THE EXPECTATIONS AND THE ACTUAL FRAMEWORK OF UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC RANKING

Ali Mohammad Adaileh, Mutah University

ABSTRACT

University ranking has high open perceivability, the ranking business has prospered, and institutions of higher education have not had the option to overlook it. This investigation of university ranking presents general contemplation of ranking and institutional reactions to it, especially thinking about responses to ranking, ranking as an inevitable outcome, and ranking as a method for changing characteristics into amounts. The researchers present a conceptual framework of university ranking dependent on three propositions and complete a graphic measurable investigation of Jordan also, worldwide ranking information to assess those propositions. The primary proposition of university ranking is that ranking frameworks are differentiated by a serious level of strength, balance, and way reliance. The subsequent proposition joins ranking to institutional characteristic. The third proposition sets that rankings work as an impetus for institutional isomorphism. The end audits some significant new advancements in university ranking.

Keywords: University Ranking, Conceptual Framework, Propositions, Higher Education, Academic Ranking.

INTRODUCTION

Because rankings rearrange, decontextualize, and amplify little contrasts, they can boost directors to concentrate on relative situating instead of progress in total terms. Rankings, when set up, become significant parts of the identity, and those associations favored by rankings deliberately influence them to shape their institutional personality, adding that Ranking frameworks can capacity to hinder variety and advance consistency and normalization.

An age has passed since U.S. News & World Report (USNWR) published its first newsstand guidebook America's Best Colleges in 1983 and Best Graduate and Professional Schools in 1987. Over 10 years has passed since the Shanghai Jiao Tong University Institute of Education first published the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) in 2003. In the resulting years, the college and university ranking business has thrived. "There are three leading global ranking systems plus eight other global rankers of varying significance, and there are over 50 national (U.S, Korea, Germany, Canada, etc.) ranking systems" (Hazelkorn, 2018). University ranking systems have demonstrated mainstream since they empower and formalize correlation. At the university level, it still up in the air, for instance, that a one-rank improvement in the USNWR best colleges ranking prompts a 1 percentage point expansion in the number of candidates for the next year (Meredith, 2004). Since higher education is a significant driver of economic turn of events, university rankings additionally impact national and international competitiveness (Hazelkorn, 2018).

As the university ranking business has flourished, as well, has its investigation. In the early stages of university rankings, research by university faculty would in general study the endeavor (Astin, 1970; Gnolek, Falciano & Kuncl, 2014; Martin, 2002; Altbach & Salmi, 2011). As of late, the investigation of ranking has gotten all the more longitudinally near, more logically refined, and more worldwide (Kehm, 2014; Kette & Tacke, 2014; Frederickson & Stazyk, 2016; Hazelkorn, 2018; Rapoport, 1999; Carraher & Paridon, 2008). Over the long haul,

plainly ranking colleges isn't simply setting down deep roots, it is ending up being both resilient and shockingly persuasive in university strategy and practice.

The ranking of universities is definitely not a particular wonder pertinent just inside the space of higher education. Maybe, the developing remarkable quality of rankings in higher education is best seen inside an expansive setting of present-day requests for "accountability, transparency, and efficiency … and social measures designed to evaluate the performance of individuals and organizations" (Espeland & Sauder, 2007). For sure, rankings, evaluations, and report cards are set up and noticeable segments of drives to work on the proficiency and adequacy of medical care suppliers (Chen, 2011; Emmert, Meszmer & Sander, 2016; Sinaiko, Eastman & Rosenthal, 2012), primary and secondary schools (Hanushek & Raymond, 2006; Kane & Staiger, 2001), public-sector associations (Schwartz, 2014; Frost & Brockmann, 2014), and not-revenue-driven substances (Lee & Nowell, 2015; Wellens & Jegers, 2014), among others. A rich and developing literature in policy implementation studies the functional and hypothetical ramifications of the public's interest for execution estimation. These examinations feature the significant and essentially wide pretended by outer actors in making an interpretation of hierarchical information into applicable and absorbable execution data (Kawasaki, Giannini, Lancman & Sznelwar, 2018; Mittal, 2020) and underscore the expected repercussions of the enormous level of scope and watchfulness going with such endeavors (Mohrman & Baker, 2008; Van de Walle, 2008). In the case of nothing else, the prevalence of rankings noted in these different literatures builds up the developing public craving for such endeavors and accordingly shows that rankings must be disregarded by associations at their risk (Martinez, Farias & Arellano, 2002).

In this article, we depict the rankings of universities to act as an illustration of the social development of the real world and of standardization (Gustafson, 1968; Walk & Olsen, 1989). University rankings force on the luxuriously fluctuated, regularly lopsided, and peculiar universe of higher education positivist suspicions of a request based on formalized orders of quality ranking applies pragmatist presumptions to the frequently vague and dim cycles and goals of universities and the particular attributes of institutions of higher education—public or private, flagship or regional, exploration or instructing, selective or open, huge or small. When standardized, ranking systems "shape the definitions of alternatives and influence the perception and the construction of the reality within which action takes place" (Walk & Olsen, 1995). In the organized setting, activity depends on set up structures, roles, identities, rules, and rehearses and the rationale of propriety or "making sense" of the situation. We first survey three significant elements of university ranking according to the institutionalist point of view: ranking and reactivity, ranking as a self-fulfilling prophecy, and ranking as equivalence (Kette & Tacke, 2014). We then, at that point set out a conceptual framework of rankings in higher education intended to work with academic discussions and discussions, research, and further hypothetical development.

Ranking and Reactivity

Reactivity is perceived as depicting and clarifying how "individuals (and organizations) alter their behavior in reaction to being evaluated, observed, or measured" (Espeland & Sauder, 2007). Ranking and different types of performance measurement and hierarchical assessment get reactions from the people and associations being ranked or measured. By and large, the reactivity is definitely perceived by those declaring rankings as an instrument through which they can endeavor to change conduct toward strategy they favor. For instance, New York State freely positions or "scorecards" the exhibition of clinical specialists utilizing models, for example, death rates. Accordingly, 79% of cardiologists detailed that their choice to "perform angioplasty or to mediate in basically sick patients was affected by likely impacts on their scorecards" (Fernandez, Narins & Ling, 2016, referred to in Espeland & Sauder, 2007). Kondratieva & Ekareva, (2015) tracked down that the use of performance and evaluative

measures in England was vital to gigantic changes in schooling, universities, budgeting, and medical services during the 1980s. So, ranking and rating has become an essential apparatus in the advocacy group toolkit (Coe & Brunet, 2006).

In its college ranking system, USNWR expects to give assessable data to every potential education consumer and to help each in the quest for the best school. USNWR offers no expressions about change in higher education or about considering universities responsible. In any case, the underlying and proceeding with responses to USNWR college rankings have gotten rolling significant institutional changes. It is hard to utilize the language of institutional improvement or headway without reference to proportions of performance and examination, especially correlation by rank. Because of formalized ranking systems, both the substance and the language of quality in higher education have been diminished to worked on proxies of quality: rank, status, and prestige.

