

When Scholarship Becomes a Status Competition: A Reverse Review of Rankings, Journal Tiers, and the Quiet Erosion of the University

Sebastian Lenz¹, Chengwen Song² and Qin Shi^{1*}

¹*Panorama Scholarly Group, Berlin, Germany*

²*Department of Public Administration, Kookmin University, Seoul, South Korea*

**Corresponding author*

Corresponding author:

shiqin543578241@sina.cn



Received: 15 February 2026

Accepted: 01 April 2026

Available online: 05 April 2026

Abstract

This article offers a critical reverse review of the contemporary order of academic evaluation. Rather than asking whether university rankings and journal classification systems accurately describe academic quality, it asks what happens to universities once these instruments begin to define quality in practice. The central argument is that rankings and journal tiers do not merely measure academic life; they reorganize it. Through the language of performance, visibility, and comparison, they reorder institutional priorities, privilege strategic behavior over educational substance, and transform scholarly judgment into a competition for recognizable status signals.

Drawing on scholarship on rankings and reactivity, audit culture, academic capitalism, responsible metrics, and cultural capital, the article develops a five-part argument. First, the expansion of performance governance has displaced older understandings of the university centered on teaching, intellectual formation, and the public cultivation of judgment. Second, rankings operate less as mirrors than as machines: they reshape organizational behavior by rewarding commensurable and publicly legible outputs. Third, journal stratification encourages a substitution in which where research is published begins to matter more than what it says. Fourth, these evaluative systems intensify existing inequalities because actors with more time, networks, language resources, and institutional prestige are better positioned to convert indicators into recognition. Finally, the article argues that evaluation becomes most damaging when proxies cease to be auxiliary tools and become sovereign criteria. Methodologically, the essay proceeds as a metacritical review: it synthesizes existing literature not to stabilize an orthodox consensus, but to reassess the evaluative paradigm itself and to clarify the intellectual costs of allowing proxies to govern academic life.

The essay does not reject evaluation as such. It argues instead for a recovery of the university as a public institution whose most important goods, including intellectual seriousness, pedagogical attention, and slow inquiry, cannot be exhausted by ranking positions or journal labels.

Keywords: university rankings; journal stratification; performance governance; cultural capital; social reproduction; university spirit

1. Introduction: The Grammar of Evaluation and the Reverse Review Approach

Contemporary universities increasingly speak in the grammar of evaluation. Strategic plans are translated into indicators, departmental worth is condensed into rankings, and scholarly achievement is often summarized through journal tiers, citation counts, grant income, and dashboard visibility. In many systems, the question “What is a good university?” is quietly displaced by the question “How does the university perform on



This article is published in *SILENCE* under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

recognized metrics?" The same displacement appears at the level of academic labor. The value of an article is often inferred from the status of the journal that houses it; the promise of a department is read through placement records and funding profiles; the standing of a scholar is made legible through measurable outputs before the substance of the work is encountered.

This development presents a basic paradox. Instruments originally justified as tools for accountability, transparency, and quality assurance increasingly reorganize the very realities they claim merely to describe. Rankings, journal lists, and performance indicators are not neutral descriptions of an independently existing academic order. As research on rankings and reactivity has shown, public measures alter conduct because actors adapt themselves to the categories through which they are judged [1, 2]. The more consequential a metric becomes, the less plausible it is to describe it as a passive mirror.

The article therefore begins from a different question than standard policy debate. It does not primarily ask whether rankings are methodologically imperfect, whether journal classifications are somewhat unfair, or whether the impact factor is occasionally misused. Those problems matter, but they do not reach the core of the issue. The deeper problem is that evaluative devices become constitutive. They reorder priorities, alter institutional self-understanding, and encourage actors to internalize a strategic orientation toward visibility, countability, and comparative advantage. In this sense, the contemporary university is not merely evaluated from the outside. It is increasingly built from the inside around the anticipation of evaluation.

