

This article was downloaded by: [UNAM Ciudad Universitaria]

On: 26 November 2014, At: 08:29

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



## Journal of Education Policy

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tedp20>

### International rankings and the contest for university hegemony

Imanol Ordorika<sup>a</sup> & Marion Lloyd<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Dirección General de Evaluación Institucional, Circuito del Estadio Olímpico Universitario s/n (costado poniente), antigua tienda UNAM, Ciudad Universitaria, México, México

Published online: 24 Nov 2014.

To cite this article: Imanol Ordorika & Marion Lloyd (2014): International rankings and the contest for university hegemony, *Journal of Education Policy*, DOI: [10.1080/02680939.2014.979247](https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.979247)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.979247>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

## International rankings and the contest for university hegemony

Imanol Ordorika\*<sup>1</sup> and Marion Lloyd<sup>1</sup>

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Dirección General de Evaluación Institucional, Circuito del Estadio Olímpico Universitario s/n (costado poniente), antigua tienda UNAM, Ciudad Universitaria, México, México*

*(Received 15 January 2014; accepted 17 October 2014)*

In just a decade, the international university rankings have become dominant measures of institutional performance for policy-makers worldwide. Bolstered by the façade of scientific neutrality, these classification systems have reinforced the hegemonic model of higher education – that of the elite, Anglo-Saxon research university – on a global scale. The process is a manifestation of what Bourdieu and Wacquant have termed US “cultural imperialism.” However, the rankings paradigm is facing growing criticism and resistance, particularly in regions such as Latin America, where the systems are seen as forcing institutions into a costly and high-stakes “academic arms race” at the expense of more pressing development priorities. That position, expressed at the recent UNESCO conferences in Buenos Aires, Paris, and Mexico City, shows the degree to which the rankings have become a fundamental element in the contest for cultural hegemony, waged through the prism of higher education.

**Keywords:** higher education; rankings; cultural hegemony; U.S. cultural imperialism; Latin America

Discipline rewards simply by the play of awards, thus making it possible to attain higher ranks and places; it punishes by reversing this process. Rank in itself serves as a reward or punishment (M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 1995, 181).

### Introduction

A decade after the first international ranking of universities was unveiled in China, these hierarchical systems have established themselves among the dominant measures of institutional performance for policy-makers worldwide. While national or regional tables have existed for several decades in the English-speaking world (Webster 1986; Turner 2005), the impact of the international rankings has become particularly significant, both on individual institutions and on national higher education systems as a whole (Marginson 2007; Ordorika and Rodríguez 2010; Marginson 2012a, 2012b).

By establishing a narrow set of criteria by which all institutions are measured, the rankings have served to reinforce the hegemony of the Anglo-Saxon model of

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: [ordorika@unam.mx](mailto:ordorika@unam.mx)

<sup>1</sup>Now at: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas, Circuito Mario de la Cueva, Ciudad de la Investigación en Humanidades, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, México, D.F., México.

higher education, and that of the United States in particular. The process is a manifestation of what Bordieu and Wacquant (1999) have termed US-based ‘cultural imperialism,’ which ‘rests on the power to universalize particularisms linked to a singular historical tradition by causing them to be misrecognized as such’ (1999, 41). In this way, ‘numerous topics directly issuing from the intellectual confrontations relating to the social particularity of American society and of its universities have been imposed, in apparently de-historicized form, upon the whole planet’ (Bordieu and Wacquant 1999, 41). In the case of higher education, a sole model of university – the elite Anglo-Saxon research institution, and the US version in particular<sup>1</sup> – has been removed from its cultural context and projected to the rest of the world as the ‘objective’ ideal to follow.

The rankings derive much of their legitimacy from such claims of objectivity. For instance, a majority relies heavily on internationally recognized measures of research production, such as the number of scholarly articles included in the Thomson Reuters’ Web of Science or Elsevier’s Scopus databases. However, even those measures, which are heavily biased toward English-language publications, reflect the hegemony of the US higher education model – and of its elite institutions in particular. As Young argues in her defense of the ‘politics of difference’ (1990), such ‘claims to impartiality feed cultural imperialism by allowing the particular experience and perspective of privileged groups to parade as universal’ (10).

The impact of US-led neoliberal<sup>2</sup> policies is also apparent in the rankings. The systems are both products of the new managerial and pro-market culture in higher education, while also serving as ‘agents of their reproduction’ (Badat 2010, 127). However, this does not imply the existence of an explicit strategy on the part of US institutions or the government to use rankings to further the country’s hegemony abroad. In fact, an apparent irony of this process is the fact that the most influential international rankings are produced outside the United States. Nor do US institutions pay much attention to the international league tables, despite dominating the top spots. Furthermore, the Obama administration has been critical of the university rankings paradigm and has recently proposed its own alternative rating system<sup>3</sup> that would grade and reward institutions based on measures of social impact and affordability.

Nonetheless, the influence of the American higher education model on the rankings’ design is undeniable. The pioneering Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), which was first released in 2003 by the Institute of Higher Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University, sought to determine how Chinese universities stacked up against ‘world-class universities’ around the world (Liu 2009). In designing their methodology, ARWU’s creators used six categories as proxies for excellence, including the number of highly cited researchers, faculty with Nobel Prizes, and the overall research performance of the institution – all categories in which US research institutions excel.

The other leading international rankings are produced in Britain, whose higher education policies increasingly resemble those of the United States, and which has the second largest number of top-ranked universities. Thus, in the logic of Bordieu and Wacquant, the international rankings have ‘tacitly constituted’ the American research institution into a ‘model for every other and as a yardstick for all things’ (1999, 42) – a process with sweeping implications for higher education policy on a global level.

University rankings have made use of the media to assemble large audiences and increase their global presence. Almost in every country, there are strong supporters

of rankings as new forms of assessment for higher education systems and institutions. An important international community of specialists and ranking producers has also generated international forums and organizations,<sup>4</sup> where they discuss good practices and establish standards, such as the Berlin Principles.<sup>5</sup>

However, there is growing resistance and opposition to the homogenizing influence of the rankings in many parts of the world. Those tensions are particularly apparent in Latin America, which has recently been the site of massive student protests against 'neoliberal' higher education policies. The region has its own distinct tradition of higher education (Arocena and Sutz 2005; Ordorika and Pusser 2007), whose modern roots lie in the Cordoba movement for university autonomy in 1918<sup>6</sup> and the 1929 movement for autonomy at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM).

In a May 2012 conference on the rankings, held at the National Autonomous University of Mexico, rectors from throughout the region questioned the hegemony of the dominant model of higher education and the role of the rankings (Ambrus 2012). In particular, they criticized the failure of the hierarchical classification systems to take into account their institutions' broader contributions to society as 'state-building universities,' a Latin American tradition which has no equivalent in the English-speaking world (Ordorika and Pusser 2007; Muñoz García 2009). Their critiques echoed views expressed during two recent UNESCO-sponsored conference on rankings in Buenos Aires and Paris, the details of which we will discuss further on in this article.

Many researchers have focused on the methodological limitations of the rankings (Van Raan 2005; Florian 2007; Ishikawa 2009; Jaienski 2009; Ordorika Sacristán, Lozano Espinosa, and Rodríguez Gómez 2009; Ying and Jingao 2009), and their negative impact on higher education policy and institutions (Ehrenberg 2004; Dill 2006; Ordorika and Rodríguez 2010). Others have noted the ways in which the systems form part of broader neoliberal policies affecting higher education (Hazelkorn 2007; Badat 2010; Marginson and Ordorika 2011; Marginson 2012a; Pusser and Marginson 2012).