One need not look close to recognize institutional transformations to rankings, despite the fact that whether such endeavors are reliable with the soul of rankings stays subject to some discussion. For example, George Washington University as of late nullified the necessity for understudies to present a SAT or ACT score for thought for undergrad affirmation. On one hand, this activity can be seen as discharging a shot across the bow of the pattern of expanded evaluation inside the USNWR rankings; on the other, the way that the quantity of candidates will without a doubt rise comparative with acknowledgments after the grade prerequisite is dropped implies that George Washington will probably turn into a more specific establishment according to USNWR after the approach change.

Ranking as Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

Among the more significant qualities of response to university ranking is Robert Merton's idea of the self-fulfilling prophecy, "a false definition of the situation evoking a new behavior which makes the originally false definition of the situation come true" (1968). The utilization of the self-fulfilling prophecy idea need not be restricted to deceptions or understandings. Any assumption or expectation that is characterized or perceived to be genuine, regardless of whether valid or invalid, when exposed to measurement or assessment, will expand the legitimacy of the first assumption or supposition and subsequently urge practices that adjust to it (Kette & Tacke, 2014). For instance, USNWR 's current ranking measurements relegate 12.5% of a school's grade or rank to be a component of understudy selectivity, with 65% of that dependent on understudy state-sanctioned grades, 25% on the extent of registering rookies in the top decile of their graduating class, and 10 percent on the school's acknowledgment rate. Exact proof proposes that Demonstration, SAT, and other grades are more vulnerable indicators of school accomplishment than secondary school grades, and understudies who don't submit test scores (an expanding number of universities don't need test scores of candidates) seem to do also in school as the individuals who don't. In any case, test scores are weighted more vigorously than grades in USNWR suspicions about understudy selectivity (Zwick, 2007).

Included in student selectivity standards is the suspicion that the less students a world-class university concedes from its candidate pool, the better that university should be.

These understudy selectivity standards and the assumptions on which they are based are, at the very least, questionable. By and by, what isn't easily proven wrong is that university-level reactions to USNWR student selectivity measures have become unavoidable outcomes. In the quest for further developed rankings, school affirmations cycles (and admissions to law schools, graduate schools, and so on) works to create enormous pools of candidates, favor candidates with high grades, and attempt to restrict those conceded to those in the best 10% of their secondary school graduating class (O'meara, 2007). Colleges, especially in the upper positions, adjust to the USNWR suspicions about student selectivity and have made them come true. Likewise, the 22.5% of the USNWR rank controlled by student retention gives a convincing clarification to the latest things of recruiting of student retention specialists, the opening of

workplaces of student achievement, and the advancement of frameworks for focusing on services to students distinguished as high risk of dropout before degree finish. The individuals who study the USNWR ranking of graduate schools have tracked down that past rankings are the most grounded indicator of current reputation score, reliable with the notable "anchoring impact" marvel uncovered in the ongoing work in psychology and behavioral economics (Anthony, Tian & Barber, 2017; Bottom, 2004). Plentiful empirical literature exhibits the amazing molding impact of past rankings on current evaluations of quality (Rindova, Williamson, Petkova & Sever, 2005; Bowman & Bastedo, 2013; Romero, 1984). For instance, completely 40% of law school rankings depend on so-called peer assessment, evaluation of every law school (on a five-point scale from "marginal" to "outstanding") through overviews rounded out by deans, faculty members, lawyers, and judges. Since it is outlandish for a dean or a faculty member to know very much about each of the around 200 certify law schools, respondents will in general depend on past decisions of law schools, classified in earlier year rankings (Kette & Tacke, 2014).

Ranking as Equivalence

Comparability is the change of characteristics into amounts that share a measurement. Comparability is principal to quantitative estimating and numeric comparison (Dobbin, 1999; Lee 2015). "Commensuration shapes what we pay attention to, which things are connected to other things, and how we express sameness and difference" (Espeland & Sauder, 2007). The cycles of equivalence include figuring out those attributes and characteristics of universities that are to be included in a shared metrics and those to be avoided. It is a cycle of improvement and decontextualization that diminishes the characteristics and attributes of universities to a couple and, at last, to one number. The ranking is, thus an activity in simplification. The cycles of simplification of this kind, following Walker (2016), make such numeric data appear to be more legitimate, more powerful, and more authoritative than narrative information. Simplification masks complexity, obscures assumptions, and conceals uncertainty. The data consequently simplified is made more versatile and all the more effectively recyclable. It is a lot simpler to recollect a university's rank than to review the subtleties of a narrative description. It is likewise easy to assume that the significance of what seems, to be a definitive number or rank is universal and stable (Kette & Tacke, 2014).

University rankings are developed utilizing raw scores, for example, middle grade-point normal or middle SAT. Such raw scores are clearly profoundly related, and the change of such ceaseless measures into ordinal scales amplifies the moment contrasts between the universities positioned first, second, and third. In USNWR rankings, ties and different ties are common. Rankings produce a progressive connection between every university being ranked, with apparently similarly estimated spans between universities that are "better than" or "worse than" different universities. As such, rankings allot exact numbers to every establishment despite the fact that differentiation between organizations are frequently minuscule (Van de Walle, 2008). This activity serves essentially to boost universities to zero in on relative situating instead of outright changes (Kette & Tacke, 2014).

A Conceptual Framework of University Ranking

Having investigated a few examples of university reactions to ranking systems, the cycles of the self-fulfilling prophecy, and the impacts of equivalence, we utilize these aphorisms to propose a conceptual framework of university ranking. We use this framework for the examination of information and for additional descriptions of reactions to rankings and to our case that university ranking systems comprise an "ivory cage," a higher education variant of Max Weber's (1968) "iron cage," a condition of institutional isomorphism wherein universities are methodically boosted toward homogeneity (DiMaggio & Powell, 2012).

Proposition 1: Under-ranking systems, universities, and colleges may in the short-run drop steadily up or down the ranks, yet over the long-haul university ranking inclines toward balance and framework stability.

Among the soonest signs that ranking systems incline toward solidness are found in crafted by Dichev (2001). The creator investigated the main 25 national universities and the best 25 national liberal arts colleges for the early years (1989–98) of the USNWR rankings, finding that adjustments of the USN rankings have a solid propensity to return in the following two rankings. The reversibility in rankings is solid in measurable terms as well as appearing to represent a strikingly huge piece of the absolute variety in ranking changes. Utilizing a straightforward model of two-period reversibility, apparently somewhere in the range of 70 and 80 percent of the variety in ranking change is because of the noise: transient impacts which rapidly vanish in later rankings. Accordingly, a large part of the "news" in USNWR yearly college rankings are basically aimless noise. (Gnolek, Falciano & Kuncl, 2014).

The cycles of equivalence include figuring out those attributes and characteristics of universities that are to be included for a common measurement and those to be avoided.

Here, we update that work and develop its scope. Following this early investigation of university rankings, table 1 sets out a 12-year arrangement of USNWR 's ranking of the 50 best universities beginning in 2000, organized by their rank in 2012, the right-hand column. Essentially checking table 1 recommends an overall harmony. Harvard, Princeton, and Yale are positioned either first, second, third, or fourth (Princeton once and Yale once) contingent upon the year. Columbia is positioned fourth in 2011 and 2012 however was positioned somewhere in the range of eighth and eleventh in prior years. Chicago is almost something very similar. Examining the announced individual components that make up the rankings (not revealed here) proposes that these upgrades appear to be to a great extent driven by changes in affirmations selectivity.

