

INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITIES RANKING AND ITS IMPACT ON UNIVERSITIES STRATEGIC GOALS

Ali Mohammad Adaileh, Mutah University

ABSTRACT

This paper orchestrates the qualities of university rankings that cause pressing factor or badgering on universities and investigations potential procedures for activity that can be done in the genuine setting of the three fundamental university rankings (QS, THE, ARWU), proposing the ramifications for the alleged world-class universities and others (which address 95% of the aggregate). Despite the fact that there is debate over the standards of the university ranking frameworks, numerous universities are setting up methodologies pointed toward adjusting to these rules and markers and advancing their positions. This review infers that global university rankings ought not be a significant wellspring of data to consider the nature of universities since this can adversely affect the improvement of medium-and long-term arrangements in higher education and the actual universities. Universities should focus on their mission and should give legitimate and dependable data to all stakeholders about the degree of accomplishment of their objectives.

Keywords: Evaluation, Higher Education, Ranking, University Mission, World-Class Universities, Strategy Design

INTRODUCTION

The effect of university ranking has started to be considered since the presence of worldwide rankings in 2003/2004 (league tables in the United Kingdom). From that point on, a few rankings have been distributed every now and again and examined in the media to advice and impact public opinion, understudy choices, university procedures, and government policies. This blend of results, media data, and public debate produce outcomes that have the right to be thought of. Informative and scholastic interest in university rankings at the global level has expanded altogether. For instance, an inquiry of the term 'university rankings' in the Web of Science data set (WOS), uncovers that just about 2500 scholarly articles have been distributed in English since 2000. Thinking about the time of the making of the vitally global rankings (2003/2004) the quantity of pertinent scientific articles has expanded twelvefold in ten years: from 30 articles in 2004 to 299 out of 2018. This developing presence of rankings in the primary databases of the international scientific literature uncovers that the distribution of university rankings is of undoubted interest to the university's community, just as to society overall. This notoriety of the rankings is fuelled by university managers, and policymakers, just as their beneficiaries (Liu, Wu & Lyu 2021; Balatsky & Ekimova, 2020; Derakhshan Hassanzadeh & Nekoofar, 2020). Be that as it may, these articles contain reactions by researchers and specialists, particularly in regard to methodological issues. This consideration builds their perceivability in political decision-making and attracts considerably more consideration in the media (Valmorbida & Ensslin, 2017). Similarly, higher-status universities' rankings add to scatter this data, to

building up components and constructions of corporate governance between them, making bunches of well-positioned universities, as a feature of a promoting methodology. To summarize, the more apparent these rankings are (even when regarded negatively), the more they are utilized. What's more, they are progressively noticeable.

This ranking data is utilized by universities for various destinations: expanding intensity, making correlations, or arranging key education policy decisions at different levels: worldwide, institutional, and national (Stensaker et al., 2019; Dembereldorj, 2018; Brankovic, Ringel & Werron, 2018). It has been seen that one of the necessities to be considered in the improvement of some university methods and decision-making is for the university to achieve the most elevated conceivable situation in the rankings. This has approach has even been upheld by national policies. For example, the ranking has been seen to be a factor in the acknowledgment of university degrees or in the qualification of foundations for the foundation of two-sided arrangements (Hauptman Komotar, 2019). In particular, rankings have been utilized in cooperation distribution policies for understudies in contexts of high social disparity and separated educational frameworks, expanding the contrasts between understudies who are in a special circumstance contrasted with the individuals who have less educational opportunities (Perez Mejias, Chiappa & Guzmán-Valenzuela, 2018). Rankings additionally assume a definitive part in economic issues, for example, the cost of educational expenses (Tofallis, 2012). There is proof that university rankings are utilized as a marker for policy-making, as estimation as well as just as an objective in itself. For example, the objective is to have a level of the national universities within the top 100 of every one explicit ranking. Nonetheless, if the ranking is simply the objective, what are the targets of the rankings? We can characterize the distribution of a rundown of the best universities, building up correlations among them and showing the most ideal alternatives for understudies' examinations, as the primary goal of university rankings. In this sense, the outcomes distributed in these rundowns influence the two understudies and managers, adjusting their standards of conduct, particularly in choosing the best university to learn at and in improving or keeping up with the situation inside these rundowns.