In this article, we seek to contribute to the debate from a broader theoretical perspective, which posits the rankings as fundamental elements in the contest for cultural hegemony on a global scale. We also show how that dispute is being played out through the following channels: the media, higher education institutions, policy-making circles, and international organizations. Finally, we provide empirical evidence of the growing resistance to the rankings paradigm in countries throughout the world, with a particular emphasis on Latin America. Possibly due to language barriers, Latin America's prominent role in the dispute – and in fomenting the resistance – has received insufficient attention outside the region. However, as we show in this article, Latin America has become a key site of contestation over the rankings paradigm.

At stake in the dispute is the prevalence of a single, hegemonic model of higher education,<sup>7</sup> whose global dominance has been bolstered by the rankings. Critics from Johannesburg to Mexico City are questioning the neutrality of the systems and their role in dictating higher education policy. In the process, they are challenging dominant cultural dogma, defined by Bordieu and Wacquant as 'these commonplaces, in the Aristotelian sense of notions or theses with which one argues, but about which one does not argue' (1999, 42). The outcome of that contest is likely to have far-reaching consequences in shaping the dominant cultural and economic paradigms of the twenty-first century.

In analyzing the dispute over the rankings, we begin by providing a brief description of their impact and underlying logic. We argue that the rankings form part of the new managerial approach to higher education and the neoliberal ethos of free-market competition. We follow with an overview of the main methodological critiques of the rankings, namely their heavy focus on scientific research production and their bias toward the English language. We then delve into the broader ideological debate behind the rankings and the dispute for cultural hegemony, which is the central focus of this article. Finally, we discuss the ways in which the contest over the rankings plays out in various contexts: in the media, within higher education institutions, in policy-making circles in Europe and Latin America, and on the broader international level.

### **The impact of the rankings**

By comparing institutions as far afield as Shanghai, Cape Town, Sao Paulo, and New York, the rankings project the universities beyond their local and regional contexts, exposing them to unprecedented scrutiny. In the context of globalization and dwindling government funding for higher education, universities already face increasing pressure to compete for resources and students. In their efforts to stand out, administrators frequently seize on the international rankings as ‘evidence’ of the superior quality of their institution; despite the relatively narrow focus of the ranking methodologies, their results have been widely viewed as a reflection of the overall quality of an individual institution, or at least, as the closest possible approximation (Lloyd, Ordorika, and Rodríguez-Gómez 2011; Marginson 2012b). In the space of just a decade, the rankings have positioned themselves as a new form of gatekeepers for higher education, determining whom and what are valued, and to what degree.

That influence has sparked growing concern among higher education experts and administrators alike regarding the rankings’ homogenizing impact and their use, or misuse, in shaping policy. Many critics cite the pressure that institutions face to conform to a largely arbitrary and Anglocentric set of performance indicators (Bowden 2000; Van Raan 2005; Florian 2007; Federkeil 2008; Siganos 2008; Ishikawa 2009; Ordorika Sacristán, Lozano Espinosa, and Rodríguez Gómez 2009; Ying and Jingao 2009). Others warn that institutions are being forced to compete in an increasingly costly and high-stakes ‘academic arms race’ (Ehrenberg 2004; Dill 2006), to the detriment of more pressing local or national development priorities.

Defenders of the rankings, meanwhile, dismiss those criticisms as a sign of institutions’ reluctance to change.<sup>8</sup> They argue that the rankings are necessary instruments for improving the quality of institutions, particularly in developing regions like Latin America.

### **The logic of the rankings**

The popularity of the rankings is a reflection of the increasingly pervasive ‘culture of accountability’ in policy agendas, as well as societal demands for access to information in both the public and private spheres. In this context, higher education institutions have faced growing pressures to develop instruments to measure, classify, and track their performance in academic and administrative areas (Power 1997; Acosta Silva 2000; Elliott 2002; Bolseguí and Fuguet Smith 2006). A consequence of this process has been an increased emphasis on management and the adoption of

‘new managerialism’ as an ideology in higher education reforms (Deem and Brehony 2005) at the worldwide level.

In a way, rankings are functional to new managerialism in higher education. Traditional academic hierarchies have been eroded by the growing importance of administrative logics and the consequent weakening of academic communities, as well as collegial bodies and practices. They have also been undermined by massification of enrollments and indiscriminate dissemination of knowledge via the Internet (Ordorika and Lloyd 2013), as well as the incorporation of nonuniversity institutions, particularly those operating with a for-profit model, into broader higher education systems. In this context, rankings have introduced additional signs of academic hierarchy that are external to higher education institutions and academic communities. This shift has far-reaching implications, including a loss of autonomy for individual institutions and higher education systems, and a tendency toward the homogenization of priorities and goals on a global scale, at the expense of locally determined agendas and missions.

Proponents of the rankings argue that this shift is positive. They assert that it is in the interest of higher education institutions, governments, publishers, scientific communities, and other relevant actors to agree on classification criteria that are based on common ideals and academic values, in order to compete in the global knowledge economy (Ordorika Sacristán and Rodríguez Gómez 2008). According to IREG, the rankings serve the following purposes:

they respond to demands from consumers for easily interpretable information on the standing of higher education institutions; they stimulate competition among them; they provide some of the rationale for allocation of funds; and they help differentiate among different types of institutions and different programs and disciplines. In addition, when correctly understood and interpreted, they contribute to the definition of ‘quality’ of higher education institutions within a particular country, complementing the rigorous work conducted in the context of quality assessment and review performed by public and independent accrediting agencies (*Berlin Principles 2006*).

In this view, such qualities explain ‘why rankings of HEIs have become part of the framework of national accountability and quality assurance processes, and why more nations are likely to see the development of rankings in the future’ (*Berlin Principles 2006*).

The rankings also reinforce the new managerial culture in higher education, in which universities are increasingly appraised as business-oriented enterprises rather than institutions at the service of society at large. As such, the systems respond to demands, established from market perspectives, to classify institutions for the benefit of potential consumers. Such institutional branding is particularly important, given the growing competition to attract international students and talent – factors that also contribute to the institutions’ rank.

The new logic is, in turn, a manifestation of broader neoliberal policies. Among fundamental transformations affecting higher education institutions are major reductions in government funding, and the decline of the public sphere in general (Boggs 1997; Pusser 2011), which have been replaced by notions of individual responsibility and what Slaughter and Leslie (1999) have termed ‘academic capitalism.’ Other changes include the new ‘audit culture’ (Apple 2007), flexibility and quality control, diminished institutional autonomy, and increased emphasis on knowledge production and industry collaboration. The combined impact of these forces on universities is hard to overstate. Institutions face increasing pressure to

secure new sources of funding and to maximize resources, in order to compete. Often that entails reducing benefits to employees, who are increasingly offered precarious and poorly paid adjunct positions in lieu of tenure. At the same time, administrative positions have taken the place of academic ones, as part of the new emphasis on accountability and fundraising (Rhoades 1998; Slaughter and Rhoades 2004).

The rankings also fuel the privatizing trend in higher education worldwide, by rewarding attributes that, at least in the US context, are characteristic of the top private institutions: high tuition and large endowments; highly competitive selection processes, both for students and faculty; and heavy emphasis on research, ideally leading to industrial patents and other profit-making ventures. It is no coincidence that only one public institution, the University of California, Berkeley, made it into the top 20 spots in the 2014 edition of *US News & World Report's* National University Rankings; it was ranked 20th. The same is true of the majority of the international rankings; almost without exception, they are dominated by private US universities and public ones that charge increasingly high tuitions such as Berkeley, Cambridge University, and Oxford University.