Table 1
USNWR 'S RANKING OF THE 50 BEST U.S. UNIVERSITIES FROM 2000 TILL 2012

University	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Harvard University	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Princeton University	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
Yale University	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Columbia University	10	10	9	10	11	9	9	9	9	8	8	4	4
University of Chicago	13	10	9	12	13	14	15	9	9	8	8	9	5
Stanford University	6	6	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	3	5	5	4	4	5	7	4	7	4	4	7	5
California Institute of Technology	1	4	4	4	5	8	7	4	5	6	4	7	5
University of Pennsylvania	7	6	5	4	5	4	4	7	5	6	4	5	5
Duke University	7	8	8	4	5	5	5	8	8	8	10	9	10
Dartmouth College	11	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	11	11	10	9	11
Northwestern University	14	13	12	10	11	11	12	14	14	12	12	12	12
Johns Hopkins University	7	15	16	15	14	14	13	16	14	15	14	13	13
Washington University (St. Louis)	17	15	14	12	9	11	11	12	12	12	12	13	14
Brown University	14	15	16	17	17	13	15	15	14	16	16	15	15
Cornell University	11	10	14	14	14	14	13	12	12	14	15	15	15
Vanderbilt University	20	22	21	21	19	18	18	18	19	18	17	17	17
Rice University	14	13	12	15	16	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
University of Notre Dame	19	19	19	18	19	18	18	20	19	18	20	19	19
Emory University	18	18	18	18	18	20	20	18	17	18	17	20	20
University of California, Berkeley	20	20	20	20	21	21	20	21	21	21	21	22	21
Georgetown University	23	23	22	24	23	25	23	23	23	23	23	21	22
Carnegie Mellon University	23	23	22	21	23	22	22	21	22	22	22	23	23

University of Southern California	42	35	34	31	30	30	30	27	27	27	26	23	23
Wake Forest University	28	28	26	25	28	27	27	30	30	28	28	25	25
University of Virginia	22	20	24	23	21	22	23	24	23	23	24	25	25
University of California, Los Angeles	25	25	26	25	26	25	25	26	25	25	24	25	25
University of Michigan–Ann Arbor	25	25	25	25	25	22	25	24	25	26	27	29	28
Tufts University	29	29	28	28	27	28	27	27	28	28	28	28	29
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	27	25	28	28	29	29	27	27	28	30	28	30	29
Brandeis University	31	31	34	31	32	32	34	31	31	31	31	34	31
Boston College	39	38	38	40	40	37	40	34	35	34	34	31	31
College of William and Mary	29	30	30	30	31	31	31	31	33	32	33	31	33
New York University	34	33	32	35	35	32	37	34	34	33	32	33	33
University of Rochester	32	33	36	36	35	37	34	34	35	35	35	37	35
Georgia Institute of Technology	40	35	41	38	37	41	37	38	35	35	35	35	36
University of California, San Diego	32	31	31	31	32	35	32	38	38	35	35	35	37
University of Miami (FL)	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	50	47	38
University of California, Davis	42	41	41	43	43	42	48	47	42	44	42	39	38
Lehigh University	34	38	38	40	37	37	32	33	31	35	35	37	38
Case Western Reserve University	34	38	38	37	37	35	37	38	41	41	41	41	38
University of Washington	44	45	45	47	45	46	45	42	42	41	42	41	42
University of Wisconsin–Madison	34	35	32	31	32	32	34	34	38	35	39	45	42
University of California, Santa Barbara	44	45	48	47	45	45	45	47	44	44	42	39	42
University of Texas at Austin	44	49	48	47	N/R	46	N/R	47	44	47	47	45	45
Yeshiva University	44	45	41	40	40	46	45	44	N/R	50	N/R	50	45
University of California, Irvine	49	41	41	45	45	43	40	44	44	44	46	41	45
Pennsylvania State University–University Park	40	44	46	45	48	50	48	47	48	47	47	47	45
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign	34	41	36	38	40	37	42	41	38	40	39	47	45
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	N/R	49	48	47	48	46	43	42	44	41	42	41	50
Tulane University	44	45	46	43	44	43	43	44	50	N/R	50	N/R	50
George Washington University	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	50
Syracuse University	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	50	N/R	50	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
University of Florida	49	N/R	N/R	N/R	48	50	50	47	49	49	47	N/R	N/R
Pepperdine University	N/R	49	48	47	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Texas A&M University–College Station	N/R	N/R	48	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
N/R = Not ranked.													

Table 2 LONGITUDINAL CORRELATIONS OF USNWR RANKS AND SCORES 2012 COMPONENT		
	Rank	**Overall Score**
2011	0.994	0.997
2010	0.990	0.995
2009	0.986	0.993
2008	0.983	0.990
2007	0.979	0.987

2006	0.967	0.982
2005	0.971	0.982
2004	0.973	0.979
2003	0.968	0.976

An application of simple longitudinal descriptive statistics is presented in table 2, which displays historical correlation coefficients for two components of the USNWR rankings: rank

(1−50, comprehensive of ties) and generally speaking score (which USNWR scales with the goal that the highest-level university in a given year gets a score of 100). Each line reports the assessed coefficient of assurance for the worth of the USNWR score segment in the year recorded in section 1 and the relating an incentive for the year 2012, determined utilizing the 47 universities that are seen as Level 1 foundations in every year saw in the information. We report the Pearson's relationship coefficient for the general score and the Spearman's rank connection coefficient for ranks.

As this table illustrates, there are solid measurable relationship between the individual components of the USNWR rankings over the time. As one would expect, the informative force of recorded values decreases marginally as the delay increments, to an almost perfect positive straight relationship persevere between the 2012 components and the corresponding values from 2003—nine years earlier.

Longitudinal harmony as the principal proposition of university ranking has additionally been the essential finding of investigations of law schools (Kette & Tacke, 2014; Rapoport, 1999; Carraher & Paridon, 2008; Larsen, 2003), schools of business (Bednowitz, 2000), and schools of public policy and administration (Frederickson & Stazyk, 2016). These discoveries are especially applicable to the investigation of university rankings and ranking frameworks given the observed "halo effect", in which the reputational evaluations of individual programs or departments are conflated by the reputation of the university of an entire leading, sometimes, to nonexistent professional schools at prestigious universities getting high reputational assessments (Streams, 2005; Webster, 1981).

We go now to the investigation of worldwide ranking frameworks. We have picked the Academic Ranking of World Universities rankings since they have the longest history of worldwide ranking, having begun in 2003. The ARWU rankings are valuable for relative purposes since they underscore research usefulness and do exclude subjective peer review or student selectivity standards. ARWU ranking models allot 10% to graduated class winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals and 20% to staff winning similar awards, 20% to exceptionally refers to the "citation impact factor" research in 21 expansive academic subjects, 20% for papers published in Nature and Science or other leading peer-reviewed journals, 20% to articles in journals recorded in the Science or Social Science Citation Indices, and 10% to per capita academic performance (the weighted scores of the previous five markers divided by the number of Full-Time Equivalent [FTE] scholastic staff). Table 3 presents the ARWU rankings from 2003 to 2014.

Table 4 presents a use of similar distinct statics to the ARWU top 50 worldwide universities that were applied to the USNWR rankings of American universities displayed in table 2. To keep up with likeness with the table 2, table 4 shows that very years and is restricted to the 39 universities that show up in the best 50 in the entirety of the years recorded.

