

Chapter 17

Globalization of World University Rankings and Its Impact on Asian Universities

Fraide A. Ganotice Jr.

The University of Hong Kong, China

Gordon Tsui

The University of Hong Kong, China

Hei-Hang Hayes Tang

The Education University of Hong Kong, China

Jonalyn B. Villarosa

Palawan State University, Philippines

Susanna S. Yeung

The Education University of Hong Kong, China

ABSTRACT

This chapter discusses how Asian universities respond to the global prevalence of university rankings, which are operated in various form with different emphases. First, it defines the context and rationales of the rise of world university rankings. Next, it compares and contrasts the three dominant university rankings, namely, Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), Quacquarelli Symonds (QS), and Times Higher Education University Rankings (THE). After assessing the controversies, limitations and solutions of the dominant ranking systems, we will evaluate the current performance of Asian universities and discuss what lessons are to be learned by Asian universities amid the globalizing forces of world university ranking.

INTRODUCTION

Across the globe, many universities strive to be world-class. The rise of world-class universities is phenomenally global in the 21st century (Altbach & Balán 2007). World-class universities are in incessant quest for creation, dissemination, and transfer of the most up-to-date knowledge for the ever-advancing global knowledge society (Altbach & Salmi 2011; Salmi 2009). The clusters of world-class research universities are expanding from the traditional ‘centres of learning’ in Europe and North America (Ben-

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-0819-9.ch017

David, 1977) to emerging and developing countries worldwide (Liu, Wang, & Cheng, 2011). Academic professions (e.g. Tang, 2013) are seen as the key to the making of a world-class university, particularly in the fast-growing regions of Asia. A world-class university is believed to be not only an institution, but also an idea (Ben-David, 1977; Shils, 1997) where a holistic understanding of knowledge is essential. Namely, they endeavor to create knowledge at disciplinary boundaries, activate cross-fertilization of basic and applied research, and encourage student engagement across academic disciplines. To understand the foundations and circumstances of world-class universities, Salmi (2009) delineates the three determinants:

1. Intensity of competent scholars in the academic profession and talented students on campus,
2. A resourceful and enabling environment for advanced research as well as learning and teaching, and
3. Effective and flexible governance that favors strategic vision, leadership, and innovation.

With this direction in mind, this chapter discusses how Asian universities respond to the global prevalence of university rankings, which are operated in various forms with different emphases. First, it defines the context and rationale of the rise of world university rankings. Next, it compares and contrasts the three dominant university rankings; namely, Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), Quacquarelli Symonds (QS), and Times Higher Education University Rankings (THE). After assessing the controversies, limitations and solutions of the dominant ranking systems, the authors evaluate the current performance of Asian universities and discuss the lessons to be learned by Asian universities amidst the globalizing forces of world university rankings.

What is “World University Ranking”?

Before discussing different university ranking systems, we aim to critically assess the notion of ‘university ranking’ according to the academic literature. In a positive light, transparency is emphasized as different world ranking organizations collect and report updated and comparable information from different higher education institutions across the globe. Through the transparent results derived from comparable information about universities (University rankings, 2013), different stakeholders of higher education and societies can better understand the performance of universities in different aspects. University rankings allow different stakeholders to make choices and informed decisions for studying, working or collaborating with universities – a key social institution among other service providers.

There are at least five different interpretations of what rankings mean for higher education and how rankings may contribute to change the sector. These five perspectives are not mutually exclusive, but are presented separately to illustrate the many potential functions of rankings in higher education.

Rankings as Market Regulation

The first perspective is about market regulation. One way of interpreting the meaning of ranking for higher education is related to the regulations of the sector. In this perspective, the role of the state is to facilitate a number of market-based or quasi market-based governing strategies, including increased competition between higher education institutions (Stensaker & Kehm, 2009). While a powerful higher education system is strongly associated with a productive economy (Hazelkorn, 2013), the quality of its institutions reflects a country’s ability to compete with other countries economically. Ranking, in this

14 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:
www.igi-global.com/chapter/globalization-of-world-university-rankings-and-its-impact-on-asian-universities/168195

Related Content

Taking a Leap to Education 4.0: The Practitioner-Learner Partnership in the Refinement of a Module Site for Learning at Scale

Enna Ayub, Johan Eddy Luaran, Syamsul Nor Azlan Mohamad and Wei Wei Goh (2021). *Transforming Curriculum Through Teacher-Learner Partnerships* (pp. 29-47).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/taking-a-leap-to-education-40/266693

The Presidency and Student Affairs: An Imperative Partnership

Jerrid P. Freeman and Shana L. Warkentine Meyer (2022). *The Evolving College Presidency: Emerging Trends, Issues, and Challenges* (pp. 103-125).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-presidency-and-student-affairs/306904

Teaching-to-Learn: Its Effects on Conceptual Knowledge Learning in University Students

Melissa McConnell Rogers (2021). *International Journal of Innovative Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* (pp. 1-14).

www.irma-international.org/article/teaching-to-learn/289863

Exploring the Role of Technology in Enhancing Adult Education and Skills Development in Urban Areas of South Africa

Reginald Botshabeng Monyai (2024). *Adjunct Faculty in Online Higher Education: Best Practices for Teaching Adult Learners* (pp. 105-131).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/exploring-the-role-of-technology-in-enhancing-adult-education-and-skills-development-in-urban-areas-of-south-africa/337404

Formative Evaluations of Teaching: Involving Students in the Assessment Process

Gina Mariano, Frank Hammonds, Sheridan Chambers and Gracie Spear (2017). *Innovative Practices for Higher Education Assessment and Measurement* (pp. 101-118).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/formative-evaluations-of-teaching/159969