The methodologies of the international rankings – which tend to equate scientific production with the absolute quality of the institutions – also reinforce the new logic behind higher education policies. John Dewey's once prevalent view of education as serving to promote upward mobility, democratic values, and social cohesion has been replaced with a new 'neoliberal common sense in education' (Torres 2013), whose main role is to fuel economic development by producing workers for the new knowledge economy. In that context, higher education institutions should aspire to become 'world-class universities,' a term favored by the Shanghai ranking and the World Bank (Salmi 2009). However, there is heated debate among academics and policy-makers as to the pertinence and cost of attempting to transform institutions in the developing world into research powerhouses that could compete in the rankings (Altabach and Balán 2007; Badat 2010).

### **Methodological critiques and reliability**

There are currently a wide variety of ranking-style classification systems at the international, regional, and national levels. There have also been recent attempts to provide alternatives to the rankings, in the form of regional or nation-wide information systems, the details of which we will discuss in the conclusions to this article. However, judging by the media coverage and the preferences of government policy-makers, the following three continue to have greatest impact on a global level – the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), the *Times Higher Education World University Rankings (THE)*, and the *QS World University Rankings (QS)* – as well as the ranking produced by *US News & World Report*, due to its foundational role in creating the rankings paradigm and its enormous influence on the US market. The rankings distinguish themselves essentially on the basis of their methodologies and the weight they assign to different indicators: those, such as ARWU, that base their analysis on the quantitative evaluation of the international circulation of knowledge production, employing indicators such as the number of publications and citations (Dill and Soo 2005); those that rely on surveys of institutional image and reputation, including many newspaper rankings in different countries; and those, including QS, THE, and US News, that combine international research production

and reputational data with a variety of other criteria, such as the proportion of foreign students and faculty on campus, research and other income, and selectivity.<sup>9</sup>

Despite the diversity of methodologies, the rankings tend to be employed interchangeably by policy-makers to rate the quality of institutions or higher education systems. Universities, meanwhile, tend to highlight the rankings in which they fare the best, featuring the results on their web pages or in marketing campaigns. The systems have also become a recurrent topic in the media, which, as we will discuss further on in this article, typically take a noncritical view of the results, while ignoring the differences among the results and methodologies (Marginson and Van der Wende 2006; Espeland and Sauder 2007; Hazelkorn 2007; Salmi and Saroyan 2007; Thakur 2008; Marginson 2009).

The commercial orientation of some of the rankings – and of THE and QS in particular – has also sparked controversy. In order to be profitable, the rankings must generate expectations regarding their results. One way of doing that is to change the order of the universities from year to year, often without providing a clear explanation; any modification in the order of the top 10 – and the No. 1 spot in particular – tends to generate a flurry of media reports, such as when Cambridge beat out Harvard in 2010 in the QS ranking (Vasagar and Williams 2010), or when the Massachusetts Institute of Technology moved into the top spot of the *US News* listing in 2012 (*El Observador* 2012). Interest is also peaked by moving lower ranked institutions by 100 or more spots in the hierarchy (Ordorika and Rodríguez 2010) or by changing the order among different rankings produced by the same company. An example of the latter strategy was the first QS Latin America University Rankings, in which the order of the universities in the region did not correspond to their respective positions in the same year's QS World Ranking.

QS officials argue that the discrepancy was due to the fact that in the case of Latin America, 'the methodology has been adapted to the needs of the region' (QS 2011/2012). Among changes was the application of an 'extensive' survey of academics and institutional leaders, which takes into account 'student satisfaction, and the quality, number and depth of relationships with universities outside the region' (QS 2011/2012, 4). Such variations, however, call into question not only the methodology employed in the larger ranking, but also that of the rankings as a whole. Nonetheless, the fluctuations can have a major impact on the perceptions of the institutions both nationally and internationally, which in turn may lead to changes in higher education policy.

### **The ideological debate**

As with any hierarchical classification, the design of the rankings' methodologies is ideologically charged, reflecting the priorities and values of their creators. 'What is ranked and what is not ranked provide a window into contemporary power in higher education' (Pusser and Marginson 2012, 98). Here, power is primarily understood in the Gramscian sense of the exercise of hegemony by civil society and by educational institutions in particular. Gramsci defines hegemony as 'the "spontaneous" consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group,' which derives its prestige from 'its position and function in the world of production' (Gramsci 1971, 145).



In higher education, hegemony is established through the construction of dominant views and the framing of the field, as well as its accepted discourses and notions. This occurs in a complex interaction between formal and cultural political processes, government, and economic relations, within institutions and in broader national and international contexts. ‘Institutions in the strongest countries exercise power by forming widespread understandings of the nature and role of higher education, acceptable outcomes and processes, and the prevailing standards and norms. They frame the field itself, determining the conditions of interaction and the terms of competition’ (Marginson and Ordorika 2011, 82).

By adopting the criteria and results of the rankings, higher education institutions and government policy-makers are affording them legitimacy, in turn, paving the way for their wider adoption by society at large. At the same time, they are legitimizing their own value systems, in which certain aspects of a university’s function – namely research production – are more highly prized than others.

To the degree to which rankings inform government decisions about higher education, they ‘serve as a key source of power and legitimacy in broader state contests’ (Pusser and Marginson 2012, 98). By classifying institutions on the basis of a narrow set of criteria, the rankings reward those that most closely resemble the ‘ideal’ model of higher education; in practice, they serve as ‘harvard-ometers,’ measuring how closely an institution resembles Harvard (Ordorika 2011). At the same time, the rankings adopt a ‘disciplinary role’ toward institutions that fall outside the established guidelines, ‘encouraging institutions in those nations – despite differences in resources, stages of development, national histories, traditions, languages, and cultures – to adopt the template of the globally dominant universities that lead rankings: comprehensive research-intensive institutions with selective admissions, emphasizing science and technology and elite professional schools’ (Pusser and Marginson 2012, 106).

The choice of indicators, in turn, reflects the dominant value systems that guide the US political and economic models. Bordieu and Wacquant (1999) describe the process by which US values are projected as global standard-bearers.

Thanks to a symbolic inversion based on the naturalization of the schemata of neo-liberal thought, whose dominance has been imposed for some 20 years by the relentless sniping of conservative think tanks and their allies in the political and journalistic fields ... the refashioning of social relations and cultural practices in advanced societies after the US pattern—founded on the pauperization of the state, the commodification of public goods and the generalization of social insecurity—is nowadays accepted with resignation as the inevitable outcome of the evolution of nations, when it is not celebrated with a sheepish enthusiasm (1999, 42).

In that context, many states face pressure to conform to the US model, pushing them into conflict with their national and local priorities (Pusser 2012). Those governments that aspire to see their universities appear among the top 100 in the international rankings must consider the economic and social implications. Almost without exception, the most highly ranked institutions are those with annual budgets exceeding \$1 billion (Hazelkorn 2008, 211), and which derive at least part of their funding from private sources, typically through charging lofty tuition fees.

In Latin America, the leading universities are predominantly publically funded, very few have budgets of that magnitude, and typically the expenditure per student is a fraction of that of their private US competitors. According to a World Bank study released in 2009, Harvard spent US\$106,000 per student, Stanford \$165,000, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, \$216,000 (Salmi 2009, 94). The

University of California, at Berkeley, among the world's top-ranked public universities, receives tuition support that partially subsidized the \$51,600 it spent per student (Salmi 2009, 94). In contrast, the University of São Paulo, the highest ranked Latin American university, spent \$17,000 per student and the UNAM, another regional leader, spent \$7700 (DGEI 2012). To put the funding gap in context, in 2009 the entire Mexican higher education budget – which accounts for the vast amount of spending in the sector – was equivalent to one-fourth of the budget of the University of California, at Berkeley (Muñoz García 2009, 30–31).