As was found in the examination of USNWR rankings, the longitudinal correlations among the ARWU ranking components are very high: the correlations of the 2003 and 2012 segments range from .93 to .96.

The longitudinal investigation of worldwide universities recommends that year-to-year vacillation in ranking is more noteworthy among lower-ranked programs contrasted and those getting higher rankings, a recommendation that is completely anticipated given the literature on securing impacts in the evaluation and ranking systems. We test this perception exactly by breaking down the relative solidness of rankings over time utilizing the USNWR rankings of the

best 100 (comprehensive of ties) of certain universities for the years 2004–12. A long time before 2004 are excluded on the grounds that USNWR just assigned ranks and overall scores to the best 50 universities in those years. We start by computing year-by-year changes in rankings for every university that shows up in the best 100. For example, MIT was positioned 4 of every 2004 and 5 out of 2005, so it is relegated to a score of −1 in 2005, demonstrating that it dropped one position. Virginia Tech was positioning 77 in 2007 and 71 in 2008, so it is assigned a score of 6 in 2008, demonstrating its expansion in the rankings. We take the outright upsides of these scores, as we are keen on supreme instead of directional changes. At long last, we partition the best 100

Table 3
ARWU TOP 50 UNIVERSITY RANKINGS, 2003–14 (SORTED BY RANK IN 2014)

University	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2 013	2014
Harvard University	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Stanford University	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	3	4	3
University of California, Berkeley	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	4
University of Cambridge	5	3	2	2	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
Princeton University	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	6
California Institute of Technology	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7
Columbia University	10	9	7	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	8	8
University of Chicago	11	10	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
University of Oxford	9	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9
Yale University	8	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
University of California, Los Angeles	15	16	14	14	13	13	13	13	12	12	12	12
Cornell University	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	13	13	13	13
University of California, San Diego	14	13	13	13	14	14	14	14	15	15	14	14
University of Washington	16	20	17	17	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	15
University of Pennsylvania	18	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	14	14	15	16
The Johns Hopkins University	24	22	19	20	19	20	19	18	18	17	17	17
University of California, San Francisco	13	17	18	18	18	18	18	18	17	18	18	18
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich	25	27	27	27	27	24	23	23	23	23	20	19
University College London	20	25	26	26	25	22	21	21	20	21	21	20
University of Tokyo	19	14	20	19	20	19	20	20	21	20	21	21
University of Michigan–Ann Arbor	21	19	21	21	21	21	22	22	22	22	23	22
Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine	17	23	23	23	23	27	26	26	24	24	24	22
University of Toronto	23	24	24	24	23	24	27	27	26	27	28	24
University of Wisconsin–Madison	27	18	16	16	17	17	17	17	19	19	19	24
Kyoto University	30	21	22	22	22	23	24	24	27	26	26	26
New York University	N/R	32	29	29	30	31	32	31	29	27	27	27
Northwestern University	29	30	31	33	29	30	30	29	30	30	30	28

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign	45	25	25	25	26	26	25	25	25	25	25	28
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	37	33	32	32	33	28	28	28	28	29	29	30
Duke University	32	31	32	31	32	32	31	35	35	36	31	31
Washington University in St. Louis	22	28	28	28	28	29	29	30	31	31	32	32
Rockefeller University	28	29	30	30	30	32	32	34	33	32	34	33
University of Colorado Boulder	31	34	35	34	34	34	34	32	32	33	33	34
Pierre and Marie Curie University—Paris 6	N/R	41	46	45	39	42	40	39	41	42	37	35
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	38	39	41	42	41	43	36
University of British Columbia	35	36	37	36	36	35	36	36	37	39	40	37
University of Manchester	N/R	N/R	N/R	50	48	40	41	44	38	40	41	38
University of Texas at Austin	47	40	36	39	38	39	38	38	35	35	36	39
University of Copenhagen	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	46	45	43	40	43	44	42	39
University of California, Santa Barbara	26	35	34	35	35	36	35	32	33	34	35	41
University of Paris Sud (Paris 11)	N/R	48	N/R	N/R	N/R	49	43	45	40	37	39	42
University of Maryland, College Park	N/R	N/R	47	37	37	37	37	36	38	38	38	43
University of Melbourne	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	44
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas	34	36	38	38	39	41	48	49	N/R	48	46	45
University of Edinburgh	43	47	47	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	45
Karolinska Institute	39	46	45	48	N/R	N/R	50	42	44	42	44	47
University of California, Irvine	44	N/R	47	44	45	46	46	46	48	45	45	47
Heidelberg University	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	49
University of Munich	48	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	49
Australian National University	49	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Utrecht University	40	39	41	40	42	47	N/R	50	48	N/R	N/R	N/R
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	38	44	43	46	47	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
University of Southern California	40	48	50	47	50	50	46	46	46	46	47	N/R
Technical University Munich	N/R	45	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	47	N/R	50	N/R
Brown University	49	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Vanderbilt University	32	38	39	41	41	42	41	N/R	N/R	50	49	N/R
Pennsylvania State University–University Park	40	43	39	42	43	42	45	43	45	49	N/R	N/R
University of Zurich	45	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
University of California, Davis	36	42	41	42	43	48	49	46	48	47	47	N/R
University of Pittsburgh	N/R	48	43	48	49	N/R	50	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R

Universities in every year into quartiles dependent on the general score doled out by USNWR in that year and figure the normal total scores for every quartile across the entire years.

These scores are deciphered as the normal change (increment or diminishing) in rank starting with one year then onto the next for a commonplace university in every quartile. The average member from the top quartile can anticipate that its rank should change by less than one position every year. As we decline in ranking to the fourth quartile, the normal yearly change increments altogether, with the average member from the base quartile encountering yearly changes of more than five positions.

From the beginning, this finding seems to give exact proof that counters the balance showed before. Nonetheless, the two are effectively accommodated if the change saw in the lower positions is arbitrary commotion instead of steady upward or downward moving over the long run.

At the end of the day, the ranking framework generally speaking displays a serious level of total strength across all organizations—yet the lower-positioned foundations are requested with less accuracy in a specific year.

Our discoveries confirm those of Gnolek, Falciano & Kuncl, (2014), who fostered a powerful model of the classes (like student selectivity), subfactors, (such as SAT, or ACT scores), and the loads relegated to them 7.5% by USNWR for the years paving the way to and including 2012. Not really settled that yearly position changes four or less positions ought to be thought of "noise", with just longer-range changes in a similar direction being significant. Utilizing their model, Gnolek, Falciano & Kuncl, show that for a school positioned during the 30s to move into the main 20 would require a supported increment of more than $112 million to its yearly academic expenditures more than quite a while, and surprisingly then, at that point, due to the modest amount of progress after some time in USNWR ranking subfactors, there is less than a .01 percent likelihood of improved on ranking.

Table 4
LONGITUDINAL CORRELATIONS OF ARWU RANKS AND SCORES 2012 COMPONENT

	Rank	Overall Score
2011	0.998	0.999
2010	0.986	0.998
2009	0.994	0.997
2008	0.991	0.995
2007	0.987	0.994
2006	0.982	0.993
2005	0.984	0.993
2004	0.975	0.987
2003	0.930	0.961

Proposition 2: Universities deliberately utilize the status managed by rankings to shape and characterize institutional identity.

