

ANALYZING METHODOLOGY OF RANKING TO ENHANCE JORDANIAN UNIVERSITIES POSITIONING

Khaled Aladwan, American University of Madaba

ABSTRACT

There has been consistent development in the quantity of national university league tables in the course of the most recent 25 years. Paradoxically, 'World University Rankings' is a later turn of events and has gotten minimal genuine scholastic examination in peer-investigated publications. Not many specialists have assessed the wellsprings of information and the statistical methodologies utilized. The current article looks to address this hole.

The creators clarify and assess the methodologies utilized by the Times Higher Education Supplement, featuring contrasts in their results and in their level of solidness after some time. A scope of concerns should be tended to if such rankings are to move a degree of certainty that rises above the set up 'infotainment' worth of league tables (Clarke, 2002).

Keywords: University Ranking, University League Table, World Class University

INTRODUCTION

For about 25 years there has been consistent development in the number of public rankings of universities. These began as business endeavors. The first, for Jordanian universities, was in 1985 by World Report (Stella & Woodhouse, 2006). Global papers at that point started to foster their own ways to deal with ranking international universities. The most created is that mutually utilized by The Times and Times Higher Education Supplement 1 from 1993. It was unmistakably business worries that prompted what has become a yearly occasion (Merisotis, 2010). Apparently, the excellent crowd for such arrangements of public rankings was expected students and therefore possible postgraduates, in spite of the fact that there is little proof that these rankings impact understudy decisions in either the local or the global (Federkeil, 2002). The originators of university rankings had, in any case, distinguished a subject of human interest. Likewise, to other mainstream reports that the media decide to distribute, league tables are an intense wellspring of 'infotainment', where a specific measure of data gives a lopsidedly huge level of diversion (Clarke, 2002).

While the main public rankings were dubious and pulled in much genuine analysis (Provan & Abercromby, 2000; Turner, 2005; Eccles, 2002) they have continued and created, and the makers have accepted this as acknowledgment by the local academic area of such rankings (Shin, Toutkoushian & Teichler, 2011). To be sure they refer to the discussion of the consequences of such rankings by academics as affirmation of their worth.

Drivers to Produce International League Tables

There are various interconnected impacts that are driving the developing craving for global comparisons. Universities have for some time been viewed as global associations and the expansive pattern is one of expanding internationalization (Zhu, 2018). One of the parts of globalization has been to make the rivalry between universities in various nations as opposed to inside a single country. Staff and understudies are all the more universally portable, the last especially at the postgraduate level, and for certain reasons, universities are in a global market. Those settling on such decisions need guidance.

Maybe the key fundamental driver is the ascent of the information society and its financial effect. In a knowledge society, knowledge replaces actual assets as the fundamental driver of economic development (Raworth, 2017). It is generally perceived that advanced education has a significant task to carry out in the creation and move of knowledge to the economy. While all universities may conceivably make some commitment to the economy, 'World-Class' Universities, with their solid science and advancement capacities, are probably going to create 'outsize economic advantages'. Simultaneously, 'science's hunger for money and labor' requires undeniable degrees of assets for this commitment to be accomplished and supported.

While there are significant contrasts between nations in the way to deal with building and fostering a knowledge-based society and economy, an investigation of the worldwide interest in innovative work shows that 'no single nation has prevailed with regard to accomplishing and supporting undeniable degrees of success without putting resources into science and innovation, and abusing them' (Held & McGrew, 2007). Consequently, logical and mechanical advancement, and its application, can be viewed as cornerstones of the knowledge society and impetuses for economic development.

Interest in contrasting public execution and the best worldwide practice fits with governments 'world-class' yearnings. The Jordanian government has related to world-classes in training (Smith 1993; Hazekorn 2015). The perpetual secretary of the Division for Training and Science, David Ringer, has freely dedicated the office to 'securely world-class instruction framework' (DfES, 2006). 'World-class' can be characterized as 'of or among the best in the world'. Along these lines 'world-class' infers a global correlation including any remaining nations. Public explanations from Jordanian government are comparative. Such arrangements lead to tension on the main Jordanian universities to show that they are performing among the highest-level worldwide universities.