Considering the effect of the distributions of the rankings in the media, a portion of the manners by which universities can foster explicit methodologies for arriving at a higher position in the rankings are, for instance, advancing understudy versatility, changing the quantities of instructors/understudies and drawing in prestigious visiting professors from international universities. The administration of universities is likewise influenced by these rankings, particularly as far as the requirement for potential resources to arrive at top positions on the rundowns and the compensation of high-ranking university authorities (Hauptman Komotar, 2019).

Plainly, the rankings are influencing the decisions made by universities, administrations, and even understudies. These decisions build up the predominance of universities that show up in the most elevated positions, setting them up as models for the others to follow, though different universities (the larger part) get steady yearly analysis rather than help to improve. In view of this, what then, at that point are these rankings that incite this tension on or provocation of most universities? Considering the presence and effect on the media of these rankings, the reason for this article is to dive further into their adverse consequence, the choices accessible to a

university, and the procedures that a university can embrace, if it is viewed as world-class. In this paper, we will zero in our examination on these two exploration questions: 1. Right off the bat, because of the ranking framework's weaknesses and threats, it doesn't appear to be a helpful situation for universities in general, however, what strengths and opportunities exist? 2. Furthermore, what are the results of this differentiation of universities and what are the universities.

Consequently, the goals of this paper are (1) to orchestrate the qualities of the rankings that cause tension on universities and (2) to dissect and characterize potential techniques for the activity that can be done in the genuine setting of the essential policy of universities. The theory of this review is that the rankings set up inadequate goals for most universities. Hence, this review presents a total amalgamation of the contentions against the utilization of the rankings as a responsibility tool and gives contentions to managers to guard themselves against the criticism of the poor performance of their establishments coming about because of the distribution of these rankings.

METHODOLOGY

This examination depends on a hypothetical methodological approach through an inductive substance investigation of past research contemplates on international rankings in the university field. In this review, a narrative literature audit has been done of scientific articles distributed in English somewhere in the range of 2012 and 2019 from the fundamental information bases: Web of Science, Scopus, and ERIC, with these watchwords in their titles: international ranking* AND university*. Additionally, ongoing reports from the European University Association have been examined. This bottom up perspective creates constructs and hypotheses lined up with the literature (Gupta, Shaheen & Reddy, 2018), and is pointed toward distinguishing, dissecting, assessing, and evaluating the collection of information on a particular theme; for this case, international university rankings.

The rankings can be named national and international rankings relying upon their extent of activity. Right off the bat, national rankings are more cognizant, taking into account that the attributes of universities inside a similar nation are more comparative, like the kinds of understudies, national politics, and so on, and depend on a wide scope of relative markers (consistency rates, graduates' compensations, and so forth) By and by, they have restricted media sway. Furthermore, international rankings, which depend on a couple of accessible pointers and well-qualified judgments, affect society and on public policies, particularly at the national level, especially in those nations where national rankings are not a practice. Albeit national rankings are more precise given the variety of foundations, strategy design, and worldwide debates are depending predominantly on the international ones. This paper is centered on the three primary international rankings since these have greater perceivability and weight in debates and public policies (Brankovic, Ringel & Werron, 2018): World University Ranking (QS), Times Higher Education World University Ranking (THE), and Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), otherwise called Shanghai Ranking.

These three rankings are the most utilized for addressing the concept of international university rankings. This review demonstrates the common parts of these three international rankings, underscoring and featuring the details of every one of them as, in spite of the fact that they have a typical weight and aggregate strategy; it ought to be considered that they utilize various weights and pointers.

The coding system of the summative substance examination depends on the primary classifications of a SWOT analysis: strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, distinguishing and portraying the distinctions and similitudes of these three rankings, as pivotal dialogue investigation and a traditional strategic planning method, to furnish universities with contentions for argumentation. This substance examination has been utilized to recognize common provisions of and contrasts between the three rankings, keeping away from any popularization. This coding works with examination of mind-boggling circumstances and conditions, for example, the university-ranking system, recognizing their inside and outside key components to take on viable procedures and decision-making, as is calling attention to in the conclusions of this paper.

At last, in light of this examination, the principle ramifications of the university rankings for institutional methodologies are portrayed, zeroing in on (1) the defined system of organizations (the world-class universities) and (2) on the institutional mission as a higher education foundation.

