

# THE COMPETITION BETWEEN GLOBAL UNIVERSITIES FOR WORLD-CLASS RANKING

**Eyad A. Shaban, Al-Ahliyya Amman University**  
**May Mousa Ahmad, Al-Ahliyya Amman University**

## ABSTRACT

*Due to the noticeable growth in the number of students, the number of higher education institutions, and the variance of their objective too, it has become hard to consider them as a homogeneous group. Prioritization of activities and choice of objectives have turned into a focal concern. At the same time, globalization leads to rising competitive pressures on institutions, in particular related to their position on global university rankings, for which their research performance is almost exclusively the measure. In this research will argue what is their impact on institutional behavior and strategy in order to avoid an adverse effect on diversity, rankings should only be used within defined groups of comparable institutions (classifications) and that the development of indicators to measure performance areas other than research needs to be developed.*

**Keywords:** Global University Rankings, World Class, Globalization, Research Performance

## INTRODUCTION

Worldwide rankings are making a furor any place or at whatever point they are distributed or referenced. Legislators routinely allude to them as a proportion of their country's economic strength and interests, colleges use them to help set or characterize targets planning their exhibition against the different measurements, while academics use rankings to support their own proficient standing and status. Which began as a customer item focused on undergrad homegrown understudies has become both a sign and driver of worldwide rivalry and the fight for greatness. To endure, higher education institutions are utilizing rankings to help deliberately plan, set targets, and characterize needs. Is it accurate to say that they are acting unreasonably?

In light of a worldwide review (2006) and broad (2008), this research gives a similar examination of the effect and impact of rankings on higher education, institutional encounters and reactions, and investigates how the more extensive public and worldwide climate shapes institutional dynamic and conduct. As such, strategy matters.

## GLOBALIZATION, RANKINGS AND PUBLIC POLICY

The development from horticultural to mechanical to information creation has changed each part of society, around the world. Across the OECD, there is a solid affirmation that the change to more information-based economies, combined with developing contest from non-OECD nations requires uplifted limit and the ability to make, spread, and endeavor "logical and mechanical information, just as other scholarly resources, as methods for improving the development and efficiency" (OECD, 2004). Information has become the establishment of economic, social, and

political forces. However, numerous nations face troubles related to sharp segment shifts proved by the turning gray of the populace and an accompanying decrease in understudies, particularly Ph.D. graduates. The "scramble for students" (Miller, 2009) or "battle for brainpower" presently supplements customary international battles for characteristic assets (Wooldrige, 2006). Nations with significant degrees of worldwide understudies' profit by the commitment they make to homegrown innovative work, while those with low numbers think that it's more troublesome... to gain by this outer commitment to homegrown human resources creation (OECD, 2007). The worldwide contest is reflected in the rising importance and prevalence of rankings that endeavor to quantify the ability to get the limit of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

While the prompt notoriety of rankings has been credited with fulfilling a "public demand for transparency and information that institutions and government have not been able to meet on their own" (Huisman, Meek & Wood, 2007), these clarifications don't completely clarify the practically immediate and widespread underwriting and fixation on either the Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Positioning of World Colleges (consequently SJT, 2003), or the Times QS World College Positioning, (2004). Not long after distribution, a significant EU meeting was informed that Europe was "behind the US as well as different economies" (Proulx, 2011). This appraisal depended on the main SJT positioning which had shown just 10 European colleges among the best 50 contrasted and 35 for the US. In resulting years, it has been trailed by various other administrative and institutional professions and promises and infrequent hand-wringing and brings.

The appearance of both the SJT and the Times QS was surprisingly all planned and propitious, but apparently, worldwide rankings were an item whose opportunity had arrived. They supplement the overall change in open strategy described by less government mediation, more noteworthy institutional administration and financial responsibility, market-drove quality confirmation and accreditation, and various leveled mission separation (Luijten-Lub & Van der Wende, 2005). As an indication or relic of globalization, rankings seemed to arrange worldwide information and to give meaning or a "conceivable" (Vaira, 2004) system or a focal point through which the worldwide economy and the public (and supra-public) situating can be perceived – and reconsidered. All things considered, governments – lawmakers and service authorities – across the OECD, and past, follow rankings intently. While hesitant to recognize the degree to which rankings give the legitimization, reasoning, or potentially proof for strategy and dynamic, they are restless to develop, fortify, and additionally secure the worldwide status of their colleges. To lose status can be embarrassing for countries and institutions the same (Huang, 2007; Altbach & Salmi, 2011).