As university ranking arose in the late 20th century, along these lines, as well, did the university's strategic planning. The equal pattern isn't unexpected. The language and logic of ranking are fit to the rationalist suppositions of strategic planning. The meeting up of ranking and university strategic planning is especially intriguing, particularly in the instances of those strategic plans that seek to fundamentally improved ranking.

After a fruitful vocation as a professor of electrical engineering and a prominent entrepreneur, Dr. Todd got to work as the eleventh president of the University of Kentucky in 2001. Four years sooner, in 1997, the Kentucky state lawmaking body had made a minimization with the University directing it to turn into a best 20 public research establishment by 2020, an exemplary instance of utilizing rankings for the reasons for setting performance targets (Kawasaki, Giannini, Lancman & Sznelwar, 2018). Accordingly, President Todd and his staff fostered the "University of Kentucky Top 20 Business Plan" (TOP 20 plan), which included

expanded enlistments, increased graduation rates, expanding quantities of the workforce, expanded research funding, and expanded university engagement in schools, business, farms, and communities. To accomplish these objectives, the Main 20 Arrangement mentioned an increment of $260 million in state funding for more than 15 years. At that point, the marketable strategy was taken on, the University of Kentucky was positioned by U.S. News and World Report 35th among public research universities and in the unranked second tier in the general rankings. State appointments for public higher education expanded in supreme terms in Kentucky get-togethers reception of the compact in 1997, even in the wake of adapting to inflation. Nonetheless, the pattern line turns out to be relatively flat if these progressions are scaled by changes in either the total state populace or personal income.

After almost 10 years in office, President Todd surrendered in September 2010. At the hour of his resignation, the University of Kentucky was positioned 38 by U.S. News and World Report among American public colleges and 129 generally, recommending minimal relative change and an inability to meet the compact's goals. In any case, notwithstanding the inability to improve meaningfully in rankings, the university improved in total terms in certain spaces, including peer scores and graduation rates. Under the initiative of the current president, Dr. Eli Capilouto, the new University of Kentucky strategic plan, "Seeing Tomorrow," doesn't unequivocally allude to rankings in outlining and portraying university objectives.

In her examination of worldwide university ranking frameworks, Hazelkorn tracked down, "One of the main spots where the impact of rankings can be seen is in university vision or statement of purpose and vital plans. She notes four normal ways to deal with the use of rankings within strategic planning: "1) rankings as an explicit goal; 2) rankings as an implicit goal; 3) rankings for target setting; and 4) rankings as a measure of success" (2011). The typical type of explicit ranking objectives appeared as plans to "be in the top 20" or "be in the first tier." With the progression of time, as the soundness of rankings has become progressively clear, ranking proclamations as a component of university strategic plans will in general depict implied and broader objectives, for example, "achieving national standing" or being "world-class." Rankings as proportions of achievement now quite often appear as implicit vision or objective statements, such as "the university is moving in the right direction" or "the university is making progress," as opposed to portraying a particular position or ranking aspiration.

In any case, these speculations are hard to show observationally. Minimal systematic evidence exists that clarifies the overall noticeable quality and thought managed the cost of rankings in the strategic planning process. Gathering reliable quantitative information that addresses the unequivocal use of rankings and ranking criteria in directing the university planning and policy-making is troublesome, as public access to relics like arranging reports, minutes from executive meetings, and so forth is profoundly lopsided across the individual universities. In lieu of expansive and exhaustive admittance to such reports, we rather foster an intermediary proportion of rankings unmistakable quality by taking raw counts of the number of novel web pages that unequivocally reference rankings across all pages indexed inside a given university's site. We utilize this measure to intermediary the relative consideration that various universities provide for rankings as a way to shape their identities. The quantitative analysis of text scratched from singular sites and the records kept up with via web search tools are turning into an inexorably common approach to deal with measuring difficult to evaluate social phenomena going from the relative priorities of administrative (Joshi Bhattacharyya & Carman, 2016) to resident racial mentalities (Stephens-Davidowitz, 2013) and public perceptions of private firms (Lachanski & Pav, 2017). We contend that distinctions in these checks genuinely show the validity of proposition 2, in the more extensive sense that they reflect, with noise, the unmistakable quality managed the cost of rank by foundations in characterizing and molding their outward persona—a key component of strategic planning.

To accumulate these data, we start with the universe of 268 universities recorded in the "Best National Universities" list distributed by USNWR in 2012 (the last year of our rankings

information), including each of the four levels. We previously led 268 Google web inquiries to learn the root domain for every university's site.

We next directed a second round of 268 Google searches, which were confined to site pages related with a solitary university's root domain. For this round of searches, we limit our outcomes to pages containing the phrases "news and world report rankings" or "news & world report rankings". Each Google search returned a total number of recognized search results, showing the absolute number of remarkable web pages facilitated on a university's domain that coordinated with the predetermined pursuit boundaries.

There is stamped heterogeneity as far as the recurrence of reference to USNWR rankings across university sites. Further, we discover systematic contrasts in the frequency of unique pages making reference to rankings as per the university's USNWR rank.

Upon past statics, there are huge differences in the median number of site pages containing references to the USNWR rankings across the position quintiles, with USNWR rankings being referred to substantially much more on the sites of universities that are with higher USNWR rank. Universities in the top quartile are substantially more likely to reference their ranking than universities with lower rank. This perception is supported by the raw counts of domains that don't mention USNWR rankings. No domains in the top quartile neglect to mention rankings, while in excess of 27% of university domains in the least quartile don't make reference to rankings by any means. Steady with proposition 2, this is strong intriguing evidence that highly positioned universities utilize the language of rankings and reference their USNWR positions to build up their own stature and identity. Patterns of reaction to crafted by ranking associations are the endeavors of university pioneers to use and figure out the rankings.

A conceivable alternative in contrast to this proposition is that rankings are descriptive instead of proscriptive that is, the rankings reflect what the privileged universities do as opposed to autonomously, and prescriptively shape their practices. Both are conceivable valid by and by, as the feasibility of any ranking framework in the marketplace depends on the more extensive social acknowledgment of the rankings as genuine and legitimate (Usher & Medow, 2009). There is plentiful evidence that USNWR has been receptive to the market, including most clearly its shift away from an absolutely reputational study of quality in its initial year to a model that reasonable balanced reputational information with more "objective" measures (Meredith, 2004). Regardless, there is a lot of evidence that proposes that the instrument of the rankings impacts university practices in manners to a great extent autonomous from the fundamental quality measures that the rankings plan to quantify and evaluate. For instance, Ehrenberg (2002) gives a record of a university that proposed to expand workforce pay rates for the sole reason of improving the "faculty resources" measurements of the USNWR rankings, free of any actual discussion of the hypothetical or real enhancements in instructing quality that could result. As Bowman and Bastedo regret, "over time, rankings increasingly become reputation, rather than reputation being an independent indicator, that rankings can use to assess changes in quality" (2013).

Proposition 3: Formalized ranking reinforces the powers of institutional isomorphism. This at last boosts universities to look like each other, holding different variables steady.