GLOBALIZATION

The improvement from agricultural to mechanical to data creation has changed each piece of society, all throughout the world. Across the OECD, there is a strong attestation that the change to more data-based economies joined with developing challenge from non-OECD countries requires inspired limit and the capacity to make, spread, and effort "logical and mechanical data, similarly as other academic resources, as strategies for improving the development and efficiency" (OECD, 2004). Data has turned into the foundation of economic, social, and political powers. In any case, various countries face inconveniences identified with sharp segment shifts demonstrated by the becoming gray of the general population and a going with decline in understudies, especially Ph.D. graduates. The "scramble for students" (Mill operator 2009) or "battle for brainpower" as of now supplements standard global fights for characteristic resources (Wooldrige, 2006). Countries with significant levels of overall understudies' benefit by the commitment they make to local innovative work, while those with low numbers believe that it's more problematic to acquire by this external commitment to local HR creation (OECD, 2007). The overall challenge is reflected in the rising significance and pervasiveness of rankings that undertaking to evaluate the capacity to get the constraint of higher education institutions (HEIs).

Globalization has changed the association between higher education and the country; at this point it is moreover changing the association among organizations, and among establishments and society. Rather than the old arrangement wherein HEIs were to an extraordinary degree permitted to do as they pick, financed at this point not deterred by an

appreciative express, their activities are as of now tied clearly to public economic accomplishment (Vargas, 2017). By including reputational detachment, rankings have impacted all HEIs—even establishments which had as of late been secured by history, mission, or administration. High-ranked, and not-ranked, overall facing and regionally focused, all foundations have been brought into the overall data market, testing supporting notions about (mass) advanced education. In any case, of whether inside or between countries, rankings are changing all HEIs into key partnerships, busy with positional contention, changed delicately between their current and their supported position. By appearing to build up or give perceivability to specific organizations, rankings have moreover uncovered seen inadequacies—at the system and institutional level. To succeed, or even endure, requires basic changes in the way HEIs lead their endeavors. Notwithstanding investigation of the methodological legitimacy of specific markers or the weightings credited to them, rankings have gotten a (beneficial and opportune) system instrument and the chief's device.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

SWOT Analysis for International Rankings

Strengths

The data gave by rankings is helpful to certain beneficiaries (Hauptman Komotar, 2019; Jongbloed, Vossensteyn, & Westerheijden, 2018). First and foremost, for expected understudies and their families, the rankings assist them with picking a proper university dependent on their necessities and interests, regardless of whether inside their nation or abroad. Besides, for governments, on the grounds that the data permits them to make decisions about conceivable political changes and legitimize to the overall population the requirement for potential changes in universities (Stack, 2020). Thirdly, for society, being more educated with regard to decisions taken at the political level and having more dependable information on higher education advances institutional straightforwardness (Taylor, 2020; Balatsky & Ekimova, 2020). Finally, for the actual universities. The aftereffects of the rankings permit these foundations to do inside examinations, to think about how to quantify global achievement, work on institutional practices, and make differentiations between universities.

Opportunities

Rankings add to the quick globalization and disguise of higher education, the increment in the number of university understudies and their portability, the inclusion and investment of the organizations in national and international discussions, and the increment in the coordinated effort among universities and the community (Moed, 2017). These angles are reflected in certain pointers under international viewpoint and industry-income standards like international workforce and understudy ratios or knowledge-transfer activities.

The distribution of rankings likewise powers universities to change their association and conduct (Jongbloed, Vossensteyn, van Vught & Westerheijden, 2018). Besides, at times, they

could give a helpful correlation of universities that are comparative in size, age, or field of specialization (Piro & Sivertsen, 2016), staying away from subjectivity with regard to the qualities of the universities (Shipton & Taweeyanyongkul, 2018). At long last, as respects understudies, rankings giving data independently on every quality measurement, instead of distributing international classifications overall, could be valuable to help an all-around well-informed university decision and, as a result, lead to a decrease in dropout rates, an expansion in human resources production, and surprisingly an improvement in the overall welfare (Pakkan, Sudhakar & Rao, 2021).

