

# Piece to Text on the Monument and One: Letters with the International Body Managers

KIYOUNG KIM

Professor of Law

AK.Edu Consulting

[https://www.youtube.com/channel/  
UCBTLFjuPrBolPJZujvYtwvg](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCBTLFjuPrBolPJZujvYtwvg)

United States Library of  
Congress  
Copyright © 2018 Kiyoun Kim  
All rights reserved. ISBN:  
1724701517  
ISBN-13: 978-1724701510



## DEDICATION

This book is dedicated to my deceased parents, wife and lovely daughter, who encouraged and charmed for the consort of family. I am also much owed to the rest of families and many friends , who always say to take care and show a concern and interest through my personal and professional lives.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

*Newton and the apple. Freud and anxiety. Jung and dreams. Piaget and his children. Darwin and Galapagos tortoises. Marx and England's factories. Whyte and street corners. Why are you obsessed with understanding?*

*Halcolm & Patton*

## CONTENTS

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Acknowledgements .....   | 4      |
| Chapter 1 Introduction.....  | 6      |
| Chapter 2 In search for King John - Law, Law School and Graduate or Research Doctoratein Law ..... | 10     |
| Chapter 3 Barons toward the Welfare and Noble Rights – Master and PH.D degree holders .....        | 18     |
| Chapter 4 Fourth Industrialization and New form of Higher Education.....                           | 43     |
| Chapter 5 Campus and Universities – The Kind of Military Camp or Arsenal .....                     | 65     |
| Chapter 6 Epilogue.....  | 70     |
| <br>APPENDIX I .....   | <br>75 |
| APPENDIX II.....   | 77     |
| APPENDIX III .....   | 77     |
| APPENDIX IV .....  | 101    |
| APPENDIX V .....   | 120    |

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

We may feel a kind of universal sharing although the world is surely some of a wide splinter of societies with the different interests, mode of custom or practice as well as societal norms and ends. One of area evidenced through a track of years probably would have become sparing within the world of college and university evaluation. Beyond the limited scale of national practice to rank the institutions or programs, a trajectory of transformation on globalization and increasing awareness tending to a ubiquitous community over jurisdictions obviously contributed to bring the service of educational evaluation. It appears now to be as necessary and informative for the audience or interested actors as public officers, administrators and professors within the higher education, as well as parents and students. Around, the dusk of new millennium, ARWU initiated by Shanghai transportation university and in collaboration with the expert groups working in Hong-Kong based consulting firm launched a new business to rank the global colleges and universities (CUs), which were followed by QS and THE some years later and considered three most influential rankers, what is now called IREGs in abbreviation. QS is a UK based consulting firm for the students and parents, whose devotion is globally and widely spread to provide the information and academic guide to choose their step for the next stage of higher education. With the development of strategic disagreement with QS, THE embarked on its own framework and working network around 2007, which is being carried along with its traditional engagement with the national rankings. Given the widest and extended array of traditional jobs in USNW, it also raised a new profile of ranking business to respond with the surging needs for providing the information, on which the students wished of foreign study can explore or make an effective decision. Its aim is to suit their personal status further with consulting service.

The kind of public institutions had risen to expand their profile of business based on know-hows and in response with the needs of consumers. For example, ARWU introduced a new face of expanded subject rankings recently from 2017. It earned now two years that the second time reporting had been released some weeks ago. The number of subjects, as enlarged around 50-60s, accounted for the categorization of journal domains within the web of science and Essential Scientific Indicators, which closely can be approximated with those that can be felt within the concentrations of student at campus. Given the collegiate level of subject categories previously as Natural and Social Sciences or Engineering, the number now can be received with the feel of departmental or program level varieties. This change can come in contrast, for example, that the USNW began and continues to rely on the journal classification austere-ly initially 21 and 22 as added with Art and Humanity and with the aid of Clarivate Analytics. QS differs from those two in that it started with a relatively large number of subjects and incrementally to add year by year at the current number of 54 rated subjects. THE had no stark deals with detailed subjects and as small as 13 in number, which featured some annual increase in coverage recent years. Nevertheless, the ambit of THE to deal with the needs of ranking information interestingly garnered a new area of business at Tandem with Wall Street or Japanese organization, which provides a domestic college ranking of US or rankings of Japanese universities. Another interesting website to rank universities globally would be CWUR, whose scope of subjects are most noteworthy in number spanning around 200-300 subjects, totally based on the number of publication with prestigious journals. It exhibited a distinct mode of presentation to the global audience that publishes the subject and country ranking daily, expected complete through one year fully. Given the rank of subjects had a great deal of implication for the decision making of students or parents, the number around 50, hence ARWU and QS seemingly can be most effective in the consultation process of entering the universities or colleges. Another point of consideration is some rate of different methodologies between the subject rankings and CUs' ranking overall inherent within the above rankings. Therefore, it is not to completely receive the result of ranking if you pass through it by looking to the overall ranking only. The introduction and information about the data and methodology would be available within each respective ranking website. They also usually present information for the most rated institutions or top institution on each subject. The idea was used to frame the KIOSK in later section, and I once exemplified onto my faculty website at Chosun Univ.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, the information below does not fully include most

<sup>1</sup> According to the IREG presentation by Moase on USNW educational ranking, I mentioned, "In 2015, UW-Madison was given a top ranking by *U.S. News & World Report* as a global university based on the number of times it placed within the top 100 of 21 evaluated subjects, tied with Harvard University and the University of Toronto." (From wikipedia page : UW-MADISON). Long decades from my graduation year, but nearest in time for the senior alumni as me if it were to be 2015. 2015, the first year

recent update in some cases, which I promise to make it complete later by following up with the kind of immanent evolution concerning a respective ranking schema to attend with the needs of public.

The global rankings can pose a different form of methodology provided that the student side of information would not be processed to reach a final ranking outcome. Of course, that slot of measure would not be entirely excluded, but indirectly incorporated by assessing the employer's reputation or award of alumni and the kind. Nevertheless, the kind of student credentials, such as GPA or test scores as SAT, MCAT and GRE, a direct valuable to rate the quality of class or group, were not used to yield ranking by international ranking agencies.<sup>2</sup> It also has a major attribute to entirely or in major portion of covered factors, avail of the research performance data from the journals, i.e., SCIs and SSCI or Scopus. ARWU uses a double classification for the Nature and Science along with a simple number of publications, and employs a factor for award, which is similar to CWUR internationally or CMUP nationally. THE considers at a fraction the research income or grant of universities as similar to the domestic report of US authorities, such as some graduate programs in USNW or NRC. In any case, the faculty quality often dominantly would be a unique factor in focus to explain the ranking outcome.

The aims of this book is clear and straightforward.

First, it was motivated to convert an inhumane or insipid experience with the various sources of global ranking into the kind of humanly and cultural experience within our daily lifestyle. Their outlook from presentation is masked with the number purely and perhaps through a myriad of complicated data or ranking information.<sup>3</sup> The concept or self-identification within the experience or exposure would be less substantial or hard to get palpable. My attempt to improve this aspect of contemporary practice certainly will fall short, but you can sense in some paragraphs or titles. I wrote this small piece of book in the end to take care of human integrity and stories for advancing the inherence and liveliness of interested actors or consumers despite all the wind-heads from the turf of existing ranking sources. The idea hopefully might be compatible with brand personification for the people interested in this area of world phenomenon.

Second, you may find a section over your perusal that I used this edition to follow up with my previous publication on ranking issues, meaning to incorporate a new development through ascertaining on the research of Westlaw, Lexis/Nexis and Heinonline. In some sections, I had responded with the kind of educational consulting website by stretching the national graduate or postgraduate study as globally. The education consulting website, close to me in the nature of work through this booklet (hence you may call K-Edu besides my title as professor), also is no less important to civilize this world through the issues or enhance public channel of communication if it may be more humanly or direct with the students and parents. They carry their business primarily through data provision from the major providers and as second hand. They also are doing business at tandem to establish a partnership with expert data collection and

---

that US News goes global, perhaps inverse to 1776 year of national independence . <http://ireg-observatory.org/en/ireg-forum-aalborg/presentations/3session/Robert-J-Morse.pdf> Actually interesting to see some comparison if the politics goes national across the global village..."

<sup>2</sup> Another credentials for college admission require a proof of foreign language skills, such as TOEFL or IELTS and Cambridge Certificate, and may be considered to include when rating. However, given the foreign base of student pool often structurally is far less in number to the native applicants over jurisdictions – (if international outlook as one element by some case of global raters), the inclusion of TOEFL score is seldom practiced in my experience except for only one instance. The webpages of CU, of course, kindly provide the information of TOEFL score, such as a minimum requirement so as to be considered for admission. Often it is 600 on paper form testing (can be converted to the scale of the internet form testing or IELTS, TOEIC, and on), arguably leveraged to the general language capabilities of native college student. Often that is the point of dissatisfaction with the native speaking professors that foreign students can perform well in the English test and gain an entrance, but that they often are less industrious to maintain their performance level in the TOEFL exam room or remain silent and actually less fluent against the professor's expectation known from each level standard of TOEFL score by ETS. They also said, "it is surprising, however, that those foreign students obtain a high grade through the school examinations with academic success, which is despite their experience within English communication." Besides such level of score, some institutions may uniquely require a higher score for admission consideration, for example, 610 for Columbia LL.M and SJD, 615 for MBA and Ph.D with Haas Business school at UC-Berkeley and 625 for the SJD at UW-Madison, and so. Given 600 for Yale, Harvard, Stanford and Duke for such student groups, the programs at those institutions facially set higher limits for entrance—of course, a strict cut off administration seems not to be a principle, but can be consulted with or viewed amenable to the discretion of admission decision makers as an educator.

<sup>3</sup> A little of fine practice can be found in QS, international as we know, and Princeton Review, national to service the US. A star mark can look special beyond the orderly cluster of ranked items in QS and a variety of campus profiles are rated in Princeton Review, such as top party school or campus magazine.

analysis specialists. A notable example would be the website of “thebestschools.org” which announced the world university ranking currently in May this year by contracting to use the labor of “academicinfluence.com” that looked into the web influence of institutions along with identification of top ten institutions across the 30 to 35 subjects. The idea was insightful to consider the past (alumni) and present tense (faculty) of institutional affiliation in measuring the rate of influence on web and from specific institutions. The kind of ideas is useful to correspond with a human genome of audience and helps to address the nature of ranking. For example, you may find a dual report concerning the US graduate program below in section, i.e., “top quality graduate program-alternative to Gourman” and KIOSK. The first type holds a focus on the capability and potential of institutions to yield a quality program in each field while the second one actually is presenting the end result through a subject to subject assessment. It also pertains to the attempt with measuring on the degree-based assessment than faculty productivity. The former will work to present an end result of education while the latter focuses on the educational process of service delivery concerning the capability and potential. The structure of book was organized in less complete way, but might look cursory and spontaneous. The dealings obviously are never exhaustive unlike the major commercial providers, rather more akin to the consulting webs primarily in direct contact with the customers. Nevertheless, the ranking results finalized through this book is original in its methodology or in terms of data collection although the presentation is little in scope and mainly suggestive as a kind of ranking philosopher. Given my status as a college professor, it would be an unusual chemistry or brought me to shimmer at some point of meditation on how I could rank fairly and meaningfully. I merely hope that the readership can generously take this attempt as a pilot work or as the kind of post-modern work *Avant Gardo* or civilization strolls from understanding, criticism. It might be even through a bootstrap with the universal constitutionalism or communicative democracy.

The book had been prepared mainly by editing into each section the previous work of articles and flowing through each of my brief pertaining to the purported ranking. Nevertheless, I am presenting an up-to-date elaboration on the graduate or post-graduate study and KIOSK on research doctorates. The refinement and boost had been made with a rejuvenation of result to respond with the idea of consulting webs open to public through Google search, for example, FindMasters. I also exerted to think about a new mode on online education and some of rank for blending and adapting with the campus based universities.

Since the piece of work arises from the background and life experience of author, the first section began with a research doctorate in law and the result of final rank published previously or traced to affirm with a tweak on weeks effort from the Westlaw and the kind had been placed. Given the primary method of IREGs relies on a five-year span of research performance, the rank differs in that all time consequence of legal scholars had been considered along with the distinct root point concerning a degree based approach than faculty. The implication is that the degree based approach thrust an end result of quality while the assessment of faculty quality only leads the audience to an inferential understanding for the prospect of students on quality performance. A research doctorate in law would variegate globally with respect to the national system and educational curriculum. A graduate based education in US and Canada can be distinct from other countries basically standing on the undergraduate mode of legal education or hybrid nature of institutions to breed the prospective lawyers. In terms of research law, the doctorate is principally required of original piece of research work at its culmination to award a degree. LLD or DCL may be found in the national system of UK which would either earned or honorary without conducting original research. An earned doctorate on this uniquely higher degree on civil law tradition originated from feudal universities. It may be conferred on the basis of stern examination over the presented piece of professional research works, and is only available to the established scholars or faculty. Therefore, it is fairly distinguishable from the legal education or research program instituted with a tuition and instruction.

In the second section, you will enjoy the status of peers, a holder of research doctorate in specific discipline, often called Ph.D, to work on the world of academics. A historical wake was charted to rank the programs and can be adjusted globally to respond with the website experience. If the kind of concern or suggestions had been triggered to the higher education, we could not deny the significance of doctoral degree holders since they are a seed and tree to landscape the world universities through an age and ahead on. They also are thriving through a bulwark of research activities with inviolability and as sedulous to excavate a new findings and generate a knowledge. Given their contribution to the civilization and welfare over space and in history, it would not be improper to revert them to the kind of Barons in 13th century Great Britain to press *King John* to sign a Magna Carta. Below the section titled as King John and in-gene to

satire research doctorates in law, the second section was nicknamed *Barons* splintered with respective expertise and might of exertion, if not realistic in secular consequence or paper tiger. In addition, as you see the title to Chapter 2, you might acquiesce if I not only intended to imply of earnest concept to denote the world of legal professionals, but also experimented on brand personification. That also would show the current picture of ranking contest among them. For example, the alumni of Harvard Law may be proud of law contest given their top place within the subject rankings, and struggled to defend its position.<sup>4</sup> The Alumni of Yale Law will like to claim the top place for the law school rankings than law. The UW-Madison graduate or doctoral degree holders in law may like the ranking gleaned from this piece. They not only claim, but also have to defend or compete to earn more advanced rankings within each part of recognition, which looks somewhat futile annually or at each ranker's interval of time, owing partly, in my guess, to the kind of Calvin's determinism, or political seasoning by ranker, or scientific nature with a consistent data reproduction or data structuration.

The chapter 4 has dealt with an ascending habitus to deliver the higher education in cyberspace. Walden, University of Phoenix or Northeastern University and Liberty University would be some of prestigious peer institutions that lead the current on line education in US. Walden is serving as a flagship university for the Laureate group, whose universities are large in number around 70-80 and as globally distributed. So it entertains a heightened international outlook in this classification of global universities. Some rank was compiled to take a brief look for the taste of audience in this new world of educational paradigm. As followed by chapter 4, the conventional spectrum of global CU rankings was discussed with a new attempt to measure them in chapter 5. Lastly, a reflection and piece of thought were wrought through little pages titled Epilogue in the last chapter.

---

<sup>4</sup>The specifics to address ranking issues may look impractical or even unrealistic for the big passers, but can say to show a corner of competitiveness and glory. While "Duke law school" is one of prestigious law schools in US, the rank on that outlook, however, would have no history for top place. Nevertheless, "Duke law" gloriously attained a top position in the global subject ranking of 2017 THE. The scene would be sharper and more radical for the graduate or research doctorates in law for the UW-Madison law school. The interdisciplinary margins as radical over top and worse rank may be found not so seldom as University of Wollongong or rising chines universities between engineering and social science subjects or Mayo clinic on devoted specialty only. In this context, most notable was two renowned institutions about MIT and Harvard traditionally and over history between Engineering and other disciplines. Nevertheless, this kind of aspect as described above and involving law professionals can additionally help to enrich or substantiate the contemporary practice of global raters. Of course, it would be no surprise for the professional rankers given a variety of rankings in Princeton Review, USNW, and National Jurists in US. I prefer or even support this kind of diversification and effort to exposure as mentioned elsewhere: (i) because of basic human element to check and balance or separation of powers principle for civil society - if indirectly through academics (ii) as the avenue to remedy the evils or lifestyle of truncation and otherness basing from the industrialization mode of mass deals - possibly majoritarian dictatorship (iii) simply for amusement or basic instinct to enjoy a new or non-highlighted corner of knowledge in human agent.

## Chapter 2

### In search for King John - A Law, Law School and Graduate or Research Doctorate in Law

#### 2018 Rank: A Follow up for the 2015 publication

The tables below had been prepared to revisit my 2015 publication concerning a rank of research doctorate in law and research doctorate in international relations and diplomacy. In reiteration, the ranking scheme is such limited and illustrative to have a focus on the degrees I had obtained over time. As said, my intention is two-fold; realistic to assess a strength of both research programs and experimental that the idea employed to address them give some kind of formula for various ranking purposes. You can see five tables and four models as differs from the coverage of citing source, such as cases and federal or state, law journals, texts and treatise. Given the law as a practical science, the importance of case citations can well be included into the ranking framework or may be excluded as the ranker prefers. The final ranking was reached, as Table 1 shows, by total result of all four tables. Only five institutions placed at the top of previous publication had been considered and the author largely is firm that other institutions would not outperform them even if a further stretch of investigation is exerted. Unless otherwise noted, the data came from Westlaw mainly and Lexis/Nexis as supplementary, and the search strategy may vary to yield the most accurate number of citations.