WORLD RANKINGS

While public rankings accomplish a few points that the previous discussion distinguished, they don't manage the globalization measurement by any means. They don't show to public governments how their universities contrast, and those of different nations, nor do they demonstrate to potential understudies who are globally portable, which are the best universities in the world. Thus, there are pressures for world rankings. Be that as it may, they can't be accomplished by consolidating public rankings, since the rules used to deliver these are not universally equivalent. World rankings, in the event that they can be incorporated in a manner that rouses certainty, would be exceptionally desirable.

Two current plans have accomplished boundless exposure and are now affecting all universities, regardless of whether just at the level of their exposure. The two plans – Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), completed by two academics from Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China, and the Times Higher Education Supplement rankings (henceforth alluded to as Times Higher) – utilize differentiating approaches both in the standards utilized and the sort of association creating the league tables. The Times Higher covers just the best 200 establishments, while the ARWU records the best 500. Nonetheless, the enormous number of organizations with tied positions implies that lone the best 100 show up in position request in the ARWU tables. The rest show up in alphabetical request in groups of 100 foundations, with up to 107 tied positions in 2007. In this article, the principle interest is in entire foundation rankings, albeit the two associations additionally give university rankings to a scope of expert fields.

ACADEMIC RANKING OF WORLD UNIVERSITIES (ARWU)

Albeit this ranking radiates from Shanghai Jiao Tong University, as the lead scientists clarify, 'The ARWU is academic examination driven by personal interest and completed autonomously with no external support' (Dill, 2007) surely, presently has a spring up disclaimer with that impact.

The data about the inference and results of their way to deal with global university league tables is shown on the university's site and has been depicted in various articles (Dill, 2007). These portray the reasoning for the fundamental methodology, however the more detailed choices engaged with the decision of information and their combination are just momentarily illustrated, with no supporting legitimization. The fundamental position was to utilize just freely accessible information that could for the most part be aggregated from a worldwide reference data set. The only one accessible at the time was that of ISI/Thomson Logical. No information was to be incorporated that were provided by universities themselves since such information couldn't be freely verified. Further reasoning for the specific decision of information isn't given. Decisions about specific journals in which to advantage publication have all the earmarks of being discretionary, however somewhat these limitations follow from the limit to utilize just publicly accessible, globally similar data in trying to separate execution at the most elevated level.

This apparently harmless prerequisite requires the avoidance of spaces of movement in universities that are not covered by unbiased, equivalent, openly accessible information. The dominating segments of the rankings are specific parts of exploration yield. The compilers for the most part tally different combinations of references ordered by ISI. This choice apparently requested on the grounds of objectivity, in its turn produces predisposition. The databases used are almost all in English and produced by ISI/Thomson Scientific (<http://www.isinet.com>). They consist of a set-up of indices: The Science Citation Index-Expanded (SCIE), Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), and other expert indices.

Whatever data are utilized, assuming there is more than one figure, the different segments must be totaled somehow or another to accomplish an overall ranking of universities. This presents issues of consolidating various sorts of information and settling on an arrangement of weighting of the different kinds.

ARWU

Apparently, gauges have been picked that solitary out little quantities of universities. These are anomalies to the overall dissemination. A choice has likewise been made to order information throughout extensive stretches of time to frame the parts prompting the ranking. In spite of the fact that there are six measures, the three measures including references are profoundly connected (somewhere in the range of 0.65 and 0.88 for the best 100 of every 2007). As the period over which the vast majority of the pointers are determined is long, yearly changes will make just little contrasts. This makes the aftereffects of this plan of rankings exceptionally delayed to change over the long run. In reality, there has been only one 'newcomer' to the establishments recorded in the main 30 over the most recent three years; an attached position in 2007 permitted 31 organizations to be recorded. As most universities will just add to the pointers for 'research output', the progressions in positions may be at much lower rankings and these will be negligible as far as the progressions to the basic variable.

The aim of this article isn't to evaluate the general legitimacy of metrics-based ways to deal with institutional ranking utilizing different types of reference; rather it is to inspect the specific

selections of pointers that are utilized in the ARWU tables and to think about this methodology to act as an illustration of utilizing measurements on Jordanian universities.

There are issues worried about ascribing establishments to graduated class who have acquired degrees at more than one university. There are additionally issues when staff completed the work, prompting a prize at an alternate foundation from the one at the time the prize was granted (Liu, Cheng & Liu, 2005).