Globalization has changed the connection between higher education and the state, yet it is additionally changing the connection among institutions, and among institutions and society. Instead of the old deal wherein HEIs were "to a great extent allowed to do as they pick, financed yet not obstructed by a thankful express", their exercises are presently tied straightforwardly to public economic achievement (Vargas, 2017). By featuring reputational separation, rankings have influenced all HEIs – even institutions which had recently been protected by history, mission, or administration. High-positioned, and not-positioned, worldwide confronting and territorially centered, all institutions have been brought into the worldwide information market, testing supporting suppositions about (mass) higher education. Regardless, of whether inside or between nations, rankings are changing all HEIs into key partnerships, occupied with positional rivalry, adjusted delicately between their current and their favored position. By seeming to reinforce or give perceivability to certain institutions, rankings have additionally uncovered seen shortcomings – at

the framework and institutional level. To succeed, or even endure, requires critical changes in the manner by which HEIs lead their undertakings. Notwithstanding analysis of the methodological legitimacy of specific markers or the weightings ascribed to them, rankings have gotten a (advantageous and opportune) strategy instrument and the executive's apparatus.

This research gives a near investigation of institutional reactions and vital decisions drawing upon a 2006 global review, and meetings with HE pioneers, personnel, understudies, and partners during 2008. Some nations share few basic qualities and encounters: I) the presence of a public positioning framework, ii) serious difficulties to the notable and hypothetical worldwide situation of every nation, iii) government strategy has tried to change/rebuild higher education in light of raising rivalry, for example public rivalries/benchmarking, greatness drives, and internationalization, and iv) internationalization has been recognized as a superb objective. Their encounters empower a more extensive comprehension of the effect and impact of rankings, past that of individual institutional conduct. The paper is coordinated as follows:

- Part 1 recognizes the notable attributes of the effect and impact of rankings on higher education,
- Part 2 moves the conversation to a more extensive level and thinks about some institutional and strategy decisions.
- The conclusion gives a short synopsis and thinks about the ramifications.

### **IMPACT AND INFLUENCE OF RANKINGS**

At first school guides satisfied a public assistance job pointed toward aiding and advising college understudies and their folks. They were normally created by media associations or autonomous offices and appraised and sporadically positioned HEIs utilizing a blend of subjective and quantitative data. Additional time they fostered a backing or public bookkeeping job, re-deciphering government and other public information or creating bespoke reviews on, inter alia, research efficiency, and instructing and learning into a positioning, with or without weightings joined to the different markers. By viably naming-and-disgracing, rankings brought a serious dynamic into the public framework which was seen to (decidedly) impact institutional conduct and accordingly improve quality. Both the Australian Public Association of Understudies study (NUS, 2007) and government Educating and Learning Asset were seeing to boost conduct, for example assigning/redirecting assets to understudy administrations or intently observing educating. Worldwide rankings were the following intelligent advance, but they moved thoughtfulness regarding solitary measurement – research. Today, rankings awareness is on the ascent all throughout the planet sped up by greatness drives, moving public segment profiles, understudy, and expert portability, public conviction that rankings are likened with quality and an incentive for-cash, and media inclusion of the outcomes.

Given this situation, it isn't amazing that more than a large portion of the respondents (58%) to the 2006 overview were so disillusioned with their present position that 93% and 82%, individually, said they need to improve their public or worldwide position. Furthermore, despite their methodological concerns or its numerical difficulty – 70% communicated a wish to be in top 10% broadly and 71% in top 25% universally (Westerheijden, Federkeil & Cremonini, 2011). HE pioneers accept rankings are digging in for the long haul and they have minimal other option however to consider them since others do.

Higher education generally accepts that rankings empower institutions to construct, keep up, or raise their standing and profile (broadly and universally); that successful undergraduates use rankings to waitlist institutional decisions, particularly at the postgraduate level; that partners use rankings to impact their choices about subsidizing, sponsorship, and worker enrollment; and that high rankings bring advantages and benefits. A high position is viewed as self-propagating once accomplished, however there are likewise disadvantages. The danger might be monetary – for instance, over-reliance on global undergraduates – however by a wide margin, and away the most significant is reputational hazard.