#### Abbreviation

M1-R: Rank from Model 1 (PC and Total percents below added for a large number and same through M4-R)

PC: Per capita citation

YG: The number of yearly graduates: LL.Ms/Research doctorates)

**Table 1: Final Rank**

|            | Harvard | Oxford  | Yale    | Chicago | Madison |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Final Rank | 2       | 3       | 3       | 5       | 1       |
| Added/4    | 2.25    | 3.5     | 3.5     | 4.75    | 1.00    |
| Added      | 2/2/2/3 | 3/3/4/4 | 5/4/3/2 | 4/5/5/5 | 1/1/1/1 |

**Table 2: Model I- Secondary sources (law reviews)**

|      | Harvard  | Oxford   | Yale  | Chicago   | Madison  |
|------|--|--|---|---|--|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Henry Hart Jr.-3,998</li> <li>● Louis Jaffe-1,566</li> <li>● Page Keeton – 6,958</li> <li>● Robert Keeton – 3,537</li> <li>● Henry Monaghan-3,436</li> <li>● Frances Olsen – 1,261</li> <li>● Mari Matsuda -3077</li> <li>● Erwin Griswold – 1,704</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Joseph Raz – 3,172</li> <li>● John Finnis – 1,890</li> <li>● Charles Fried – 4,221</li> <li>* Jeremy Waldron-4,243</li> <li>* Ian Brownlie - 3,198</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Henry Manne – 1,523</li> <li>● Myres McDougal – 1,947</li> <li>● James WM Moore – 2,253</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lawrence Friedman – 6,546</li> <li>● Mary Glendon – 4,054</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Wayne LaFave – 6,310</li> <li>● Kimberle Crenshaw- 4,588</li> </ul> |
| M1-R | 2  | 3  | 5   | 4   | 1  |



|       |                    |                    |               |                    |                 |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| PC    | 150 (10.04%)       | 304 (20.34%)       | 190 (12.71%)  | 124 (8.29%)        | 726 (48.59%)    |
| Total | 27,920<br>(38.85%) | 16,724<br>(23.27%) | 5,723 (7.96%) | 10,600<br>(14.74%) | 10,898 (15.16%) |
| YG    | 185                | 55                 | 30            | 85                 | 15              |

● In consideration of future development on this ranking framework, one scholar attracted with a notable accomplishment and high number of citations, who is Jeremy Waldron with 4,254 citations. Some other scholars also are rising considerably to make a change for the Shapiro's most cited scholars, few in number though. The framework is rather a replicate of Shapiro's, as 50 in number for most cited legal scholars than 100 in Heinonline and including the text and treatise writers, and on. In the process, we may decide either to include or exclude scholars outside the framework because they are starkest well be comparable with the preexisting groups although my tight frame would not allow their inclusion. One is Jeremy Waldron for Oxford case (outside 100 in Heinonline), John Langbein for the Cambridge side (58th, outside 50th formula from Shapiro), and Lucian Bebchuk for Harvard (70th, and same). John Langbein was missed because only one Cambridge researcher with citations total 3792 (law journal only), 3942 (law journal + texts and treatises, 4,200 at total including cases) could not outrank five institutions. Cambridge, however, can stay with the previous 6<sup>th</sup> position. Through the process, the rise or fall within the group as varying with the institutions had been confirmed that ultimately came to set off one side effect against the final rank as I yielded. With a decline of other Harvard legal researchers on the most list of citations over time, it would be a reason that Bebchuk (4087, 4157, 4286, 4298 cites to the frame of this work) was dropped out of the select names on this list. In reminder, I not only agreed, but also followed the Shapiro's framework that independently cherished the articles or legal books beside a scholar as a whole. It is a reason that you can find a number of names on this list with a less citations. In case for J. Waldron, it depends on the policy or choice of rankers whether he will be included or not since he is stark to merit inclusion although it is not formulaic to be penetrating through the framework. Hence, his case is experimental, and I decided to include him to disclose more bright side of Oxford. Therefore, the names appeared were entirely based on Shapiro's except for his case, although I searched widely to chart the pool of potentially most cited scholars.

**Table 3: Model 2-Secondary sources (law review/texts and treatises)**

|       | Harvard  | Oxford  | Yale   | Chicago   | Madison  |
|-------|--|---|--|---|--|
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Henry Hart Jr.-4,138</li> <li>● Louis Jaffe-1,628</li> <li>● Page Keeton – 7,421</li> <li>● Robert Keeton – 3,728</li> <li>● John Wade-2,577</li> <li>● Henry Monaghan – 3,469</li> <li>● Frances Olsen – 1,263</li> <li>● Mari Matsuda -3,088</li> <li>● Erwin Griswold – 1,833</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Joseph Raz – 3,185</li> <li>● John Finnis – 1,892</li> <li>● Charles Fried – 4,253</li> <li>* Jeremy Waldron-4,254</li> <li>* Ian Brownlie- 3,208</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Henry Manne – 1,548</li> <li>● Myres McDougal – 1,950</li> <li>● JamesWM Moore – 5,835</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lawrence Friedman – 6,637</li> <li>● Mary Glendon – 4,065</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Wayne LaFave – 9,272</li> <li>● Kimberle Crenshaw- 4,589</li> </ul> |
| M2-R  | 2  | 3   | 4  | 5   | 1  |
| PC    | 157 (8.61%)  | 305 (16.73%)  | 311 (17.06%)   | 125 (6.86%)   | 924 (50.71%)   |
| Total | 29,145   | 16,792  | 9,333 (11.69%)   | 10,702  | 13,861   |

|    |          |          |    |          |          |
|----|----------|----------|----|----------|----------|
|    | (36.50%) | (21.03%) |    | (13.40%) | (17.36%) |
| YG | 185      | 55       | 30 | 85       | 15       |

**Table 4: Model III-Secondary sources (+ cases at total)**

|       |  |  |   |   |   |
|-------|--|--|---|---|---|
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Henry Hart Jr.-5,508</li> <li>● Louis Jaffe-1,986</li> <li>● Page Keeton –19,421</li> <li>● Robert Keeton – 8,728</li> <li>● John Wade – 7,384</li> <li>● Henry Monaghan – 3,790</li> <li>● Frances Olsen – 1,289</li> <li>● Mari Matsuda -3,106</li> <li>● Erwin Griswold – 2,206</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Joseph Raz – 3,199</li> <li>● John Finnis – 1,902</li> <li>● Charles Fried – 4,529</li> <li>* Jeremy Waldron-4,292</li> <li>* Ian Brownlie-3,222</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Henry Manne – 1,606</li> <li>● Myres McDougal – 1,961</li> <li>● James WM Moore- 17,750</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lawrence Friedman – 8,692</li> <li>● Mary Glendon – 4,099</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Wayne LaFave – 28,989</li> <li>● Kimberle Crenshaw- 4,560</li> </ul> |
| M3-R  | 2  | 4  | 3   | 5   | 1   |
| PC    | 288 (7.79%)  | 311 (8.41%)  | 710 (19.21%)  | 150 (4.05%)   | 2,236 (60.51%)  |
| Total | 53,418 (38.64%)  | 17,144 (12.40)   | 21,317 (15.42%)   | 12,791 (9.25%)  | 33,549 (24.27%)   |
| YG    | 185  | 55   | 30  | 85  | 15  |

**Table 5: Model IV-Secondary sources + federal appellate**

|  |   |  |  |   |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Henry Hart Jr.-4,668</li> <li>● Louis Jaffe-1,816</li> <li>● Page Keeton – 12,323</li> <li>● Robert Keeton – 5,728</li> <li>● John Wade – 4,439</li> <li>● Henry Mongahn – 3,665</li> <li>● Frances Olsen – 1,275</li> <li>● Mari</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Joseph Raz – 3,196</li> <li>● John Finnis – 1,901</li> <li>● Charles Fried – 4,292</li> <li>* Jeremy Waldron-4,259</li> <li>* Ian Brownlie-3,222</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Henry Manne – 1,555</li> <li>● Myres McDougal – 1,960</li> <li>● James WM Moore – 16,962</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lawrence Friedman – 7,649</li> <li>● Mary Glendon – 4,054</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Wayne LaFave – 14,772</li> <li>● Kimberle Crenshaw- 4,599</li> </ul> |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|

|          |   |                    |                    |                 |                    |
|----------|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
|          | Matsuda -3,100<br>● Erwin<br>Griswold – 2,171 |                    |                    |                 |                    |
| M4-<br>R | 3   | 4                  | 2                  | 5               | 1                  |
| PC       | 208 (7.92%)                                   | 306 (11.66%)       | 682 (25.99%)       | 137 (5.22%)     | 1,291 (49.19%)     |
| Total    | 39,185<br>(36.41%)                            | 16,870<br>(15.67%) | 20,477<br>(19.02%) | 11,703 (10.87%) | 19,371<br>(18.00%) |
| YG       | 185   | 55                 | 30                 | 85              | 15                 |

### An extension for global scene in Westlaw legal scholars

I applied various ways to search for accuracy and against loss on count. For example, “J.S. Mill”, Stuart /s Mill, John /s Mill, and so was used for Boolean search on the Westlaw site. Some of notable scholars on law were listed below, which is not exhaustive and who are not included into the box above since their degrees are from other institutions, or are neither a degree recipient after the modern form of graduate education or degree system (for example , PhD degree mainly required of original research and as originated from the German system and influence on philanthropy) around the end of 19th centuries, or without a graduate degree, or a holder of higher doctorate not on the educational basis . The list is thought to encompass all major scholars to the best of my knowledge and so as not to taint my purpose to trace the follow up confirmation for my previous publication, July 2016, on degree-based research impact ranking and consulting result on research doctorate in law.

John Locke 9,375 (16,716)  
J.S. Mill 8250 (9,088) roughly  
H.L.A. Hart 8,130 (8,260) roughly  
JJ Rousseau 2,080 (2,274)  
Thomas Hobbes 3,557 (3,795)  
Hans Kelsen 2,962 (3,002) roughly  
Carl Schmitt 1,228 (1,558)  
Georg Jellinek 172 (174)  
William Blackstone 11,960 (16,897)  
Jeremy Bentham 5,782 (6,147)  
Edward Coke 2,994 (3,906)  
P.S. Atiyah 992 (1,016)  
Glanville Williams 1,270 (1,453)  
Carol Smart 410 (620)  
J.H. Baker 904 (1,023)  
Neil MacCormick 2,402 (2,362)

### Between the Social Science and Law

The social scientist often works closely to impact the legal research and jurisprudence, which draws upon a continued interest for the legal scientists - if wearing a tuxedo vividly for their identity, for example, alphabet J on their degree name in US - to imagine how much they exert an influence over them. Below is a part of answer for the curiosity that I provided the citations total printed on the Westlaw website for 37 most cited scholars in Art, Humanity and social Science compiled by Thomson Reuter and published in 2007 issue of THE supplemental. The citations total are all time that you need to be careful for a meaningful comparative feel. It is more than sharp to skew according to the

disciplines of scholar. For example, citations of Bandura by legal authority is far less than Foucault in proportionality against their total citations in the Web of Science. The philosophers, Immanuel Kant and John Dewey, for example, and political scholars on morality, i.e., John Rawls, Karl Marx, Max Weber, will have a more chance to be cited by the legal researchers or jurists.

**Table 6: Comparison between the Web of Science and Westlaw (Non-legal scholars) based on the Times Higher Education - Most cited authors of books in the humanities, 2007**

| Field  | Citations to books in 2007 (one sample year and in the Web of Science)---Citations in Westlaw (all time) |
|--|--|
| Michel Foucault (1926-1984) Philosophy, sociology, criticism | 2,521 ---3,749   |
| Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) Sociology                        | 2,465 ---1,299   |
| Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) Philosophy                       | 1,874 ---1,633   |
| Albert Bandura (1925- ) Psychology                           | 1,536 --- 340  |
| Anthony Giddens (1938- ) Sociology                           | 1,303 --- 771  |
| Erving Goffman (1922-1982) Sociology                         | 1,066 ---1,308   |
| Jurgen Habermas (1929- ) Philosophy, sociology               | 1,049 ---2,815   |
| Max Weber (1864-1920) Sociology                              | 971 --- 4,033  |
| Judith Butler (1956- ) Philosophy                            | 960 --- 1,533  |
| Bruno Latour (1947- ) Sociology, anthropology                | 944 --- 455  |
| Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) Psychoanalysis                     | 903 ---1895  |
| Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) Philosophy                        | 897 --- 269  |
| Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) Philosophy                         | 882 ---4,957   |
| Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) Philosophy                      | 874 ---602   |
| Noam Chomsky (1928- ) Linguistics, philosophy                | 812 --- 910  |
| Ulrich Beck (1944- ) Sociology                               | 733 ---394   |
| Jean Piaget (1896-1980) Philosophy                           | 725 ---527   |
| David Harvey (1935- ) Geography                              | 723 --- 392  |
| John Rawls (1921-2002) Philosophy                            | 708 ---8,984   |
| Geert Hofstede (1928- ) Cultural studies                     | 700 ---212   |
| Edward W. Said (1935-2003) Criticism                         | 694 --- 563  |

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) Sociology                            | 662 ---1,226  |
| Roland Barthes (1915-1980) Criticism, philosophy                | 631 ---545    |
| Clifford Geertz (1926-2006) Anthropology                        | 596 --- 1,328 |
| Hannah Arendt (1906-1975) Political theory                      | 593 --- 403   |
| Walter Benjamin (1892-1940) Criticism, philosophy               | 583 ---1,134  |
| Henri Tajfel (1919-1982) Social psychology                      | 583 --- 205   |
| Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951) Philosophy                      | 583 ---1,451  |
| Barney G. Glaser (1930- ) Sociology                             | 577 ---100    |
| George Lakoff (1941- ) Linguistics                              | 577 ---760    |
| John Dewey (1859-1952) Philosophy, psychology, education        | 575 ---2,996  |
| Benedict Anderson (1936- ) International studies                | 573 ---677    |
| Emmanuel Levinas (1906-1995) Philosophy                         | 566---236     |
| Jacques Lacan (1901-1981) Psychoanalysis, philosophy, criticism | 526---366     |
| Thomas S. Kuhn (1922-1996) History and philosophy of science    | 519---2,207   |
| Karl Marx (1818-1883) Political theory, economics, sociology    | 501---2,845   |
| Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) Philosophy                      | 501---75      |

**Table 7: Trace for the 2007 Times Supplemental for Higher Education**

| Rank  | Researcher      | Citations | H-Index |
|-------|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| 1 (1) | Michel Foucault | 782097    | 242     |
| 2 (2) | Pierre Bourdieu | 574044    | 249     |
| 3     | Jacques Derrida | 242744    | 190     |
| 4 (4) | Albert Bandura  | 451545    | 180     |
| 5     | A. Giddens      | NCOH      | NC      |
| 6 (7) | Erving Goffman  | 232339    | 87      |
| 7     | J. Habermas     | NCOH      | NC      |

|         |                  |        |     |
|---------|------------------|--------|-----|
| 8       | Max Weber        | NCOH   | NC  |
| 9       | Judith Butler    | NCOH   | NC  |
| 10      | Bruno Latour     | NCOH   | NC  |
| 11 (3)  | Sigmund Freud    | 482648 | 272 |
| 12 (8)  | Gilles Deleuze   | 216083 | 151 |
| 13      | Immanuel Kant    | NCOH   | NC  |
| 14      | M. Heidegger     | NCOH   | NC  |
| 15 (5)  | Noam Chomsky     | 337098 | 164 |
| 16      | Ulrich Beck      | NCOH   | NC  |
| 17      | Jean Piaget      | NCOH   | NC  |
| 18 (10) | David Harvey     | 159706 | 102 |
| 19 (12) | John Rawls       | 153304 | 81  |
| 20 (14) | Geert Hofstede   | 145974 | NC  |
| 21      | Edward W. Said   | NCOH   | NC  |
| 22 (15) | Emile Durkheim   | 143383 | 88  |
| 23      | Roland Barthes   | NCOH   | NC  |
| 24 (9)  | Clifford Geertz  | 169354 | 98  |
| 25 (11) | Hannah Arendt    | 158405 | 120 |
| 26      | Walter Benjamin  | NCOH   | NC  |
| 27      | Henri Tajfel     | NCOH   | NC  |
| 28      | L. Wittgenstein  | NCOH   | NC  |
| 29      | Barney Glaser    | NCOH   | NC  |
| 30 (13) | George Lakoff    | 150561 | NC  |
| 31      | John Dewey       | NCOH   | NC  |
| 32      | Bene. Anderson   | NCOH   | NC  |
| 33      | E. Levinas       | NCOH   | NC  |
| 34      | Jacques Lacan    | NCOH   | NC  |
| 35      | Thomas Kuhn      | NCOH   | NC  |
| 36 (6)  | Karl Marx        | 271714 | 163 |
| 37      | Fried. Nietzsche | NCOH   | NC  |

● The table was prepared to trace the original publication 2015 for degree-based research ranking on Art and Humanities in 2007. The data was collected within 2017 Webometrics top 1000 researchers based on total citations compiled through Google Scholar. The automatic reproduction of total citations only can be made when the e-mail account of each scholar was ascertained on the Google Scholar. The blank void of information, therefore, is the case otherwise (NCOH means “not confirmed and only hand on count/NC means “not confirmed”). The hand on count can well be feasible, but a slot of scholars was left blank since the trend on yearly citation is fairly consistent over the period. It also was thought that the hand count can make a time for pleasure on the audience side. Your guess can work to rank although it is never perfect, but is suggested if you are busy or tedious to ascertain. My original publication was based on the Web of Science, which covers the different scope of journals or differing nature of written scholarly pieces. The difference could have had a potential to radically discriminate against the scholars on both indicators, but is relatively coherent among another as Erving Goffman 6th originally and 7th on the Google Scholar. Since the purpose of table is to provide a trace for former publication in 2007 and 2015, the original rank had come first while the rank in parenthesis indicated the result of 2017 Google Scholar. Since a latter rank pertains to the original list, the scope was limited to the Art, Humanities, and Social Science on qualitative basis. Because the social science on the quantitative methodology had long entertained as a prosperous practice to cull the scientific knowledge, it is no surprise that Altman had a top list, as notably on highest ascending wave recent years. Given that common journal practice separates a category of those subjects from that Economics and Business, the rank needs to be received as excludes the group of economic scientists. Some profile of data for the group was elicited below.

- The data for this edition was collected during the third week of August 2017 of a BETA list of the public

profiles of the Top 1000 cited researchers according to their declared presence in the Google Scholar Citations database. The list, that includes both living and deceased authors, is ranked first by the total number of citations.

● Some of renowned economists: Joseph Stiglitz 245163/199, Paul Krugman 189878/146, Joseph Schumpeter 168631/86, Milton Friedman, 136173/101

## Chapter 3

### Barons toward the Welfare and Noble Rights – Master and Ph.D degree holders –

In this chapter, I will present three pieces of assessment on the graduate or research doctorate in other disciplines. The first part deals with the research doctorate in US, as usually called Ph.D in specific discipline or program, which was yielded by combining NRC assessment and USNW graduate program ranking. You will read two models with a usual caution against the generality beyond specific program ranking. As said elsewhere, the strength of graduate school as a whole stems from and is amenable to perspectives that NRC and USNW had not been sanguine to provide over history. The second part, the quality graduate school in US, presents a ranking of US graduate schools to measure their potential and capability at greater extent, meaning as to the kind of present tense or mills of faculty performance. It would be compared to the first part as a post-deal strength on graduates. The third part, Table 8 & 9, is a bootstrap and stretch of US result onto the global context within the masters' level of graduate education.