The references ascribed to staff and organizations are ordered from ISI/Thomson sources. The expanding utilization of this information source to survey the usefulness and quality of university yield has prompted a lot more prominent examination of its shortcomings for such purposes. The English language inclination definitely favors universities. There are further predispositions: references cover just journal articles and not books or examination monographs; the reference records are a lot more fragile outside the natural sciences; and the selection of journals from which the references are taken are vigorously overwhelmed by those distributed. Besides, there are worries about the sorts of articles incorporated the cleaning of information and the attribution of references to organizations (Liu, Cheng & Liu, 2005). There are examples of tracing errors somewhere in the range of seven and 30 percent in various settings (Weingart, 2005). Since 'highly cited' status draws on twenty years of references, the ranking is established in history and is probably going to be a helpless impression of current execution. An examination of the writers of the 10 most exceptionally referred to articles distributed between 1996-1999 and 2000-2003 in the ISI/Thomson Scientific database shows that five had changed organizations by 2006 and two had passed away (Bookstein, Seidler, Fieder & Winckler, 2010).

The ISI/Thomson Scientific

Data sets quality references to different creators similarly. Albeit the quantity of writers of an article has been seen to differ, they all get equivalent credit. In this manner, it is an irregularity that attributions made by the ARWU group, as for articles in Nature and Science, include differential attributions by the number and situating of the writer in the posting.

There are clear contrasts in looking at multi-workforce foundations. Additionally, the connected issue of the size of the establishment. For certain reasons, it could total that is required, while for decisions about proficiency, cost-adequacy, or useful contemplations size should be mulled over. Below rankings supports the point that position request fluctuates significantly as per whether the examination yield assesses the size of the establishment (Frenken, Heimeriks & Hoekman, 2017). Just one factor in the ARWU list assesses the size; 90% of the information is unweight in this regard.

How much the ARWU results are reproducible has been the subject of late examination. Utilizing the predefined information sources, Florian (2006, 2007) attempted to imitate the 2005 outcomes. He discovered ambiguities in the estimation of the number of staff in establishments yet more worryingly tracked down that the values for an objective indicator such as SCI [Science Citation Index] can't be imitated utilizing the distributed methodology' (Ioannidis, Patsopoulos & Kavvoura, 2007). Correspondence for the sake of 'The Ranking Group' from Shanghai Jiao Tong University conceded to 'statistical treatment' having been applied, keeping up that this didn't influence the reproducibility and declining to give crude information to examination.

An 'International Ranking Expert Group' (IREG), established by UNESCO European Center for Higher Education in Bucharest and the Institute for Higher Education Policy in Washington, DC in 2004, prompts the ARWU compilers on the issue including methodology, responsibility, and quality affirmation. Individuals have produced and examined the scope of papers and presentations since its initiation (see <http://www.arwu.org>), and in 2006 they drew up a 'set of standards of value and great practice' in university rankings (Fernández, Fernández & Rey, 2018).

In any case, any refinements to the ARWU way to deal with data seem, by all accounts, to be peripheral and efficiently recorded.

Times Higher Education Supplement World University Rankings

The fundamental way to deal with these rankings, which has been refined since its initiation in 2004, is clarified on its site (<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk>), in the enhancement containing the outcomes and in various articles (for instance, Guarino, Ridgeway & Chun, 2005). This is a totally different methodology from that of ARWU and a large part of the detail of the approach is questionable.

The rankings endeavor to mirror a more extensive viewpoint of university execution than the ARWU rankings, by consolidating abstract decisions and target pointers. The strategy for presenting judgmental markers is by the utilization of worldwide peer view by academics and employers. Enormous boards are recognized and requested to select the best universities in their field. These are then conflated somehow or another to create the worldwide evaluations. Information is additionally gathered from universities on quantities of worldwide staff and international understudies, and staff: understudy proportions.

Times Higher has utilized a business organization, QS 'Quacquarelli Symonds' to determine the information. It has all the earmarks of being a coordinator of worldwide displays of university courses to pull in understudies, and presentations of employers to draw in university graduates (<http://www.qsnetwork.com/>). This is professed to give it exceptional information on the two areas. Not all universities are shrouded in the rankings, just foundations showing students with a wide yet not really a full spread of subjects. Organizations in a government structure are isolated, if conceivable, yet no multi-grounds establishments are incorporated.

This article doesn't endeavor to evaluate the benefits of including peer survey as the reason for creating rankings. In a broadly utilized strategy for making appraisals when there are no total rules on which to base a legitimate judgment (Lindblad & Lindblad, 2009). Like democracy, peer audit is regularly advocated on the premise that however it very well might be flawed it is superior to the other options. In this article, consideration is aimed at the specific way to deal with joining peer evaluations into the making of global institutional rankings.