Across OECD nations, the effect of rankings on higher education shares various remarkable highlights which have been very much reported (Proulx, 2007; Taylor & Braddock, 2007).

1. The marketization of higher education has changed undergraduates into astute buyers. Rank has become an issue of self-pride and friend regard or the opposite. Basically, there are four classifications of undergraduates, undergrad, and postgraduate, homegrown, and global undergraduates, every one of which utilizes rankings in an unexpected way.

- Domestic college undergraduates generally go to a neighborhood college, yet relying on conditions and decision this could be inside their city or the following Lander. They utilize a blend of nearby knowledge, neighborhood rankings, -the more troublesome a college is to enter, the better it supposedly is. For the majority of homegrown undergraduates, positioning cognizance rises while at college, generally as a result of inside correspondences from the President, faculty, brochures, or discussions with peers.

- International college undergraduates establish a moderately little level of the undergraduate companion, aside from those spending either a semester or year abroad. These choices are typically made based on institutional organizations, but inside the decision accessible, a few undergraduates do consider reputational factors which could conceivably have been gotten from worldwide rankings. Full-time worldwide undergraduates are bound to settle on their decision dependent on nearby knowledge and family associations, in spite of the fact that residency prerequisites may likewise be a factor.

- Domestic postgraduate undergraduates are probably going to have gotten aware of rankings while at college and are probably going to utilize them to educate their postgraduate decision. While they do settle on more unpredictable decisions' dependent on their field of specialization and skill of personnel, they are acutely sensitive to the apparent after-deal worth of their capability. Successful postgraduate is progressively prone to travel either inside their country or to another country.

- International postgraduate undergraduates are the significant clients of worldwide rankings. They use rankings to waitlist a selection of institutions, sometimes inside a recognized nation. Like their homegrown partners, global undergraduates are particularly cognizant that institutional position communicates social and cultural capital which resounds with family, companions, and expected businesses. This is especially basic for Asian undergraduates eventually looking for work in their nation of origin.

In rundown, undergraduates are probably going to utilize rankings to help short-list or check their decision as opposed to decide their decision, albeit this seems subject to capacity and sociocultural yearnings. Those looking for proficient work, for example medication and law or an academic vocation show up touchier to institutional status than undergraduates in other/more up to date trains, for example media/news coverage or human sciences. Undergraduates are especially

delicate to media inclusion and exposure: we have one college which has endured a precarious drop in enrolments universally and this is a direct result of awful exposure...

Thusly, segment changes and speeding up contests have constrained HEIs and governments to utilize rankings to target specific kinds of understudies. New refined advertising/enlistment procedures are being created to charm successful understudies with appealing monetary and grant bundles, regularly with different advantages, including monetary help, admittance to specific offices, and so on at the postgraduate level, HEIs are probably going to utilize rankings to short-list candidates. Moreover, governments are tying study-abroad grants to specific HEIs.

2. Rankings advise vital reasoning and arranging. They are a thing on the plan of most senior chief gatherings, and most of HEIs embrace some type of investigation typically drove by the Bad habit Chancellor/President however every so often by the Administering Body.

Most institutions use rankings to distinguish an aspiration, set an objective or benchmark, specifically picking markers for the board purposes. These measurements are painstakingly dissected and planned against real execution to recognize qualities and shortcomings, put out essential objectives, characterize targets/key execution markers (KPIs), and help asset assignment. Thus, the measurements fix focuses for singular office/units and relying on execution, impact asset distribution. Subsequently, rankings give the proof, legitimization, or reasoning for rolling out critical improvement, accelerating change or seeking after a specific plan. It permits the board to be more systematic less an administration device yet a bar for the executives' back.

For some HEIs, rankings have taken on a QA work, particularly in nations where QA instruments are generally new or frail. This may mirror an absence of public trust in institutional-based appraisal. In like manner, HEIs are focusing harder on understudy fulfillment, the nature of the educating/learning climate and offices, support for understudy committees, and so on. Albeit various cycles, there is a nearby connection between expert accreditation and rankings, and they share comparable properties. The previous is progressively seen as indispensable for specific orders, for example business, designing, and some clinical wellbeing sciences. Accreditation measures maps easily against rankings rules – like the number and level of workforce, distribution rates, staff/understudy proportion, and so forth the previous additionally gives a comparative QA and global worth imprint; institutions without fitting accreditation in those fields for which proficient acknowledgment matters may end up progressively confined.