This article calls its approach a *reverse review*. A reverse review does not begin with the validity of measurement; it begins with the effects of measurement on the measured world. Its task is not to ask whether rankings and journal tiers capture academic reality faithfully enough, but to ask how academic reality changes once institutions and scholars must live inside such regimes of comparison. Methodologically, the essay is a critical synthetic review of literature from higher education studies, the sociology of quantification, science and technology studies, and Bourdieusian sociology. It draws especially on work on rankings and reactivity [1, 2], audit culture and managerial surveillance [3, 4], academic capitalism [5, 6], responsible metrics [7–9], and cultural capital and academic distinction [10–12].

As a form of critical review, the reverse review differs from ordinary literature mapping in one decisive respect. A conventional review usually organizes prior studies in order to identify a gap that can be filled. The present essay instead treats the evaluative order itself as the problem. It asks how apparently practical devices of comparison become intellectual institutions in their own right, how they transform the questions scholars learn to ask, and how they reorganize academic aspiration before any particular study is even designed. In that sense, this is not only a review of scholarship on rankings and metrics; it is also a review of the conditions under which scholarship is now expected to justify itself.

The article advances four questions. How has performance governance reordered the purposes universities attribute to themselves? Why do rankings function as organizational machines rather than neutral mirrors? How does journal stratification displace the substantive value of knowledge with the reputational value of outlets? And how do these processes convert academic achievement into a visible currency of distinction that intensifies social and institutional stratification?

The argument is not nostalgic in the simple sense of opposing modern accountability with an idealized golden age of pure scholarship. Universities have always been unequal, status-conscious, and institutionally constrained. Nor is the argument that all quantification is illegitimate. Evaluation is unavoidable in systems that distribute scarce resources and public trust. The problem arises when proxies become substitutes, when comparison becomes an end in itself, and when universities increasingly recognize themselves only through the categories of competitive display. Under those conditions, the evaluative order ceases to be a supporting infrastructure and becomes a governing ethos.

2. From Intellectual Formation to Managed Optimization: The Reorientation of University Values

The traditional ideal of the university has never been singular, but several themes recur across its major formulations. Universities have been understood as institutions for the cultivation of judgment, the transmission and renewal of knowledge, the formation of intellectual character, and the protection of spaces in which inquiry can proceed without immediate submission to external utility. Even where these ideals were only partially realized, they gave the university a normative language broader than productivity alone. Teaching, critical reflection, disciplinary continuity, and public reason were not residual activities. They were constitutive of what universities claimed to be.

The rise of performance governance has not abolished these ideals, but it has rearranged their hierarchy. Under regimes shaped by managerial reform, audit culture, and academic capitalism, universities are increasingly expected to act as strategic organizations that continuously display outputs, benchmark themselves against peers, and translate complex academic processes into legible performance signals [3–5]. What matters is no longer only whether an institution teaches well or supports serious inquiry. What matters is whether these activities can be rendered comparable, countable, and externally visible.

This shift does not occur only through state policy. It is also internalized by universities themselves. Administrators build strategic plans around ranking criteria. Departments adapt hiring to publication incentives. Faculty internalize output expectations as career common sense. Burrows [13] captures this condition with the notion of "metric assemblages," in which multiple forms of quantification interact to shape institutional mood, career behavior, and organizational aspiration. In such environments, performance language becomes a totalizing medium. It offers a common vocabulary through which diverse activities can be compared, governed, and justified, but it also narrows what appears valuable. Once value is translated into measurable performance, priorities are quietly reordered. Teaching becomes important insofar as it contributes to satisfaction scores, retention numbers, or employability metrics. Research becomes important insofar as it yields recognized outputs, citations, and grants. Public engagement becomes important when it is convertible into impact statements and branding narratives. A university may still claim to cultivate reflective citizens, preserve difficult fields, or host slow and speculative thought, but these goods often occupy a subordinate institutional position because they are harder to display in competitive performance systems.

One major consequence is the marginalization of teaching and intellectual formation. In many academic systems, the symbolic center of institutional prestige lies overwhelmingly with externally visible research performance. Teaching remains indispensable to university reproduction, yet it is often weakly rewarded relative to publication counts, grant acquisition, or elite outlet placement. This is not because teaching lacks importance, but because it often lacks status-efficient legibility. A devoted teacher can change intellectual lives in ways no spreadsheet can summarize. Yet such value does not circulate as effectively within competitive evaluative regimes as a high-impact publication or a movement in league tables.