#### The KIOSK FOR DOCTORAL STUDIES IN US [1986-2018]

- A. 1996 NRC Assessment
- B. 2010 NRC Assessment
- C. US News Graduate Programs Ranking

#### <Words of Reference to the Kiosk>

- The range numbers in this kiosk replicated the sum of R-Rank and S-Rank from 2010 NRC report. The left ranking is highest possible ranking and the right one is lowest possible, which is in terms of statistically 5% rule. The average of both numbers is used to yield a comparison and final definite ranking among the institutions for 2010 NRC report, which rests with parenthesis.

- Ranking for each program finally has been yielded by average number of 1996, 2010, and USNW ranking for the graduate programs. Hence the coverage in period is longitudinal possibly from 1986 (the first year from last 1985 NRC) through 2020 (the last year for ten year interval of NRC practice, but not surely for every turn). The ranking of USNW graduate programs are mostly yearly, or changed with the interval of about three years for Natural and Social Sciences. The USNW ranking mostly was based on 2017-2018 version (eventually to determine the period of effect for this KIOSK), but in rare case, might be adjusted to avoid a sharp precariousness or in consideration of promotional equity.

- The Kiosk is designed to reveal the compiled rankings of leading institution that is not exhaustive to include all of doctoral programs. I have, nevertheless, list major follow-up institutions from the 2010 NRC report.

- As we see, the global rankings produce a scope of subject rankings beside overall university rankings, which is variable to the schema of each ranking agency. Their scope was tabulated below, and the basic characteristics of those rankings have drawn on the publication and citations or awards and teaching competence of faculty. It also differs from USNW college ranking that resides squarely with the quality of both faculty and student largely being purported to rank overall strength of undergraduate element within the institution. Global rankings are closer to assess the graduate strengths of institution than USNW college ranking, but are less rigorous because the subjects may be too broad, or neither comprehensive nor accurate to cover the specific programs. According to Moase, USNW chief data strategist, the subject is neither college, department nor program, meaning that it mainly relates with the academic journals, Clarivate or Scopus and books or articles produced within the period of each ranking purpose by the institutions. Instead, USNW uses the name of program, of course more specifically graduate program, for their ranking purpose and Deans or Department chairs are specifically made to contact to survey the quality and competence of each graduate institution. While 1996 NRC was conducted with the 41 areas, they played within the title 'area' or 'field.' 2010 NRC reported each doctoral program as titled by each institution along with 62 fields classified by NRC in advance and abstraction. Therefore, 2010 NRC should be most corporate while 1996 NRC and USNW are medium- corporal and the global rankings are more paper-based than substantial or corporal.

- The information is best to the knowledge and conscience of this KIOSK designer, but may include inaccurate or false information as humanly. Please do not hesitate to contact me if error is found or one likes to suggest.



- / may appear two or three times at the cell within the rank box. It denotes the rank of 1996 NRC, 2010 NRC and USNW ranking of graduate programs in order. The ranks with two / often denote those of 1996 and 2010 NRC reports in order. Nevertheless, in some cases, one may be either of NRC reports and the other was that of USNW graduate ranking. ND or NA refers to Not Available or No Data, meaning that no specific rank or rank range is available for that institution.

- The number in the square bracket [ ] is a ranking yielded from the average of three sources.

- I believe that the collective ranking for the graduate or doctoral programs, such as Gourman, is less contributive or create controversy and criticism than the general university or college ranking. The graduate degree, especially PhD degrees, would be some kind of lifetime asset for the degree recipients that may capitalize on their career life. Hence, it can be more specific and destined as similar with the property rights. In some cases, the element of degree, for example, damages for the loss or injury of degree recipient, may matter that the courts typically use a word, “degree or license.” Therefore, it realistically can be the kind of economic item although its major characteristics would be intellectual or social. It is thought that the collective ranking for graduate programs- more than unpleasant with research doctorates-would not be acclaim practice for the IREG or quasi-IREG professionals (other main job and interested work in the meantime). In this context, schools’ practice to count the number of each higher ranking (top, fifth or tenth, and rated) in the NRC report could be understandable even if eager statisticians might strive to yield more refined picture. Nevertheless, the kind of hut to enshroud humble elements could help the audience to begin their reference in need so that I provided an overall ranking with the “breadth (50%) and top (first and second ranks for each institution)” principle inferred from the presentation by Dr. Newton surrounding the 1996 studies. I hope that it could be helpful for the journey through this Kiosk, the kind of fiasco blaring many of good hands to build the marvelous civilization over history and space. I have produced another piece elsewhere, which assessed the quality of graduate schools in US. I hoped it to alter or complement with the traditional Gourman report, which aimed to address its vicissitude or criticisms. In that piece, I considered that ranking partially as a variable to yield the final ranking, and presented others to represent overall strengths of graduate studies for each institution.

- As you see in a Linguistic case with the college of Social Science, categorization can variegate the outcome of ranking which is due to the wisdom of rankers on one hand, but also the transformation of science on the other. Therefore, the rankers need to take a care, which could support an argument that the collective ranking can potentially mislead or crumble with the mind of each doctoral degree holder. Then, some readers might criticize that I am also opaque between the graduate and doctoral programs. Does the title, graduate programs, include the masters along with doctors? That may be seen as a psychiatric question, too sensitive and less persuasive. However, the rankers do not pass or are even keen to sift and winnow on their job of classification. For example, the methodology of US graduate programs ranking specifically denotes that this is for masters only or graduate degree as a whole, and JDs or MBAs. This faith can foreclose at the ranking stage that there is no department for such name on the list or so. This problem needs to be distinguished from the source of subject rankings, mostly global as I commented earlier, that it is wholly from the journal or book categories, not directed to specific colleges and departments or programs. So the professors of psychology may contribute to law journals in terms of journal classification that was traced often automatically and with the system (needs to be clear so as not to be lost about his or her affiliated institutions) and considered to generate the ranking of law subject according to five year principle to aid with the scholarly competition. One more example needs to be remarked surrounding such classifications that nomenclature is a thread not only for rankers, but vastly represents the transformation of scientific and intelligent world. As you see in the face page of USNW, the main category of graduate ranking shingles out five or six professional schools along with Social and Natural Sciences at the corner of page. Other space was spent to life and health disciplines as well as other disciplines on less public highlight, such as library science or fine arts and so. This corroborates our secular knowledge that philosophy began to phase into a number of branches as a node of thinking in early of 20 century. This would be common within our two leading continents at that time, but more salient in new continent. I have once benchmarked various sections of NY Times Science page in which experts in their field pen on their interested topic shared with the newspaper subscribers. Now and days, the science governs a behavior and thought of civilians. Food is publicly regulated, and tobacco is sanctioned to frustrate avid smokers as a law. A constitutional shield is not available for the smokers that implanted an imagery of criminality. A past imagery of social groove on the wealth and prestige became quite opposite for them, who look even miserable with no support from the right to happiness argument, say, final, philanthropic or philosophical, but least shelter for the marginal people, what we often know, discrete and insular minority. The tendency is more than

transformative in US, and titles of notable graduate schools, taught-based than research-based, embarked their business that had attained public attention and preference or loving. In this thought, the streamlines on the first page of US News on graduate ranking is not surprising, but accurately reflect the reality of science and knowledge world. It is, therefore, natural that US only publishes the title of report around the world, only country of sexy and colored bones. The academy and IREG or Quasi-IREG are mutual and symbiotic although criticisms are no less echoing with accusation that the academy should remain sacred and quasi-religious with their earnest commission to educate through universal needs. A small school or college, under-disclosed for their greatness, may be taunted to that context. In other cases, undergraduates or alumni of small colleges around the same range of SAT scores to those of big research or global universities may outrightly spell out the schema of global or research ranking, reject its presence, and may be afraid if his or her reputation could be spoiled.

- Despite criticisms against 2010 NRC, it disposed the strengths that no definite ranking is persuasive to explain each doctoral program in terms of quality. It is also very informative that the real programs within each college and university was incorporated into the rankings of program with their real title along with the title of broad field, abstract and academic in general. The practice differs from other rankings, such as 1996 NRC report and USNW graduate programs ranking. I once pointed out that global ranking entails the elements of graduate ranking, but is neither perfect nor exhaustive than specific graduate rankings. Without such perfect or exhaustive ranking, foreign students have no way but to consult them when they need to decide which school they should go. Notably, QS world university ranking provides a good guide for both graduate and undergraduate students planned with the foreign destinations for their study. I like statistics, but, in fact, am fairly ignorant of its deep knowledge. Additionally, my propensity is fatal with human subject in the end that prefers to envision with them about the identity of various ranking projects. Therefore, we have types of those desiderata to be wanted by students or investors. The undergraduate, master and doctors would stand in the first type, as you see in global rankings while the masters or doctors would stand in second type with the USNW graduate ranking. The research doctors, as distinct from professional doctors in terms of designation, would stand in third type, say, in each slot of their fields before NRC 2010 report. The 2010 NRC report enabled that they can stand in the specific programs of his or her university. Therefore, we can verify if I should stand in the social policy program of Harvard or sociology program of Harvard in the slot of abstract category within "Sociology" title. That is same about the economics discipline that Stanford was ranked with two programs, economic statistics and analysis program as well as the general economics program. It is noted most extensively in the ranking slot entitled Public Health. Harvard reported seven or eight programs in this slot as if it were to be implied that the final goal of researchers or science would be public health in this contemporary world of oxymoron. It may diminish the easiness of comparison, but should be no less imperative that we need to include the Nutrition program of UW-Madison in Agricultural Sciences while same name program is more inclined to the character of Public Health for Harvard case. Therefore, nomenclature is not purely the problem of shingling, but can have implications of program content or characteristics although individual degree awardee may be more pleasant if it is ranked in other slots. Of course, non-existing programs cannot be incorporated as a matter of methodology so that schools with no research doctoral programs cannot appear within the ranking slots. For this reason, UW-Madison or UC-Berkeley may have no ranks in the public policy and administration while U Michigan will be placed at eighth. That came in comparison with the ranking of USNW public policy graduate program since the latter incorporates master programs of public policy, often large in the number of included institutions and known as MPA. Along with the ranking of other professional schools, such as law school, medical school, and business school, it seems a practice that addresses the need of prospective elite workers in that specific field. Therefore, the scope and manner to deal with graduate students in USNW – nuanced as if graduate students are a unique recipient of those rankings while taste with the words, 'subject ranking' is abstract open to all students or professors and even unrelated persons in general - are more diverse and commercialized with popular demand than NRC. Nevertheless, the implication in this pattern of deal is no less significant involving new perception and transformation of academia or science world.

- Between the USNW and NRC report, we may head if masters can refer to USNW math or economics graduate program ranking because a person of researcher can learn in one institution and another through his five to ten years of graduate study, for example, graduate students in the economics or political science department of several institutions. We cannot reject that litany without any perfect evidence since the Ipsos questionnaires are not available. According to the USNW methodology, two set of questionnaires are sent to the department head or director of graduate studies and college deans. One seems like to serve the whole of graduate programs and others would be specific for doctoral

programs. In any way, we humanely have no cause to suppress the wishes of master student seeking his or her personal use of USNW graduate ranking. In this viewpoint, it is true, as generally assumed, that NRC reports are more exhaustive and specific in terms of three sources of reference studied to generate this KIOSK. Other characteristics of USNW is that it is a yearly fare while NRC is planned with ten years interval. The controversy or disagreement would be more intense and data collection process might require a more extended years than expected. In any case, it can well procrastinate as you see the bridge years between two last reports. The KIOSK is given a weight to NRC reports if the category arises from that model, and some adjustment may be made with the USNW over years' record although the ranks mostly replicate those of 2017-2018 USNW report. In the event, I used all of three sources as combined to produce a final ranking because my intention is to trace the doctoral programs not only historically, but rigorously. Although NRC is more traumatic with method and inter-relational struggle to argue their strength of doctoral programs, reference to USNW also reinforces the history of departments or programs that would support the rigor of this research scheme. Such elaboration fuels the findings that the existing structure surrounding leading institutions in each program and faculty can be more durable and reinforced to shade short time amenities or pass time of ranking manias. The problem is obvious, however, since the US rank was about the sample year, mostly 2017-2018. Some readers may well think that it needs to represent an average of ten years to comply with the NRC schema. Others may suggest that the sample year approach can be acceptable with a same rationale of general practice within the social science research. Some others may also suppose that yearly renewal with an average from the beginning year of KIOSK, say, 2017 - thereafter, average of 2017/2018 for the 2018 KIOSK, average of three years in 2019, and so on - may suffice. Since I have many responsibilities and may only be feasible to revisit KIOSK for update years or decade hereafter, the last choice would be unwise and, more importantly, least persuasive among the three options. The rest of readers may also prefer to be consistent only with the historical monitor of NRCs. A divergence or even disagreement can well be conceived, but the KIOSK 2018 is certain to provide the data of three sources at verbatim at this point of time. As hinted, construction to the whole rank, compared to that of each program, would be more problematic because it is stiffer or more physical rather than chemical intuitively. My thought is that it could be multiplied according to the approach of institutions, while the highlight is put to each program or college at large. Given the rank of doctoral programs, the maxim seems that "small" will prevail "large." Then, the KIOSK is a product possibly among the tremendous number of versions on doctoral assessment. Therefore, I suggest that the use of KIOSK is caveat emptor and it can well be read in the cause and stance of each reader. For example, the researchers may waive the factors of USNW in future if he likes to know a specific or destined profile of research doctoral programs.

- Through the KIOSK, the readers meander down-most with the typology of global university rankings beginning from the US News college ranking or similar sources of general college ranking, such as Gourman or Kiplinger, Fiske and others. With the journey, bachelors may turn to feel that they are more than 'political' with the kinds of US News or that they may be more book or article-oriented, hence 'scholarly,' within the global authorities or Niche. As said, what does subject imply, the question which propels us to imagine not a person, but intellectual symbols that the uneducated persons even can make to themselves. A title named 'subject' commonly assumed by the global rankers and uniquely by Niche.com in US could be referred to the people at large because they are mainly from the quality of faculty resources through the regular degree programs, those of community extension, and their public activities. As said, US News graduate ranking largely covers various master and doctoral programs, which comes with a comparison of NRC, if purely with the PhDs in latter case. In this purview, the audience of KIOSK may be felicitous with the legal doctrine "*lex specialis* overrides a law governing only general matters *lex generalis*" through the three types of source. The contemporary peers and citizens are the kind of beneficiary, despite the many on dislike, who can refer to a variety of ranking services that are commercial or strategic in cases as well as educational or informative in others. Once I argued on the post-modern livability to understand evaluation or reflexivity for researchers and teachers. Within the super-intensity of e-communication or satellite mapping on planet, one can be a subject of restoration or critiquing toward his or her identity through community that 'general' could be challenged. One law school dean advised, "law students or graduates now just may take his or her due share on his admission data if he or she is lost from the public ranking scheme." Now it is time of data, which supports each ranking scheme and may be publicly disclosed according to the policy of rankers.

- I had yielded an experimental rank for the institutions investigated over time, which is fairly radical and sharp or seems restored with the Lincoln-ian feel, centered at the Land and balanced to save the unity of nation. This enables that other scale of ranking scheme can bring a different outcome, for example, fifth, tenth, fifteenth and twentieth

ranges or so. Therefore, too much weight with mind and psychological attachment is not a scene I like to share with the readers. You may be adjusted, for example, between Minnesota and Cal Tech or UC-San Diego through the journey, which may be more adventurous than other scale of rankings. Hence, I adverted on that difference below overall rank box. In other aspect, the KIOSK overall ranking arose from the similar context which we found in Moase's global tour presentation in Denmark and Shanghai years ago. Number of top programs along with other two scaled overall rankings was typified. The KIOSK overall rankings might be in tandem with the Moase's latter type, i.e., number of most rated programs, which is structural, basis of rating project, or can facilitate the readers to grasp. The difference, of course, lies within the specifics, in which the programs have to come within top hundred in US case while they have more than five doctoral students and demonstrate a fit for the national research paradigm in the NRC or KIOSK.

- My intention is to consider the service of universities to respond with the diversity of prospective doctoral students, whose right to choose their programs is precious than assessment of each specific program's quality. The discriminating standard between ranked and unranked programs is so primitive, as said, involving five doctoral students and fitness. However, it indicates the diversity of programs as well as success for their operation. Most of all, it offers a threshold for this business and implicates between the basic element of doctoral studies or production of good research student - hence educational in character – and simple rank order arguably from quality assessment – hence romantic in character for the interested people. Additionally, the KIOSK was designed to bring the kind of sky-view tower into use allowing the peers or interested people to feel the valuable research workers in each specific program notwithstanding his or her institutional affiliation overall. In this vein, it may be encouraged to draw as many possible pictures for the overall rank in order to inculcate knowing the doctoral world.

- Through 2010 NRC, the public universities had fared well, notably Penn State for example, which implies that the traditional sense of American academy keeps to be vindicated. However, it still also would be a good proposition that the kind of superb private institutions, such as Harvard, Stanford or MIT, can well top even the graduate programs as seen below. The prime strand attributed to those institutions, such as SAT or TOEFL likely reinforces their pride through graduate context (if GRE confidential for the face of professors or researchers) to become highly productive and enables to fare as top or leading institutions. Those institutions, on the other hand, certainly would be the kind of publication Giant with a high productivity in terms of amount and citations on books and articles. The context of undergraduate education, however, may sharply depart between the small colleges and big public universities in US provided that a SAT score of many small colleges well compete with the superior graduate public universities. Although the imagery and conventional sense for the undergraduates tilt on private universities as meritorious, that does not exactly replicate with the doctoral or graduate rankings. This is possibly because the scholarly community is fairly contagious and susceptible of liberal paradigm with high mobility of scholars. While the rankers often ground their basis of work on number, the kind of numerical analysis and quantitative approach, we need to know that it finally addresses the interest holders or so. It entails a social, political, cultural and philosophical element to reach the human agent. So diversity can be considered beyond the number in some cases. Diversity also can make a good for the community in terms of balance and informatization, so that we can enjoy UNC as a top public university in Kiplinger while we receive UC-Berkeley and UCLA as top public universities in USNW. If it highly depends on the scale, perception or purpose of rankers, you may encounter some list of possible forerunners with respect to such difference.