Contrasted with the particular, whenever restricted, wellsprings of information utilized and the freely accessible data that are utilized in the ARWU approach, how the Times Higher rankings are ordered, and the outcomes must be accepted on the whole based on previous experience. Any possible inclination, genuine or perceived, of having the interaction led by an organization that has a business interest in offering administrations to universities and managers is altogether unacknowledged.

Peer review carries a 50 percent weighting (40% for academics, 10% for businesses). In any case, the cycle needs meticulousness and transparency. The study is messaged to 190,000 potential academic respondents drawn from two data sets: 'World Scientific', situated in Singapore, and 'Mardev', zeroed in on Arts and Humanities. It isn't indicated whether respondents are themselves research dynamic. In 2006, this created just 1,600 reactions, which were joined with those from the past two years to yield a sum of 3,703 reactions (Holmes, 2010). A three-year 'latest response' model implies that solitary the latest reaction will be taken from some random peer. In 2007, reactions developed to 3,069 (Hägg & Wedlin, 2013), yielding 5,101 altogether across the period 2005-7 (Ince, 2007). In any event, considering these increments, if the 190,000 addressed a fitting example from which to gather decisions, the level of self-choice, demonstrated by a 1.6-percent reaction rate, presents a colossal measure of inclination. Peers can enroll decisions on more than one of the Times Higher's five assigned branches of knowledge and more than one geographic locale; no models are given on which to base the judgment. It isn't clear how far the studies

evaluate notoriety that the respondents may have procured from different sources and how far they depend on genuine contact with universities (Huang, 2009).

For the rankings in 2007, Times Higher rolled out a few improvements to the World University ranking methodology (Abernethy & Chua, 1996), explicitly, the utilization of z-scores, change of reference database, change of the peer evaluation.

Maybe, the most un-dubious approach to change the crude relative scores on every one of the six segments making up rankings, and change them into z-scores. This is a method of orchestrating disseminations that are especially fitting when scores are to be consolidated. It is the strategy applied in any modern way to deal with consolidating assessment scores for various subjects that have altogether different reaches. An analysis of the z-score change prior to joining scores to accomplish the last rankings was not made for the Times Higher rankings in 2006. Be that as it may, this change can be made to the scores to explore the impact on the off chance that it had been made at that point. The position request connection coefficient between the z-score ranking and the crude score ranking for the main 100 universities in 2006 is 0.98. This shows an extremely high proportion of in general arrangement between the two methodologies. Just five foundations leave the best 100, however a few establishments would move rankings extensively.

The difference in the information base for references is more dubious for the individuals who have created incredible steadfastness to ISI. ISI/Thomson Scientific is a business activity in the USA that has been created since the 1960s, yet it is likewise a distributor of journals. This evident irreconcilable situation, its US and English language inclination, and its restricted journal inclusion should be thought of. This isn't the spot for a definite thought of the choices that have arisen since 2004 – Scopus, created by Elsevier and Google Researcher – however papers are starting to show up (Kear & Colbert-Lewis, 2011) that show diverse reference results from the three sources specifically fields and there is no unmistakable victor. Times Higher has picked in 2007 to utilize Scopus; this covers extra journals contrasted with ISI and is accounted for to be less one-sided towards English language distributions.

The last significant change in the system for the Times Higher World University Rankings in 2007 has been to 'strengthen measures' to keep peers from deciding in favor of their own foundation (Ince, 2007).

COMPARISON OVERVIEW OF THE RANKING RESULTS

There are striking contrasts in the most recent outcomes from the two systems, while the two rankings favor the English-speaking world, there stay significant contrasts between the rankings in the quantities of establishments from singular nations. This thus influences what district can guarantee the most 'world-class' universities. While North America has the most universities in the best 100 in the two rankings, it is in the runner up to Europe in Times Higher if the main 200 foundations are thought of however holds the principal position in ARWU. The Asia Pacific area is a solid competitor in the Times Higher rankings yet represents just 10% of the ARWU top 200 establishments.