3. Rankings are impacting the re-association or re-organizing of higher education institutions. This may incorporate consolidating discipline viable however particular offices, combining entire institutions by and large in a similar locale/city, fusing outside associations inside the area institution, or, in actuality, isolating undergrad and postgraduate movement through the making of semi-self-governing examination establishments/Foci of Excellence or Graduate Schools. To be sure, the last is a widespread subject. The goal isn't simply more noteworthy efficiencies however more prominent perceivability through minimum amount: more dynamic scientists working in groups, winning more aggressive assets and delivering more evident yields, with public/worldwide accomplices, in a convenient design. In nations where English isn't the local language, the accentuation is on making the above as English-language units.

HEIs are improving, pulling together or creating affirmations, showcasing and exposure exercises into all year proficient workplaces with quickly growing spending plans and staff. Numerous HEIs are intensely associated with participation at understudy fairs in key Asian urban areas and broad publicizing. A completely resourced institutional arranging and exploration office

is de rigueur. Practically half of worldwide respondents and 35% of US presidents utilize their position for exposure purposes (Hazelkorn, 2007; Li, Shankar & Tang, 2011), featuring (positive) results on their page, in discourses, at new workforce or understudy direction or global gatherings, or while campaigning government.

An arbitrary gander at HEI website pages and key plans delineates the degree to which numerous institutional aspirations are communicated as an assigned positioned position. These advancements relate to huge modernization and professionalization of academic administrations, and a development in managerial contrasted and academic posts.

4. There is developing proof that rankings are impacting needs, including educational plan: a development in the (English-language) subject matters expert/proficient Bosses projects to draw in worldwide understudies, adjusting or fitting projects, or suspending programs which don't decidedly influence graduation rates. Notwithstanding, the greatest changes are evident in balancing educating/exploration and undergrad/postgraduate action, and re-centering asset allotment towards those fields which are probably going to be (questionably) more useful, better entertainers, and pointer delicate/responsive. Despite what sort of HEI, the message is clear: research matters all the more now, not more than educating fundamentally but rather it makes a difference all the more right now.

Human expressions, humanities, and sociologists feel particularly powerless (The simplest method to help rankings is to murder the humanities), especially in institutions with a solid presence in the biomedical and different sciences – yet this may likewise apply to other non-clinical wellbeing callings. Proficient orders, for example designing, business, and education, which don't have a solid practice of companion explored distributions, are likewise under tension. There is little uncertainty that HEIs are thinking about the expenses related with staying in fields/disciplines which are considered less fundamental to their profile or perform ineffectively on near pointers. Their decision is boosting the exhibition of solid zones and maybe reallocating procured assets to more fragile regions later, bringing more vulnerable regions up to the level of the solid or shutting them down. While there is inadequate verification of an inescapable development out of specific fields there is a lot of proof of the (relative) reinforcing high science zones. This is being refined either straight by utilizing the President's uncommon asset to dole out extra staff to specific units or building new committed labs and different offices or in a roundabout way by compensating those divisions which are particularly useful or secure excellent financing.

5. The academic calling is going under extraordinary strain to modify the manner by which it has customarily performed. Rankings are frequently deconstructed down to the departmental level and used to distinguish both best performers and under-performers. All over the place, staff execution is being connected to the kinds of measurements that drive rankings.

Institutional self-governance has empowered the presentation of market-based compensations, merit/execution pay, and alluring bundles to be utilized to remunerate and charm successful researchers. Enrollment accentuation is on mid-vocation researchers, and some dread this may affect contrarily on post-docs, more youthful researchers, and ladies. Simultaneously, personnel are not blameless casualties. They rush to utilize rankings to support their own proficient standing and, as one individual expressed, are to be probably not going to consider research organizations with a lower-positioned college except if the individual or group was outstanding.

At long last, while rankings were at first evolved to advise college understudies and their folks, rankings cognizance currently stretches out to a wide scope of outer partners including

government and policymakers, managers, donors, and private financial backers, graduated class, mechanical accomplices, and other academic associations. Most governments are careful about demonstrating the degree to which rankings educate genuine choices yet energetically recognize that rankings – as a marker of global seriousness and execution – to advise strategy, anyway by implication. The different greatness drives are a perfect representation (Wang, Cheng & Liu, 2012). Graduated class, givers, and mechanical accomplices allude to rankings as a sign of the worth of their relationship or likely to profit from the venture. SMEs and nearby bosses have a verifiable positioning dependent on their own encounters, which is self-sustaining albeit bigger/worldwide organizations and expert associations are more efficient. They will in general utilize rankings as a short-posting gadget to candidates experience a discriminatory constraint.

## NATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIC CHOICES

The connection between higher education institutions, public approach and worldwide cycles is an unpredictable one. Are HEIs hapless casualties, rocked by strategy choices, carried out by a similarly defenseless state or does globalization simply open up a "entire exhibit of new freedoms" (Luijten-Lub & Van der Wende, 2005) or is the appropriate response some place in between? As indicated by (Shah, Nair 2016), in spite of changes in administration, public governments keep on having a significant job in characterizing the principle destinations of the higher education framework, deciding the instruments with which to accomplish those goals, and the standards for evaluating the presentation of those instruments. In any case, the cycles and occasions affecting on and impacting both state and institutional conduct and activities are progressively aggressive, and rise above public lines. The working climate is formed, just as obliged, by an intricate dynamic including worldwide, public and neighborhood specialists, which (Welsman, 2009) call a "glonacal agency heuristic". Contingent on mission and different variables, HEIs are progressively transnational or worldwide entertainers broadening their impact across the world. Watchman's jewel of "upper hand" adds another measurement; by featuring the basic part of institutional procedure/decision, HEIs are followed up on as well as are information concentrated businesses imparting attributes to comparable entertainers (Doorman, 1990). There is a menu of conceivable institutional or endeavor systems and strategy decisions that are darkened by the less difficult one-dimensional structure. To reword Best: every HEI endeavors to foster a particular procedure; however every HEI works inside a public and progressively worldwide higher education framework (Helen, 2005). This part analyzes the transaction among public and institutional vital alternatives.

## POLICY OPTION

What do we have to accomplish by 2013? Two colleges positioned in the main 20 around the world (Wheeler-Bellm, 2017).

This is the chance for a greater number of our colleges to arise as a-list institutions. A greater number of our colleges should mean to be inside the main 100 universally and I might want a portion of our colleges to seek to the best 10 (Diocesan, 2007).

Rankings have become (questionably) a significant estimation of worldwide seriousness and public economic strength. Notwithstanding SJT's over-dependence on research markers or the Times QS' inclination for notoriety (apparently another pointer of exploration), governments, and

policymakers are believed to be more receptive to worldwide as opposed to public rankings. Rankings are utilized to support government appeals about being more serious and receptive to the commercial center and clients, characterizing a particular mission, being more effective or useful, and turning out to be elite. The fight for top notch greatness has melded public and institutional needs and changed worldwide rankings from a benchmarking device into an essential instrument. This has direct ramifications for the manner by which strategy desires and drives are drafted – and deciphered by institutions.

These advancements have incited a wide-going discussion on the (mass) higher education, and whether exploration and examination preparing (Ph.D.) speculation ought to be concentrated "through substantially more focused subsidizing of examination foundation in [one or two] high-performing institutions" or "backing for a vague number of high-performing research escalated colleges" or "backing for superb execution, any place its institutional setting" (Survey of HE, 2008). Indeed, even the term first class causes pressures, inciting recollections of ongoing nation history. Issues related to late improvement imply that this methodology definitely incites Matthew Impact allegations since they depend on lose-lose suppositions about subsidizing – except if, obviously, more assets can be placed into the framework. There are likewise suggestions for local institutions and variety, with political contrasts arising inside and between parties about how to offset greatness drives with help for great quality colleges in the nation over. These distinctions are best represented in Australia since the new difference in governments (Gilliard, 2008).

The system is supported by the conviction that contest will drive vertical (reputational chains of importance) and flat (useful) separation compelling HEIs to practice and zero in on specialty fields of ability. Those in favor highlight proof that the different paired or public/private divisions in some countries are as of now shrinking ceaselessly, while others propose that contest without anyone else empowers copy-cat activities except if strategy effectively energizes variety of mission (Van Vught, 2009). Australia may decide to part subsidizing for higher education from research/advancement officially at the government level for example separate services, as the UK has as of late done. In this and comparable examples, two corresponding methodologies may be arising: Seek after mission separation by services of education by means of focused financing and seek after research greatness by services of big business development through serious subsidizing. Another system is to interface rankings with institutional agreements or compacts, similarly that QA or accreditation measures may be utilized to both characterize/affirm separated missions. For this situation, rankings go about as a semi financing instrument.