- Most importantly, the KIOSK is intended to develop into the book or article form, hence, the publication at this time is aimed to draw on the report of possibly numerous errors, comments and suggestions so as to improve this product. The kind of notice and comment period is my purpose that I am seriously waiting for the kind of assistance and even criticism. The KIOSK is not comprehensive to cover all institutions, rather focused on the profile of leading institutions, but could help to locate the status of other institutions with the links at the end of this KIOSK for extended reference. Additional links with my previous studies will be found about the background for this project.

**<Model I: Average Table from the Two Exercises Below>**

| Ranks | Institution | First Table | Second Table | Average Table |
|-------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| 1     | UW-Madison  | 2           | 1            | 1.5           |
| 2     | Stanford    | 1           | 3            | 2             |
| 3     | Michigan    | 3           | 4            | 3.5           |

|   |             |   |   |     |
|---|-------------|---|---|-----|
| 4 | Harvard     | 6 | 2 | 4   |
| 5 | MIT         | 3 | 8 | 5.5 |
| 6 | Princeton   | 8 | 4 | 6   |
| 6 | UC-Berkeley | 6 | 6 | 6   |
| 7 | Yale        | 6 | 7 | 6.5 |

● Unranked institutions including Cal Tech, U Chicago, Columbia, UCSF, Minnesota, and Penn State, UCLA can possibly range 5-20<sup>th</sup> place in terms of breadth and depth according to the characterization of Newton in 1996 studies.

● Within the different scale, Duke, Johns Hopkins, U Penn, UC-San Diego, NYU, Northwestern, Washington U (St. Louis), U Pittsburgh can possibly enter the 5-22<sup>th</sup> place.

● Within the different scale above, Cornell, U Texas, UNC, NYU, U Washington (Seattle), Ohio State, U Illinois (Urbana), Purdue, Indiana (Bloomington), SUNY (Buffalo), UC-Davis, Brown, U Iowa, Rutgers, Rochester, U Virginia, Case Western, U. Kansas, U. Utah, UC-Irvine, Tulane and some others can come within 12-40<sup>th</sup>.

● Other institutions, such as Vanderbilt, Georgia Tech, Rice and Carnegie Mellon, Brandeis, Rensselaer (NY), Notre Dame may not have a top spot in this formula, but are very robust and strong that can possibly fall within top thirty in other yardstick overall or pertaining to some specific programs.

#### <1996 NRC + US News Education/Other 1>

| Ranks    | Institution | Rated Programs | Top Grade 1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> |
|----------|-------------|----------------|--|
| 1        | Stanford    | 40 (50)        | 7/2 (1/0 USNW)<br>(49)                     |
| 2        | Wisconsin   | 38 (45)        | 4/3 (4/1<br>USNW) (46)                     |
| 3        | MIT         | 23 (37)        | 6/7<br>(52*)                               |
| 4        | Michigan    | 38 (45)        | 2/4 (1/3<br>USNW) (44)                     |
| 6        | Yale        | 30 (39)        | 6/1<br>(48)                                |
| 6        | Harvard     | 30 (39)        | 5/3 (0/1)<br>(48)                          |
| 6        | UC-Berkeley | 36 (40)        | 2/8 (0/1)<br>(47)                          |
| 8        | Princeton   | 29 (38)        | 2/4<br>(44)                                |
| Unranked | UCLA        | 37             | 1/1  |
| Unranked | Minnesota   | 37             | 1/0  |
| Unranked | Penn State  | 36             | 1/0  |
| Unranked | Columbia    | 34             | 1/1  |

|                 |                   |    |     |
|-----------------|-------------------|----|-----|
| <b>Unranked</b> | Pittsburg         | 34 | 0/1 |
| <b>Unranked</b> | Duke              | 33 | 0/1 |
| <b>Unranked</b> | Chicago           | 30 | 2/2 |
| <b>Unranked</b> | Northwestern      | 30 | 0/1 |
| <b>Unranked</b> | UC San Diego      | 29 | 2/0 |
| <b>Unranked</b> | NYU               | 25 | 0/1 |
| <b>Unranked</b> | Georgia Tech      |    | 1/0 |
| <b>Unranked</b> | Rockefeller       |    | 0/1 |
| <b>Unranked</b> | Cal Tech          |    | 3/1 |
| <b>Unranked</b> | Cal San Francisco |    | 1/1 |

**<2010 NRC + US News Education/Other 1>**

| <b>Ranks</b> | <b>Institution</b> | <b>Rated Programs (Breadth)</b> | <b>Number of programs marked 1<sup>st</sup> in both S/R rank + US News (Education 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>) + US News Other uncovered 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>)</b> |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>1</b>     | UW-Madison         | 78 (50 points)                  | 8 (3 + 5) (45 points)   |
| <b>2</b>     | Harvard            | 52 (36 points)                  | 14 (13 + 1) (50 points)   |
| <b>3</b>     | Stanford           | 49 (35 points)                  | 9 (8 + 1) (46 points)   |
| <b>4</b>     | Princeton          | 48 (raw 34) (34 points)         | 6 (40 points)   |
| <b>4</b>     | U Michigan         | 65 (41 points)                  | 4 (33 points)   |
| <b>6</b>     | UC-Berkeley        | 52 (36 points)                  | 5 (36 points)   |
| <b>7</b>     | Yale               | 48 (raw 34) (34 points)         | 4 (33 points)   |
| <b>8</b>     | MIT                | 52 (raw 29) (36 points)         | 3 (30 points)   |

● I included 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> spot in the USNW because the programs marked 1<sup>st</sup> in both ranks of NRC often, if not always, fall within 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> for each specific ranking. USNW had been monitored since 1990 and sample year plus adjustment made (1982-Present): education & other NRC uncovered subjects as the table 'Other 1' shows below. B-School, Law School, Nursing School, and Medical School are not included for they are MBA/JD/MD focused- hence, taught based mainly. Same through the end of this ranking textbook.

● As a system along with the research quality, UC-Santa Barbara and UC-San Diego can be seen typical to report small number of rated programs with one or two top rank programs, for example, material engineering and Oceanography in 2010 NRC ranking. The turnout might be received as a kind of strategy of UC system to grow their local campuses.

**<Model II: Big Eyes with the Combined Ranks>**

| Ranks | Institution | Breadth/Availability<br>(Rated Programs) | Number of Top<br>Programs (1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> ) |
|-------|-------------|--|---|
| 1     | UW-Madison  | 48 points                                | 6/1 42 points   |
| 2     | Harvard     | 40 points                                | 7/13 49 points  |
| 2     | Stanford    | 40 points                                | 9/10 49 points  |
| 4     | U Michigan  | 46 points                                | 3/4 41 points   |
| 4     | UC-Berkeley | 40 points                                | 6/10 47 points  |
| 6     | Princeton   | 36 points                                | 6/4 44 points   |
| 6     | MIT         | 35 points                                | 6/6 45 points   |
| 8     | Yale        | 37 points                                | 4/2 41 points   |

- Within my scale, Minnesota, Cal Tech, UCLA, Penn State, Michigan State U Possibly around 6-14<sup>th</sup> places in terms of breadth and depth according to the characterization of Newton in 1996 studies.
- Within the different scale, U Chicago, U Penn, UCSF, Columbia, Duke, Northwestern, UC-San Diego, Washington University (Saint Louis), Johns Hopkins University possibly can enter around 6 to 13<sup>th</sup> places overall.
- Within the different scale above, Cornell, U Texas, UNC, NYU, U Washington (Seattle), Ohio State, U Illinois, Purdue, U. Pittsburgh, SUNY (Buffalo ), Indiana (Bloomington ), UC-Davis, Brown, U Iowa, Rutgers, Rochester, U Virginia, Case Western, U. Kansas, U. Utah, UC-Irvine, Tulane and some others can come within 15-40<sup>th</sup>.
- Other institutions, such as Vanderbilt, Georgia Tech, Rice, Carnegie Mellon, Brandeis, Rensselaer (NY), Notre Dame may not have a top spot in this formula, but are very robust and strong that can possibly fall within the top 30<sup>th</sup> in other yardstick overall or pertaining to some specific programs.

**<Number of Programs with 1<sup>st</sup> or second in ranks for each Faculty and programs>**

| Faculty               | Yale            |                 | Stanford        |                 | Harvard         |                 | U. Michigan     |                 | MIT             |                 | Princeton       |                 | UC-Berkeley     |                 | UW-Madison      |                 |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                       | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| Education             |                 |                 | 1               |                 |                 | 1               | 1               | 3               |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 | 3               | 0               |
| Social Science        |                 |                 | 1               | 1               | 3               | 2               | 1               | 1               | 1               | 1               |                 |                 | 1               |                 | 1               |                 |
| Engineering           |                 |                 | 2               | 2               |                 |                 |                 |                 | 3               | 2               |                 |                 | 1               | 2               |                 |                 |
| Art & Humanities      |                 | 2               |                 | 4               | 2               | 4               |                 |                 |                 |                 | 3               | 3               | 2               | 2               |                 |                 |
| Health Sciences       | 3               |                 | 1               | 1               | 1               | 2               |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Life Sciences         | 1               |                 | 2               | 1               | 0               | 4               |                 |                 | 2               | 1               |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Natural Sciences      |                 |                 | 2               | 1               | 1               |                 |                 |                 | 2               |                 | 2               | 2               | 1               | 5               |                 |                 |
| Agricultural Sciences |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 | 1               |                 | 1               |                 |

|            |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Other<br>1 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total      | 4 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
|            |   |   | 0 |   |   | 3 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 0 |   |   |   |

<Number of Research Doctoral Programs>



| Authority | NRC (KIOSK on 2010 categories) | US News (Outside NRC)  | Total in Coverage |
|-----------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Number    | 59 (2010) /40 (1996)           | 13 (rank-based on US News /4~8 (program-based on each university)) | 63~67             |

● Recently, US News began to report the Nursing graduate programs with two classifications (master level and DNP). The DNP program was not taken into account since it newly appeared in near years to want us to wait for its progress or change. The character also seems moderate between the practice doctors and research ones given the KIOSK with a focus on research doctorates. Of course, the shingles of upper US portion, i.e., law school, medical school, business school, were not included since they produce the different mode of doctors, mainly, taught-based or because the ranking scheme is skewed to cover MBAs, JDs, or MDs, other than research-based programs or doctors. The engineering and education programs differ so as to be incorporated into the KIOSK in consideration of US News data.

● As seen above, the data readily available with KIOSK (without clicking the sources linked at the bottom of it) would project the scene of top two spots within the sorted PhD programs that are destined to the leading institutions. A whole picture of research doctorates in classification and ranks may largely resemble the Gourman Report, which, however, was critiqued for opaqueness of methodology and big-universities oriented. The other side of coin, as an account of half scores concerning the overall rank above, may complicate a scene with the frequency as rated, which, I consider, to reflect the educational or diversity aspect of doctoral education than the traditional measure on quality-oriented struggle. That was noted as basic than romantic above. The approach epitomes as more radical than Gourman, and for reasons as stated. Hence, the KIOSK could be a kind of alternative to Gourman along with one other piece separately produced besides KIOSK. On the other hand, I may not be exhaustive to uncover some rest of top programs, which would be outside the box above presented. Those can be confirmed through each college slot below, in red of parenthesis. Some may still be lost, for example, UCLA with Applied Math [1] 4-18 (2010 NRC)/2 or possibly others (US News), which, however, needs to require patience for the observation over a long period of time or new method of dealing the US News ranks, such as average of ten or more than years. This may be true in other determined cases of this KIOSK since it largely relies on 2017-2018 US News or above rank of UCLA in Applied Math may stand to be counted for the purpose of this KIOSK depending on its 2017-2018 rank.

#### [A] [Social and Behavioral Sciences]

| Rank (1996 category: Linguistics-art and humanities) | Rank (2010 category: Linguistics-Social Sciences) | Institution | Agricultural & Resource Economics | Anthropology   | Economics         | Geography | Linguistics       | Political Science | Psychology       | Public Policy & Administration | Sociology       |
|--|---|-------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| 7 (sum)/5 (programs) [1]                             | 16 (sum)/6 (programs) [1]                         | Harvard     |                                   | 5/4-11 (1) [2] | 1/4-11 (2) /1 [1] |           | 21/14-62 (15) [9] | 1/3-6 (1) /1 [1]  | 6/2-10 (1)/3 [2] | 11-31 (6)                      | 7/2-3 (1)/1 [1] |
| 39 /5 [6]  | 39 /5 [6]   | Princeton   |                                   | 27/64-138 (29) | 5 /7-16           |           |                   | 7/14-30 (9)/3     | 1 3/2-14         | 2-8 (1)                        | 1 3/2-14        |

|                 |                  |               |   |                               |                                      |                            |                                 |   |   |               |                                       |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------|---------------------------------------|
|                 |                  |               |   | [21]                          | (4)/<br>1 [3]                        |                            |                                 | [7]                                     | (2)/<br>8 [5<br>]                           |               | (2)/<br>1[3]                          |
| 19<br>/5<br>[2] | 22<br>/6<br>[2]  | Stanf<br>ord  |   | 7/1<br>9-40 (7<br>) [5]       | 4<br>/11-<br>26 (6<br>) /1 [4]       |                            | 2<br>/10-<br>33 (6<br>) [3<br>] | 5<br>/3-6<br>(1)/<br>1 [2]              | 1<br>/3-<br>19<br>(3)/<br>1 [1<br>]         |               | 8<br>/17-<br>57<br>(11)<br>/5 [7]     |
| 36<br>/5<br>[5] | 41<br>/6<br>[5]  | Chica<br>go   |   | 2/1<br>9-40 (7<br>) [4]       | 2<br>/5-<br>11 (3<br>) /7 [5]        |                            | 6<br>/10-<br>28 (5<br>) [5<br>] | 6<br>/13-<br>33<br>(9)/1<br>2 [6]       | 1<br>8/1<br>4-<br>60<br>(12)<br>/17<br>[15] | 14-<br>34 (8) | 1<br>/17-<br>58<br>(<br>12)/<br>8 [6] |
| 23<br>/5<br>[3] | 36<br>/6<br>[4]  | Michi<br>gan  |   | 1/9<br>-25 (2)<br>[1]         | 1<br>3/34<br>-58<br>(20)/<br>12 [14] |                            | 3<br>1/28<br>-66 (21)<br>[13]   | 4<br>/3-7<br>(3)/<br>4 [3]              | 2<br>/7-<br>31<br>(6)/<br>3 [3<br>]         | 11-<br>35 (7) | 4<br>/12-<br>33<br>(5)/<br>1 [2]      |
| 43<br>/5<br>[8] | 58<br>/6<br>[10] | Yale          |   | 8/3<br>2-71 (14)<br>[8]       | 6<br>/18-<br>34 (9<br>) /1 [7]       |                            | 3<br>0/42<br>-72 (25)<br>[15]   | 3<br>/10-<br>24 (5<br>) /4 [4]          | 3<br>/7-<br>25<br>(5)/<br>3 [3<br>]         |               | 1<br>9/73<br>-123<br>(35)<br>/22 [21] |
| 37<br>/7<br>[4] | 41<br>/8<br>[3]  | Berke<br>ley  | 1 | 3/1<br>1-31 (4<br>) [3]       | 7<br>/10-<br>18 (5<br>) /1 [6]       | 7<br>/13-<br>41 (7)<br>[6] | 4<br>/9-<br>34<br>(6)<br>[4]    | 2<br>/15-<br>36<br>(10)/<br>4 [5]       | 9<br>/25<br>-<br>129<br>(27)<br>/1 [12]     |               | 3<br>/36-<br>68 (16)<br>/1 [4]        |
| 58<br>/7<br>[7] | 70<br>/8<br>[8]  | Wisc<br>onsin | 5 | 18/<br>27-75 (14)<br>[13<br>] | 1<br>5/20<br>-40 (12)/<br>12 [12]    | 2<br>/4-14<br>(1)<br>[1]   | 3<br>2/24<br>-55 (14)<br>[12]   | 1<br>0/33<br>-57<br>(15)/<br>15 [13]    | 1<br>5/7<br>-37<br>(7)/<br>13 [9]           |               | 2<br>/24-<br>57<br>(13)<br>/6 [6]     |
| Unrank<br>Ed    | Un<br>ranked     | MIT           |   |                               | 3<br>/4-7<br>(1)/<br>1 [2]           |                            | 1<br>/NA                        | 1<br>2/14<br>-41<br>(11)/<br>9 [11<br>] | 5<br>-44<br>(8)/<br>8<br>[6]                |               |                                       |
| 52<br>/6<br>[9] | 53<br>/7<br>[7]  | UCL<br>A      |   | 9/1<br>5-38 (6<br>)<br>[6]    | 1<br>1/52<br>-93<br>(26)/            | 8<br>/4-15<br>(2)<br>[2]   | 3<br>/5-<br>21<br>(2)           | 8<br>/34-<br>68<br>(16)/                | 4<br>/10<br>-41<br>(9)/                     |               | 5<br>/43-<br>84<br>(20)               |