It was Weber (1968), who portrayed present-day associations as change-safe "iron cages" on which we come to depend. In their adaption of Weber's iron cage postulation, DiMaggio, and Powell (1983) set out a hypothesis of institutional isomorphism that is especially fit to clarifying the impact of university ranking systems. Current universities are bureaucracies liable to the powers of stasis, homogenization, equilibrium, and way reliance. Examples of hierarchical change related to responding to university ranking systems result in "processes that make organizations more similar without making them more efficient" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Current universities are profoundly perplexing bureaucracies of request, dependability, and consistency. Examples of institutional isomorphism are a specific characteristic of associations, like universities, that work in fields where there is a questionable and hard to

measure the connection among means and end, and in fields in which the agreement to favored results is illusive (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Three types of institutional isomorphism are clear in higher education. Coercive isomorphism results from forced guidelines and policies, a typical lawful environment, authorizing, and particularly frameworks of accreditation. Standardizing isomorphic pressing factors incorporate the filtering cycles of formal education and credentialing, with proficient associations filling in as carriers of standards, principles, and culture. Generally significant in higher education is a mimetic isomorphism, where associations will in general model themselves after comparative associations in their field that they see to be more authentic or fruitful (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). On account of higher education, one should add "prestigious" to the words "authentic" and "fruitful" to represent mimicking in higher education.

In his investigation on the connection among the variety and notoriety in higher education, Van Vught (2008) contrasts conflicting hypothetical contentions regarding whether differentiation or homogenization ought to normally rise up out of frameworks of higher education. That work centers around the idea of the elements of the relationship among associations and the conditions in which they operate as a key driving component, recognizing the common values held by administrators and employees prepared and socialized within academia (a type of normative isomorphism) just as the unified planning mechanisms took on in many states and countries (a type of coercive isomorphism) as outside ecological environmental advancing framework solidness and driving de-differentiation. To that rundown, we would add the impact of rankings. Since rankings favor certain measurements that advantage certain exercises (academic and research performance) and institutions over others, rankings advance homogeneity by boosting universities to center their efforts and consideration in uniform manners to keep up with authenticity and mimic those institutions considered "high achieving," along these lines supporting the patterns of "academic drift" (Morphew, 2009; Tightn, 2015).

To exhibit the isomorphic properties of rankings, we again use the USNWR ranking information from 2012, zeroing in on the 201 exceptional universities getting a numeric ranking in that year. To this information, we consolidate information on the number of baccalaureate degrees given by every university by the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code, a scientific classification created by the National Center for Education Statistics that aggregates individual fields of study into more extensive classifications based on the subject matter. We utilize the two-digit CIP codes, which perceive 54 interesting major fields of study that reach from the social sciences, engineering, to the liberal arts and sciences. To keep away from issues of scale, we change each count into a rate by dividing it by the total number of baccalaureate degrees given. They listed the entirety of the 54-CIP codes addressed in their information and gives distinct insights to every one of those degree fields.

As one would anticipate, business, the social sciences, and engineering make up enormous proportions of the ordinary university's undergrad programs. Past these three categories, in any case, there is a marked variety in the composition of USNWR - positioned universities' undergrad programs.

To test for a connection between the relative position and undergrad program composition, we initially ascertain pairwise Gower's divergence coefficients for every unique pair of universities. Gower's coefficient is a standard measure for assessing the likeness of two observations dependent on a bunch of determined factors and is generally utilized in such assorted fields as ecology and computer science (Podani, 1999). This action is limited by nothing, addressing two completely indistinguishable observations, and one, addressing two entirely dissimilar observations.

To decide the connection between relative rank and our measure of similitude in undergraduate degree programs, we compute the total contrast in rank between the two universities being compared in every extraordinary pair. We then, at that point basically relapse our dissimilarity coefficients on irrefutably the rank contrasts, subsequently deciding whether the similarity in undergrad offerings can be anticipated by closeness in USNWR rank. We

likewise include for our relapse a vector of factors to control for other noticed similitudes in universities that might confoundingly affect our estimate of the strength of the connection between undergrad offerings and positions. In particular, we control for whether the universities addressed in every unique pair operate in a similar sector (public; private, not-for-profit with religious affiliation; , not-for-profit with no religious affiliation), are situated in a similar evaluation district, have indistinguishable land grant university status, and are categorized within the same Carnegie Classification category (utilizing the 2000 Carnegie Classification scheme). We likewise control for the total contrast in the normal log of total enlistments to take out the conceivably frustrating impact of similarity in size.

We track down a solid, positive, and profoundly genuinely critical connection between the college degree contributions and rank, demonstrating that as a total distinction in rank expands, the structure of undergrad programs additionally diverge, all else held consistent. This shows that controlling for the wide range of various factors included for the model, comparably ranked colleges will in general have similar college degree offerings. Our control factors likewise show that different similarities between colleges beyond rank are related with the comparability of undergrad offerings also, in the expected directions: sets of colleges with matching institutional characteristics have comparable undergrad offerings, and undergrad offerings diverge at colleges as discrepancies in size (as estimated by the regular log of complete enlistments) increment. Albeit not revealed here, researchers ran extra models including the supreme distinction of income per FTE enlisted understudy, just as the outright distinction in educational uses expenditures FTE, selected understudy to test for the expected extra confounding impact of contrasts in wealth and expenditure patterns.

As a matter of fact, this is just an interesting evidence of the isomorphic pressing factor applied by rankings. Isomorphism is a dynamic interaction by definition, and our dependence on static, cross-sectional information implies that, while we can observe an outcome steady with the proposition, we can't straightforwardly observe the cycle driving the patterns of results that we distinguish. In any case, in spite of the way that USNWR rankings make no distinctions in the rating standards as indicated by the field or a diversity of undergraduate degree offerings, there's an experimental finding is predictable with an overall isomorphic pressure to adjust that is supported by the USNWR ranking system. This finding warrants further investigation and could be straightforwardly expanded using board information.

On the off chance that ranking drives cycles of change in the direction of institutional homogeneity are the powers of ranking-driven, change making colleges less effective, as the hypothesis of institutional isomorphism would anticipate? A new exhaustive investigation of American schools of law recommends that this is the situation (Rapoport, 1999). It is proposed somewhere else that if the equilibrium is the default condition under university and college ranking systems, colleges and universities will not risk changing except changes in the direction of ranking models. Rankings are thusly, "an enemy of college and university creativity and innovation and a form of institutional isomorphism" (Frederickson and Stazyk, 2016). Universities will in general resist change, and contextual components as well as ranking, like frameworks of accreditation, frameworks of assessment and performance measurement, and frameworks of accountability, amplify those inclinations. Despite the fact that it is hard to separate the impact of ranking from the power of context, this ought not to be taken to deny the homogenizing impact of rankings.

CONCLUSIONS

As we enter the second era of university ranking, it is proper to check out what we have realized. Ranking frameworks display a serious degree of macro-level consistency, as that ranking associations agitate their yearly rankings as they endeavor to hold interest or to make news. We show here that, when a ranking association sets its ranking standards, the order of the positions of colleges is very steady and only occasionally displays long-term change. Regardless

of the equilibrium related with university rankings, investigations give evidence consistent with the suggestion that ranking impacts university planning and strategy, quite a bit of that impact toward criteria set by ranking associations.