Governments have been substance to unobtrusively excuse the job that rankings have played in speeding up the contest between HEIs while disputing from the real idea or cycle. They have been disparaging of what they see as all HEIs needing to dominate in research and of mission float. In looking to switch this pattern, a few governments have tried to split apart educating and exploration as though they were selective traits, and afterward were confounded that the outcomes didn't deliver the expected polarity. However, none of this should come as an unexpected when there is little proof of elective qualities. The impact has been apparently to subvert variety and support the standing race.

## INSTITUTIONAL OPTIONS

Strategy center around rivalry and elite greatness implies that not very many HEIs can overlook the quarrel related with rankings. While most HE pioneers rush to say they are not

constrained by rankings, they are utilized as a sort of method to improve performance...it's undecided circumstance to this contrast from one college to another contingent on the mission and goal. Others are more straightforward:

The most intelligent reaction is to distinguish those pointers (for example research in the SJT or notoriety in the Times QS) which are most effortless to impact, and to set corresponding focuses for various units and levels of the association. It is doubtful that the entirety of the activities underneath can be credited straightforwardly to rankings as unmistakable from ordinary serious variables, better proficient association, or quality improvement, yet there is a solid connection among them and explicit pointers.

The least complex and most expense unbiased activities are those that influence brand and institutional information, and decision of distribution or language. Most non-local English HEIs are caught up with urging their personnel to distribute in English language profoundly referred to/worldwide journals and guaranteeing that a typical institutional brand is utilized on all academic distributions. The last is particularly basic for HEIs which have as of late combined various associations/units every one of which conveyed a different character or logo. Furthermore, precise information assortment – regardless of whether the center is research yield or worldwide understudy numbers – is viewed as imperative. The point is to guarantee that all movement is caught by the positioning associations and precisely reflected the [research yields; worldwide personnel/students]. After this, the costs rise – possibly dramatically.

Since rankings reward (more seasoned and) bigger thorough institutions – by amassing yields – size matters; appropriately, institutional rebuilding and especially the rearrangement of examination including the making of exploration establishments and graduate schools – frequently with uncommon or focused on speculation – is inescapable across higher education [research yield, research quality/reference index]. Late changes to the SJT do mean to control for this, yet doesn't militate against their general benefit. Furthermore, a large portion of this movement will in general support the sciences since this action is best caught in universally, openly accessible and certain information bases, for example Skopus or Thompson ISI [research yield, research quality/reference index]. Numerous HEIs are creating/growing English-language offices and limit through the enrollment of global researchers and understudies [research yield, nature of workforce and worldwide personnel/students]; improving promoting and thus peer information on the institution through costly/broad notice highlights, for example in Nature, polished handouts, or showcasing visits [peer examination, nature of faculty], compensating personnel and PhD understudies who distribute in exceptionally referred to diaries [research output], and looking to decidedly influence the staff-understudy proportion [teaching quality]. Institutions wherever are distracted with enlisting all the more successful understudy numbers, ideally at PhD level who like global researchers will be resources in the standing race – a variety of the maxim: greatness in, greatness out [quality of staff, worldwide personnel/understudies, research yield, research quality/reference list, peer examination, graduate employability].

Contriving an intelligent and progressive technique is the consequence of a perplexing arrangement of decisions. HEIs are conflicted between placing assets into updating the educational program or developing examination. Should the association be reconfigured and if so how? What is the most ideal approach to sort out cycles and designs to improve quality, academic execution, perceivability, and additionally proficiency? Should the accentuation be on enrolling successful or HiCi workforce with appealing pay rates and advantages or creating existing personnel – and if the

center is around the previous, do we chance estranging or unsettling the last mentioned? Should rankings be utilized to help improve our essential arranging or characterize our objectives? Would it be advisable for us to converge with another institution or re-coordinate our own institution? What amount do we need to spend? What amount would we be able to bear to spend?

## CONCLUSION

As information has become the critical indicator of current and possible public intensity, worldwide HE rankings have arisen to quantify interest in world science by the quantity of HEIs or order/offices among the best 20, 50 or 100. Since "public pre-distinction is not, at this point enough" (O'Brien, Dyson & Kunc, 2011), an internationalist procedure is presently basic for governments, and for global confronting and provincially engaged HEIs. Nobody is unsusceptible. The speeding-up the steps of this "weapons contest", with its constant "journey for truly expanding assets" (Locke, 2014), nonetheless, presents significant approach difficulties for public governments, and thus higher education.