The same logic disadvantages forms of thought that are slow, exploratory, or not immediately strategic. Serious inquiry often requires time to read, hesitate, revise, and sometimes fail. It may involve local problems, archival labor, conceptual reconstruction, or difficult

interdisciplinary conversations that do not produce rapid output. But where performance competition dominates, slowness is easily redescribed as underperformance. Time itself becomes morally coded: accelerated production appears virtuous, while patient reflection risks appearing unproductive. The result is not simply a busier university, but a university in which the temporal conditions of thought are themselves pressured by audit expectations.

The broader transformation may be described as a shift from a university of formation to a university of managed optimization. In such a university, educational and intellectual activities are not abandoned, but increasingly subordinated to the strategic imperative of demonstrable performance. Academic work is asked not only to be good, but to be visibly countable in the right way. This is why the contemporary problem cannot be understood as mere administrative excess. It is a reordering of value. Performance governance does not simply ask universities to prove their worth. It teaches them to define worth through proof formats that privilege competition, speed, and reputational visibility.

3. Rankings as Organizational Machines: The Logic of Quantified Comparison

University rankings are often defended as descriptive devices. They supposedly inform students, parents, policymakers, and institutions by turning a complex educational landscape into a comparative map. Yet their social power lies precisely in the fact that they do not remain descriptive. They intervene. Rankings create what Espeland and Sauder [1] call reactivity: people and organizations change their behavior in response to being measured. Once a ranking becomes consequential for prestige, recruitment, funding, or legitimacy, institutions begin to organize themselves with that ranking in mind.

This is why rankings are better understood as machines rather than mirrors. A mirror reflects what already exists. A machine produces effects. Rankings produce commensuration by forcing diverse institutions into shared categories of comparison. Universities with different missions, histories, student populations, regional obligations, disciplinary profiles, and public functions are rendered comparable through a small set of standardized indicators. The problem is not only methodological simplification, although that is real. The problem is ontological and political: by deciding what counts as comparable, rankings define what kind of institution is treated as recognizable success.

What commensuration achieves administratively, however, it also destroys conceptually. Once unlike institutions are translated into a common ordinal field, qualitative difference is re-described as relative position. A university deeply invested in undergraduate formation, regional service, or linguistically specific scholarship may still be excellent in ways inseparable from its mission, yet the ranking form pressures such difference to appear as deficiency if it does not convert well into internationally portable indicators. The violence of the ranking machine is therefore subtle. It does not openly forbid institutional plurality; it codes plurality into a hierarchy where some forms of value travel easily and others become difficult to perceive at all.

Sauder and Espeland [2] show that rankings exert disciplinary force because organizations internalize their logic. Anxiety, aspiration, and self-monitoring combine to produce tight coupling between evaluative criteria and organizational change. In higher education, this can be seen in the expansion of ranking-conscious management: the creation of offices devoted to data reporting, the recruitment of staff likely to increase publication counts, the prioritization of internationally visible fields over low-status or local ones, the concentration of resources on units most likely to improve ranking performance, and the redesign of institutional messaging to fit global competition narratives. Rankings do not simply reveal hierarchy. They actively help to assemble it.

Hazelkorn [14] demonstrates that global rankings shape institutional ambition and national policy well beyond their formal methodological scope. They influence how governments imagine “world-class” universities, how leaders allocate scarce resources, and how universities narrate themselves to external audiences. Once the ranking position becomes a reputational shorthand, it begins to guide internal decisions even when the ranking metrics fit the institution poorly. The symbolic power of ranking lies in its public simplicity. Complex educational missions are compressed into a signal that travels quickly across policy and media space.