|                |                |              |   |                               |                              |                           |                               |   |            |  |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------|--|
|                |                |              |   | 12 [15]                       |                              | [1]                       | 12 [12]                       | 3 [6]                                   |            | /8 [11]                                |
| 61<br>/5 [11]  | 63<br>/6 [9]   | Penn         |   | 6/1<br>9-49 (12)<br>[7]       | 8<br>/17-34<br>(8)/10 [8]    | 5<br>/7-23<br>(3) [2]     | 4<br>2/73-134<br>(33)/19 [29] | 8<br>/18-82<br>(15)<br>/8 [8]           | 20-42 (13) | 1<br>1/8-27<br>(3)/11 [9]              |
| 59<br>/5 [10]  | 59<br>/5 [11]  | Columbia     |   | 16/<br>67-102<br>(24)<br>[15] | 1<br>2/23-45<br>(14)/9 [11]  |                           | 1<br>6/7-20 (4)<br>) /7 [9]   | 1<br>7/1<br>5-63<br>(12)<br>/17 [14]    |            | 1<br>5/11-35<br>(6)/11 [10]            |
| 79<br>/5 [18]  | 79<br>/5 [19]  | Northwestern |   | 34/<br>15-52 (11) [16]        | 9<br>/22-36<br>(11)/7 [9]    | N<br>A/11-38<br>(10)      | 2<br>2/51-83<br>(22)/23 [19]  | 2<br>4/6<br>5-147<br>(35)<br>/17 [22]   |            | 9<br>/37-97<br>(23)<br>/10 [13]        |
| 72<br>/5 [14]  | 78<br>/6 [12]  | UC-San Diego |   | 10<br>/ 68-116(26)<br>[14]    | 1<br>6/32-55<br>(21)/12 [15] | 1<br>4/27-46 (12) [6]     | 9<br>/11-30 (8)<br>) /9 [8]   | 1<br>0/2<br>2-98<br>(19)<br>/13 [13]    |            | 2<br>2/10<br>5-167<br>(44)<br>/13 [22] |
| 70<br>/5 [12]  | 70<br>/5 [14]  | Duke         |   | 19/<br>11-42 (6)<br>[9]       | 2<br>2/38-61<br>(23)/16 [18] |                           | 1<br>4/19-47<br>(12)/7 [10]   | 3<br>3/2<br>4-78<br>(16)<br>/17 [19]    |            | 2<br>0/18-55<br>(9)/15 [14]            |
| 10<br>2/6 [19] | 10<br>7/7 [17] | Cornell      | 6 | 31/<br>58-111<br>(24)<br>[19] | 1<br>8/37-59<br>(19)/16 [17] | 9<br>/30-72 (22) [7]      | 1<br>5/39-66<br>(17)/19 [15]  | 1<br>4/1<br>25-234<br>(60)<br>/ 24 [32] |            | 3<br>5/45-117<br>(30)<br>/17 [23]      |
| 92<br>/5 [21]  | 10<br>6/6 [21] | NYU          |   | 13/<br>22-58 (13)<br>[10]     | 1<br>7/14-28<br>(7)/10 [10]  | 36/3<br>0-61<br>(18) [14] | 56/1<br>0-19<br>(6)/12 [22]   | 3<br>4/5<br>0-132<br>(34)<br>/36        |            | 2<br>1/46-96<br>(24)<br>/11 [17]       |

|                  |                |                    |                           |                                 |                                       |                                       |                                  |                                      |  |  |  |
|------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                  |                | UNC                |                           |                                 |                                       |                                       |                                  |                                      | [33]   |  |  |
| 94<br>/6<br>[16] | 94<br>/6 [18]  |                    |                           | 29/<br>75-119<br>(27)<br>[19]   | 2<br>5/90<br>-137<br>(36)/<br>29 [20] | 22<br>/28-<br>67<br>(15)<br>[16]      |                                  | 1<br>8/21<br>-45<br>(12)/<br>11 [14] | 2<br>5/5<br>6-<br>127<br>(35)<br>/13<br>[21] | 13-<br>38 (10)                           | 6<br>/19-<br>44<br>(8)/<br>6 [4]         |
| 10<br>7/6 [20]   | 12<br>3/7 [20] | UW-<br>Seattl<br>e |                           | 28/<br>40-81 (17)<br>[16]       | 2<br>6/89<br>-133<br>(35)/<br>35 [23] | 10<br>/20-<br>53 (11)<br>[8]          | 17/7<br>3-99<br>(39) [16]        | 2<br>3/26<br>-56<br>(14)/<br>33 [20] | 1<br>2/5<br>9-<br>141<br>(39)<br>/26<br>[24] |  | 1<br>0/50<br>-99<br>(26)<br>/17<br>[16]  |
| 89<br>/6<br>[15] | 10<br>0/7 [15] |                    | Texas                     |                                 | 12/<br>30-84 (16)<br>[10]             | 3<br>1/73<br>-125<br>(32)/<br>27 [20] | 14<br>/27-<br>64<br>(14)<br>[11] | 1<br>1/42<br>-86<br>(31)<br>[11]     | 1<br>9/69<br>-102<br>(26)/<br>19 [18]        | 1<br>6/5<br>7-<br>141<br>(38)<br>/8 [18] | 29-<br>53 (16)                           |
| 11<br>0/7 [17]   | 11<br>7/8 [16] | Illinoi<br>s       | 8                         | 14/<br>31-78 (15)<br>[12]       | 2<br>8/83<br>-129<br>(34)/<br>29 [22] | 16<br>/11-<br>40 (6)<br>[9]           | 1<br>8/21<br>-51<br>(13)<br>[7]  | 3<br>0/34<br>-71<br>(17)/<br>24 [21] | 5<br>/35<br>-<br>110<br>(23)<br>/7 [9]       |  | 2<br>9/48<br>-109<br>(27)<br>/47<br>[30] |
| 11<br>0/5 [22]   | 11<br>0/5 [22] |                    | John<br>s<br>Hop<br>k ins |                                 | 21/<br>60-117<br>(25)<br>[18]         | 3<br>2/57<br>-111<br>(28)/<br>23 [19] | 23<br>/NA                        | N<br>A/2-<br>15(1)                   | 2<br>1/10<br>9-<br>157<br>(44)/<br>49 [33]   | 35/<br>14-<br>58<br>(11)<br>/36<br>[25]  |  |
| 95<br>/7 [13]    | 95<br>/7 [13]  | Minn<br>esota      | 7                         | 50/<br>150-<br>162 (49)<br>[22] | 1<br>0/28<br>-52<br>(17)/<br>16 [13]  | 3<br>/46-<br>80 (19)<br>[9]           | N<br>A/53<br>-78<br>(32)         | 1<br>3/45<br>-74<br>(20)/<br>24 [16] | 7<br>/30<br>-98<br>(20)<br>/8 [9]            |  | 2<br>4/54<br>-117<br>(32)<br>/17 [20]    |

● Anthropology : Penn State 7-20 (3) U of Arizona 11-31 (4) UC-Irvine 13-46 (7) Emory 17-45 (10) Indiana U at Bloomington 36-81 U (16) Georgia 34-91 (18) UC-Santa Barbara 34-91 (18) SUNY (Binghamton) 32-96 (20). \*U Michigan UC-Berkeley/San Francisco Duke two programs (higher ranks included & the other excluded from total ranks)

● Economics : Cal Tech 20-35 (10) Brown 26-44 (13) U Maryland 23-48 (15) Washington U (St Louis) 34-53 (17) Carnegie Mellon 47-85 (20) Penn State 51-84 (24) 54-90 U Pittsburgh (25) U Rochester 54-90 (27) \*Stanford 2 programs Harvard 3 programs (higher ranks included & the others excluded from total ranks)

● Geography : Boston U 4-25 (4) Clark U 8-29 (5) [5] University of Illinois-UC 11-40 (6) U of Maryland 9-44 (7) Ohio State 12-40 (8 tied) [4] Penn State 14-45 (10) [2] U of Oregon 14-56 (12) U Kentucky 15-58 (13) U of Washington

20-53 (13) SUNY-Buffalo 19-54 (14) Iowa 21-56 (14) Georgia 22-58 (16) \* corr) Colorado 4-16(3) ASU 14-47(11)

- Linguistics : Johns Hopkins 2-15 (1) San Diego State & U San Diego 6-31 (4) University of Massachusetts 10-36 (8) U Maryland 11-36 (9) USC 18-50 (11) Indiana U at Bloomington 23-57 (16) U of Delaware 22-61 (17) U Colorado at Boulder 22-69 (18) University of Arizona 32-61 (20) UCLA other program (potentially 20 not included for ranking purpose)

- Psychology : Carnegie Mellon 7-56 (10) U Colorado at Boulder 14-66 (13) U Rochester 13-74 (14) Brown 17-86 (17) Indiana U at Bloomington (18) Vanderbilt University 32-100 (21) Washington U at St Louis 35-98 (22) Syracuse University 33-113 (24) SUNY at stony Brook 36-116 (25) U of Iowa 34-119 (26) Dartmouth 38-125 (28) U of Florida 37-127 (29) Penn State 35-130 (30) Ohio State 39-150 (31) U of Arizona 52-126 (32) Michigan State 50-129 (33) Arizona State 53-134 (36) Florida State U 45-151 (37) Temple University 77-152 (46) \* A considerable numbers of universities have two or more than two programs on the list (As same with other cases, higher ranked program included and others excluded for ranking purpose)

- Sociology: U Arizona 27-54 (14) Penn State 20-65 (15) U Miami 21-84 (17) Rutgers 33-74 (18) Ohio State 31-77 19 (19) Indiana U at Bloomington 42-85 (20) U Iowa 38-92 (22) UCSF 24-115 (25) U Nebraska 41-102 (27) Brown University 42-116 (29) U Maryland 55-111 (31) UC-Santa Barbara 56-114(31)

- Public Affairs: Indiana U at Bloomington 5-17 (2) Carnegie Mellon 5-19 (3) Syracuse 8-25 (4) USC 12-25 (5) U Kentucky 16-37 (9) Georgia Institute of Technology 16-41 (10) Johns Hopkins 15-46 (12) U Georgia 22-49 (14) SUNY at Albany 33-58 (17)

#### [B] [Engineering]

| Ran<br>ks | Institu<br>tion     | Aerospace           | Biomed<br>ical          | Chem<br>ical                | Civil &<br>Environm<br>ental | Electri<br>cal &<br>Comp<br>uter | Materi<br>al Scienc<br>e | Mecha<br>nical             | Industrial             | Total                               |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1         | MIT                 | 2/9-24<br>(6)/1 [3] | 1/4-<br>18 (4)/1<br>[1] | 2/<br>4-14 (4)/1<br>[1]     | 1/9-<br>40 (3)/<br>7 [3]     | 2/<br>11-<br>31(7)/<br>1 [2]     | 1/5<br>-20 (3)<br>/1 [1] | 2/8<br>-<br>22(5)/1<br>[2] | 5/3-<br>9(2)/NA<br>[3] | 16<br>(sum)/<br>8<br>(progra<br>ms) |
| 2         | UC-<br>Berkel<br>ey | NA/N<br>A/NA        | 8/5-<br>12 (3)/6<br>[3] | 3/<br>5-12 (3)/2<br>[2]     | 2/4-<br>16(1)/1<br>[1]       | 4/<br>9-28 (6)/3<br>[3]          | 4/8<br>-23 (5)/5<br>[4]  | 3/6<br>-<br>17(4)/3<br>[3] | 3/4- 19(<br>4)/2 [2]   | 18/7                                |
| 3         | Stanfo<br>rd        | 3/3-6<br>(2)/2 [2]  | 12/N<br>A/3 [4]         | 7/<br>11-35<br>(7)/4<br>[4] | 3/6-<br>26 (2)/<br>4 [2]     | 1/<br>2- 4(1<br>)2 [1<br>]       | 6/1<br>0-33 (8<br>)4 [5] | 1/4<br>-<br>11(1)/1<br>[1] | 7/2-8<br>(1)/7 [4]     | 23/8                                |
| 4         | Cal<br>Tech         | 1/2-4<br>(1)/4 [1]  | NA/<br>(2-9)<br>1/NA    | 6/<br>(2-5)<br>1/2 [3]      | 5/19-<br>71 (12)<br>/NA [7]  | 5/<br>4/4 [3]                    | 12/<br>2/5 [6]           | 4/2<br>0-94 (14)/4<br>[8]  | NA/N<br>A/NA           | 28/6                                |

- Aerospace Engineering : Cal Tech 2-4 (1) University of Michigan 5-14 (3) U of Colorado at Boulder 9-19 (4) University of Minnesota-Twin Cities 8-23 (5) Georgia Institute of Technology 13-35 (7)

- Biomedical Engineering : Cal Tech 2-9 (1) UC-San Diego 2/3-11 (2)/3 [2] U of Washington 4-22 (5) Duke 7-38 (6) U of Michigan (6) Yale (8) Rice (9) Johns Hopkins 13-47

- Chemical Engineering : Cal Tech 2-5 (1) UT-Austin 3-12 (2) UC-Santa Barbara 5-13 (4) U of Minnesota-Twin Cities 8-29 (6) U of Wisconsin-Madison 11-42 (8) U of Illinois-UC 14-43 (9) Northwestern 12-46 (10) Carnegie Melon 13-45 (10)

- Civil & Environmental Engineering : Yale R-rank 23-91/S-rank 1-2 (Corrected R-rank 7-43 /S-rank 1-1)

- Electrical & Computer Engineering: Princeton 3-10 (2) Harvard 3-15 (3) Cal Tech 7-21 (4) U of Illinois-UC

8-26 (5) U of Michigan 12-32 (8) UCLA 12-37 (9) Georgia Institute of Technology (10)

- Material Sciences : UC-Santa Barbara 2-3 (1) Cal Tech 4-11 (2) U of Massachusetts 6-21 (4) Northwestern 8-30 (6) Penn State 8-36 (7) Stanford University 10-33 (8) University of Illinois-UC 9-34 (8) U of Florida 10-41 (10)

- Material Sciences (Combined: 1996 NRC + 2010 NRC/Same as below) : Northwestern 2/6/2 [2] UC-Santa Barbara 8/1/3 [3] Cal Tech 12/2/5 [6]

- Mechanical Engineering : Northwestern 5-11 (2) U of Michigan 5-17 (3) Brown 6-28 (6) UC-Santa Barbara 12-30 (7)

- Industrial Engineering : Georgia Institute of Technology 2-10 (2) Northwestern 5-21 (5) Carnegie Mellon 7-27 (6) Cornell 10-31 (7) U of Michigan 13-35 (8) Purdue 14-46 (9) Penn State (9) U of Iowa (11) UW-Madison (12) U of Penn 22-56 (13) Ohio State 18-64 (14) Virginia Polytech 23-65(15)

- Industrial Engineering: GIT 1/2/1 [1]

### [C] [Art & Humanities]

|   |             | AS | Classics            | Comp Lit             | English                | French               | German               | History                | Art-History        | Music                | Philosophy            | Religion           | Spanish                | Heat re | Total               |
|---|-------------|----|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|
| 1 | Princeton   |    | 4<br>/4-20 (3) [2]  | 5<br>/2-27 (4) [2]   | 1<br>3/3-17 (3) [8]    | 2<br>/5-17 (3) [1]   | 2<br>/12-42 (11) [4] | 3<br>/2-10 (1)/1 [1]   | 6<br>/8-28 (3) [3] | 6<br>/8-28 (9) [4]   | 1/<br>3-14 (2) [1]    | 3<br>/7-26 (6) [2] | 4<br>/13-64 (11) [4]   |         | 32(sum)/12(program) |
| 2 | Harvard     | 2  | 1<br>/3-17 (2) [1]  | 4<br>/8-26 (5)/ [2]  | 2<br>/2-15 (1)/8 [2]   | 1<br>7/10-34 (6) [9] | 4<br>/7-34 (5) [2]   | 4<br>/2-12 (2)/4 [3]   | 4<br>/9-32 (5) [3] | 1<br>/4-11 (2) [1]   | 3/<br>27-67 (17) [11] | 2<br>/9-27 (8) [5] | 1<br>0/N A             |         | 41/11               |
| 3 | UC-Berkeley |    | 2<br>/7-25 (5) [2]  | 1<br>0/3-22 (2)/ [4] | 3<br>/24-63 (13)/1 [6] | 7<br>/21-45 (14) [8] | 1<br>/5-21 (2) [1]   | 2<br>/15-38 (10)/4 [5] | 3<br>/3-14 (2) [1] | 3<br>/17-51 (14) [5] | 4/<br>5-21 (5) [2]    | N<br>D/N D         | 9<br>/9-40 (6) [4]     | 7       | 45/11               |
| 4 | Stanford    |    | 1<br>6/2-10 (1) [4] | 9<br>/3-22 (2) [3]   | 5<br>/3-12 (2)/3 [2]   | 6<br>/6-28 (5) [2]   | 6<br>/13-39 (10) [5] | 7<br>/13-28 (6)/1 [4]  | 1<br>4/N D [4]     |                      | 6/<br>15-42 (9) [5]   | 1<br>9/N D         | 1<br>7/21-66 (14) [11] | 2       | 42/10               |

- Classics : Columbia 2-19 (2) U Penn 6-26 (5)

- Comp. Lit. : U. Maryland 3-15 (1) Duke 9-31(6) NYU 5-38 (7) Yale 7/37 (8 tied) U. Penn 8-37 (10)

- Comp. Lit (Combined): Duke 2/6 [1] Yale 1/8 [2] \* Columbia 3/No data

- English Language : Columbia 6-22 (4) Yale 7-33 (5) Cornell 10-42 (6) U of Michigan 12-43 (7) U of Chicago 12-48 (8) U of Pennsylvania 14-50 (9) Vanderbilt 13-53 (10) Duke 14-58 (11) UW-Madison 17-61 (12) CUNY 22-67 (14) Brown 22-69 (15)

- English Language (Combined) : Stanford 5/3/3 [2] Yale 1/5/8 [4] Columbia 9/3/3 [5] Cornell 7/5/6 [7] U Penn 8/8/3 [8]

- French Language : Duke 2-13 (1) U Penn 5-16 (2) U Michigan 6-21 (4) Vanderbilt 9-36 (7) Yale 13-31 (8) U of Wisconsin 13-35 (9) Johns Hopkins 13-40 (10) Indiana U at Bloomington 20-42 (11) Penn State 15-48 (12) Cornell 18-47 (13) NYU 21-48 (15) Brown 25-52 (16) Columbia 24-54(17)