Weaknesses

The majority of the weaknesses are identified with genuine methodological angles. In any case, the various actors engaged with university classifications may not be completely mindful of these hardships, or the intricacy of the current cycles and models for the advancement of rankings, despite the fact that they show incredible interest in realizing what position a university is in (Sohail et al., 2020). Each ranking system utilizes various wellsprings of data, some of which are of sketchy straightforwardness (Hou & Jacob, 2017), and evaluate universities as per its own models utilizing indicators that don't cover every one of the exercises that a university can grow, unequivocally zeroing in on the organizations' examinations (Johnes, 2018). For instance, most ranking systems depend basically on research activities (Hammarfelt, De Rijcke, & Wouters, 2017), including indicators, for example, research usefulness, research income, or papers distributed in Nature and Science; leaving to the side different elements of the universities. This is particularly eminent on account of the ARWU, where every one of its pointers allude to the nature of exploration activity. The markers identified with research activity may likewise be centered around specific components to the exclusion of others, for example, the benefits acquired in areas of knowledge like arts, humanities, and surprisingly social sciences, or those distributions of the incredible effect that are not articles in scientific journals.

Teaching, research, knowledge transfer and institutional are the main indicators used in the QS, THE, and ARWU ranking. Each indicator considers many sides such as teaching indicator includes reputation, staff-to-student ratio and employability and their reputation as well. For research indicator covers the research reputation, incomes, Nobel prizes and field medals, publications which contains citations, productivity (papers published and per capita performance) and international collaboration, and finally doctorate element which identified by doctorate-to-bachelor's ratio and doctorate awarded-to-academic staff ratio. Knowledge transfer includes research income and institution earns from industry by innovations, inventions and consultancy. Institutional indicator considers institutional income by general status, infrastructure and facilities, adding to internationalization by attracting students and academic from other nations (Vidal & Ferreira 2020).

Notwithstanding the exploration markers, the evaluation of the nature of university exercises depends on reputation surveys with a huge load in the general score in two systems (70 percent in the QS and 63 percent in THE). In these overviews, academics are approached to recognize the establishments wherein they believe that their own field of specialization is as a

rule best developed. In any case, how would they recover this data about prestige of universities? For instance, THE review in 2017 requested the academics views on (1) The best exploration universities in the world, (2) the best teaching universities in the world, (3) additional best examination universities inside your country, (4) additional best teaching universities inside your country. The sort of inquiry for these reputation markers is 'pick up to 15 institutions in the world (in any request) that you view as delivering the best instructing inside your branch of knowledge'. For the motivations behind this paper just three thoughts should be emphasized. First and foremost, the inquiry is too open in that, whatever the appropriate response is, the most well-known universities will be referenced by a large portion of the respondents. Besides, the absence of examining technique description utilized for the survey infers a high risk of bias. At long last, there are not kidding questions about the expertise of the 'rankers' (Lim, 2018).

Along these lines, the portrayal of universities based on their exploration activity doesn't appear to be totally satisfactory, however correlations dependent on reputation and not on the benefits of the activity just advantage the foundations that as of now pioneers in the rankings and neglect to advance the improvement of the rest (Hammarfelt, De Rijcke & Wouters, 2017). The utilization of delicate information (that is, qualitative information dependent on opinions, ideas, knowledge, experience), and the weighting systems utilized can support some well-known universities in developed nations (Hou & Jacob, 2017; Piro & Sivertsen, 2016).

There is proof that the entirety of the rankings has weaknesses and none of the current rankings is perfect. This reality isn't to recommend dismissing all comparison and public data about them. It involves focusing on analysis and intermittently amending the classifications to adjust them to the reality of universities (Safón, 2019). Another alternative is to expand more valuable classifications adapted to the reality of universities and their missions, utilizing substantial measures and solid information from universities that are not founded on assessment overviews (Hammarfelt, De Rijcke & Wouters, 2017). Regardless of these weaknesses, the outcomes are viewed as strong data to the reason behind being viewed as an unavoidable pointer for national and institutional higher education policies.

Threats

The fundamental threat is the affirmation that numerous significant angles identified with the quality of university education (Kiraka et al., 2020) are not estimated corresponding to other essential values in higher education (Blanco-Ramírez & Berger, 2014) and society, like human resources development (Brankovic, Ringel & Werron, 2018). This suggests a danger of loss of interest in those measurements that are not estimated.

The subsequent threat is question concerning what is truly being estimated: the reputation or the performance of universities. While the first is a social build dependent on perceptions, the subsequent one, that is genuine university activity, is estimated through peer review in which there is information on who is the best. This presentation review of the universities and the subsequent classifications are done by scholastics and alludes to explicit fields of exploration, yet not to the organization overall (Dembereldorj, 2018).