This public simplicity creates a second effect: rankings stabilize and naturalize difference. Because highly ranked institutions enjoy accumulated advantages in reputation, selectivity, networks, and resource attraction, rankings can operate as self-reinforcing mechanisms. Prestigious institutions draw stronger applicants and faculty, which helps them perform better on future indicators, which then confirms their prestige. Institutions lower in the hierarchy face the opposite dynamic. Their lower ranking can reduce attractiveness, which then helps reproduce their lower position. Munch [6] argues that the struggle for excellence in such conditions tends toward intensified stratification rather than broad systemic improvement. Under competitive funding and public comparison, resources cluster around already advantaged actors.

The normative problem is therefore not only inaccuracy. Even a technically improved ranking would still reward certain forms of institutional behavior over others. Institutions are pushed to optimize what counts within the ranking frame. Disciplines that generate high citation volume or international visibility tend to gain leverage, while fields with local, linguistic, interpretive, or pedagogical orientations can become harder to defend. Institutional diversity is pressured toward strategic isomorphism. Universities that ought to differ in mission are encouraged to imitate a narrow model of excellence defined by visibility and competition.

This dynamic also changes institutional subjectivity. Universities begin to imagine themselves as competitive actors whose main task is positional advancement. The educational institution becomes a strategic brand. The public university becomes a rank-seeking organization. Status mobility within the ranking field acquires a moral intensity that can overshadow quieter educational questions: Who is being taught? What forms of knowledge are being protected? What kinds of regional or public obligations are being served? These questions do not disappear, but they are increasingly subordinated to the urgency of measurable ascent.

To say that rankings are machines is not to deny that they provide information. It is to insist that their informational role cannot be separated from their performative role. Rankings help produce the world they rank. They alter resource allocation, organizational attention, and institutional desire. For that reason, the issue is not whether universities should ignore rankings completely, which is unrealistic. The issue is whether rankings should be permitted to govern universities as if comparative visibility were the same thing as academic worth.

4. Proxy Sovereignty and Journal Stratification: The Displacement of Knowledge Value

If rankings reorganize universities at the institutional level, journal stratification reorganizes them at the level of knowledge production. In many academic systems, publication outlets are arranged into hierarchical tiers, whether through formal classification lists, impact factor bands, quartiles, or locally institutionalized prestige categories. These hierarchies are often justified as practical shortcuts. Committees cannot read

every article carefully; administrators need efficient criteria; funding systems require scalable judgments. Under these conditions, journal status appears to offer a convenient proxy for quality.

Yet the use of journal status as a proxy introduces a decisive substitution. The question of what a piece of research contributes becomes secondary to the question of where it appears. Seglen [7] showed long ago that journal impact factors are unsuitable for evaluating individual research because citation distributions within journals are highly skewed and because journal-level prestige says little about the quality of any particular article. The broader responsible metrics movement, including the Leiden Manifesto, has reiterated this point: indicators should support expert judgment, not replace it [8]. Nevertheless, the attraction of stratified journal systems persists because they simplify evaluation under conditions of scale and scarcity.

It is useful to name this condition more sharply as *proxy sovereignty*. A proxy is initially defensible as an aid to judgment under practical constraint. It becomes sovereign when actors begin to treat it as more authoritative than the first-order qualities it was meant to approximate. At that point, the evaluative sequence is inverted. Scholars no longer ask first whether a question is intellectually necessary and then consider where it may be published; they begin by imagining the venue ecology and only then adjust the question accordingly. Committees no longer read outlet reputation as one clue among others; they increasingly allow outlet reputation to preempt reading. Proxy sovereignty is therefore not merely a technical misuse of indicators. It is a reorganization of judgment in which signs of value become more actionable than value itself.

The effect is not merely epistemic shortcutting. Publication regimes shape research behavior in advance. When career advancement, hiring, rewards, and institutional status depend heavily on recognized outlet placement, scholars learn to ask not only whether a question matters, but whether it is publishable in the right venue. Butler's study [15] of publication-count incentives in Australia demonstrated how funding formulas can raise output while lowering average impact, revealing how performance incentives reshape production strategies. Aagaard [16] similarly showed how national bibliometric incentives trickle down into local management practices even when their formal financial importance is limited. Once indicators are institutionalized, they reappear in everyday departmental life as hiring criteria, workload expectations, internal rewards, and symbolic norms.