At the degree of individual foundations, the two rankings have seven of the main 10 establishments in like manner in 2007th the best 100 only 56, with a Spearman connection coefficient of 0.62. In 2006, 133 universities showed up in the best 200 in the two rankings; nonetheless, four of which showed up in the best 50 in ARWU were totally missing from the Times Higher Bookstein, (Seidler, Fieder & Winckler, 2010). These inconsistencies and contrasts can't be exclusively ascribed to the way that Times Higher rejects foundations with no undergrad arrangement. The two rankings reflect two unique ways to deal with the undertaking. We examine the situation of individual universities in more detail in the following segment.

Shanghai Jiao Tong University has gained extremely quick headway in the two rankings, as demonstrated. The acknowledgment of this university following the 2003 exposure would seem to have followed rapidly in the Times Higher ranking, with its more prominent dependence on peer survey and a commitment from name acknowledgment. The total figures are not distributed to demonstrate the size of the progressions in the information that prompted such enormous changes in the ARWU positions, yet almost certainly, they were minuscule, since groups of 100 or more foundations have appeared with tied positions.

HOW WELL DO THE TWO METHODOLOGIES REFLECT CHANGES OVER TIME?

In the period 2004-07, the quantity of some universities in the best 100 has continued as before in the ARWU rankings, yet in a similar period has ascended from 13 to 19 in the Times Higher rankings, and from 15 to 19 somewhere in the range of 2006 and 2007. A large portion of universities in the best 100 of every 2006 have an advanced situation in 2007 and six new contestants to the main 100 have jumped somewhere in the range of 33 and 61 spots to their new positions. This brings to the front an issue that had been seen in before rankings (see, for instance, Bagley & Portnoi, 2014), to be specific that the rankings delivered by Times Higher show up substantially less stable from one year to another than those of ARWU.

While the ARWU rankings can be believed to enjoy a benefit of strength (at any rate in the best 100), this can likewise be viewed as made on a very misleading premise, when the make-up of the individual part scores is examined. We have appeared that the incredibly extensive period over which a portion of the ARWU information is cumulated. The couple of Nobel prizes at whatever year will have just a little effect to the score throughout so long period. Essentially, the 20-year time frame to simulate high references prompts a comparative impact. The relationship coefficients between the 2006 and 2007 parts are Graduated class 0.95, Grants 0.95, and exceptionally referred to (HiCi) 0.96. At the point when this mass of chronicled information is likewise considered for its legitimacy in demonstrating a current ranking, there is a reasonable confound. Nobel prizes are credited to establishments of the holder when the prize was granted. This might be not quite the same as both the establishment where the work was done and the current working environment of the holder. The case is comparative for exceptionally referred to creators. ISI distributes this to the institutional assignment given in the referred to paper and not the current working environment of the creator. Consequently, the ARWU accentuates measures that are authentic and whose legitimacy for current quality is in some uncertainty.

Since the Times Higher approach has been refined every year, this might be liable for a portion of the yearly variety. Be that as it may, as we have appeared, the considerable variety somewhere in the range of 2006 and 2007 is just disclosed to a little degree by the progressions to z-scores. As references from ISI/Thomson Scientific utilized by ARWU are not communicated in a similar structure as the Scopus ones utilized by Times Higher, it is preposterous straightforwardly to evaluate contrasts produced by the difference in database. Considering the moderately little weighting of the reference factor in the two strategies (20 percent), it is exceptionally improbable that this factor completely represents the variety.

A portion of the worries about evident 'instability' in the Times Higher tables (Bagley & Portnoi, 2014) may not consider the highlights of rankings. There should be a superior comprehension of the impediments of the choice to communicate the outcomes in position request. The clearest part of rankings is that they pass on less data than different types of scale, in that exceptionally little changes in the fundamental information can create enormous changes in the subsequent rankings. This is a curio of rankings and not really a disappointment of the fundamental technique.

There are further issues concerning the impediments that follow from the restricted precision of the essential segment information from which the rankings are determined. These are communicated to three critical figures on account of ARWU and fundamentally two huge figures for Times Higher. At the point when scores are consolidated and the rankings determined from the subsequent information communicated to three critical figures, numerous tied positions, and changes of rankings follow extremely small changes in the basic information. An elective type of show of the outcomes would be to communicate them as scores, with fitting certainty limits. In any case, it would be significantly harder for easygoing clients of the outcomes to comprehend the discoveries. For any genuine reason, in any case, this ought to be a solid thought.