The last threat is the periodical distribution of the rankings, which incites worry in numerous universities about the deliberate assortment of information that permits universities to ascend in the rankings step by step, changing over the means (measurement) into the objective (to be measured). Notwithstanding, after numerous long stretches of reports, we definitely realize that outcomes are entirely steady: the relationship (r Pearson) of results starting with one year then onto the next is up to 0,96 (Fowles, Frederickson & Koppell, 2016b). Along these lines, what we have has been a steady arrangement of magnifying the top universities and of trashing the rest. As an outcome, numerous university chiefs invest their energy reestablishing inner morale and public confidence (Kiraka, 2020), and many ministers utilize the outcomes as an issue of public pride and an appealing offering point to empower internal investment (Kiraka, 2020). The two activities appear to be a waste in time and, by and large, cash.

To put it plainly, the weaknesses and threats of the rankings cast a critical shadow over their strengths and opportunities. Considering that, then, at that point, what are their impacts upon, and the alternatives available to a university? What methodologies can a university adopt, if it is world-class? A couple (world-class) colleges underscore their great outcomes, and numerous others not showing up in the top groups are forced each year to deal with their poor classification.

Ramifications of Global Rankings for World-Class Universities

One of the results of the effect of the rankings is the foundation of a separated system of universities that causes their commercialization (Stack, 2020), particularly on account of the so-called world-class universities. The primary benefits for these universities are that it is moderately simple for them to enlist partners and funders into their cooperative activities (counting economic help from government and business) and to drag in more and better understudies (Pakkan, 2021), and professors, particularly those from different nations since, in some cases, this is one of the pointers included for the rankings (Brankovic, 2018), for example, with 'worldwide to domestic understudy/staff ratios and the global coordinated effort'.

This impact makes the acknowledgment and distribution of ranking data an incredible marketing device for universities, particularly for world-class universities (Ramirez, 2020), just as giving an approach to draw in more resources: understudies, financing, projects, and so on (Ryazanova, McNamara & Aguinis, 2017). Nonetheless, there are different components that also advance the presence of specific universities in the top positions, for example, being in rich and more democratic nations however, most importantly, being straightforward. This perspective ought to be considered in decision-making by governments since, in the event that they increment transparency, they improve the probability that their universities will be considered as a world-class (SARIENE, Rodríguez & de Rosario, 2018). Governments are progressively taking on techniques for giving access to college data as a way to guarantee scholastic quality because of the competitiveness that college rankings produce. These classifications are defended as a productive method for giving data to potential customers (understudies) just as to the foundations and decision makers in regions requiring improvement (Derakhshan, Hassanzadeh & Nekoofar, 2020).

For these world-class universities, the rankings represent an opportunity to stand out from the rest, with consequences for their marketing strategies and alliances. This does not seem to influence their common activity, especially when they are strongly research oriented (Stensaker, 2017), yet they exploit the picture that the rankings give, such as the 'quality' label.

Ramifications of Global Rankings for Other Universities

The rest of the universities are, by definition, most universities. These are excluded not only from the top positions, but also from the reputation race itself. Their mission is not (and is never going to be) under the umbrella of the areas and indicators that are evaluated in the main rankings. This is particularly true in the case of teaching-oriented universities, those that concentrate university degrees on the arts or humanities or those concentrated on local or national social needs. Rankings do not respond to all universities, since only a small percentage (about 3-5 per cent) belongs to the group considered world-class universities (Moed, 2017; Wilson, 2011). Neither do the rankings respond to the complexity of the entire higher education system (Balatsky & Ekimova, 2020), nor can we stop using them or avoid their consequences.

Thus, it is outlandish for most universities (95%) to meet the majority of the prerequisites and rules of the worldwide rankings. This is made more troublesome when they don't cover numerous areas that are within the mission of a university (Hou & Jacob, 2017; Moed, 2017). In the moment that a university doesn't have the mission of being globally excellent with a significant level of research, it can't be very much reflected in the ebb and flow rankings and should surrender to not having a place with the world's top research universities. In any case, this ought not be baffling, while not satisfying its mission as a university ought to be. The openness and effortlessness of the information published in the rankings occupy consideration from universities' moral and political destinations, while its mediation makes a feeling that what is of legitimacy can be progressively requested and undeniably judged (Ajayan & Balasubramanian, 2020). This infers a responsive measure wherein the object of study can be altered because of what one is attempting to measure (Allen, 2017).