- French Language (Combined): Duke 3/1 [1] U Penn 5/2 [2] Yale 1/8 [5] U of Michigan 9/4 [6] U Wisconsin 11/9 [7] Cornell 8/13 [8]
- German Language : U of Minnesota 4-24 (1) U of Chicago 5-21 (2) Indiana University at Bloomington 6-33 (4) Harvard 7-34 (5) Washington University in St Louis 10-35 (6) NYU 11-35 (7) UT-Austin 10-39 (8) UNC 12-38 (9) Stanford 13-39 (10) Princeton 12-42 (11) Ohio State 12-44 (12) Cornell 18-38 (12) U of Michigan 14-43 (14) UCLA 15-42 (14) U Wisconsin-Madison 24-38 (16) Yale 22-46 (17)
- German Language (Combined) : U of Minnesota 11/1 [2] Washington University in St. Louis 7/6 [4 tied]
- History : Princeton 2-10 (1) Harvard 2-12 (2) U of Chicago 4-17 (3) Princeton (History of Science) 4-20 (4) Johns Hopkins 7-22 (5) Stanford 11-28 (6) Columbia 11-31 (7) Yale (Medieval studies) 11-32 (8) U Penn 13-31 (9) UC-Berkeley 15-38 (10) UNC 19-37 (11) Harvard (History of Science) 18-38 (11) U Michigan 18-40 (13) Yale 19-40 (14) Rutgers 22-45 (15)
- Music : Indiana University at Bloomington 2-12 (1) 6-22 (5) Harvard 4-11 (2) UCLA 4-11 (3) 7-23 (6) U of Chicago 5-16 (4) Yale 8-25 (7) Princeton 8-28 (8) Columbia 15-26 (9) NYU 10-40 (10) Cornell 14-45 (11) U of Rochester 18-43 (12) UC-Berkeley 17-51 (14) U Penn 20-49 (14)
- Music (Combined) : U of Chicago 2/4 [2] Yale 5/7 [3]
- Philosophy: U Chicago 2-12 (1) Princeton 3-14 (2) Rutgers 3-16 (3) U Michigan 3-17 (4) UC-Berkeley 5-21 (5) NYU 7-23 (6) MIT 10-31 (7) U Pittsburgh 15-41 (8) 19-47 (11) Stanford 15-42 (9) Carnegie Mellon 15-49 (10) Columbia 17-51 (12) UC-San Diego 24-48 (13) U Notre Dame 20-53 (14) Brown 21-54 (15) UNC 25-59 (16) Harvard 27-67 (17)
- Philosophy (combined) : U of Pittsburgh 2/8 [4]/2/11 [7] (two programs) U of Michigan 7/4 [5] U Chicago 1/11 [6] Rutgers 12/3 [8] MIT 9/7 [10]
- Religion : Duke 2-11 (1) U Chicago 2-11 (1) U Notre Dame 5-17 (3) Emory 7-21 (4) UNC 5-23 (4) Princeton 7-26 (6) Yale 9-24 (7) Harvard 9-27 (8)
- Religion (combined): U Chicago 1/1 [1] Duke 1/4 [2] Princeton 3/6 [3] Emory 4/5 [3] Harvard 2/8 [5]
- Spanish : Yale 2-11 (1) Brown 3-26 (2) NYU 6-25 (3) Penn state 6-38 (4) Vanderbilt 7-39 (5) UC-Berkeley 9-40 (6) Columbia 12-46 (7) UC-Davis 18-50 (8) U Virginia 17-54 (9) U Illinois-UC 23-52 (11) Princeton 13-64 (11) Purdue 17-63 (12) UT-Austin 21-63 (13) Stanford 21-66 (14) UC-Santa Barbara 18-70 (15)
- Spanish (combined): Brown 3/2 [1] Columbia 1/7 [2] U Virginia 9/5 [3]
- History: Yale 1/7-28 (5)/1 [2] Columbia 5/9-26 (5)/6 [5]

**[D] [Health Sciences]**

|   | Immunology<br>& Infectious<br>Disease   | Kinesiology                     | Microbiology                | Nursing              | Pharmacology<br>&<br>Toxicology | Public Health                      | Total |
|---|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------|
| 1 | Yale 2-3/4                              | PSU 2-9                         | Stanford 2-5/2              | UCSF 2-7             | Yale 3-28                       | Harvard (Epidemiology) 2-10        |       |
| 2 | Stanford 4-11/4                         | U of Connecticut 2-17           | Harvard 2-17/1              | U Penn 3-12          | UNC 3-37                        | Harvard (Occupational Health) 2-16 |       |
| 3 | Washington U. (St Louis) 4-11/outside 6 | U of Georgia 4-22               | Washington U -St Louis 4-26 | Yale 3-13            | U Penn 2-41                     | Harvard (Nutrition) 4-21           |       |
| 4 | Harvard 4-26/3                          | U of Massachusetts 3-27         | UC-Berkeley 5-34/3          | Johns Hopkins 4-20   | Stanford 3-49 (4 tied)          | U. of Michigan 3-40                |       |
| 5 | U Penn 5-36/8                           | U of Minnesota-Twin Cities 7-23 | Columbia 5-37               | U of Washington 6-22 | Vanderbilt 4-48 (4 tied)        | Harvard (Health Policy) 5-46       |       |
| 6 | UCLA 7-36/outside 6                     | U of Illinois-                  | NYU 9-43                    | U of Michigan        | MIT 6-49                        | UC-Berkeley 8-47                   |       |

|    |  |   |  |  |
|----|--|---|--|--|
| 7  | Chicago 2-33<br>UC-Berkeley 5-41/outside 6<br>Washington U-St Louis 9-36 | 9-32<br>Duke 9-45<br>Case Western Reserve 8-34<br>Yale 9-51 |  |  |
| 8  | Emory 8-44/outside 6<br>UNC 12-34  | U of Washington 10-50<br>U of Illinois-Chicago 11-35        |  |  |
| 9  | U of Chicago 7-46/outside 6<br>U. of Delaware 13-35                      | U Penn 11-53<br>Emory 9-37                                  |  |  |
| 10 | U of Michigan 14-55/outside 6<br>U of Florida 10-42                      | U Virginia 11-54<br>U of Iowa 9-38                          |  |  |
| 11 | ASU 13-39  | Tufts 12-55<br>U of Kentucky 12-36                          |  |  |
| 12 | U of Maryland 13-42  | Yale 14-53<br>NYU 15-50                                     |  |  |
| 13 | U of Wisconsin-Madison 18-48   | UW-Madison 12-56/4<br>UW-Madison 19-49                      |  |  |
| 14 | U of Illinois-UC 15-53   | Case Western Reserve 13-58                                  |  |  |
| 15 | UT-Austin 17-52  | U of Pittsburg 20-57  |  |  |
| 16 | U of Virginia 18-61  |   |  |  |

**[E] [Life Sciences]**

| <b>Ran<br/>k</b> | <b>Biochemist<br/>ry,<br/>Biophysics,<br/>and<br/>Structural<br/>Biology</b> | <b>Biology /<br/>Integrated Biology<br/>/<br/>Integrated<br/>Biomedic<br/>al<br/>Sciences</b> | <b>Cell and<br/>Developmen<br/>tal Biology</b> | <b>Ecology<br/>and<br/>Evolutiona<br/>ry Biology</b> | <b>Genetics<br/>and<br/>Genomic<br/>s</b> | <b>Neuroscien<br/>ce and<br/>Neurobiolo<br/>gy</b> | <b>Physiolo<br/>gy</b> | <b>Tot<br/>al</b> |
|------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1                | Stanford 3/3-24 (3)/1  | Cal Tech 2-7 (1)  | MIT 1/2-5 (1)/outside 6 or 4                   | Stanford 1/ND/4                                      | MIT 1/2-7 (1)/6                           | UC-San Diego 1/4-19 (4)/2                          | Yale 1/2-19 (2)        |                   |
| 2                | MIT 2/2-14   | UC-SAN  | Harvard 5/3-13                                 | Harvard ND/4-  | Harvard                                   | Harvard 3/2-14                                     | UCLA 4/                |                   |



|   |                                    |                     |  |          |                                    |  |   |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|----------|------------------------------------|--|---|
|   | (1)/5                              | DIEGO               | (2)/3 or 1   | 19 (3)/6 | 3/ND                               | (1)/5  | 2-17(1)   |
|   |                                    | 3-19                |  |          | /1                                 |  |   |
| 3 | Harvard<br>5/4-27<br>(4)/1         | Yale<br>6-25<br>(3) | UCSF<br>(tied)<br>3/5-31<br>(4)/3 or 7<br><br>Stanford<br>(tied)<br>6/5-21<br>(3)/2 or 4 |          | Stanfor<br>d<br>5/3-10<br>(3)/1    | Stanford<br>5/2-19<br>(3)/1<br><b>[2] (tied)</b> | Baylor College of<br>Medicine 6/13-65<br>(8)/[14] |
| 4 | UC-<br>Berkeley<br>4/3-19<br>(2)/5 | UCSF<br>9-35<br>(4) |  |          | UC-<br>Berkeley<br>10/2-9<br>(2)/3 | UCSF<br>4/4-24<br>(5)/5                          | U. of Washington<br>7/13-64(7)/[14]<br>(tied)     |
| 5 | UCSF<br>1/9-32<br>(5)/7            |                     |  |          | UCSF<br>2/20-<br>93(23)/7          | MIT<br>14/3-15<br>(2)/5                          | UCSF 5<br>(1996<br>NRC)                           |

- Biology/Integrated Biology (2010 only)
- Cell Developmental Biology : UC-Berkeley 12/6-34 (5)/outside 6 or 1
- Ecology and Evolutionary Biology : UC-Berkeley 8/6-30(6)/1 Averaged for 3 institutions [3]
- Neuroscience and Neurobiology : UC-Berkeley 9/8-38 (8)/outside 8
- Ecology and Evolution 2010 : Princeton 3-15 (1) Duke 4-18 (2) Indiana-Bloomington 4-25 (4) Washington U. 4-25 (4) UC-Davis 9-38 (6) U of Chicago 9-34(7)
- Neuroscience : Johns Hopkins 6-29 (6) Yale 9-35 (7)
- Physiology(Combined): U. of Virginia 9/11-64(6)/[5] U. of Iowa 12/5-60(5)/[6] Vanderbilt 15/2-31(3)/[7] U. of Michigan 16/4-33(4)/[8] UC-San Diego 2/No data UCSF 5/No data Stanford 8/No Data
- Only the ranks of program are provided, in which those of life sciences or health sciences as a faculty seem a

little malleable as a matter of integrity and scholarly classification. For the programs without a red rank in parenthesis, red ranks at the most left column could possibly apply to them. Since the practice of US graduate programs can vary along the years (for example, shorter list in 2018 for the specialties), the indication 'outside' may not be serious to understand the institutions. 'or' may be more appropriate since the indication of programs does not replicate exactly between the NRC and US rankings.

#### [F] [Natural Sciences]

| Ra<br>nk | Institu<br>tion | Applied<br>Mathe<br>matics | Astroph<br>ysics<br>and<br>Astrono<br>my | Chemi<br>stry           | Comp<br>uter<br>Scienc<br>es | Earth<br>Scien<br>ces       | Mathe<br>matics          | Oceanog<br>raphy,<br>Atmosph<br>eric<br>Sciences,<br>and<br>Meteorol<br>ogy | Phys<br>ics             | Statisti<br>cs and<br>Proba<br>bility | To<br>tal |
|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1        | Berkeley        | [8](<br>US<br>News)        | 3/4-<br>17 (3)/<br>[3]                   | 1/4<br>-11<br>(3)/1 [1] | 3/2<br>-4<br>(1)/1 [2]       | 3/<br>3 39 (<br>7 /3<br>[2] | 2/4-11<br>(3)/3<br>[2]   |   | 4<br>/3-16<br>(2)/2 [2] | 2/4<br>-11<br>(3)/2 [2]               | 22<br>/8  |
| 2        | MIT             | 9-27<br>(5)/4<br>[3]       | 8/9-<br>29 (8)/<br>[5]                   | 5/1<br>1-34<br>(8)/1    | 2/5<br>-14<br>(3)/1          | 2/<br>13-44<br>(10)/1       | 3/10-<br>23 (7)/1<br>[3] | 2/8-35<br>(7)   | 3<br>/6-32<br>(5)/1     |                                       | 24<br>/7  |

|   |           |                             |                         | [4]                         | [3]                               | [2]                        |                               |           | [4]                                |                              |
|---|-----------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 3 | Princeton | 1-1<br>[1]                  | 2/3-<br>8 (2)/1<br>[2]  | 20/<br>26-80<br>(17)/1      | 6/7<br>-23<br>(4)/8               | 13<br>/12-<br>44 (9)       | 1/2-9<br>(1)/1<br>[1]         |           | 2<br>/6-21<br>(4)/2                | 29<br>/7                     |
| 4 | Harvard   | 9-29<br>[8]                 | 4/8-<br>27 (6)/4<br>[4] | 4/2<br>-11<br>(1)/4<br>[3]  | 11/<br>14-63<br>(10)/1<br>8 [8]   | 8/<br>3-18<br>(1)/8<br>[5] | 4/6-<br>15 (5)/3<br>[4]       |           | 1<br>/2-5<br>(1)/2<br>[1]          | 6/4<br>-7 (2)/3<br>[3]<br>/8 |
| 5 | Cal Tech  | 7-30 (7)/3 (US news)<br>[2] | 1/2-<br>5 (1)/2<br>[1]  | 2/4<br>-<br>10(2)/1<br>[1]  | 12/<br>72-153<br>(35)/1<br>1 [14] | 1/<br>5-18<br>(3)/1<br>[1] | 11/1<br>2-37<br>(10)/7<br>[6] |           | 5<br>/15-<br>65<br>(12)/<br>2 [5]  | 30<br>/7                     |
| 6 | Stanford  | [8]<br>(US news)            | 22/<br>ND/5<br>[8]      | 3/1<br>0-34<br>(7)/4<br>[4] | 1/2<br>-4<br>(1)/1<br>[1]         | 5/<br>6-26<br>(5)/3<br>[2] | 6/4-<br>12 (4)/5<br>[5]       | 18/N<br>D | 9<br>/14-<br>55<br>(10)1<br>/2 [6] | 1/2<br>-2 (1)/1<br>[1]<br>/8 |

- Astrophysics : PSU 7-24 (4) Johns Hopkins 7-29 (5) U Chicago 9-28 (7) OSU 10-33(9)
- Math : NYU 2-9 (1) U Michigan 8-21 (6) PSU 9-26 (8) UW-Madison 14-34 (9) Cal Tech 12-37 (10) Yale 16- 43 (11)
- Applied Math : UCLA 4-18 (2) U of Washington 6-20 (3) Cornell 5-24 (4) Brown 6-23 (4)Northwestern 8-28 (5) Cal Tech 7-30 (7) Harvard 9-29 (8) NYU 9-31 (9) UC Davis 9-32 (10) UT-Austin 10-33 (11) U. Arizona 12-35 (12) U. Colorado-Boulder 13-36 (13) SUNY at Stony Brook 16-40 (14) USC 20-42(15)
- Computer Sciences : UC Santa Barbara 8-33 (5) Cornell 10-44 (6) U Penn 13-44 (7) UC San Diego 7-65 (8) University of Illinois-UC (9) Michigan State 14-69 (11) UCLA 13-68 (11) Duke 24-71 (13) UW-Madison 20-78 (14) \* Carnegie Melon 1<sup>st</sup> in US news Computer Sciences
- Earth Sciences: UC-Irvine 3-18 (1) Four more Cal Tech programs within top ten (3)(4)(6) (8) PSU 21-54 (11) U of Chicago 27-64(12)
- Oceanography : UC-San Diego 2-12 (1) UCLA 3-19 (2) Colorado State University 4-27 (3) U of Maryland 4-27 (4) UW-Madison 7-30 (5) UC-Santa Barbara 6-37 (6) MIT 8-35 (7) U of Michigan 9-43(8)
- Oceanography (Combined) : UC-San Diego 1/1 [1] MIT 2/7 [2] \* A number of programs in 2010 NRC, for example, Colorado State, UC-Santa Barbara or UCLA do not appear in 1996 NRC so that the combined rank should be in limited purpose of the Kiosk.
- Physics: Harvard DEA program 3-17 (3) UC-Santa Barbara 7-32(6)
- Statistics : U of Michigan 8-26 (4) U of Chicago 9-26 (5) Duke 9-32 (6) Penn State 11-36 (7) UNC 13-35 (8) Iowa State University 13-38 (9) U of Washington 14-39 (10) UW-Madison 11-45 (11) Columbia 18-49 (12) North Carolina State 21-46 (12) U Penn 21-46 (12<sup>th</sup> three tied)

#### [G] [Communication]

| Rank | Institution | Range (S-Rank + R-Rank) |
|------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 1    | U of Penn   | 3-52                    |
| 2    | PSU         | 6-58                    |
| 3    | MSU         | 7-62                    |
| 4    | Stanford    | 2-70                    |
| 5    | Cornell     | 4-70                    |
| 6    | UW-Madison  | 6-81                    |

|   |                        |       |
|---|------------------------|-------|
| 7 | U of Michigan          | 6-88  |
| 8 | Indiana at Bloomington | 8-86  |
| 9 | OSU                    | 14-89 |

#### [H] [Education]

| Rank | Institution   | Curriculum and Instruction | Educational Administration and Supervision | Education Policy | Educational Psychology | Elementary Teacher Education | Higher Education Administration | Secondary Teacher Education | Special Education | Student Counseling and Personnel Services | Technical / Vocational | Total |
|------|---------------|----------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|------------------------|-------|
| 1    | UW-Madison    | [1]                        | [1]  | [3]              | [1]                    | [4]                          |                                 | [6]                         | [10]              | [3]                                       |                        | 29/8  |
| 2    | MSU           | [2]                        | [8]  | [9]              | [4]                    | [1]                          | [1]                             | [1]                         | [11]              | [12]                                      |                        | 49/9  |
| 2    | Van derbilt   | [3]                        | [2]  | [4]              | [5]                    | [6]                          | [8]                             | [8]                         | [2]               |   |                        | 38/8  |
| 2    | U of Michigan | [6]                        | [12]                                       | [7]              | [2]                    | [2]                          | [2]                             | [2]                         |                   |   |                        | 33/7  |
| 5    | Columbia      | [3]                        | [3]  | [5]              | [19]                   | [3]                          | [13]                            | [3]                         | [16]              |   |                        | 65/8  |
| 5    | Stanford      | [3]                        | [6]  | [1]              | [3]                    | [10]                         | [12]                            | [5]                         |                   |   |                        | 40/7  |
| 5    | Harvard       |                            | [3]  | [2]              | [13]                   |                              | [11]                            |                             |                   |   |                        | 29/4  |

\* Between the specialty and programs, the college of education has a number of specialties, being described as specialty or programs by USNW graduate ranking. The institutions may have one or several doctoral programs in Education, but were not included in the previous NRC rankings. The rankings had a decade of history, and compose part of this KIOSK. They would be around 4-6 at maximum for possible number of 1 or 2<sup>nd</sup> when we need to count. The rationale is to be consistent with the NRC way of approach based on the real programs of institution. The specialties for the Social Science in USNW merge within NRC categories. However, those of Natural Science, mostly subcategories of the biological science, had been paralleled within the Life or Health Sciences. It is because they cross over the name of programs although they are designated solely as specialty, with no mention as programs.