Seen from an 'infotainment' point of view (Clarke, 2002), the variety appeared by Times Higher might be exceptionally attractive, as the distinctions create interest and conversation every year. Nonetheless, it is barely dependable that there could be such huge changes in institutional quality in such brief time frame periods. This is vital as it risks ruining peer appraisal as a generous supporter of worldwide rankings. Hence this type of companion evaluation ought to be created and made stronger in the event that it is to offer another option and a corresponding way to deal with distinguishing world-class organizations.

The entirety of this leaves rather opens any thought of how much yearly variety in the rankings ought to be relied upon from one year to another and across a period like five years. In the event that any procedure to deliver world rankings was both dependable and legitimate, this would be an excess inquiry as there would then be an assumption that the appropriate response would be observational and rise out of the information. In any case, both of the procedures here have been defined on a hypothetical premise and address impromptu gatherings of information. Without a doubt, both would have been made with some assumption that changes would be exhibited in the rankings step by step. This assumption would be of the progressions in general and not assumptions for specific organizations.

Unmistakably the ARWU is so weighted by authentic information, that it doesn't reflect the current quality or changes well. Any progressions from one year to another are at much lower rankings where changes in the fundamental reference information over a brief period have an impact. Then again, the significant changes in position positions for some foundations every year in Times Higher are probably not going to be really demonstrative of basic changes in quality. They are bound to address changes in the view of the friend commentators and chance variety in their appraisals, mirroring the generous predisposition emerging from a reaction pace of fewer than 2% in any one year.

Changes to marker frameworks ought to be made rarely as each change breaks the coherence of the strategy that gives the premise to a legitimate verifiable examination of changes after some time. Against that, in any case, in the early developmental phases of another pointer framework, it is critical to change the working of the framework so its capacities as expected. In this manner, the framework is adjusted to convey longer-term equivalence of the outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Past academic examinations of the methodologies utilized in university league tables have overwhelmingly centered on public rankings.

Normally, concerns are raised regarding unwavering quality and factual legitimacy. This article adds to and widens the writing by investigating the two-head strategies for creating world-class university rankings, and looks to advance further conversation and examination around here. Issues of dependability, legitimacy, and utility remain. Along with the issues made by the requirement for, and constraints of, globally practically identical information, such issues are unavoidably more mind boggling to determine. In any case, since the multiple Times Higher and

ARWU rankings are still at a developmental stage, it is dire that update and change happens, before the aggregation measures become standardized.

The contrasts between the Times Higher and ARWU approaches could be seen basically as demonstrating contrasts between the exploration execution of universities and a more adjusted perspective on quality presentation. This would make the uprightness of the utilization of two distinct systems. Nonetheless, both have shortcomings that should be tended to before they could be acknowledged as legitimate pointers of the features of world-class universities. Presently, the creation of information is unregulated and there are restricted or differing levels of straightforwardness in both the information assortment and information-examination measures. In the Times Higher ranking, the headings given to peer analysts are uncertain. It was not until the fourth year of activity that actions were 'reinforced' to forestall peers deciding in favor of their own establishments (Ince, 2007), recommending an absence of an examination of their criticism. The job and weighting of peer audit obviously need cautious thought. Grounded renowned universities produce a 'radiance' impact, whereby existing standing keeps on being reused regardless of whether the relative execution has changed (Bagley & Portnoi, 2014).

Notwithstanding the requirement for legitimacy in the rankings by outer clients, if the rankings are to give a motivating force to organizations to advance their position, at that point they should be viewed as substantial and stable. There would be little point in a university supervisory crew trying to improve their university's ranking on the off chance that they didn't respect the factors making up the rankings as markers of fundamental quality cycles. Nor would they be astute to do as such, if the reason for computing the rankings changed from one year to another or if verifiable execution is generously advantaged over current work. The enormous developments in the position places of specific universities from one year to another in Times Higher don't rouse trust in the utility of rankings as a reason for creating heading and system.

Further refinements and upgrades to the introduction of discoveries could be executed, when changes to the current strategies have been focused on. Clarke (2002) suggests that for league tables to expand their utility to clients-past simple 'infotainment' esteem, an online 'all in one resource' could be made, where clients could characterize their own hunts dependent on their own needs. Steps towards this methodology have been taken in Jordan whereby clients can weight measures as per inclination, hindering the utilization of subjective weightings to join the rules into a solitary outcome (Vaughn, 2002).