All things considered, there are other legitimate higher education values to be commended. For example, in a review completed by (Mussard & James, 2017), understudies, professors, and regulatory staff thought about that the most noteworthy need of universities ought to be to prepare acceptable professionals (78%) and afterward do explore undertakings, knowledge advancement, and development (65%). Mengual-Andrés (2013) centers around the need of the universities to play a functioning role in the conventional accreditation and validation of informal learning. Moreover, inside the so-called Third Mission (Topf, 2021), universities should add to the economic and social advancement of the area in which the college is found (45%), train new residents (35%), and contribute to the decrease of social inequality (34%). Going further, we could take a gander at the association between the training given to understudies at universities and the accomplishment of life objectives by these understudies (Geller, 2018) as the main quality indicator.

So, there are two alternatives. On the off chance that universities concur with the system and the mission behind ranking pointers, they should just keep on making progress toward the

best outcomes in the areas evaluated (Balatsky & Ekimova, 2020); if not, they should characterize and guard their own mission and concede that the top rankings don't react to the entirety of the requirements of the stakeholders and don't think about methodologically either the assortment of missions of every university or the variety of existing establishments (Taylor, 2020). Along these lines, universities might choose to embrace the values that the rankings set up, or to zero in on the mission characterized by the fundamental stakeholders in every foundation, quitting any pretense of utilizing the consequences of the rankings as a vital perspective in their decisions and policies (Pozzi, 2019). In this subsequent choice, it is fundamental that every one of the referenced stakeholders accept its results. This implies that these establishments will not have to invest energy and money clarifying similar adverse outcomes every year. All things being equal, they ought to be aware (and proud) that their organization has a ton of objectives to reach beyond the objectives estimated by the rankings and nearer to the assistance they can provide for society. Universities ought not to stress unduly over the way that rankings are available and their ranking outcomes, particularly if organizations and staff have attempted to accomplish their academic work in the most ideal manner (Vidal & Ferreira, 2020).

CONCLUSION

It appears to be that worldwide rankings are digging in for the long haul and there is sufficient data on how they are developed and who is liable for it. Other than the reactions and negative sentiments they produce, these rankings globally affect universities as far as association, practice, and construction (Aina, Abubakar & Alshuwaikhat, 2019). In this review, the attributes of the rankings that cause universities to be feeling the squeeze and the potential techniques for activity that can be completed in the genuine context were investigated.

Global ranking is an issue for fewer than 5% of universities and, as far as they might be concerned, it is principally an issue of advertising and business, associated with international prestige. In addition, aside from that, we realize that 95% of universities go through resources every year responding to inquiries concerning their 'bad outcomes' and their future techniques to improve in the rankings. Following 10 years of global rankings, neither have important changes been occurring nor will they happen in the main 100 or 200 places, and, in case there are changes in the rest of the rundown, those progressions neither have been nor will be applicable to the effect regions we have referenced. New versions don't give any new pertinent data.

All things considered, the intensity of these rankings can permit universities to draw in understudies, raise funds for their scientific activities, and advance the granting of prizes to educators, and understudies just as commitments to critical discoveries (Pietrucha, 2018), yet the global rankings are hassling or tormenting 95% of universities with the equivalent outcomes year after year. These establishments can't invest energy and money clarifying the equivalent outcomes every year when a few outcomes are self-evident and some are nonsense. These rankings can't make university scholastics, staff, and administrators feel bad for what they are not, and what they are not dispatched to be. Other than that, these rankings are utilized as a source of perspective for significant decision-making (Frenken, Heimeriks & Hoekman, 2017),

to the point that the university's independence, at the assistance of the necessities of society, would be debilitated for private specialists not legitimized to build up the mission of higher education establishments. Angles identified with the Values, purposes and policies of higher education are being saved in the planning of these rankings (Ajayan & Balasubramanian, 2020).

To confront this reality, universities should keep to their pathways notwithstanding media pressures, consider whether they are near their conception of university quality and comprehend the impediments of these classifications. It might happen that these universities are enticed to change their vision, with the ensuing loss of their differential character, if policymakers utilize the rankings to set needs (Wilkins & Juusola, 2018).

As we have shown, these classifications are utilized as a principle reference despite the fact that there is sufficient proof to scrutinize their legitimacy and dependability. A rational utilization of different wellsprings of data, for example, assessment and the management apparatuses in education, can be genuinely helpful in investigating the weaknesses and strengths of the foundation, just as being important for the conversation in essential decision-making and scholastic quality (Taylor, 2020).