#### [I] [Agricultural Sciences]

| Rank | Institution | Animal Sciences | Entomology | Food Science | Forestry and Forest Sciences | Nutrition  | Plant Sciences | Total |
|------|-------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|----------------|-------|
| 1    | UW-Madison  | 2-44 [4]        | 6-30 [7]   | 5-26 [5]     | 2-5 [1]                      | 2-19 [3]   | 5-29 [3]       | 23/6  |
| 2    | Cornell     | 3-18 [2]        | 5-30 [6]   | 2-14 [2]     |                              | 15-36 [10] | 5-34 [4]       | 24/5  |

|    |                 |           |           |            |           |            |              |      |
|----|-----------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|--------------|------|
| 3  | UC-Davis        |           | 3-20 [3]  | 7-30 [6]   |           |            | 6-34 [6]     | 15/3 |
| 4  | of Georgia      |           | 6-28 [5]  | 4-22 [4]   | [5]       |            | 8-38 [7]     | 21/4 |
| 5  | U of Washington | 4-38 [3]  |           |            | 5-23 [3]  | 12-48 [12] |              | 18/3 |
| 6  | PSU             |           | 7-31 [8]  | 15-43 [10] | 12-49 [8] | 5-26 [5]   | 2-17 [2]     | 33/5 |
| 7  | of Illinois-UC  | 2-15 [1]  | 2-12 [1]  | 12-45 [10] |           | 5-32 [8]   | 15-85 [20]   | 40/5 |
| 8  | U of Minnesota  |           | 3-26 [4]  |            | 11-30 [7] | 11-38 [9]  | 43-138 [28]  | 48/4 |
| 9  | Kansas State    |           | 5-29 [5]  | 12-44 [9]  |           | 38-60 [20] | 18-85 [21]   | 55/4 |
| 10 | U of Kentucky   |           | 16-41 [9] |            |           | 13-39 [11] | 40-146 [29]  | 49/3 |
| 11 | UC-Riverside    |           | 2-15 [2]  |            |           |            | 19-84 [21]   | 23/2 |
| 12 | State           | 10-59 [5] |           |            |           |            | 103-196 [33] | 38/2 |

- Food Science: U of Massachusetts 2-10 (1) Purdue 3-18 (3) U of Arkansas 8-35 (7) Rutgers 14-40 (8) U of Maryland 19-47 (11)
- Forestry: Yale 4-15 (2) Oregon State 6-22 (3) Purdue 8-30 (5)
- Nutrition: UNC 2-15 (1) Tufts 2-16 (2) PSU 5-26 (4) UC-Davis 6-26 (5) UC-Berkeley 5-30 (6) Ohio State University 13-49 (12) University of Florida 16-48 (13)
- Plant Sciences : UC-Berkeley 2-13 (1) Washington State University 5-35 (5) \* The rule of rank on average was not applied for the institutions with 1 or 2 programs.

| Rank | Nuclear Engineering    | Clinical Psychology | Rehabilitation Counseling |
|------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1    | University of Michigan | UCLA                | UW-Madison                |
| 2    | UW-Madison             | UC-Berkeley         | Michigan University State |

- From the Data 2010-2018: **[J] Other 1** (Included for overall rank)

**[K] [Other 2: Master or other Graduate Programs covered comprehensively by NRC]\***

| Rank | Occupational Therapy               | Physician Assistant | Health Care Management  | Social Work                        | Physical Therapy   | Speech Language Pathology |
|------|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| 1    | Boston U.                          | Duke                | U of Michigan           | U of Michigan                      | U of Delaware/U  | U of Iowa                 |
| 2    | Washington University in St. Louis | U Of Iowa           | U of Alabama-Birmingham | Washington University in St. Louis | of Pittsburg/U of Southern California/Washington University in St. Louis | Vanderbilt                |

- Since this study is based on the classification of NRC field category, Other 2 was not included for ranking consideration while Other 1 was accounted.

#### Useful Links & References

<http://www.phds.org/> (2010 NRC)

<https://www.chronicle.com/article/NRC-Rankings-Overview-/124743> (2010 NRC before revision)

[https://www.stat.tamu.edu/~jnewton/nrc\\_rankings/nrc41indiv.html](https://www.stat.tamu.edu/~jnewton/nrc_rankings/nrc41indiv.html) (1996 NRC-1 41 specific areas)

[https://www.stat.tamu.edu/~jnewton/nrc\\_rankings/nrc1.html](https://www.stat.tamu.edu/~jnewton/nrc_rankings/nrc1.html) (1996-NRC-2 Brief)

Kim, Kiyong and Ju, Hyun-Meong and Khatun, Marium, A Reflection on the Research Method and Exemplary Application to the College and University Rankings (October 23, 2015 ). Kiyong Kim, Hyun -Meong Ju, Marium Khatun. A Reflection on the Research Method and Exemplary Application to the College and University Rankings. Education Journal. Vol. 4, No. 5, 2015, pp. 250-262. doi: 10.11648/j.edu.20150405.23. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2686045>

Kim, K., Borhanian, S., Chung, K.-T., Park, Y.-H., Lee, W.-S., & Kim, J.-H. (2016). The Graduate Law Degree Holders in the Legal Education Market: Evidence from the US, Rankings and Implications. Beijing Law Review, 7, 371-399. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/blr.2016.74031>

Kim, Kiyong and Ju, Hyun-Meong and Khatun, Marium, A Teacher and Researcher: A Scratch on the Science Community and Meaning of Evaluation with the Research Doctoral Programs Ranking (September 7, 2015). International Journal of Philosophy, 3(4): 34-46, 2015, DOI: 10.11648/j.ijp.20150304.11. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2668450>

The KIOSK will be part of my on-going research project. In the meantime, the comment and suggestion are welcome for the data errors or constructive goodness. Any questions or inquiries will be directed to the author: Kiyong Kim, Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, Chosun University. E-mail) [kiyoungkim@chosun.ac.kr](mailto:kiyoungkim@chosun.ac.kr).

#### [Tips]

The rankings above had been retrieved as accurate as possible. Since the final rank in the square bracket was intended to reach as focused on the lead institutions of overall faculty quality, the rankings of each program below the box table may not be an exact replica of institutions' rank order within the original scheme of 2010 NRC. Some institutions may not be included while the rank is ahead of other institutions, which I made an effort to avoid as much as possible. Therefore, the rankings of 2010 NRC in the box table may possibly be higher, although the order of ranks for each program of list institutions stays intact and the final result is reliable.

The Quality Graduate School in the US  
-Longitudinal Studies 1992-2018:  
Alternative to 1997 Gourman Report

|    | Institution             | Breadth<br>/<br>Availability<br>(40%) | Research<br>Funding<br>(11%) | CM<br>UP<br>(6%) | Patent Total<br>(5+ 6=<br>11%) | Gourman<br>Report<br>(17%) | Funded<br>Graduate<br>Students<br>(5%) | Number of<br>Doctorates<br>Awarded<br>(10%) |
|----|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| 1  | Wisconsin<br>(Madison)  | 1                                     | 2-6                          | 10-12            | 4-<br>8/5                      | 8                          | 5-15                                   | 2-8   |
| 2  | Michigan<br>(Ann Arbor) | 3                                     | 2                            | 5-8              | 9-<br>11/11                    | 3                          | 3-7                                    | 1-5   |
| 3  | Harvard                 | 15                                    | 8-31                         | 1-4              | 9-<br>29/9                     | 1                          | 5-11                                   | 8-16  |
| 4  | Stanford                | 15                                    | 9-14                         | 1-4              | 3-<br>4/2                      | 5                          | 7-11                                   | 4-14  |
| 5  | MIT                     | 12                                    | 11-23                        | 1-4              | 2/7                            | 9                          | 17-33                                  | 14-17                                       |
| 6  | UC-<br>Berkeley         | 13                                    | 16-26                        | 9                | 1/1                            | 2                          | 16-31                                  | 1-4   |
| 7  | Minnesota               | 2                                     | 13-15                        | 16               | 29-<br>50/-                    | 14                         | 14-21                                  | 4-11  |
| 8  | UCLA                    | 10                                    | 3-12                         | 10-12            | 1/1                            | 9                          | 5-13                                   | 5-11  |
| 9  | U Penn                  | 11                                    | 3-18                         | 1-4              | 14-<br>19/4                    | 15                         | 2-6                                    | 18-34                                       |
| 10 | Columbia                | 13                                    | 10-24                        | 1-4              | 9-<br>19/-                     | 11                         | 8-16                                   | 19-27                                       |
| 11 | Yale                    | 18                                    | 18-33                        | 5-8              | 48-<br>85/-                    | 4                          | 6-17                                   | 37-50                                       |
| 12 | Cornell                 | 7                                     | 12-17                        | 18-19            | 12-<br>28/13                   | 13                         | 19-23                                  | 18-25                                       |
| 13 | Chicago                 | 18                                    | 40-55                        | 18-19            | 23-<br>/-                      | 6                          | 18-37                                  | 33-43                                       |
| 14 | Princeton               | 15                                    | 78-92                        | 29               | 55-<br>/-                      | 7                          | 51-82                                  | 44-54                                       |
| 15 | Johns<br>Hopkins        | 23                                    | 1                            | 13-15            | 7-<br>20/6                     | 29                         | 1-3                                    | 23-36                                       |
| 15 | Washington<br>(Seattle) | 6                                     | 3-5                          | 10-12            | 18-<br>27/15                   | 34                         | 2-4                                    | 13-17                                       |
| 17 | Illinois<br>(Urbana)    | 5                                     | 22-34                        | 30-32            | 10-<br>24/17                   | 17                         | 24-55                                  | 3-13  |
| 18 | Ohio State              | 4                                     | 9-22                         | 27-28            | 25-<br>/19                     | 28                         | 30-40                                  | 6-13  |
| 19 | Duke                    | 18                                    | 5-10                         | 5-8              | 27-<br>46/8                    | 21                         | 6-19                                   | 39-54                                       |
| 20 | Texas<br>(Austin)       | 7                                     | 23-34                        | 20-22            | 3-<br>8/3                      | 18                         | 29-31                                  | 1-12  |
| 21 | Penn State              | 9                                     | 14-22                        | 30-32            | 45-<br>76/-                    | 35                         | 14-55                                  | 9-14  |
| 21 | UC-San                  | 32                                    | 5-7                          | 17               | 1/1                            | 19                         | 4-18                                   | 19-31                                       |

|    |                               |    |         |       |          |    |        |        |
|----|-------------------------------|----|---------|-------|----------|----|--------|--------|
|    | Diego                         |    |         |       |          |    |        |        |
| 23 | Cal Tech                      | 18 | 56-66   | 26-27 | 4-10/-   | 12 | 47-105 | 75-104 |
| 24 | Northwest<br>Ern              | 27 | 28-31   | 14-17 | 14-23/-  | 16 | 18-29  | 26-46  |
| 25 | UNC<br>(Chapel Hill)          | 27 | 8-29    | 20-22 | 26-44/20 | 25 | 8-18   | 19-24  |
| 26 | NYU                           | 27 | 23-59   | 23    | 16-35/16 | 26 | 31-47  | 27-44  |
| 26 | Pittsburgh                    | 18 | 10-22   | 20-22 | 21-35/-  | 43 | 7-21   | 27-42  |
| 28 | California-<br>Davis          | 39 | 15-27   | 33    | 1/1      | 33 | 24-52  | 18-24  |
| 28 | Iowa (Iowa<br>City)           | 30 | 39-61   | 50-51 | -/-      | 24 | 23-44  | 40-52  |
| 30 | Michigan<br>State             | 31 | 36-41   | 48-49 | 59-77/-  | 32 | 44-73  | 18-28  |
| 30 | Virginia                      | 25 | 54-76   | 34    | 58-81/-  | 31 | 29-57  | 34-64  |
| 32 | Purdue<br>(Lafayette)         | 37 | 32-37   | 36-37 | 12-34/-  | 27 | 51-116 | 8-15   |
| 32 | Georgia<br>Tech               | 24 | 25-30   | 30-32 | 9-43/-   | 46 | 36 -   | 19-29  |
| 34 | Rutgers<br>(New<br>Brunswick) | 27 | 31-45   | 52-53 | 21-68/   | 47 | 39-75  | 35-48  |
| 35 | Indiana-<br>Bloomington       | 33 | 45-106  | 54-59 | 44-/-    | 23 | 37-197 | 26-45  |
| 36 | Washington<br>(St. Louis)     | 34 | 18-29   | 24-25 | 49-/-    | 34 | 13-20  | 60-76  |
| 37 | Brown                         | 43 | 63-102  | 54-59 | -/-      | 22 | 41-85  | 74-94  |
| 37 | Vanderbilt                    | 36 | 28-36   | 24-26 | 37-62/-  | 39 | 13-21  | 54-65  |
| 37 | Rochester                     | 38 | 40-66   | 50-51 | 42-70/-  | 37 | 24-52  | 63-92  |
| 40 | Case<br>Western<br>Reserve    | 40 | 38-55   | 54-59 | 43-63/-  | 49 | 23-37  | 78-105 |
| 40 | SUNY<br>(Buffalo)             | 25 | 54-65   | NA    | 29-38/-  | 30 | 86-262 | 45-59  |
| 42 | Utah                          | 43 | 39-72   | 43    | 10-33/-  | 45 | 41-78  | 46-60  |
| 44 | Carnegie-<br>Mellon           | 42 | 74-92   | 54-59 | 40-83/-  | 36 | 63-143 | 56-77  |
| 45 | Kansas                        | 43 | 74-83   | 65-75 | 87/-     | 42 | 65 -   | 49-62  |
| 46 | Rice                          | 43 | 125-157 | 39-41 | -/-      | 38 | 217    | 92-107 |
| 47 | Rensselaer<br>(NY)            | 43 | 144-159 | 65-75 | -/-      | 44 | 137    | 95-120 |

|    |            |    |         |    |     |    |     |         |
|----|------------|----|---------|----|-----|----|-----|---------|
| 48 | Brandeis   | 43 | 162-179 | NA | -/- | 40 | 96  | 144-166 |
| 49 | Tulane     | 43 | 105-121 | NA | -/- | 41 | 192 | 113-153 |
| 50 | Notre Dame | 43 | 104-143 | NA | -/- | 50 | 213 | 77-103  |

[For the view of 1992-2018 graduate students]

- Breadth/Availability (1996, 2010 NRC Assessment of Research Doctorate): measured the availability of doctoral programs for the prospective graduate students. The ranking is based on the number of doctoral programs in two NRC reports, and adjustment, just in cases, had been made with the institution named Technology or typical universities with regent commission and rank order in each doctoral programs. Nevertheless, the main intention with the number of rated programs had been upheld over most of all cases and rigorously.

- Research funding (1992-2017) NSF ranking of research expenditure/including the amount of dollars for funded students): measured the capabilities of faculty to operate the doctoral studies under his or her supervision as well as the competence of doctoral students.

- CMUP (Center Measuring University Performance/Gourman Report): Traditional measure from the faculty resources including award and grants, membership of national academy, givings, and etc. The ranking is intended to highlight the diversity of graduate studies and school's response to provide a fit on the width of graduate programs so that the proportionality is given to weight accordingly in addition to the small share of traditional measure.

- The patent data was collected through the Association of American Investors. An adjustment was made in consideration of the state populace against the collective base of patent numbers on several institutions, i.e., University of California all campuses, Wisconsin foundation, UT foundation and so.

- The Gourman ranking was compiled through a decade of years over time, and the ranking as a measure for this report represents its last publication in Princeton Review 1997. Since the ranking had long been steady without a significant change, it is not inaccurate to say the ranking can have a ground through the years. That is otherwise in other slot of indicators, which cover the period of data production to corroborate with this longitudinal studies.

- NA means that the institution falls behind top 75 institutions.

## References

Kim, Kiyoun and Ju, Hyun-Meong and Khatun, Marium, A Reflection on the Research Method and Exemplary Application to the College and University Rankings (October 23, 2015).

Education Journal. Vol. 4, No. 5, 2015, pp. 250-262. doi: 10.11648/j.edu.20150405.23.

Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2686045>

Kim, K., Borhanian, S., Chung, K.-T., Park, Y.-H., Lee, W.-S., & Kim, J.-H. (2016). The Graduate Law Degree Holders in the Legal Education Market: Evidence from the US, Rankings and Implications. Beijing Law Review, 7, 371-399. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/blr.2016.74031>

Kim, Kiyoun and Ju, Hyun-Meong and Khatun, Marium, A Teacher and Researcher: A Scratch on the Science Community and Meaning of Evaluation with the Research Doctoral Programs Ranking (September 7, 2015). International Journal of Philosophy, 3(4): 34-46, 2015, DOI:

10.11648/j.jp.20150304.11. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2668450>

- The ranking has been revised with the suggestions and criticism -- for example, adjustment of shares within



each slot and inclusion of patent data on universities -- against my initial publication within the social media of global researchers, i.e., SSRN, Academia.edu, Researchgate.net and Philpapers.org. It will be part of my consulting reference and school guide. At any time, the comment and suggestion are welcome for the data errors or any constructive goodness. Any questions or inquiries will be directed to the author of this data sheet: Kiyoung Kim, Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, Chosun University. E-mail) [kiyoungkim@chosun.ac.kr](mailto:kiyoungkim@chosun.ac.kr)

**Table 8: Top Quality Graduate School US plus Find-Masters** (Please see Appendix I)

**Table 9: Previous Global Ranking plus Find-Masters** (Please see Appendix II)

**[REINSTATEMENT OF THE RANKING FOR THE STUDENTS 2019-2021]**

THIS IS TO REINSTATE THE RATING OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS DEVELOPED FROM THE TABLE "THE QUALITY GRADUATE SCHOOL IN THE US- LONGITUDINAL STUDIES 1992-2018: ALTERNATIVE TO 1997 GOURMAN REPORT." I HAD TRACKED THE DATA OVER YEARS AND CONFIRMED THAT NO SUBSEQUENT CHANGES TO IMPACT THE ORIGINAL RANKING WERE NOTICED. DESPITE MINOR CHANGES ON THE DATA AT THE TABLE, THE RANKING CONTINUED TO STAND THROUGH THE YEARS AS ABOVE SPECIFIED. HENCEFORTH, WITH THE BEST OF KNOWLEDGE AND FIDELITY, THE RANKING OF THE TABLE IS HEREBY REINSTATED FOR THE TERM 2019-2021 AS SUPPLEMENTED WITH THIS BOOK.