A comparative framework is probably going to be presented in various other European nations, including Switzerland, Austria, the Netherlands, and Belgium (Bagley & Portnoi, 2014; Salmi & Saroyan, 2007). The selection of factors utilized will impact a university's situation in a league table (Morrison & Magennis, 1995; Clarke, 2002) thus, if clients can choose and weight their own rules, the utility will be improved. We have discovered that while it is feasible to control the information distributed on the Times Higher site utilizing factual programming; the shortfall of supreme figures such as, the quantity of worldwide understudies and staff, extraordinarily restricts straightforwardness and the estimations that can be made. It would exactness of the fundamental information.

Restrictions of the Jordan methodology are that information identifies with singular academic trains as opposed to entire establishments and are just gathered broadly. The ranking of entire establishments accepts that all segments are of equivalent quality, but it is information on the nature of expert territories that partners, including understudies, organizations, and exploration chambers, regularly require. Such control based and expert rankings offer another course for the further advancement of 'world class' rankings, and these are as of now all around created, for instance, in the field of the board training, concerning business colleges (Martins, 2005).

While, Clarke (2002) focuses to the 'infotainment' worth of rankings, the remarkable quality of league tables has significantly expanded somewhat recently. Rankings and league tables have

become 'some portion of the advanced education scene', and their effect presently stretches out past understudy decision to 'organizations' notoriety and ... the conduct of academics, business, and would-be sponsors' (Abernethy & Chua, 1996). Also, the speed of globalization keeps on speeding up, fueling interest in worldwide examinations, and building up the requirement for worldwide intensity. Since the institutional situation in league tables progressively matters, further exploration is required with respect to how philosophies can be improved, to build the legitimacy and dependability of world university rankings.

Note 1 Times Higher Education Supplement was renamed Times Higher Education in January 2008. Rankings discussed in the article were published under the former title.

REFERENCES

- Stella, A., & Woodhouse, D. (2006). 'Ranking of higher education institutions'. *Higher Education Development and Evaluation*, 3.
- Al-Adwan, Y.A., & Zamil, A.M. (2021). Development of theoretical framework for management departments' ranking systems in Jordanian Universities. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 10(1).
- Al-Adwan, A., Yousef, A., & Zamil, A. (2021). "Development of theoretical framework for management departments' ranking systems in Jordanian Universities." *International Journal of Higher Education*, 10(1).
- Al-Bashir, N., Al-Ali, A., & Ahmad, A. (2021). Justice in gradation of female academics in the promotion ladder in Jordanian Universities. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 24(2).
- Yousef, A., Zamil, A., Alheet, M.A., Ahmad, A.F., & Abushaar M.M.M. (2020). The concept of governance in Universities: Reality and ambition. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 13(1).
- Dehon, C., McCathie, A., & Verardi, V. (2010). *Uncovering excellence in academic rankings: A closer look at the Shanghai ranking*. *Scientometrics*, 515-524
- Eccles, C. (2002). *The use of university rankings in the United Kingdom*. *Higher Education in Europe*, 423-432
- Guarino, C., Ridgeway, G., Chun, M. (2005). 'Latent variable analysis: A new approach to University ranking'. *Higher Education in Europe*, 30 (2), 147-165
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2007). *Globalization/anti-globalization: Beyond the great divide*.
- Provan, D., & Abercromby, K. (2000). *University league tables and rankings: A critical analysis*. British Library Document Supply Centre, 21.
- Turner, D. (2005). Benchmarking in Universities: League tables revisited. *Oxford Review of Education*, 353—371.
- Smith, D.A. (1993). *Technology and the modern world-system: Some reflections*. Science, Technology, & Human Values.
- Dill, D.D., & Soo, M. (2007). *Academic ranking of World Universities – Methodologies and Problems*. Institute of Higher Education.
- Hazelkorn, E. (2015). 'Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for World-Class Excellence'. *Economist*, T. (2005). The best is yet to come. *The Economist*, 376, 8443, 20.
- Bookstein, F., Seidler, H., Fieder, M., & Winckler, G. (2010). *Too much noise in the times higher education rankings*. *Scientometrics*, 295-299.
- Moya-Anegón, F., Vargas-Quesada, B., & Herrero-Solana, V. (2004). *The rise and rise of citation analysis: A new technique for building maps of large scientific domains based on the cocitation of classes and categories*. *Scientometrics*, 61, 129-145.
- Federkeil, G. (2002). Some aspects of ranking methodology--The Che-ranking of German Universities. *Higher Education in Europe*, 4, 389-397
- Moed, H.F. (2017). A critical comparative analysis of five world university rankings. *Scientometrics*, 967-990.
- Morrison, H.G., & Magennis, S.P. (1995). Performance indicators and league tables: A call for standards. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 49(2), 128-145
- Aguillo, I., Bar-Ilan, J., Levene, M., & Ortega, J. (2010). Comparing university rankings. *Scientometrics*, 243-256
- Hägg, I., & Wedlin, L. (2013). Standards for quality? A critical appraisal of the Berlin principles for International rankings of Universities. *Quality in Higher Education*, 3, 326-342
- Ince, M. (2007). Fine tuning reveals distinctions. *Times Higher Education Supplement*. *World University Rankings Supplement*, 9(7).
- Salmi, J., & Saroyan, A. (2007). *League tables as policy instruments: Uses and misuses*. Higher Education Management.
- Vaughn, J. (2002). 'Accreditation, commercial rankings, and new approaches to assessing the quality of university research and education programmes in the United States. *Higher Education in Europe*, 4, 433-441.