It very well may be presumed that we should invest energy and money making better rankings which beat their notable Weaknesses; however there are insufficient resources to figure out how to think about on global bases every one of the elements of these complicated foundations. All things being equal, there is no requirement for such an examination. The issue isn't the measurement tool; however the interest in what is intended to be measured. As a result, universities should consider whether they acknowledge the rankings' concept of university quality or keep to their differential character notwithstanding media pressures. We have attempted to give proof that universities should focus on their mission and should give legitimate and valid data to all stakeholders about the degree of accomplishment of their objectives. Allow us to allow these universities to follow their mission and clarify their accomplishments as opposed to wasting effort and money clarifying their rank in each ranking distributed yearly.

REFERENCES

- Aina, Y.A., Abubakar, I.R., & Alshuwaikhat, H.M. (2019). Global Campus Sustainability Ranking. *Encyclopedia of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 743-752.
- Ajayan, S., & Balasubramanian, S. (2020). "New managerialism" in higher education: The case of United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Comparative Education and Development*.
- Allen, R.M. (2017). A comparison of China's "Ivy League" to other peer groupings through global university rankings. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 21(5), 395-411.
- Balatsky, E.V., & Ekimova, N.A. (2020). Global competition of universities in the mirror of international rankings. *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, 90(4), 417-427.
- Brankovic, J., Ringel, L., & Werron, T. (2018). How rankings produce competition: The case of global university rankings. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 47(4), 270-288.
- Dembereldorj, Z. (2018). Review on the impact of world higher education rankings: Institutional competitive competence and institutional competence. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(3), 25-35.
- Derakhshan, M., Hassanzadeh, M., & Nekoofar, M.H. (2020). A cross analysis of impact university ranking system. *International Journal of Information Science and Management (IJISM)*, 19(1), 87-98.
- Derakhshan, M., Hassanzadeh, M., & Nekoofar, M.H. (2020). A cross analysis of impact university ranking system. *International Journal of Information Science and Management (IJISM)*, 19(1), 87-98.

- European University Association. (2013). Global University Rankings and their impact. Report II. Belgium: European University Association.
- Fowles, J., Frederickson, H.G., & Koppell, J.G.S. (2016b). University rankings: Evidence and a conceptual framework. *Public Administration Review*, 76(5), 790–803.
- 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), 859-872.
- Geller, J., Toftness, A.R., Armstrong, P.I., Carpenter, S.K., Manz, C.L., Coffman, C.R., & Lamm, M.H. (2018). Study strategies and beliefs about learning as a function of academic achievement and achievement goals. *Memory*, 26(5), 683-690.
- Gretchenko, A. I., Nikitskaya, E. F., Valishvili, M. A., & Gretchenko, A. A. (2018). Role of higher education institutions in developing hr potential in a forming innovation economy. *Spaces Magazine*, 39 (21), 13.
- Hammarfelt, B., De Rijcke, S., & Wouters, P. (2017). From eminent men to excellent universities: University rankings as calculative devices. *Minerva*, 55(4), 391-411.
- Hauptman Komotar, M. (2019). Global university rankings and their impact on the internationalisation of higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 54(2), 299-310.
- Hou, Y.W., & Jacob, W.J. (2017). What contributes more to the ranking of higher education institutions? A comparison of three world university rankings. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 16(4), 29-46.
- Johnes, J. (2018). University rankings: What do they really show? *Scientometrics*, 115(1), 585-606.
- Jongbloed, B., Vossensteyn, H., van Vught, F., & Westerheijden, D.F. (2018). Transparency in higher education: The emergence of a new perspective on higher education governance. In *European higher education area: The impact of past and future policies*, 441-454. Springer, Cham.
- Kiraka, R., Maringe, F., Kanyutu, W., & Mogaji, E. (2020). University league tables and ranking systems in Africa: Emerging prospects, challenges and opportunities. In *Understanding the Higher Education Market in Africa*, 199-214. Routledge.
- Lim, M.A. (2018). The building of weak expertise: The work of global university rankers. *Higher Education*, 75(3), 415-430.
- Liu, J., Lin, S., Wu, M., & Lyu, W. (2021). Winning and losing relationship: A New Method of University Ranking in the case of countries along the belt and road. Complexity, 2021.
- Mengual-Andrés, S. (2013). Rethinking the role of Higher Education. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 2(1), 01–02.
- Miller, T., & Shulha, L. (2008, March). Formative computer-based assessment in higher education. In *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference*, 105-111. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Moed, H.F. (2017). A critical comparative analysis of five world university rankings. *Scientometrics*, 110(2), 967-990.
- Mussard, M., & James, A.P. (2017). Boosting the ranking of a university using self-citations. *Current Science*, 113(10), 1827-1827.
- OECD. (2004). Science, Technology and Industry Outlook, Paris.
- OECD. (2007). Education at a Glance, Paris.
- Pakkan, S., Sudhakar, C., Tripathi, S., & Rao, M. (2021). Quest for ranking excellence: Impact study of research metrics. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 41(1).
- Pietrucha, J. (2018). Country-specific determinants of world university rankings. *Scientometrics*, 114(3), 1129-1139.
- Piro, F.N., & Sivertsen, G. (2016). How can differences in international university rankings be explained? *Scientometrics*, 109(3), 2263-2278.
- Pozzi, F., Manganello, F., Passarelli, M., Persico, D., Brasher, A., Holmes, W., & Sangrà, A. (2019). Ranking meets distance education: Defining relevant criteria and indicators for online universities. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 20(5), 42-63.
- Ramirez, F.O. (2020). The socially embedded American University: Intensification and globalization. In *Missions of Universities*, 131-161. Springer, Cham.
- Ryazanova, O., McNamara, P., & Aguinis, H. (2017). Research performance as a quality signal in international labor markets: Visibility of business schools worldwide through a global research performance system. *Journal of World Business*, 52(6), 831-841.