In some cases, the rankings have adopted an explicit stance in favor of private investment in higher education. When analyzing the outcome of its 2012 ranking of Latin American universities, the British firm Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) noted the increasing presence of private universities among the top spots, and the clear dominance of Brazil in the line-up. According to the company's analysis:

Private investment in education seems to be the most reasonable way of increasing the proportion of overall national income invested in education. Likewise, collaborations between the private sector and higher education institutions, as well as the strengthening of connections between curriculum design and employers' requirements, should be perceived as important tools for improving productivity and creating more opportunities for enrolment in good quality tertiary education (QS 2012).

It is a ringing endorsement of the private sector role in higher education. However, QS overlooks the fact that two-thirds of enrollment in Brazil is already concentrated in the private sector, much of it in poor quality, for-profit institutions, while the bulk of research continues to be conducted in the public sector (Kinser and Levy 2006; Lloyd 2013a). By recommending a still greater private investment in the country's higher education system, the ranking company is staking its ground in one of the most critical debates facing the sector today: whether higher education constitutes a public or a private good. The implications of that debate extend far beyond higher education, encompassing the role of government and the state in promoting collective societal goals.

### **The contest over rankings**

In spite of their media presence and policy impact, the rankings have not gone uncontested. In addition to experts' critiques that we mentioned at the beginning of this article, the rankings have sparked debates among specialists and adverse reactions from faculty, students, university administrators, and even government officials. Much of the discussions and critiques have been played out in the media, while other instances of contestation have occurred in institutional, national, and international settings. Many of the arguments against the rankings are closely linked with a thorough questioning of the existence of a hegemonic model of elite research universities (Marginson and Ordorika 2011).

### ***The dispute in the media***

In general, one of the defining aspects of the rankings has been their largely symbiotic relationship with the media. Several rankings, including the *US News & World Report* edition, are produced by media outlets, for which the listings are a major source of revenue. The media coverage of the results serves to legitimize the rankings among the broader public and government policy-makers. However, that

exposure also invites criticism of the rankings, and in particular, of their outsized influence on higher education policy.

In the case of countries or regions in which few or no universities figure in the top 500 in the main rankings, the media coverage tends to focus on the perceived failure of higher education policies, and on the lack of funding for research in particular. For example, the Uruguayan daily *El Observador* noted in October 2012 that ‘no South American university ranked among the 100 best universities on the planet’ (*El Observador* 2012). The article highlighted the region’s poor showing and that of Uruguay in particular, in that year’s World’s Best Universities ranking, produced by *US News & World Report* in collaboration with QS. Similarly, following the THE 2012–2013 ranking, the English-language website *Free Malaysia Today* lamented the state of the Asian country’s universities in a story headlined ‘Local varsities fail rankings test again’ (Lee 2012). Neither story discussed the methodologies of the rankings, instead taking them as unqualified proof of the need to reform their countries’ higher education systems.

Some media reports, and a growing number of columnists, however, question the reliability of the rankings and their use in guiding higher education policy. In some cases, such as a recent guest column on *Voice of America* (VOA), the official US external broadcast network, the criticism has come from within the government establishment. The piece highlighted recent changes among the university line-up and asked: ‘How useful are rankings then, if they can’t even agree on a top contender?’ (Stahl 2012).

### ***Institutional adaptation?***

The dispute over the rankings is also being played out within the universities themselves. In some cases, institutions have engaged in unethical practices in an effort to improve their standing in the rankings. One example is the recent admission by a half dozen US colleges and universities that they misreported their enrollment statistics, in some cases over the period of a decade, in hopes of securing a higher standing in the *US News & World Report* ranking. The list of prestigious institutions that admitted to wrongdoing in 2012 and early 2013 includes: Claremont McKenna College, Emory University, George Washington University, Tulane University, and Bucknell University (DeSantis 2012, 2013; Hoover 2012; Supiano 2012). Furthermore, the list continues to grow by the month, suggesting that such malfeasance is widespread.

Such questionable tactics reveal the degree to which university administrators have adopted the competitive message implicit in the rankings that survival as institutions requires being rated among the best, regardless of the ethical costs. However, there is considerable opposition to the rankings paradigm within US institutions. In 2007, for instance, dozens of colleges and universities refused to provide information to *US News & World Report* in protest for what their leaders viewed as a distorted and questionable classification process.

### ***National reactions and conflict***

Another sphere in which the rankings have become contentious elements in the struggle for cultural hegemony is in government policy-making. A growing number of countries are using the results of the rankings as justification for implementing

sweeping reforms to their higher education systems, or to justify reforms that are already underway. In most cases, the changes follow neoliberal policy trends in the United States, including a reduction in state funding for universities, and the adoption of accreditation systems and incentives linked to research production. Many governments are also using the results to condition access to study-abroad scholarships and work visas. Such uncritical use of the hierarchical classification systems has sparked a backlash, primarily within countries where higher education has traditionally been viewed as a public good, such as in Latin America.

### *The policy debate in Europe*

One example in which the rankings have fueled controversial policy changes is France. In 2010, the government of then President Nicolas Sarkozy pledged billions of euros toward higher education reforms with the goal of elevating the visibility and research production of its leading universities. In justifying the reforms, the government cited the country's relatively poor showing in the main international rankings (Labi 2010); the highest ranked French institution, the University of Paris VI, typically hovers around 40th place. Changes include fusing existing universities into 10 regional supercampuses in hopes of eventually rivaling the research output of Harvard or MIT (Labi 2010), a strategy that has also been adopted by Finland and other countries (Labi 2011; Välimaa 2012). The reforms also grant universities more autonomy over the use of finances, including the freedom to assign salaries and award performance-based bonuses. As a result, the universities face pressure to generate resources from alternative sources and to adopt a new culture of accountability. Critics, meanwhile, argue that the reforms threaten the collegial and democratic nature of the French system, remaking it along US lines – in another instance of US cultural imperialism. According to Laurence Giavarini, spokeswoman for the faculty opposition group Let's Save the University, 'the entire French university system is under attack ... We're not talking about small reforms at the margins. This is a complete disruption of the system' (Labi 2010).

Russia is another site of dispute over the rankings paradigm. As part of broader university reforms, the government of President Vladimir Putin recently announced it would waive the onerous credential review process for academics from other countries who wish to work at Russian universities and who earned their PhDs at top-ranked universities (Nemtsova 2012). In addition, the government also announced plans to condition where students awarded study abroad grants can attend university, based on a list of 210 qualifying institutions. Other strategies include investing in a select group of Russian universities and recruiting top talent, in hopes of improving the institutions' standing in the rankings (Nemtsova 2012).

The moves have sparked heated criticism from within Russian academe, with faculty arguing that the country would be better served by investing in its native talent. There is also concern over the impact of the international rankings on higher education policy. In March 2012, Andrei Fursenko, the Russian education minister at the time, announced that the government was devising its own international ranking of universities to counteract the influence of the international tables. Rankings are an "instrument of competitive battle and influence' and should not be monopolized" (Kishkovsky 2012). To an extent, the debate reflects lingering mistrust within the Russian establishment of Western – and in particular US – cultural dominance in the post-cold war era.

*The dispute in Latin America*

The rankings have had an even more polarizing impact in Latin America, due to the region's long tradition of free, public higher education and resistance to US imperialism (political, economic, and military, as well as cultural). Unlike in the United States, the top-ranked universities in Latin America are virtually all public institutions, although private universities have fared well in the new regional rankings, such as the one produced by QS. Public universities, in particular, have played a key role in the economic and social development of their respective nations: by training a majority of the professional workforce; designing state institutions; tackling pressing development problems; and providing a wide array of community service and cultural programs. (Arocena and Sutz 2005; Ordorika and Pusser 2007). As defined by Arocena and Sutz (2005), 'the Latin American idea of university highly values an active institutional compromise with social progress' (581).