Under these conditions, publishability can displace intrinsic importance. Scholars are encouraged to formulate projects that are internationally legible, methodologically fashionable, positively framed, and likely to survive journal gatekeeping within a compressed timeframe. Questions of local significance, long-term theoretical reconstruction, replication, negative findings, integrative synthesis, and pedagogically valuable scholarship can become relatively less rewarding because they travel poorly through prestige hierarchies. The result is not that all scholarship becomes trivial, but that the ecology of attention shifts toward work more easily convertible into recognized outputs.

This shift also affects academic writing itself. When the route to survival runs through high-status outlet conventions, prose becomes more templated, projects become more sliced, and topical alignment becomes more strategic. de Rijcke et al. [9] review extensive evidence showing that indicator use can generate gaming, strategic adaptation, and shifts in evaluative practice. Heuritsch's study [17] of publication pressure further links metric-driven research cultures to misconduct risks, diminished justice perceptions, and damage to research quality. Even without outright misconduct, strong pressure to perform can normalize milder distortions: salami slicing, citation choreography, exaggerated novelty claims, avoidance of risky questions, and narrowing of intellectual ambition to what looks reviewable.

This has implications for intellectual style as well as for output count. When publication systems reward recognizable format, they encourage a particular moral economy of writing: claim novelty quickly, display method efficiently, position within fashionable debate, and minimize forms of ambiguity that slow evaluative uptake. Yet some of the most important scholarly work does exactly the opposite. It proceeds by reframing inherited questions, lingering with conceptual difficulty, or refusing premature closure. A publication regime that over-rewards speed and formal recognizability does not merely distort incentives. It narrows the imaginable style of serious thought.

The damage is especially severe in fields whose best work is slow, synthetic, locally grounded, multilingual, or difficult to standardize. Humanities scholarship, interpretive social inquiry, regional studies, pedagogical research, and public-facing scholarship can all be disadvantaged when journal hierarchies are treated as general measures of value. The issue is not simply disciplinary complaint. It is that a common yardstick privileges forms of output more compatible with high-volume citation circuits and internationally standardized formats. A formally uniform standard thus becomes substantively unequal.

There is also a deeper normative cost. Journal stratification can transform scholarly judgment from an intellectual assessment into a reputational transfer mechanism. Instead of asking whether an argument is careful, original, necessary, or true, evaluation is outsourced to outlet prestige. Knowledge value is replaced by container value. The authority of the journal stands in for the labor of reading. This is institutionally convenient, but intellectually corrosive. It weakens the capacity of academic communities to defend the proposition that scholarship should be assessed, however imperfectly, through substantive engagement rather than reputational shorthand.

None of this implies that journals have no signaling function or that peer review is irrelevant. The problem is the hardening of publication outlets into sovereign categories of worth. Once the prestige of the venue overwhelms the content of the work, the evaluative order begins to reward recognizable placement more reliably than intellectual necessity. The scholar then learns a lesson that is both practical and tragic: in order to be heard, one must first be seen in the right place. What is said comes after.

5. The Conversion of Distinction: Metrics, Cultural Capital, and Academic Stratification

The consequences of rankings and journal stratification are not evenly distributed. Evaluative systems appear universal because they apply common criteria, but their effects are mediated by unequal starting points. Institutions differ in endowment, infrastructure, language environment, teaching loads, administrative support, doctoral pipelines, and international networks. Scholars differ in mentoring access, time security, research funding, mobility, and familiarity with dominant publication codes. A single metric can therefore produce very different burdens depending on where one begins.

This is why the contemporary evaluative order cannot be understood only as a problem of utilitarian distortion. It is also a problem of stratification and social reproduction. When universities and scholars are judged through rankings, journal tiers, and other prestige signals, preexisting advantages are more easily converted into recognized merit. Actors located in better-resourced institutions typically have more support for grant applications, more collaborative networks, greater access to high-status coauthors, stronger doctoral socialization into dominant writing conventions, and more institutional legitimacy in the eyes of editors and reviewers. What appears as neutral competition often rests on asymmetrically distributed capacities to play the game.

Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital is especially useful here [10]. Academic success is never purely the result of raw intellectual merit detached from social form. It depends on dispositions, competencies, language repertoires, institutional affiliations, and symbolic recognition that are unevenly distributed and historically accumulated. In *Homo Academicus*, Bourdieu [11] showed that the academic field is structured by struggles over legitimacy, authority, and consecration. Contemporary metrics do not abolish that field logic. They provide new instruments through which it is administered and publicly displayed.

What rankings and journal classifications do, then, is not simply measure distinction. They help convert it. Institutional reputation becomes easier to translate into grants, partnerships, student demand, and policy attention. Journal prestige becomes easier to translate into hiring success, promotion, mobility, and voice within a field. The evaluative order thereby functions as a conversion device through which economic, social, linguistic, and organizational advantages are transformed into symbolic capital and then re-presented as transparent achievement.

Lamont's analysis [12] of academic judgment is relevant here because it reminds us that evaluation is always social, interpretive, and culturally situated, even when it presents itself as neutral assessment. Metrics seem to reduce arbitrariness by replacing judgment with numbers. In practice, they redistribute judgment into prior classificatory systems and institutional contexts. A ranked university, a Q1 journal, or a citation threshold appears objective because it is depersonalized, but the path to these markers is deeply shaped by unequal social conditions. The authority of the number can therefore conceal rather than eliminate hierarchy.

Uniform standards can intensify inequality precisely because they are indifferent to difference. To require the same publication targets from researchers carrying radically different teaching loads, language constraints, funding conditions, or caregiving burdens is to universalize a standard whose attainability is stratified in practice. To compare universities with sharply different missions through a single ranking matrix is to privilege institutions already aligned with that matrix. Such systems often claim fairness by virtue of sameness, but sameness of criterion can coexist with deep structural unfairness.

The cultural consequences are equally important. Academic achievement becomes a visible marker of identity and distinction. Scholars learn to present themselves through recognizable prestige credentials. Universities market themselves through rank, citation excellence, and outlet quality. Departments use publication profiles as status narratives. The result is a field in which academic life is increasingly saturated with comparative display. Scholarship becomes not only a practice of inquiry, but a medium of positional signaling.

This helps explain the peculiar moral atmosphere of contemporary academia. Competition is not experienced merely as a technical allocation mechanism; it is experienced as a test of worth. Failure to secure the right outputs can feel like failure of self, not simply failure within a flawed system. Sauder and Espeland [2] note the anxiety produced by public measures. That anxiety is intensified when measurement is linked not only to employment outcomes but also to dignity, recognition, and belonging. In that sense, the evaluative order does not just distribute rewards. It shapes subjectivities.

The final irony is that this order presents itself as meritocratic while often deepening cumulative advantage. Those already near the center of recognized value find it easier to accumulate further recognition; those at the margins must exert more labor for less symbolic return. Metrics thereby help reproduce hierarchy while narrating it as transparent fairness. Once academic status is condensed into apparently objective signals, structural inequality can appear as the natural outcome of measured excellence.

6. Conclusion: Recovering the Plural University Beyond the Evaluative Order

The contemporary university cannot escape evaluation, nor should it seek a romantic refuge from all comparison. Public institutions require accountability. Academic communities need criteria for judgment. Resources must be distributed somehow. But none of this requires universities to mistake evaluative proxies for educational reality. The core danger begins when indicators cease to assist judgment and begin to replace it, when rankings cease to inform institutions and begin to govern them, and when journal labels become more authoritative than engagement with ideas themselves.

The argument of this article has been that rankings and journal stratification matter not only because they are imperfect measures, but because they are transformative ones. They reorder institutional priorities, privilege what is countable and comparable, intensify strategic behavior, and convert accumulated advantage into apparently neutral merit. In doing so, they contribute to the alienation of the university spirit: the slow replacement of educational, intellectual, and public purposes by a status-oriented culture of visible performance.