- Safón, V. (2019). Inter-ranking reputational effects: An analysis of the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) and the Times Higher Education World University Rankings (THE) reputational relationship. *Scientometrics*, 121(2), 897-915.
- Sariene, L.S., Rodríguez, M.D.M.G., & de Rosario, A.H. (2018). Exploring determining factors of web transparency in the world's top universities: Exploring the determining factors of web transparency in the world's top universities. *Revista de Contabilidad-Spanish Accounting Review*, 21(1), 63-72.
- Shipton, W.A., & Taweeyanyongkul, K. (n.d.). Institutional Ranking and Related Issues Facing Universities in the 21st Century.
- Sohail, S.S., Siddiqui, J., Shakil, M.T., Ubaid, S., Ahmed, J., & Alam, M.A. (2020). *Sustainable Approach for University Ranking System*, 2021. ICIDSSD.
- Stack, M. (2020). Academic stars and university rankings in higher education: Impacts on policy and practice. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 4(1), 4-24.
- Stensaker, B., Bilbow, G. T., Breslow, L., & Van der Vaart, R. (2017). Strategic challenges in the development of teaching and learning in research-intensive universities. In *Strengthening Teaching and Learning in Research Universities*, 1-18. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Stensaker, B., Lee, J.J., Rhoades, G., Ghosh, S., Castiello-Gutiérrez, S., Vance, H., & Peel, C. (2019). Stratified university strategies: The shaping of institutional legitimacy in a global perspective. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 90(4), 539-562.
- Taylor, G.M. (2020). *Search results: Predicting ranking algorithms with user ratings and user-driven data* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Topf, D. (2021). Inspiring the mission of pentecostal higher education. In *Pentecostal Higher Education*, 127-143. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Valmorbida, S.M.I., & Ensslin, S.R. (2017). Performance evaluation of university rankings: Literature review and guidelines for future research. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 14(4), 479-501.
- Vargas, C. (2017). Lifelong learning from a social justice perspective 21.
- Vidal, J., & Ferreira, C. (2020). Universities under pressure: the impact of international university rankings. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research (NAER Journal)*, 9(2), 181-193.
- Wilkins, S., & Juusola, K. (2018). The benefits and drawbacks of transnational higher education: Myths and realities. *Australian Universities' Review*, the, 60(2), 68-76.
- Wooldridge, A. (2006). The Battle for Brainpower. *The Economist*.

Received: 05-Feb-2022, Manuscript No. JLERI-21-9610; **Editor assigned:** 08-Feb-2022, PreQC No. JLERI -21-9610 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 21- Feb-2022, QC No. JLERI -21-9610; **Revised:** 08-Mar-2022, Manuscript No. JLERI -21-9610 (R); **Published:** 17-Mar-2022.