That tradition has come under attack in recent years. Governments throughout Latin America have seized on the region's relatively poor showing in the international tables – with just half a dozen universities listed in the top 500 – to justify accelerating neoliberal reforms to their higher education systems, or, in the case of Chile, to conserve the existing model, in which students and their families bear the majority of the cost of their education.

The debate reflects conflicting goals: on the part of the government and industry, of creating a globalized workforce that can compete in the knowledge economy; and social demands for higher education as a mechanism for upward social mobility (Labaree 1997). This is true even in the case of self-declared leftist governments, such as in Ecuador and Peru, both of which have used their countries' poor showing in the rankings as justification for pushing through new higher education laws.

In the case of Ecuador, legislation passed in 2010 required all university professors to hold PhDs within a decade, despite the fact that at the time, only one university in the country offered doctoral degrees (Lloyd 2010). The law also creates a new academic accrediting agency and increases federal control over the university system. Critics have accused President Rafael Correa, who holds a doctoral degree in economics from the University of Illinois, of blindly adopting US inspired policies that are inappropriate in the Ecuadoran context (Lloyd 2010).

Similarly, the Peruvian Congress approved a set of reforms to the country's higher education law in June 2013, which includes mandatory accreditation of all universities and programs, the creation of a new federal agency to oversee higher education, and a moratorium on the creation of new universities until new quality controls are in place (Lloyd 2013b). Opponents, including the National Rectors Assembly and the Federation of Peruvian Students, accuse the government of seeking to undermine hard-fought university autonomy under the guise of quality assurance (Lloyd 2013b).

Governments in many Latin American countries are also using the rankings to determine where students can study abroad on government grants. Those policies are particularly significant in the case of Brazil, Chile, and Ecuador, which are sending record numbers of students abroad in a bid to increase their countries' research capacity. In Brazil, for example, the government's Science without Borders program, launched in 2010 amid great fanfare, seeks to send 100,000 students in the STEM fields to study in top-ranked universities by 2015, and another 100,000 by 2018. However, critics note that by restricting students to the top-ranked institutions – a

majority of which are in the United States – governments are unnecessarily raising the costs of such programs. The Ecuadoran government, for example, has committed to spend up to \$250,000 per student for the first 2000 applicants admitted to universities ranked among the top 50 (AP 2012), far more than the cost of a comparable degree in Europe.

Nonetheless, there is also a counter trend in Latin America, in which governments in the region are seeking to expand access to higher education for underprivileged groups. In the presence of massive student demonstrations, from 2011 to 2014, the new Chilean president, Michelle Bachelet, campaigned on a pledge to provide free, public higher education – a dramatic reversal of privatizing policies in place since 1980. Similarly, in 2012, Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff sanctioned a new law requiring the country's 63 federal universities – which tend to be among the country's top institutions of higher education – to reserve half of all their spots for graduates of public high schools and Afro-Brazilians, despite critics' warnings that the affirmative action policies would negatively impact the academic level of the institutions, and thus their place in the rankings. The policies reflect competing views of the role of higher education institutions in the twenty-first century, particularly within developing countries.

### **Conflicting international views**

The contest over the rankings is increasingly being played out in international forums, in which Latin America has occupied a central role – for example, the IV Meeting of University Networks and Councils of Chancellors in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in April 2011, which was sponsored by IESALC, UNESCO's higher education institute for Latin America. There, university presidents and administrators from throughout Latin America and the Caribbean drafted a joint statement<sup>10</sup> ratifying earlier UNESCO declarations<sup>11</sup> that defined higher education is a 'social public good' and 'not a tradable commodity' (IESALC 2011). The Buenos Aires declaration also outlined the main criticisms of the rankings and proposed alternatives that would provide information on different aspects of universities' performance without classifying them hierarchically.

That meeting was followed a month later by the UNESCO Global Forum on Rankings and Accountability in Higher Education: Uses and Misuses, held in Paris, which drew together more than 250 delegates from 68 countries. Critics, who included representatives of the main multilateral organizations and academics at some highly placed institutions, faulted the rankings for failing to take into account the diversity of institutions and higher education systems around the world. Irina Bokova, director general of UNESCO, argued that while competition and international comparisons could be positive, 'no ranking ever says how to promote quality higher education open to all which fulfills its three missions of research, teaching and service to the community' (Marshall 2011).

In an even more critical vein, Ellen Hazelkorn, vice president of research and enterprise at the Dublin Institute of Technology, warned that by increasing emphasis on scientific research that might be too expensive for many universities, the rankings may actually 'undermine a broader vision to provide education' (Guttenplan 2011). Furthermore, she argued, they promote conflict between two main emerging policy trends in higher education: the 'neo-liberal' model, which concentrates excellence and resources in a small number of elite universities; and the 'social-democratic'

model, which seeks ‘to balance quality across the country,’ while promoting collaboration between teaching and research (Marshall 2011).

On the other side of the debate were the producers of the rankings and some academics. Ben Sowter, head of the QS Intelligence Unit that produces the QS World University Rankings, argued that his ranking helped students make educated choices, particularly in the case of the 3.4 million who study outside their home countries, enabling them to ‘fulfill their potential achievement and career development’ (Guttenplan 2011; Marshall 2011). Similarly, Dirk van Damme, head of the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, argued that tables were ‘in part an external answer to the lack of accountability and transparency for which the academic community is responsible’ (Marshall 2011).

Many of those arguments reemerged in even sharper detail in May 2012, when dozens of university rectors, higher education experts, and representatives from the ranking institutions convened in Mexico City for the conference Latin American Universities and the International Rankings: Impact, Scope and Limits. Several speakers criticized the rankings for failing to take into account the significant social and cultural impact of the nation-building universities in Latin America<sup>12</sup> and elsewhere (Ordorika and Pusser 2007). Other speakers cited the rankings’ linguistic bias, given the fact that the vast majority of scientific journals listed in the main bibliographic databases are published in English (Marginson 2012a; Ordorika 2012; Wouters 2012).

Many of those arguments were outlined in the conference’s Final Declaration,<sup>13</sup> a 10-page critical analysis of the rankings paradigm and its impact on Latin America.

The bias toward the Anglo-Saxon research university model does not permit universities in the region to compete on an even footing with their counterparts in more economically developed nations ... The result is a bias against the universities in Latin America and their scientific publications. Finally, there are enormous differences in the amount of investment in higher education and scientific research in different countries, which is the single most important element in determining the presence of institutions in the rankings (*Final Declaration 2012, 4*).

The document was signed by dozens of university rectors and top university officials, in 12 Latin American countries, as well as representatives of IESALC and the region’s main associations of universities. Among its long list of recommendations, it urges policy-makers to ‘develop strategic and long-range policies to strengthen universities in the region in accordance with their historic traditions and national development plans, conserving the emphasis on the formative mission of higher education and as a tool to promote inclusion, reduce the inequality gap and, simultaneously, promote economic development’ (2012, 5). For the media, it recommends ‘a more balanced, subtle and informed coverage of the rankings’ (2012, 8). It also proposes a strategic pact to expand access to the scientific production of the region’s universities – in fulfillment of the institutions’ debt to society, not as a ploy to improve their standings in the rankings (2012, 9).

As with the earlier conferences, representatives from several of the leading international rankings – THE, QS, and Webometrics – defended the scientific nature of their methodologies. However, several also acknowledged their inherent limitations. In a series of articles following the meeting, THE editor Phil Baty cautioned policy-makers against taking the rankings at face value as proxies for the overall quality of the institutions. ‘One of the great strengths of global higher education is

its extraordinarily rich diversity; and this can never be captured by any global ranking, which judges all institutions against a single set of criteria. In this context, a new declaration from a consortium of Latin American university rectors must be welcomed' (Baty 2012, 10–11).