There is an obvious proof that HEIs are working as essential ventures – utilizing rankings to help characterize targets and put forward essential objectives. In spite of setting contrasts – political system, history, mission, and geology – there are exceptional similitudes between how various sorts of institutions are reacting, the choices they are making and the reasons why. Obviously, rankings are empowering and affecting the modernization and justification of institutions, the professionalization of administrations and marketization of higher education, the exploration mission and fields of examination, educational plan and trains, staff enlistment and new vocation/authoritative courses of action, and understudy decision and work openings. At the point when segment changes are contracting the quantity of (customary) understudies and increasing rivalry, rankings help assemble brand mindfulness.

Rankings are additionally changing the manner in which HEIs liaise and team up with one another, moving past trade projects to worldwide organizations. More prominent institutional self-rule, and for some monetary autonomy, implies HEIs are deciding to benchmark themselves against peers in different nations, and manufacture consortia through which examination and program improvement can happen. While some HEIs compete for high position, for some others simply being referenced is valuable – the more noticeable, the more alluring they are to possible shoppers, regardless of whether they be understudies, expected staff, humanitarians, businesses or other HE accomplices. Fundamentally, even HEIs which are not internationally positioned are influenced/contaminated by the ranking's fixation. They are worried about being disregarded, minimized or by-passed by possible understudies, the government (nearby and public), and different partners. Popular assessment, as communicated and scattered by means of the media, can be particularly savage: the neighborhood papers compose that nearby government ought not to go through more cash for our college.

Globalization is achieving more noteworthy union, however HEIs are installations of the state and public strategy – and their (re)actions mirror those aspirations and worth frameworks. In numerous cases, rankings are being utilized to as a strategy instrument, to coordinate or illuminate drives or go about as a semi-subsidizing component. The most well-known methodology is to look to (further) concentrate assets, generally through a serious interaction, in a little gathering of tip-top colleges which can contend no holds barred with highest-level US institutions. Size matters in this system; numerous government drives are pointed toward empowering consolidations between

institutions, or among institutions and other self-sufficient organizations, for example research foundations or clinics.

Today it is basic for lawmakers and other public pioneers to announce public aspirations dependent on a specific position on either the SJT or Times QS scale. Rankings are making a desire to move quickly speeding up the speed of change and boosting institutional conduct. A portion of these progressions can be seen as a component of the more extensive modernization plan, improving execution and public responsibility, while others can be seen as unreasonable,

For example, reshaping/realigning academic needs and exploration to coordinate with markers, and enlisting just successful understudies.

Since rankings and comparable benchmarking evaluations do impact institutional conduct and execution, the arrangement decisions are basic. Governments need to adjust the destinations of assisting institutions with improving execution and quality; drive research greatness; give better and more straightforward data to understudies, likely understudies and general society; cause financial backer certainty to the general population/citizen; give the premise to prove based approach making; and make more straightforwardness of variety – in light of the fact that the hallucination of a variety can be perilous. The key test is adjusting greatness in world science (counting human expressions, humanities, and sociologists) with an elite higher education framework – open to the largest number of individuals. Utilizing worldwide rankings as the benchmark possibly bodes well if the markers are suitable – something else, governments, and institutions hazard changing their framework and institutions to adjust to measurements planned by others for different purposes.

## REFERENCES

- Luijten-Lub, A., & Van der Wende, M. (2005). On cooperation and competition: A comparative analysis of national policies for internationalization of higher education in seven western European countries. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(2).
- Al-Adwan, A., Yousef, 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, M.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).
- Kalimullin, A.M. (2014). Improvement of teachers' qualification at Kazan federal University. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 30(4), 447-450.
- Yousef, A., Zamil, M.A., Alheet, A.F., Ahmad, M.M.M., & Abushaar. (2020). The concept of governance in universities: Reality and ambition. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 13(1).
- Hou, A.Y.C., Morse, R., & Chiang, C.L. (2012). An analysis of mobility in global rankings: Making institutional strategic plans and positioning for building world-class universities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31(6), 841-857.
- Dufner, B. (2004). *Educating the elite, ministry of education and research*.
- Helen, C. (2005). *University research management meeting the institutional challenge: Meeting the institutional challenge*.
- Vargas, C. (2017). Lifelong learning from a social justice perspective 21. *Education Research and Foresight*, 21.
- Westerheijden, D.F., Federkeil, G., & Cremonini, L. (2011). Ranking goes International: Piloting the CHE ranking of study programmes in Flanders and the Netherlands. *Questioning Excellence in Higher Education*, 175-193
- Huang, F. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the developing and emerging countries: A focus on transnational higher education in Asia. *Journal of studies in international education*.
- Van-Vught, F. (2009). Diversity and differentiation in higher education. *Mapping the Higher Education Landscape*, 1-16