If universities are to resist that alienation, the first step is conceptual clarity. Evaluation cannot be allowed to stand in for education itself. A ranked institution is not therefore a good university, just as a paper in a high-status journal is not therefore an important contribution. Such markers may sometimes correlate with quality, but they cannot define it exhaustively. Universities must preserve spaces in which difficult, unfashionable, locally relevant, pedagogically serious, and slow forms of work remain defensible even when they do not optimize performance indicators.

Second, the public character of the university must be reasserted. Universities do not exist only to outperform one another in prestige markets. They also exist to sustain critical traditions, train judgment, expand access to knowledge, host disagreement, and cultivate capacities that no ranking can fully measure. Public value often appears precisely where commensuration is weakest: in mentoring, disciplinary stewardship, civic interpretation, regional engagement, and the protection of inquiry whose benefits cannot be predicted in advance.

Third, academic communities need a stronger defense of plural evaluation. Responsible assessment should treat metrics as context-bound inputs rather than sovereign verdicts; should recognize disciplinary, linguistic, and institutional diversity; and should reward forms of labor that sustain common intellectual life, including teaching, review work, synthesis, replication, and collaborative care. The point is not to abolish standards, but to prevent standards from collapsing into a narrow regime of positional display.

Such a defense also requires a different emotional economy of academic life. As long as recognition is organized primarily through public comparison, scholars will continue to experience metrics not just as administrative instruments but as mirrors of self-worth. A healthier university culture would have to weaken that identification. It would need institutions willing to say, in practice rather than slogan, that not every valuable contribution must be optimized for visibility, and that not every unreadable number deserves authority simply because it travels well across dashboards, rankings, and annual reviews.

In the end, the question is not whether universities will be evaluated. The question is whether they will still be able to understand themselves in terms larger than evaluation. A university that knows itself only through its rank, its citation profile, or the tier labels of its journals has already

surrendered too much. The defense of the university begins not with the fantasy of no judgment, but with the insistence that judgment must remain answerable to purposes richer than comparison.

References

References

- [1] Espeland, W. N., & Sauder, M. (2007). Rankings and reactivity: How public measures recreate social worlds. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1), 1-40. <https://doi.org/10.1086/517897>
- [2] Sauder, M., & Espeland, W. N. (2009). The discipline of rankings: Tight coupling and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 74(1), 63-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400104>
- [3] Shore, C., & Wright, S. (1999). Audit culture and anthropology: Neo-liberalism in British higher education. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 5(4), 557-575. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2661148>
- [4] Lorenz, C. (2012). If you're so smart, why are you under surveillance? Universities, neoliberalism, and new public management. *Critical Inquiry*, 38(3), 599-629. <https://doi.org/10.1086/664553>
- [5] Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- [6] Munch, R. (2014). *Academic capitalism: Universities in the global struggle for excellence*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203768761>
- [7] Seglen, P. O. (1997). Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. *BMJ*, 314(7079), 498-502. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.314.7079.497>
- [8] Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., de Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, 520(7548), 429-431. <https://doi.org/10.1038/520429a>
- [9] de Rijcke, S., Wouters, P. F., Rushforth, A. D., Franssen, T. P., & Hammarfelt, B. (2016). Evaluation practices and effects of indicator use - a literature review. *Research Evaluation*, 25(2), 161-169. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvv038>
- [10] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Greenwood Press.
- [11] Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Stanford University Press.
- [12] Lamont, M. (2009). *How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Harvard University Press.
- [13] Burrows, R. (2012). Living with the h-index? Metric assemblages in the contemporary academy. *The Sociological Review*, 60(2), 355-372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2012.02077.x>
- [14] Hazelkorn, E. (2015). *Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for world-class excellence* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137446671>
- [15] Butler, L. (2003). Explaining Australia's increased share of ISI publications: The effects of a funding formula based on publication counts. *Research Policy*, 32(1), 143-155. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(02\)00007-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(02)00007-0)
- [16] Aagaard, K. (2015). How incentives trickle down: Local use of a national bibliometric indicator system. *Science and Public Policy*, 42(5), 725-737. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scu087>
- [17] Heuritsch, J. (2021). Reflexive behaviour: How publication pressure affects research quality in astronomy. *Publications*, 9(4), 52. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9040052>