### Final considerations

After just a decade, or several in the US context, the rankings have established themselves as a new sort of gatekeepers of higher education, a form of bureaucratic certification that has become the norm in both the private and public sectors (Post et al. 2013). This widespread adoption of international rankings has occurred through a complex process of consensual and, at the same time, reluctant acquiescence. So entrenched is the paradigm that governments from around the world, and across the political spectrum, have seized on their universities' relatively weak showing in the rankings to justify bold higher education reforms. These include such upcoming economic powerhouses as Brazil, Russia, India, and China, which, despite challenging US hegemony, have internalized many of the dominant cultural messages implicit in the US-led neoliberal project. Those envision higher education as a competitive marketplace, with a sole dominant model to which all institutions should aspire.

As we have shown in this article, however, the rankings paradigm is facing resistance from a wide range of social actors – academics, the media, policy-makers, and regional and international coalitions, that object to both the impact and the ideological underpinnings of the league tables themselves. In that context, a number of alternative information systems have emerged in recent years, which seek to address some of the main critiques of the mainstream rankings. Examples include the European Commission's new U-Multirank system, which was launched in 2014 after several years of development. It casts a wider net than most rankings, with information on more than 850 higher education institutions in the following areas: research, teaching and learning, international orientation, and knowledge transfer and regional engagement. Unlike traditional rankings, it enables users to compare institutions of like size, within regions or based on specific data.

The United States is also home to numerous alternative rankings, although none currently rivals the ones produced by *US News*. Examples include the *Washington Monthly* ranking, which has been comparing institutions since 2006 according to their 'contribution to the public good' (*Washington Monthly* 2013). Among the criteria it uses in judging an institution: 'how well it performs as an engine of social mobility (ideally helping the poor to get rich rather than the very rich to get very, very rich), how well it does in fostering scientific and humanistic research, and how well it promotes an ethic of service to country' (*Washington Monthly* 2006).

A third example, in Latin America, is the Comparative Study of Mexican Universities, which has been produced since 2009 by the National Autonomous University of Mexico. The study's online, interactive database is one of the largest of its kind, providing information on the more than 3000 institutions that are engaged in research or teaching in the country. However, as in most of the alternative models, the system's creators deliberately refrain from assigning institutions an overall rank.

In challenging one of the underlying principles behind the rankings – namely that there is such a thing as the ideal university for all contexts and for all students – critics



are also questioning broader higher education policies and trends underway on a global scale. The stakes are particularly high in Latin America and other developing regions, where aspiring to the ideal of a ‘world-class’ research-intensive university may mean forgoing other priorities. More than national or institutional pride is at stake. In the end, the contest over the rankings reflects broader efforts to challenge the hegemony of a dominant model of universities in the twenty-first century.

## Notes

1. Defining elements of the elite, US research institution include: a strong focus on knowledge production (emphasis on research and graduate studies); highly competitive admissions, seen as a proxy for excellence; among the highest tuition fees in the world, even in the case of public institutions; strong ties to business and the knowledge economy; heavy emphasis on productivity and efficiency in evaluating faculty; and financial autonomy through financial diversification.
2. We ascribe to Harvey’s definition of neoliberalism, as a philosophy that ‘holds that the social good will be maximized by maximizing the reach and frequency of market transactions, and it seeks to bring all human action into the domain of the market’ (2005, 3).
3. Obama announced his proposal for a College Scorecard system in August 2013, amid growing concern over soaring tuition rates at US institutions. The proposed system, which has faced stiff resistance from many of the institutions themselves, would grade colleges on measures such as the average tuition they charge, the share of low-income students they enroll, and the amount of student-loan debt incurred by graduates. Under the model, students attending highly rated institutions could qualify for larger federal loans or lower interest rates. See <http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/higher-education/college-score-card>.
4. The most well established of these is the International Ranking Expert Group (IREG), which was founded in 2004 by the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (UNESCO-CEPES) in Bucharest and the Institute for Higher Education Policy in Washington, DC. Its members include producers of the main rankings, as well as rankings experts and analysts. The group operates the IREG Observatory on Academic Ranking and Excellence: <http://www.ireg-observatory.org/>.
5. IREG members met in Berlin in May 2006 to develop a ‘set of principles of quality and good practice in HEI rankings.’ The resulting guidelines, known as the Berlin Principles on Ranking of Higher Education Institutions, seek to establish best practices in university rankings on a national, regional and international level. They include recommendations in four areas: the purposes and goals of rankings; the design and weighting of indicators; data collection and processing; and the presentation of ranking results.
6. The 1918 Cry of Córdoba, named for the student movement at the University of Córdoba, in Argentina, gave root to a tradition of university autonomy in the region, as well as a strong emphasis on the role of universities in promoting social change.
7. The contest over the hegemonic model of higher education is also being played out in the student protest movements in Chile, Colombia, Great Britain, and Quebec, as well as in the protests against the skyrocketing levels of student-loan debt in the United States and Chile, to name a few examples. In most of those cases, the students and their allies are demanding a return to free, public higher education and the recognition of higher education as a public good.
8. Examples include recent opinion pieces by conservative columnist Andrés Oppenheimer in *The Miami Herald* and Andrés Bernasconi, a higher education professor at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, in *Inside Higher Ed*.
9. For a more detailed overview of the rankings’ methodologies, see the Swiss education ministry’s website on the international rankings: <http://www.universityrankings.ch/>
10. See: [http://www.iesalc.UNESCO.org.ve/dmdocuments/posicion\\_alc\\_ante\\_rankings\\_en.pdf](http://www.iesalc.UNESCO.org.ve/dmdocuments/posicion_alc_ante_rankings_en.pdf)
11. The definitions were ratified in the UNESCO-sponsored World Conference on Higher Education, in 1998 and 2008. (IESALC 2011).

12. The event was convened by José Narro Robles, the rector of the UNAM, Rubén Hallú, rector of the University of Buenos Aires, Víctor Pérez Vera, rector of the University of Chile, and Moisés Wasserman, rector of the National University of Colombia. Full information about this Latin American meeting is available at <http://www.encuentro-rankings.unam.mx/>.
13. The English version of the Final Declaration is available online at: <http://www.encuentro-rankings.unam.mx/Documentos/Final-declaration-english.pdf>.

### Notes on contributors

Imanol Ordorika is a professor of sociology and education at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México and the editor-in-chief of the journal *Revista de la Educación Superior*. He works on politics and conflict in higher education, globalization, and international higher education; social movements in higher education, as well as social theory and education. He is the author of *Power and Politics in University Governance* (2003), *La Disputa por el Campus [The Dispute over the Campus]* (2006), co-author of *Hegemonía en la Era del Conocimiento [Hegemony in the Knowledge Era]* (2010), and joint editor of *Comparative Education* (2010) and *Universities and the Public Sphere* (2012).

Marion Lloyd is a doctoral student in sociology at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, where she is also the chief project coordinator for the General Directorate for Institutional Evaluation. Her research focuses on the impact of globalization on higher education policies, as well as issues of access and equity in higher education, with a particular focus on Latin America. Her work has appeared in *Rankings and Accountability in Higher Education* (UNESCO, 2013) and in *The Relevance of Academic Work in Comparative Perspective* (forthcoming).