Unquestionably, the relationships we recognize miss the mark concerning casual confirmation of these propositions in practice. In any case, we contend that the quantitative, empirical affiliations we uncover in the information do give solid, suggestive evidence of the impact of ranking frameworks on the colleges they try to assess that can illuminate the next generation regarding rankings research. Future examinations should make the following legitimate step of expanding on the establishment we build up to differentiate the effect of the various alternatives and jumbling forces that impact Jordanian universities behavior, accordingly checking the overall strengths of these forces. Institutions of higher education vary broadly in context and in purpose. Ranking frameworks should treat these distinctions in a serious way, as must those doing research on the ranking of institutions of higher education.

There are some significant ramifications of our discoveries concerning the proceeded suitability of frameworks of higher education in worldwide and Jordan in specific that are deserving of discussion. The conjunction of evidence proposes that the burden of ranking systems isn't an impetus of development in higher education except if that advancement favors ranking standards. Rankings improve, diminishing university qualities, contexts, and one-of-a-kind characteristics to less complex measurements. Rankings decontextualize. Rankings amplify small differences. Rankings veil intricacy and shroud ambiguity. Rankings supplant "not quite the same as" with "better than." Be that as it may, in any event, knowing this, university ranking systems keep on being influential. Why?

The criteria utilized by USNWR surely address the predominant recognizing characteristics of the traditional research university. Undoubtedly, there are minor departure from that model, including the regional universities, the urban colleges, the liberal arts colleges, the community colleges. These are institutions that, taken together, instruct definitely a bigger number of individuals than those educated at the institutions sorted in the Carnegie Classifications as "Doctoral/Research University—Extensive." By the by, research colleges keep on characterizing the model privileged by ranking associations, and consequently rankings keep on advantaging historically elite institutions.

The conversion of evidence recommends that the imposition of ranking systems isn't an impetus of advancement in Jordanian higher education except if that development favors ranking criteria.

Second-generation Jordanian university ranking is progressively set apart by competing ranking associations utilizing various criteria. In Jordan, this is generally prominent in the ranking of business colleges and MBA programs, with three competing ranking associations. It is additionally a characteristic of international or global university ranking systems, likewise with three essential ranking associations. Some ranking associations, most eminently Bloomberg Businessweek, use study based technique and "soft" criteria, for example, "student experience," in their rankings of business colleges. Similarly, as with the ranking frameworks examined before, these methodologies show total stability with micro-level fluctuation that appears to be owing to randomness as much as systematic improvement or decrease regardless of the varying system utilized. For instance, the best 15 business colleges are consistently the best 15, however Harvard moves from first to eighth and Duke moved from 6th to first in the 2014 Businessweek rankings. Notwithstanding the somewhat clear question of how or regardless of whether the Harvard MBA program got significantly worse and the Duke MBA improved, all over the course of about a year, this churning, or noise, appears to catch the consideration of the media, similar as the consideration given the ranking of university football teams. More direct, the MBA ranking project at Bloomberg Businessweek is vivaciously rivaling USNWR, the prevailing part in the ranking game, and with Forbes, the other significant MBA ranking game member.

Some fascinating and significant late advancements have additionally arisen that can possibly acquaint huge changes with the rankings landscape. One is the reestablished center around value-added approaches to deal with assessing institutions of higher education (Rodgers 2007). Value-added measures offer the possibility to beat a portion of the well-known shortcomings of the traditional ranking frameworks. To start with, they generally center around the intermediate or long-term results instead of sources of inputs (like workforce pay rates, volumes of books and periodicals housed, or average ACT score of matriculating freshmen) or outputs, (for example, awards granted, articles distributed, or understudies held). Value-added measures rather focus on measures like degree gained or the economic accomplishment of graduates, estimated through positions or pay rates. Second, value-added estimation endeavors to segment these results into two particular segments by unequivocally controlling for the relative contrasts in inputs across colleges (as far as the two understudies just as different resources), accordingly making a more conceivable endeavor to appraise the direct, negligible commitment of the university to the well-being of the understudies it serves. Rankings of colleges built around value-added measures contribute a totally different point of view than that addressed by traditional ranking systems, to a great extent inferring that the most elevated accomplishing institutions are those zeroing in on engineering, STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math), and medical fields (Mabel, Libassi & Hurwitz, 2020). Advocates of significant value-added measures contend that they put all colleges on an equivalent balance for comparison and that the value-added proportions of higher education institutions show a serious level of consistency over the long haul. Critics contend that value-added gauges just substitute new biases for old ones, bringing up those differences across colleges in organizing understudy result information combined with depending on noisy result measures, for example, graduate salaries make value-added measures less solid and valuable than they show up.

As higher education in Jordan and abroad enters the second era of involvement in ranking and colleges keep on sorting out it, we ought to pose bigger questions: Have rankings been a power for development in higher education? Assuming this is the case, for whom and in what ways? Does higher education ranking simply befuddle status and prestige with quality, in this manner reifying already elite universities? (Kauppi & Erkkilä, 2011). As ranking associations proceed with their work, it is imperative that their impact keeps on being the subject of thorough empirical research.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P.G., & Salmi, J. (Edition). (2011). *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities.* World Bank Publications.

Anthony, T., Tian, Z., & Barber, D. (2017). *Thinking fast and slow with deep learning and tree search*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08439.

Astin, A.W. (1970). *How colleges are rated. Change*: The magazine of higher learning, *2*(6), 11-86.

Barbalet, J.M. (2001). *Emotion, social theory, and social structure: A macrosociological approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Bednowitz, I. (2000). *The impact of the" business week" and" us news & world report" Rankings on the Business Schools They Rank*.

Bottom, W.P. (2004). *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment*.

Bowman, N.A., & Bastedo, M.N. (2013). 15 Anchoring effects in world university rankings. Higher education in the global age: Policy, *Practice and Promise in Emerging Societies*, 271.

Campos, P.F. (2015). The real reason college tuition costs so much. *The New York Times, 4*.

Carraher, S.M., & Paridon, T.J. (2008). Entrepreneurship journal rankings across the discipline. *Journal of Small Business Strategy, 19*(2), 89-98.

Cavanagh, G.F., Moberg, D.J., & Velasquez, M. (1981). The ethics of organizational politics. *Academy of management review, 6*(3), 363-374.

Chen, Y. (2011). Why are health care report cards so bad (good)?. *Journal of Health Economics, 30*(3), 575-590.

Coe, C.K., & Brunet, J.R. (2006). Organizational report cards: Significant impact or much ado about nothing?. *Public Administration Review, 66*(1), 90-100.

Dichev , I. (2001). News or Noise? Estimating the noise in the u.s. news university rankings. *Research in Higher Education, 42*(3), 237 – 66

DiMaggio, P.J., & Powell, W.W. (2012). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields [1983]. *Contemporary sociological theory*, 175.

Dobbin, F. (1999). The struggle for water: Politics, rationality, and identity in the american southwest by wendy nelson espeland. *American Journal of Sociology*.

Ehrenberg , R.G. (2002). *Tuition rising: Why college costs so much* . *Cambridge, MA*: Harvard University Press.

Emmert, M., Meszmer, N., & Sander, U. (2016). Do health care providers use online patient ratings to improve the quality of care? Results from an online-based cross-sectional study. *Journal of medical Internet research, 18*(9), e254.

