate, 6–8 September, 2011. UK: Leeds.
- Koskela, H. (2004). Webcams, TV shows and mobile phones. *Empowering exhibitionism, Surveillance and Society*, 2(2/3), 199–215.
- Leclercq-Vandelannoite, A. (2023). The panopticon, an emblematic concept in management and organization studies: Heaven or hell?, *international journal of management reviews*, 2023, 25(1), pp. 52–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12305ff>. Ffhal-03759646.
- Leopold, S. S. (2016). Editorial: ORCID is a wonderful (but not required) tool for authors. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*, 474(5), 1083–1085. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-016-4760-0>
- Lewis, M. S. (1991). The polytechnics—A peculiarly British phenomenon. *Metropolitan Universities*, 2(4), 24–34.
- Lo, W., & Wai, Y. (2011). Soft power, university rankings and knowledge production: Distinctions between hegemony and self-determination in higher education. *Comparative Education*, 47(2), 209–222.
- Lyon, D. (2006). The search for surveillance theories. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing surveillance: The Panopticon and beyond*. Portland: Willan Publishing.
- MacNeela, P., Dawson, K., O'Rourke, T., Healy-Cullen, S., Burke, L., & Flack, W. F. (2022). *Report on the national survey of staff experiences of sexual violence and harassment in Irish HEIs*. Dublin: Higher Education Association.
- Mann, S., Nolan, J., & Wellman, B. (2002). Sousveillance: Inventing and using wearable computing devices for data collection in surveillance environments. *Surveillance and Society*, 1(3), 331–355. <https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v1i3.3344>
- Marginson, S. (2011). Criteria for technological university designation. <https://9thlevel.ie/wp-content/uploads/ProfessorMarginsonFullReport.pdf>.
- Marusic, A. (2016). What's in a name? The problem of authors' names in research articles. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*, 26, 174–175. <https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2016.018>
- Meadows, A. (2016). Everything you ever wanted to know about ORCID...but were too afraid to ask. *C&RL News*, January, 23–30.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *The phenomenology of perception*. London: RKP.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *Signs*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The visible and the invisible*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Moran Stritch, M., Winterburn, M., & Houghton, F. (2021). The Conti ransomware attack on healthcare in Ireland: Exploring the impacts of a cybersecurity breach from a nursing perspective. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Informatics*, 16(3–4).
- Mullally, U. (2020). Aoihbhinn Ní Shuilleabháin: Two years of harassment at UCD. The Irish Times, September 6th 2020. Last accessed 19th December 2023 at: <https://www.irishtimes.com/life-and-style/people/aoibhinn-ni-shuilleabhain-two-years-of-harassment-at-ucd-1.4346015>.
- Murphy, J. P. (1990). *From Peirce to Davidson*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Parkhill, A. J., Nixon, M., & McEwan, T. E. (2022). A critical analysis of stalking theory and implications for research and practice. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 40(5), 562–583. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2598>
- Powell, J., Hoover, C., Gordon, A., & Mittrach, M. (2019). Bridging identity challenges: Why and how one library plugged ORCID into their enterprise. *Library Hi Tech*, 37(3), 625–639.
- Pratt, L. (1997). *The polytechnic experiment: 1965–1992*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Qiu, J. (2008). Scientific publishing: Identity crisis. *Nature*, 451(7180), 766–767.
- Quinn, A. M. (2022). Promoting ORCID registration at Emory University's School of Law. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 49(102656). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102656>
- Raveenthiran, V. (2016). Editors' insensitivity regarding cultural variations of author surnames. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*, 26, 164–168. <https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2016.016>
- Reimer, T. (2015). Your name is not good enough: Introducing the ORCID researcher identifier at Imperial College London. *Insights*, 28(3), 1–7.
- Research Information. (2016). *Publishers to require ORCID identifiers for authors* (p. 21). February/March: Research Information.
- Ritter, F. (2021). Problems with ORCID, or 10 reasons why I don't have an ORCID number. Last accessed 27th July 2023 at: <http://www.frankritter.com/problems-with-orcid.html>.
- Romele, A., Gallino, F., Emmenegger, C., & Gorgone, D. (2017). *Panopticism is not enough: Social media as technologies of voluntary servitude* (Surveillance and Society).
- Russell, G. M., & Kelly, N. H. (2002). Research as interacting dialogic processes: Implications for reflexivity. *Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3(3).
- Sale, J. E., Lohfeld, L. H., & Brazil, K. (2002). Revisiting the quantitative-qualitative debate: Implications for mixed-methods research. *Quality & Quantity*, 36(1), 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014301607592>
- Salmi, J., & Saroyan, A. (2007). League tables as policy instruments: Uses and misuses. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 19(2), 1–38.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1969). *Being and nothingness*. London: Routledge.
- Sprague, E. R. (2017). Resource review: ORCID. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 105(2), 207–208. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2017.89>
- Supak-Smolcic, V., Simundic, A.-M., & Lundberg, G. D. (2016). Identification of authors without surnames: Is ORCID the right way forward? *Biochemia Medica*, 26(2), 147–149. <https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2016.014>
- Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2017). ORCID: The challenge ahead. *European Science Editing*, 43(2), 34.
- Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2020). ORCID: Issues and concerns about its use for academic purposes and research integrity. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 67, 246–250.
- Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2021a). Non-compliance with ethical rules caused by misuse of ORCID accounts: Implications for medical publications in the COVID-19 era, ethics. *Medicine and Public Health*, 18, Article 100692. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2021.100692>
- Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2021b). Abuse of ORCID's weaknesses by authors who use paper mills. *Scientometrics*, 126(7), 6119–6125.
- Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2022a). Is mandatory ORCID a violation of an author's freedoms and rights? *Serials Review*, 1–2.
- Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2022b). Should ORCID be mandatory for authors, but not for editors? *Operations Research Forum*, 3(1), 1–5.

- Teixeira da Silva, J. A. (2022c). A dangerous triangularization of conflicting values in academic publishing: ORCID, fake authors, and risks with the lack of criminalization of the creators of fake elements. *Epistemes Metron Logos*, 7, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.12681/eml.27238>
- Thomas, W. J., Chen, B., & Clement, G. (2015). ORCID identifiers: Planned and potential uses by associations, publishers, and librarians. *The Serials Librarian*, 68, 332–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2015.1017713>
- Vieira, S. (2016). Disambiguating author names: Part two. *Serials Review*, 42(2), 135–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2016.1179540>
- Weigert, V., & Johnson, R. (2015). *ORCID pilot tests nuts and bolts of university implementation* (pp. 6–7). August/September: Research Information.
- Whitaker, R. (1999). *The end of privacy: How total surveillance is becoming a reality*. New York: New Press.
- Winterburn, M., & Houghton, F. (2021). Cybersecurity, ransomware attacks and health: exploring the public health implications of the recent cyberattack on Ireland's health service. *Medicina Internacia Revuo-International Medicine Review*, 29(116), 160–163.