### References

- Acosta Silva, A. 2000. *Estado, políticas y universidades en un periodo de transición*. México: Universidad de Guadalajara/Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Altabach, P., and J. Balán, eds. 2007. *World Class Worldwide: Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ambrus, S. 2012. "Educators Debate Negative Effects of International Rankings on Latin American Universities." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- AP. 2012. *Ecuador's Students Gamble between Studying Abroad or at Home*. The Associated Press. <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/lifestyle/2012/07/14/ecuador-students-gamble-between-studying-abroad-or-at-home/>.
- Apple, M. W. 2007. "Education, Markets and an Audit Culture." *International Journal of Educational Policies* 1 (1): 4–19. <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/lifestyle/2012/07/14/ecuador-students-gamble-between-studying-abroad-or-at-home/>.
- Arocena, R., and J. Sutz. 2005. "Latin American Universities: From an Original Revolution to an Uncertain Transition." *Higher Education* 50: 573–592.
- Badat, S. 2010. "Global Rankings of Universities: A Perverse and Present Burden." In *Whose Interests Are We Serving? Global Inequalities and Higher Education*, edited by E. Unterhalter and V. Carpentier, 117–141. New York: Palgrave.
- Baty, P. 2012. "When Rankings Go Too Far." *International Higher Education* 69: 10–11.
- Boggs, C. 1997. "The Great Retreat: Decline of the Public Sphere in Late Twentieth-century America." *Theory and Society* 26 (6): 741–780.
- Bolseguí, M., and A. Fuguet Smith. 2006. "Cultura de Evaluación: Una Aproximación Conceptual [The Evaluation Culture: A Conceptual Overview]." *Investigación y Postgrado* 21 (1): 77–98.
- Bordieu, P., and L. Wacquant. 1999. "On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason." *Theory, Culture and Society* 16 (1): 41–58.
- Bowden, R. 2000. "Fantasy Higher Education: University and College League Tables." *Quality in Higher Education* 6 (1): 41–60.

- Final Declaration. 2012. *Conference, Latin American Universities and the International Rankings: Impact, Scope and Limits*, Mexico City. May 17–18.
- Deem, R., and K. J. Brehony. 2005. "Management as Ideology: The Case of 'New Managerialism' in Higher Education." *Oxford Review of Education* 31 (2): 217–235. doi:10.2307/4618615.
- DeSantis, N. 2012. "'US News' Pulls George Washington US Ranking after It Admits Inflating Data." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- DeSantis, N. 2013. "'US News' Moves Tulane U. Business School to 'Unranked' over Inflated Data." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- DGEI. 2012. *La complejidad del logro académico: Estudio comparativo sobre la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México y la Universidad de Sao Paulo* [The Complexity of Academic Achievement: Comparative Study of the National Autonomous University of Mexico and the University of Sao Paulo]. Preliminary report. Mexico: DGEI/UNAM.
- Dill, D. D. 2006. *Convergence and Diversity: The Role and Influence of University Rankings*. Keynote Address at the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER) 19th Annual Research Conference, University of Kassel, Germany, September 9.
- Dill, D., and M. Soo. 2005. "Academic Quality, League Tables, and Public Policy: A Cross-National Analysis of University Ranking Systems." *Higher Education Review* 49 (4): 495–533.
- Ehrenberg, R. G. 2004. "Econometric Studies of Higher Education." *Journal of Econometrics* 121: 19–37.
- El Observador. 2012. *El MIT estadounidense es la mejor universidad del mundo*. <http://www.elobservador.com.uy/noticia/235526/el-mit-estadounidense-es-la-mejor-universidad-del-mundo/>.
- Elliott, J. 2002. "La Reforma Educativa en el Estado Evaluador [Education Reform in the Evaluatory State]." *Perspectivas*, XXXII (3): 1–20.
- Espeland, W., and M. Sauder. 2007. "Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds." *American Journal of Sociology* 113 (1): 1–40.
- Federkeil, G. 2008. *Graduate Surveys as a Measure in University Rankings*. Presentation at OECD Conference, Outcomes of Higher Education. Quality, Relevance and Impact, Paris, September 8–10.
- Florian, R. V. 2007. "Irreproducibility of the Results of the Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities." *Scientometrics* 72 (1): 25–32.
- Foucault, M. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage/Random House.
- Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Translated by Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Guttenplan, D. D. 2011. "Debating the Merits of University Rankings." *The New York times*.
- Harvey, D. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hazelkorn, E. 2007. "Impact and Influence of League Tables and Ranking Systems on Higher Education Decision-Making." *Higher Education Management and Policy* 19 (2): 87–110.
- Hazelkorn, E. 2008. "Learning to Live with League Tables and Ranking: The Experience of Institutional Leaders." *Higher Education Policy* 21 (2): 193–215.
- Hoover, E. 2012. "Claremont McKenna Official Resigns after Falsely Reporting SAT Scores." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- IESALC. 2011. *The Position of Latin America and the Caribbean on Rankings in Higher Education*. Fourth Meeting of University Networks and Councils of Rectors in Buenos Aires, International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC), May 5–6.
- IREG Observatory on Academic Ranking and Excellence. 2006. *Berlin Principles on Ranking of Higher Education Institutions*. Ratified May 20, 2006, during Meeting of the International Ranking Experts Group in Berlin.
- Ishikawa, M. 2009. "University Rankings, Global Models, and Emerging Hegemony: Critical Analysis from Japan." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 13 (2): 159–173.
- Jaienski, M. 2009. "Garfield's Demon and 'Surprising' or 'Unexpected' Results in Science." *Scientometrics* 78 (2): 347–353.
- Kinser, K., and D. C. Levy. 2006. *The for-Profit Sector: US Patterns and International Echoes in Higher Education*. Albany, NY: PROPHE Working Paper Series.

- Kishkovsky, S. 2012. "Russia Moves to Improve Its University Rankings." *The New York Times*.
- Labaree, D. F. 1997. "Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle over Educational Goals." *American Educational Research Journal* 34: 39–81.
- Labi, A. 2010. "France's Latest Revolution." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Labi, A. 2011. "University Mergers Sweep across Europe." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Lee, P. 2012. "Local Varsities Fail Rankings Test Again." *Free Malaysia Today*. <http://www.freemalaysiatoday.com/category/nation/2012/10/04/local-varsities-fail-rankings-test-again/>.
- Liu, N. C. 2009. "The Story of Academic Ranking of World Universities." *International Higher Education* 54: 2–3.
- Lloyd, M. 2010. "Ecuadorian President's Push to Improve Higher Education Meets Resistance." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 6.
- Lloyd, M. 2013a. "Las Políticas de Fomento a la Ciencia y Tecnología en México y Brasil: Un Estudio de Caso de la Universidad Autónoma Nacional de México y la Universidad de São Paulo [Science and Technology Policies in Mexico and Brazil: A Case Study of the National Autonomous University of Mexico and the University of Sao Paulo]." Master's thesis in Latin American Studies, National Autonomous University of Mexico.
- Lloyd, M. 2013b. "Reforma Universitaria Enfrenta a Gobierno", *Estudiantes y Academia en Perú*. Campus Milenio, August 15.
- Lloyd, M. W., I. Ordorika Sacristán, and R. Rodríguez-Gómez Guerra. 2011. "Los Rankings Internacionales de Universidades, su Impacto, Metodología y Evolución [International University Rankings, their Impact, Methodology and Evolution]." México: DGEI-UNAM.
- Marginson, S. 2007. "Global University Rankings: Implications in General and for Australia." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 29 (2): 131–142.
- Marginson, S. 2009. "University Rankings, Government and Social Order: Managing the Field of Higher Education according to the Logic of the Performative Present-as-Future." In *Re-Reading Education Policies: Studying the Policy Agenda of the 21 Century*, edited by M. Simons, M. Olssen, and M. A. Peters, 2–16. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Marginson, S., and I. Ordorika. 2011. "El Central Volumen de la Fuerza": Global Hegemony in Higher Education and Research." In *Knowledge Matters: The Public Mission of the Research University*, edited by D. Rhoten and C. Calhoun, 67–129. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Marginson, S. 2012a. Global University Rankings: The Strategic Issues. Keynote Speech Delivered at the Conference Latin American Universities and the International Rankings: Impact, Scope and Limits, Mexico City, May 17–18.
- Marginson, S. 2012b. "Improving Latin American Universities' Global Ranking." *World University News*, 225.
- Marginson, S., and M. Van der Wende. 2006. *To Rank or to Be Ranked: The Impact of Global Rankings in Higher Education*. Twente: University of Twente Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies.
- Marshall, J. 2011. "Global: UNESCO Debates Uses and Misuses of Rankings." *University World News*. <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20110521105752138>.
- Muñoz García, H. (Coord.). 2009. "Introducción [Introduction]." In *La Universidad Pública en México [The Public University in Mexico]*, 5–22. Mexico: Seminario de Educación Superior/Miguel Ángel Porrúa.
- Nemtsova, A. 2012. "Russia Will Recognize Degrees from Top-Ranked Foreign Universities." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Ordorika, I., and B. Pusser. 2007. "La máxima Casa de Estudios: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México as a State-building University." In *World Class Worldwide: Transforming Research Universities in Asia and America*, edited by P. G. Altbach and J. Balán, 189–215. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ordorika Sacristán, I., and R. Rodríguez Gómez. 2008. "Comentarios al Academic Ranking of World Universities 2008 [Comments on the Academic Ranking of World Universities 2008]." Cuadernos de Trabajo de la Dirección General de Evaluación Institucional, No. 1. México, DF: DGEI-UNAM.