Espeland , W.N., & Michael, S. (2007). Rankings and reactivity: How public measures recreate social worlds. *American Journal of Sociology, 113*(1), 1 – 40.

Fernandez, G., Narins, C.R., & Ling, F.S. (2016). The influence of public reporting of outcome data on decision making by interventional cardiologists: A follow-up survey. *Circulation, 134*(suppl_1), A20081-A20081.

Frederickson, H.G., & Stazyk, E.C. (2016). Ranking public policy and administration graduate programs, 1995-2016: An analysis and discussion. *The American Review of Public Administration, 46*(5), 507-525.

Frost, J., & Brockmann, J. (2014). When qualitative productivity is equated with quantitative productivity: Scholars caught in a performance paradox. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 17*(6), 25-45.

Gnolek, S.L., Falciano, V.T., & Kuncl, R.W. (2014). Modeling change and variation in US News & World Report college rankings: What would it really take to be in the top 20?. *Research in Higher Education, 55*(8), 761-779.

Gower , J.C. (1971) . A general coefficient of similarity and some of its properties biometrics, *27*(4), 857 – 71.

Grewal, R., Dearden, J.A., & Llilien, G.L. (2008). The university rankings game: Modeling the competition among universities for ranking. *The American Statistician, 62*(3), 232-237.

Guri-Rosenblit, S., Šebková, H., & Teichler, U. (2007). Massification and diversity of higher education systems: Interplay of complex dimensions. *Higher Education Policy, 20*(4), 373-389.

Gustafson, J.M. (1968). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*, 122-125

Hanushek, E.A., & Raymond, M.E. (2006). School accountability and student performance. *Regional Economic Development, 2*(1), 51-61.

Hazelkorn, E. (2018). Reshaping the world order of higher education: the role and impact of rankings on national and global systems. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education, 2*(1), 4-31.

Joshi, A., Bhattacharyya, P., & Carman, M. (2016, June). *Political issue extraction model: A novel hierarchical topic model that uses tweets by political and non-political authors*. In Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis, 82-90.

Kauppi, N., & Erkkilä, T. (2011). The struggle over global higher education: Actors, institutions, and practices. *International Political Sociology, 5*(3), 314-326.

Kawasaki, B.C., Giannini, R., Lancman, S., & Sznelwar, L.I. (2018, August). *New public management, performance measurement, and reconfiguration of work in the public sector*. In Congress of the International Ergonomics Association. Springer, Cham, 486-493.

Kehm, B.M. (2014). Global university rankings—Impacts and unintended side effects. *European Journal of Education, 49*(1), 102-112.

Kette, S., & Tacke, V. (2014). *University Rankings: Between organization and society*. In From Globalization to World Society. Routledge, 225-246.

Kondratieva, A.A., Muravlev, V.V., & Ekareva, I.L. (2015). University national and international ratings based on a comprehensive performance assessment of its structural units. *Science and Peace, 2*(6), 114.

Lachanski, M., & Pav, S. (2017). Shy of the character limit:" Twitter mood predicts the stock market" revisited. *Econ Journal Watch, 14*(3), 302.

Larsen, P.V. (2003). Academic reputation: How US news & world report survey respondents form perceptions. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 4*(2), 155-165.

Lee, C.J. (2015). Commensuration bias in peer review. *Philosophy of Science, 82*(5), 1272-1283.

Lee, C., & Nowell, B. (2015). A framework for assessing the performance of nonprofit organizations. *American Journal of Evaluation, 36*(3), 299-319.

Mabel, Z., Libassi, C.J., & Hurwitz, M. (2020). The value of using early-career earnings data in the College Scorecard to guide college choices. *Economics of Education Review, 75*, 101958.

Martin, R. (2002). Getting ranked and going global. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 27*(1), 3-6.

Martinez, M., Farias, J., & Arellano, E. (2002). State higher education report cards: What's in a Grade?. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 1-18.

Meredith, M. (2004). Why do universities compete in the ratings game? An empirical analysis of the effects of the US News and World Report college rankings. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(5), 443-461.

Merton , R.K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*, Enlarged ed. New York Free Press.

Mittal, P. (2020). Big data and analytics: A data management perspective in public administration. *International Journal of Big Data Management, 1*(2), 152-165.

Mohrman, K., Ma, W., & Baker, D. (2008). The research university in transition: The emerging global model. *Higher education policy, 21*(1), 5-27.

Morphew, C.C. (2009). Conceptualizing change in the institutional diversity of US colleges and universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(3), 243-269.

National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) . 2016 . Ed Launches New College Scorecard. September 21.

O'meara, K. (2007). *Striving for what? Exploring the pursuit of prestige*. In Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Springer, Dordrecht, 121-179.

Podani, J. (1999). Extending gower's general coefficient of similarity to ordinal characters. *Taxon, 48*(2), 331-340.

Rapoport, N.B. (1999). Ratings, not rankings: Why US news & world report shouldn't want to be compared to time and newsweek--or The New Yorker. *Ohio St. LJ, 60*, 1097.

Rindova, V.P., Williamson, I.O., Petkova, A.P., & Sever, J.M. (2005). Being good or being known: An empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational reputation. *Academy of management journal, 48*(6), 1033-1049.

Rodgers, T. (2007). Measuring value added in higher education: A proposed methodology for developing a performance indicator based on the economic value added to graduates. *Education Economics, 15*(1), 55-74.

Romero, L.M. (1984). Assessment of affirmative action in law school admissions after fifteen years: A need for recommitment, *An. J. Legal Education, 34*, 430.

Schwartz, D.M. (2014). Breaking through barriers: Using technology to address executive function weaknesses and improve student achievement. *Applied Neuropsychology: Child, 3*(3), 173-181.

Sinaiko, A.D., Eastman, D., & Rosenthal, M.B. (2012). How report cards on physicians, physician groups, and hospitals can have greater impact on consumer choices. *Health Affairs, 31*(3), 602-611.

Stephens-Davidowitz, S.I. (2013). *The cost of racial animus on a black presidential candidate: Using google search data to find what surveys miss*. Available at SSRN 2238851.

Tam, M. (2001). Measuring quality and performance in higher education. *Quality in higher Education, 7*(1), 47-54.

The Kane, T.J., & Staiger, D.O. (2001). Improving school accountability measures.

Tight, M. (2015). Theory development and application in higher education research: the case of academic drift. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 47*(1), 84-99.

Usher, A., & Medow, J. (2009). *A global survey of university rankings and league tables*. In University rankings, diversity, and the new landscape of higher education. Brill Sense. 1-18.

Van de Walle, S. (2008). What services are public? What aspects of performance are to be ranked? The case of "services of general interest". *International Public Management Journal, 11*(3), 256-274.

Van Vught , F. (2008). Mission diversity and reputation in higher education. *Higher Education Policy, 21*(2), 151 – 74.

Walker II, E.G. (2016). Predicting higher education outcomes and implications for a postsecondary institution ratings system. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 38*(4), 422-433.

Wellens, L., & Jegers, M. (2014). Effective governance in nonprofit organizations: A literature based multiple stakeholder approach. *European Management Journal, 32*(2), 223-243.

Wolf, A., & Jenkins, A. (2018). What's in a name? The impact of reputation and rankings on the teaching income of English universities. *Higher Education Quarterly, 72*(4), 286-303.