- Shin, J.C., Toutkoushian, R.K., & Teichler, U. (2011). *University rankings: Theoretical basis, methodology and impacts on global higher education*.
- Merisotis, J.P. (2010). *Summary report of the invitational roundtable on statistical indicators for the quality assessment of higher/tertiary education institutions: Ranking and league table methodologies, higher education in Europe, 4*, 475-480
- Ioannidis, J.P.A., Patsopoulos, N.A., & Kavvoura, F.K. (2007). International ranking systems for universities and institutions: A critical appraisal'. *BMC medicine*, 5, 30.
- Frenken, K., Heimeriks, G.J., & Hoekman, J. (2017). 'What drives university research performance? An analysis using the CWTS Leiden Ranking data'. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(3).
- Mok, K. (2005). 'The quest for world class university'. *Quality Assurance in Education*, ISSN: 0968-4883.
- Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. Book, Available: <https://boos.google.jo/>
- Fernández, L., Fernández, S., & Rey, L. (2018). Innovation in the first mission of Universities. *Journal of Innovation Management*. ISSN 2183-0606. *Libraries*, 72(8).
- Martins, L.L. (2005). *A model of the effects of reputational rankings on organizational change*. Organization Science.
- Clarke, M. (2002). Some guidelines for academic quality rankings. *Higher Education in Europe*, 27(4).
- Dobrota, M., Bulajic, M., & Bornmann, L. (2016). *A new approach to the QS University ranking using the composite I-distance indicator: Uncertainty and sensitivity analyses*, 67(1), 200-211.
- Abernethy, M.A., & Chua, W.F. (1996). A field study of control system "redesign": The impact of institutional processes on strategic choice. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 13(2), (569-606).
- Liu, N.C., Cheng, Y., & Liu, L. (2005). *Academic ranking of world universities using scientometrics-A comment to the "Fatal Attraction"*. *Scientometrics*, 64(1), 101-109
- Weingart, P. (2005). *Impact of bibliometrics upon the science system: Inadvertent consequences?* *Scientometrics*, 117-131
- Holmes, R. (2010). The THE-QS world university rankings, 2004-2009. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 6, 91-113.
- Kear, R., & Colbert-Lewis, D. (2011). *Citation searching and bibliometric measures: Resources for ranking and tracking, College & Research*.
- Pompeu, R., Marques, C., & Braga, V. (2005). The influence of University social responsibility on local development and human capital. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Human Resource Management*, 7.
- Huang, S. (2009). 'Factors influencing the stability and instability of International rankings in higher.
- Lindblad, S., & Lindblad, R.F. (2009). Transnational governance of higher education: On globalization and International University ranking lists. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 108(2), 180-202.
- Bagley, SS., & Portnoi, L.M. (2014). Setting the stage: Global competition in higher education. *New Direction for Higher Education*, 5(11), 168.
- Zhu, X. (2018). Service quality and intercultural adjustment: Exploring and comparing the perceptions of International students and academic staff of a UK Russell Group University. *University of Southampton Institutional Repository*.
- Zamil, A.M.A., & Yousef, A.A. (2020). The impact of accreditation of higher education institutions in enhancing the quality of the teaching process. *Journal of Talent Development and Excellence*, 12(3).