- O'Brien, F.A., Dyson, R.G., & Kunc, M. (2011). Teaching operational research and strategy at Warwick Business School. *INFORMS Transactions on Education*, 12(1).
- Harman, G. (2005). Internationalisation of Australian higher education. *International relations*, 3.
- Jin, G., & Whalley, A. (2007). *The power of information: Do rankings affect the public finance of higher education?* NBER Working Paper
- Enders, J. (2004). *Higher education, internationalization, and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory*, 47, 361-382
- Huisman, J., Meek, L., & Wood, F. (2007). Institutional diversity in higher education: A cross-national and longitudinal analysis. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 61(4), 563-577.
- Jr. Dean, J.W., & Bowen, D.E. (1994). Management theory and total quality: Improving research and practice through theory development. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(3).
- Baird, K. (2012). Trapped in mediocrity: Why our schools aren't world-class and what we can do about it.
- De-Backer, K., Lopez-Bassols, V., & Martinez, C. (2008). *Open innovation in a global perspective: What do existing data tell us?*
- Mok, K.H., & Oba, J. (2007). Paradigm shift or business as usual: The search for new governance in higher education in Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 233-236
- Li, M., Shankar, S., & Tang, K.K. (2011). Why does the USA dominate university league tables? *Studies in Higher Education*, 36, 923-937.
- Morgan, M. (2012). The evolution of student services in the UK, Perspectives: Policy and practice in higher education, 16, 77-84.
- Shah, M., & Nair, C.S. (2016). A global perspective on private higher education.
- Vaira, M. (2004). Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis, *Higher education*.
- MEXT – Ministry for Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2005). *Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities*.
- NUS – National Union of Students. (2007). *NUS NEXT STEPS RANKINGS*, 26.
- OECD. (2004). *Science, Technology and Industry Outlook*, Paris.
- OECD. (2007). *Education at a Glance*, Paris.
- Taylor, P., & Braddock, R. (2007). International university ranking systems and the idea of university excellence. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 3(29), 245-260.
- Altbach, P.G., & Salmi, J. (2011). The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities.
- Wang, Q., Cheng, Y., & Liu, N.C. (2012). Building world-class universities: Different approaches to a shared goal. *Building World-Class Universities*, 1-10
- Wheeler-Bell, Q. (2017). Educating the elite: A social justice education for the privileged class. *Philosophical Inquiry in Education*, 24(4), 379–399.
- Proulx, R. (2007). Higher education ranking and leagues tables: Lessons learned from benchmarking. *Higher Education in Europe*, 32, 71-82.
- Proulx, R. (2011). Using World University ranking to inform and guide strategic policy making: A case study of Canadian Research University. Competition and cooperation among Universities in the Age of Internationalization.
- Grant, R.M. (1991). Porter's 'competitive advantage of nations': An assessment. *Strategic management journal*, 12, 535-548
- Welsman, S.J. (2009). Regional to global enterprise-A collaboration to extend academic work: Helix potential, systemic problems, triple helix vii network of University-industry-government interactive relations. *International Conference*.
- SJT – Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Ranking of World Universities,
- Miller, T. (2009). Formative computer-based assessment in higher education: The effectiveness of feedback in supporting student learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(2), 181-192.
- Times QS University Rankings.
- Teichler, U. (2011). The future of university rankings. *University Rankings*, 3, 259-265.
- Locke, W. (2014). *The intensification of rankings logic in an increasingly marketized higher education environment*.
- Wooldridge, A. (2006). The battle for brainpower. *The Economist*, 5(2).

Zamil, M.A., & Yousef, A. (2020). The Impact of accreditation of higher education institutions in enhancing the quality of the teaching process. *Journal of Talent Development and Excellence*, 123s, Special Issue.