- Ordorika Sacristán, I., F. J. Lozano Espinosa, and R. Rodríguez Gómez. 2009. "Las Revistas de Investigación de la UNAM: Un Panorama General [The UNAM's Research Journals: An Overview]." Cuadernos de Trabajo de la Dirección General de Evaluación Institucional, No. 4. México, DF: DGEI-UNAM.
- Ordorika, I., and R. Rodríguez. 2010. "El Ranking Times en el Mercado del Prestigio Universitario [Times Ranking and the Market of University Prestige]." *Perfiles Educativos* 32 (129): 8–29.
- Ordorika, I. 2011. "Pertinencia de los Rankings en la Misión de las Universidades [The Pertinence of Rankings in Universities' Missions]." PowerPoint presentation at the National University of Colombia, Bogota, Colombia, November 4.
- Ordorika, I. 2012. "La Universidad Ante el Riesgo Homogeneizador de los Rankings [The Homogenizing Impact of Rankings on Universities]." Presentation Delivered at the Conference Latin American Universities and the International Rankings: Impact, Scope and Limits, Mexico, May 17–18.
- Ordorika, I., and M. Lloyd. 2013. "A Decade of International University Rankings: A Critical Perspective from Latin America." In *Rankings and Accountability in Higher Education. Uses and Misuses*, edited by P. T. M. Marope, P. J. Wells, and E. Hazelkorn, 211–231. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Post, D., Stambach, A., Ginsburg, M., Hannum, E., Benavot, A., and Bjork, C. 2013. "Los Rankings Académicos." *Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas* 21 (19): 1–19. <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1347/1072>.
- Power, M. 1997. *The Audit Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pusser, B. 2011. "Power and Authority in the Creation of a Public Sphere through Higher Education." In *Universities and the Public Sphere: Knowledge Creation and State Building in the Era of Globalization*, edited by B. Pusser, K. Kempner, S. Marginson, and I. Ordorika, 27–46. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Pusser, B. 2012. "Power and Authority in the Creation of a Public Sphere through Higher Education." In *Universities and the Public Sphere: Knowledge Creation and State Building in the Era of Globalization*, edited by B. Pusser, K. Kempner, S. Marginson, and I. Ordorika, 27–46. New York: Routledge.
- Pusser, B., and S. Marginson. 2012. "The Elephant in the Room: Power, Global Rankings and the Study of Higher Education Organization." In *The Organization of Higher Education: Managing Colleges for a New Era*, edited by M. N. Bastedo, 86–117. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- QS. 2011/2012. *QS University Rankings: Latin America*. Tec de Monterrey/QS Intelligence Unit. [http://www.ireg-observatory.org/pdf/QS\\_Latin\\_American\\_supplement.pdf](http://www.ireg-observatory.org/pdf/QS_Latin_American_supplement.pdf).
- QS. 2012. Brazilian Higher Education in 2012: Background. Quacquarelli Symonds (QS). <http://www.topuniversities.com/where-to-study/south-america/brazil/brazilian-higher-education-2012-background>.
- Rhoades, G. 1998. *Managed Professionals : Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Salmi, J. 2009. *The Challenge of Establishing World Class Universities*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Salmi, J., and A. Saroyan. 2007. "League Tables as Policy Instruments: Uses and Misuses." *Higher Education Management and Policy* 19 (2): 24–62.
- Siganos, A. 2008. "Rankings, Governance, and Attractiveness of Higher Education: The New French Context." *Higher Education in Europe* 33 (2–3): 311–316.
- Slaughter, L., and L. L. Leslie. 1999. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., and G. Rhoades. 2004. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy : Markets, State, and Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stahl, J. 2012. What is the Best University in America? Voice of America.Org. <http://blogs.voanews.com/student-union/2012/10/04/what-is-the-best-university-in-america/>.
- Supiano, B. 2012. "Emory U. Intentionally Misreported Admissions Data, Investigation Finds." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Thakur, M. 2008. "The Impact of Ranking Systems on Higher Education and Its Stakeholders." *Journal of Institutional Research* 13 (1): 83–96.

- Torres, C. A. 2013. *El Neoliberalismo como un Nuevo Bloque Histórico: Un Análisis Gramsciano del Sentido Común Neoliberal en Educación* [Neoliberalism as a New Historical Block: A Gramscian Analysis of Neoliberal Commonsense in Education]. Conference Delivered at the National Autonomous University of Mexico upon Acceptance of Membership in the Mexican Academy of Sciences, Mexico City, August 4.
- Turner, D. R. 2005. "Benchmarking in Universities: League Tables Revisited." *Oxford Review of Education* 31 (3): 353–371.
- Välilmaa, J. 2012. "The Corporatization of National Universities in Finland." In *Universities and the Public Sphere: Knowledge Creation and State Building in the Era of Globalization*, edited by B. Pusser, K. Kempner, S. Marginson, and I. Ordorika, 101–119. New York: Routledge.
- Van Raan, A. F. J. 2005. "Fatal Attraction: Conceptual and Methodological Problems in the Ranking of Universities by Bibliometric Methods." *Scientometrics* 62 (1): 133–143.
- Vasagar, J., and R. Williams. 2010. "Cambridge Ousts Harvard as World's Best University." *The Guardian*. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2010/sep/08/cambridge-worlds-best-university-harvard>.
- Washington Monthly. 2006. *The Washington Monthly'S Annual College Guide*. <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2006/0609.collegeguide.html>.
- Washington Monthly. 2013. *National Universities Ranking*. [http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/college\\_guide/rankings\\_2013/national\\_university\\_rank.php](http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/college_guide/rankings_2013/national_university_rank.php).
- Webster, D. S. 1986. *Academic Quality Rankings of American Colleges and Universities*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Wouters, P. 2012. *Does Ranking Make the World Go round*. Presentation Delivered at the Conference Latin American Universities and the International Rankings: Impact, Scope and Limits, Mexico City, May 17–18.
- Ying, Y., and Z. Jingao. 2009. "An Empirical Study on Credibility of China's University Rankings: A Case Study of Three Rankings." *Chinese Education and Society* 42 (1): 70–80.