**KIYOUNG KIM**  
**AK.EDU.CONSULTING**  
**PROFESSOR OF LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY**

## Chapter 4

### Fourth Industrialization and New Form of Higher Education

The following two tables and pages show the global context of higher education with the ranks for top institutions. As Table 8 (Appendix I) shows, the ranking can be referenced for the graduate study, especially in case that the institutions are international or on-line.

**Table 10: Equity Table between Campus and On-Line Universities**

| Institutions   | Campus Universities*   | On-line Universities**  |
|--|--|---|
| Top 21 Institutions<br>(No indication was implied within the order of list institutions or classification-tied collectively for the 21 institutions) | Traditional-<br>Harvard/Yale/Princeton/Madison, Wisconsin/Oxford/Cambridge/Academie de Paris (Paris Universities)/Heidelberg<br><br>Rising – MIT/Stanford  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walden University</li> <li>University of Phoenix</li> <li>Liberty University</li> <li>Strayer University</li> </ul><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West Governor University</li> <li>Capella University</li> <li>American Intercontinental University</li> <li>Herzing University</li> <li>Southern New Hampshire University</li> <li>Ashford University</li> </ul>   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology: I chose the global leading institutions based on the mixed method. The data and contemporary ranking had been considered to account for a half of final scores (50%). I also considered the qualitative aspect of institutional influence (50%), which in many cases, decisively affects the decision of prospective students or academic investors beyond the global rampancy of numerical stress on rankings. In order to gain a plausible picture on this context, I used the basic belief of Christian society (20%) and socio-political prestige of nations within which they are based (20%). Finally the Wow factor was reserved and applied to suit with the fool of global public (10%).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology: the ranking of online universities was compiled with the existing data and ranking sources. The institutions listed had been selected based on the number of times cited as a top online universities. In some cases, the ranking would have a wide concept of online universities-if campus universities mainly.</li> <li>Therefore, the popularity or enrollment and availability of degree programs were considered to bring a highlight for the pillar institutions, say mainly online. Otherwise, the ranking may be skewed from the existing faculty-oriented schema, although the estimates on on-line education have other expectation or within the different nature of educational service (Perhaps and as conventionally, that Harvard would top the list only with its online extension program without any program for degree production)</li> </ul> |

# Founded in 1932, Southern New Hampshire University has been offering online programs for over 15 years and graduating successful professionals for over 75 years. Today, this private, nonprofit university offers over 200 career-focused online degrees and certificates to more than 75,000 distance learners, delivering the same quality, student-centered educational experience as SNHU's on-campus programs. All academics at SNHU are designed to prepare students not only for today's challenges but tomorrow's as well.

# For more than 40 years, Walden University, an accredited institution, has helped working professionals reach their educational goals. Walden degree and certificate programs are designed to help students explore current market trends, gain relevant skills that can be applied immediately in the real world, and create positive social change in their lives and communities. Students are taught by faculty members who are both scholars and practitioners, bringing academic perspective and practical experience into the online classroom. This Minneapolis-based higher learning institution first opened its doors in 1993, and today enrolls nearly 38,000 students, the majority of whom are earning advanced degrees.

# Capella offers 154 degree options at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral level, as well as 51 certificates; more than 1,940 individual courses are also available. The university also operates learning centers in 48 states and eight countries outside the United States.

# Herzing has built a supportive community of faculty, staff, and fellow learners. Founded in 1965 by Henry and Suzanne Herzing, the family legacy continues with their daughter, Renée Herzing, as the university's acting president. A private, nonprofit institution, Herzing University has been recognized repeatedly as a member of the GI Jobs List of "Military Friendly Schools" (most recently in 2017), and was recently ranked one of the "Best Online Bachelor's Degree Programs" for the third consecutive year by *U.S. News & World Report*.

# AIU Online is the virtual campus of American Intercontinental University, which has been providing higher education to professionals for more than 40 years. Students can earn an associate's, bachelor's, or master's degree in majors including business, criminal justice, design, education, and information technology. Courses are customized to provide applicable, industry-specific skills in the student's area of interest.

# Strayer University offers graduate and undergraduate degree programs in areas such as business, information systems, criminal justice, public administration, management, education, health administration and other areas. The university also offers undergraduate diplomas and certificates. Quarter systems allows students to take more courses in a year than in a traditional semester system.

# Although The University of Phoenix does not provide a separate online student population total, our research indicates the University of Phoenix has the largest online student population. The University of Phoenix, a pioneer in adult learning, is the largest private university in North America. The university provides undergraduate and graduate degrees in high-demand fields such as business, nursing, education, and technology.

# Liberty University, offers more than 100 undergraduate and postgraduate degree programs in business, education, criminal justice, nursing, and in other fields. The university also offers certificate programs. Liberty University reports having the lowest tuition rates among top online colleges.

# Ashford University provides graduate and undergraduate degree in over 50 programs. The university offers degrees in business, education, healthcare, the sciences, and other areas.

**Table 11: Equity Table for the Two Modes of Doctoral Program in PPA**

| Institutions  |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| DoctoralProgram/Campus and On-line doctoral programs in PPA   |  |  |
| <b>Top Institutions</b><br><br>- No indication was implied within the order of list institutions or classification-tied collectively among all of two type institutions | Indiana-Bloomington , Syacuse, Erasmus U. Rott.,USC, Harvard<br><br>- In terms of subject ranking in PPA, Harvard comes first globally and the USNW or NRC college ranking of graduate programs in PPA often ranked other three institutions as a top programs in the US. Unless the kind of specific ranking is available in the international context, they would stand alone with other institutions in countries on equal rank to be paired wit Harvard. | Walden University<br><br>- Walden University has produced a most number of doctorates in US according to statistics of NSF, and provides a world class cutting-edge education by leading and sharing equally through the global jurisdictions. That would push it at the top of world as a leader of on line education or on equal footing with online universities across the countries on the planet. It also is a flagship university for the Laureate group.<br><br>- It outnumbered many of major campus universities in 2016 and had long been noted as first to confer the doctoral degree for historically black or Hispanic people. It has a strong profile of doctoral education with a variety of doctoral programs across the disciplines. As seen below, the result of internet search helps to grasp the status of doctoral programs, three only on online mode and 23 doctorates in public policy |

- In some encounter, we can be exemplified with the kind of rankings to appreciate the picture of doctoral studies public policy or administration with hand on assessment. That could help to advise and provide an available option for the prospective students. As I introduced myself as the kind of K.Edu, I like to show as pertains to my case on PPA with a photo example.

### About the On-Line Learning

I think it to be a precise description about our daily lives, as Watkins states, “there is sometimes more of an opportunity in the online environment that in a face to face” situation. It is plainly agreeable to look back on the pattern of subsistence. As a patron of Korean politics, I usually prefer to see the news articles and netizens’ comment tailed to follow the main story. While I was not a frequent visitor for the US web case, I could usually find a bold response and critical comment from the Korean netizens. That would be similar, I suppose, given a little difference across the countries. Thanks to the help of internet, the exchange of ideas was intensified and became closer or bold in the previous context

of face-to-face routines. I also suppose, that could be an important contributor to the quality learning of students. We can experience the true aspect of given topic by being exposed to the bold, practical and more intelligent (we can surmise if a written form as on the internet generally requires an intelligent way of approach other than oral) discussion post and response. In this context sharing and learning could be more actively progressed to form a knowledgeable mind and constructive professional. I had many occasions to participate in the classes, seminars and academic conferences. It is true that they were helpful, but I normally was reluctant to raise my point of arguments or some way of suggestions to be entangled with. One of primary reasons perhaps would lie in the hard nature of face-to-face contact. It would get worse if the learners or audience are of less active personality. I found it of great use that we can share the discussion board to learn. For the Korean case, I need to point to the ethical aspect of netizens. Their comment enabled to get through the core of debated issues, but the expressions tend to be direct and abusive, or in some cases insulting. The internet ethic would seem essential to hold a proper forum of public debate in Korean case. In any way, I realized that the way of approach and basic mind seem to be critical over a diverse context of learning, debating, and academic publishing in the cyber space, and so on. We could safely share the following points through the class, as Watkins taught on the pages: We would be (i) bold, ask questions, (ii) give positive comments and praises in the class work, (iii) communicate in a way for the instructor to feel your presence and a way for you, the student, to share in the learning experience, and gain a sense of community in the class.

### References

Kim, Kiyong, Fiscal Administration and Public Sector (March 22, 2015). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2586039> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2586039>

Kim, Kiyong, The Relationship between the Law and Public Policy: Is it a Chi-Square or Normative Shape for the Policy Makers? (September 10, 2014). Social Sciences. Vol. 3, No. 4, 2014, pp. 137-143. doi: 10.11648/j.ss.20140304.15. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2577832>

Kim, Kiyong, The Leadership of Korean Universities: A Case Study Concerning the Chosun University (March 30, 2014). Science Journal of Business and Management. Vol. 2, No. 2, 2014, pp. 50-66. doi: 10.11648/j.sjbm.20140202.12. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2577828>

Kim, Kiyong, Amidst the Temper Across the Equality, Equity, Ethics and Responsibility: A Stymied or Pondering Administrator? - A Little Highlight on the Concept of Equality (September 1, 2014). Management and Administrative Sciences Review. 3(6). 909-921. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2574739>

Kim, Kiyong, The Strategic Planning: Some Dangling for the Socio-Historical and Organic Lives (September 1, 2014). Management and Administrative Sciences Review, 3(6) 845-857.. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2574732> <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2573560>

Kim, Kiyong, Theories and Tenets: An Impalpable Troll for the Policy Makers, Research Officers and Administrators? (March 4, 2015). International Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Studies (IJIMS), 2014, Vol 1, No. 8, 30-50.. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2573526>

Kim, Kiyong, A Case Study Concerning the Strategic Plan: V2020 of Chosun University (.October 20, 2013). Science Journal of Business and Management. Vol. 1, No. 4, 2013, pp. 43-57. doi: 10.11648/j.sjbm.20130104.11. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2572943>

Watkins, Corry. *E-Learning Companion, A Student's Guide to Online Success, 3rd Edition*. Wadsworth Publishing, 01/2010.

## Key Word Search

The key words search enabled to retrieve a scope of materials that can be possibly helpful to assist with our research work. The next work is to evaluate the source in terms of value and credibility. If we consider value, it generally means a maximum benefit or profit with a least cost in a certain context. Of course, the concept of personal value offers an assumption for ethical action where a value system is a set of consistent values and measures. For the value about the sources, a first point is rather strong if we are faced with the problem of how much the sources are effective or efficient to support the research work. We may plainly see the concept as a reputation of sources and academic significance in the specific field. That is, however, not a whole, but a part of value considered in this assignment.

Therefore, the concept of critical thinking or reading would intervene to evaluate the sources if we are not a plain evaluator of read materials. We analyze, skip in some cases, have a mind of critique, and consider the way of dealings or author's methodology, which are all centered on the research topic we have purported for. Therefore, the value means fifty percent for the first, and fifty percents for its objective academic quality on discrete basis.

The credibility, in this case, brings again more independently for the above half of value, which would be in a more complex context. Fifty percents of value requires an independent judgment of readers on the quality of substance itself, who may be junior or senior experts as well as PhD scholars in that specific field. The credibility moves toward in a similar way, but entails a more formal aspect of sources and plays of more apparent elements of sources. That is also because the evaluation of sources occurs before the substantial performance of research, and in the context of specific task undertaken the readers, which is other than a peer-review process of submitted articles.

A most traditional way of credibility test relies on what we call 3 C's method, which is referred to as evaluating in context and includes "compare, corroborate, context." The comparing work is important to assess the sources properly, and ensure a file of most credible sources for the researcher's work. Actually, most researchers experience if there are plenty of articles on the same or similar topic. Therefore it often is rudimentary and usual to process on comparative evaluation. The corroborating work enriches a comparison which involves multiple sources and strengthens your thesis with an increased reference points. A more substantial nature of evaluating steps occur in the contextualizing work, which requires to understand the extent of current sources on the topic, identify the mainstream theory or understanding of topic, and investigate other streams of theory or debates. In passing onto these inquires and documentation, we most correctly locate the sources in a right angle within that specific field, and have an idea about their credibility.

Prevailing criteria concerning credibility and half of value would perhaps be found on many of tactics. As said, therefore, we do not here concern a specific research topic which varies with each research work. I mentioned half of value in this context where the rest of half needs to be considered as related with each research work.

First, credibility can be properly grounded on three elements, which include "author's credentials, evidence of quality control, meta-information."

Second, value covers several elements among which we turn to focus on "accuracy, reasonableness, support." Accuracy is paramount and increases both value and credibility of articles which requires "timeliness, comprehensiveness, and interconnectivity with audience and purpose." Given the modern science having been built up from the reason, reasonableness is a fundamental touchstone to evaluate the sources. This element encompasses a scope of sub-element including fairness, objectivity, moderateness, consistency, world view and so. The scientific way of research also requires a customized formality and inter-network to increase its credibility and purports to aid a future research. The element of support requires a source documentation or references, and sees them a factor such as corroboration and external consistency.

There are several points of similarities between two articles.

First, both articles conducted a qualitative research method to create a data source, and provide their analysis on the points of focus as well as implications, which is to inform, predict or suggest. Second, both articles are scholarly in nature, and peer-reviewed, which includes a scientific evidence and meta- information. Third, both articles possess high quality of accuracy on timeliness, comprehensiveness, and interconnectivity with audience and purpose. Fourth, both articles also score high on reasonableness, which adhered with fairness, objectivity, moderateness, and consistency. Fifth, both articles are informative in nature other than argumentative about any countervailing streams or theories. Sixth, both articles are moderately lengthy, and education friendly with figure and graphs, which is concise as well as expedient to obtain an information in a straightforward way.

There are several points of difference between two articles.

First, the scope of research object is narrow, intense and more affiliated with each other in the first case, which deals with a change of paradigm within the national health system. In comparison, the second article triggered an international context of health perception concerning a lay group of persons.

Second, the second article summarizes points of the survey result in dot formatted information, which is in contrast with the first article. This format would increase a ready understanding of survey results. The article, however, may go a bit insipid to bring a dynamics to the audience. The first article would let less on this problem while the key summary of interview results is presented in the story text of articles.

Third, the second article waives a reference or citation where the presentation of findings on data analysis is a substantial way to deliver an information. That is not the case in the first where a summary form of citations was provided.

Fourth, the first article carries the transformative nature of health care system which requires looking into and contextualizing the progress or challenge of health system. In comparison, the second article features most prominently a perception and reality of the patients in the comparative context. Therefore, the first article shed more focus on the operation or benefit and ill-side effect as well as prediction of the health care system on transformation, while the second one centers on comparative purpose. The first article, therefore, may deal with an “ought” issue or policy aspect of the health system. The second article is more informative and may offer a basis, in the long term, for the future research on policy reform.

Fifth, two articles utilized a qualitative methodology of research, but they may differ in details. The first article has a rather small pool of interviewees, who are, however, more keenly interested and have rich knowledge about the research topic. The interviewees actually are health professionals, brokers for, or representatives of the health care system. In contrast, the second one is based on a wider scope of lay patients, who are involved in the research topic, but less minded to respond than the first case.

Sixth, I suppose if it is necessary to support the second case with a quantitative way of assistance such as confidence interval or proper number of interviewees. It may be so given the loose nature of international context. The first case seems intense and relies on narrative or scenario-based presentation of studies, and thus is more qualified in nature than the first case.

Assuming I undertake a research about the health system, both articles are helpful to grasp its basic understanding, but can well fall short or partial to require more corroborating sources for reasons.

First, the nature of articles is less exhaustive other than the comprehensive coverage of research topic. In the first



article, summary form of references was utilized to support the nature of its work as scholarly, which also includes a meta-information in the left section, and abstract in *Italic* at the front page of article. It includes major references, but a specific link to the main text was waived. The pictures or colored text weakens its scholarly nature, which we may class a substantial news other than scholarly in the Cornell's four frame of articles.

Second, the second article also seems less comprehensive to grasp the nature of patients' perception since it is intensely focused on the year of 2001. It also fails to provide an abstract, and other sources on reference to analyze it comparatively. The article heavily relies on figures or graphics to attract the audience, and may, in some aspect, be well perceived as a substantial news other than the scholarly article. The audience seems not exactly targeted at the experts of same field, but it may well be patronized by TV news editor or other public interested in the topic.

Third, both articles are best effective on the factor of timeliness. The first article focused on 2007 through 2008 period, although it is short to explore the health system exhaustively. The second article is also timely responding to the inquisitiveness of audience about the nature of their health system.

I like to mention two other points about the credibility issue. The second article provides an affiliation of four authors on the bottom of first page, in which two are with the Commonwealth Fund and two others are with the Harvard School of Public Health. The second article also offers the author's affiliation with HSC and an institutional affiliation with the Mathematic Policy Research Inc. That tends to increase the value or credibility of sources. On the other hand, both articles had been produced in a funded context. The first research was performed partly with the fund from Johnson William Foundation, and the second research was funded by the Commonwealth Fund. This factor also seems to play increasing the value and credibility of research.

I raised several points to evaluate the value and credibility of sources, and I consider them in an endeavor to perform the research work more effectively.

A timeliness element is important to spot most updated issues in controversy, which could appeal to the public and a proper selection of which would increase the merits of research. Even the sources, as classed a substantial news other than scholarly, can address this kind of necessities. There are other variables to assess the value and credibility of sources, which includes the forms of article, author's credentials, and funded or non-funded research, and so, An element of comprehensiveness is also important to increase the value and credibility of sources. For the research topic on national health care system, two articles may work just inducting or theme-understanding in nature, which needs to be corroborated, more intense and contextualized.

The previous work on "peer-reviewed v. non-peer review," and key words searching can come into play in this respect. Researchers generally work through finding the mainstream of theories and other opposing views, which concerns the research topic. We then advance to frame the research questions, and perform a data collection. We analyze the data and draw upon the implications, or make a prediction or suggestion. This process of work may be attributed to the author of sources, which means that "fairness, objectivity, interconnectivity to the audience and purpose" could give a niche to look into the value of credibility of sources.

### **Independent Study**

Toward the goal of doctoral studies, it is necessary to combine two basic characteristics of independent study. I like to call it an independent study, which would be partial to capture the whole of graduate studies. As for its high honor, the title page of dissertation in vast of universities usually use the phrase "...submitted for the partial fulfillment of doctorate degree...." That phrase implies that the completion of dissertation would be a major part of doctoral studies, but should be partial depending on some of additional factors. Idealistically, that could be the whole quality as an independent researcher or investigator, and possibly the kind of human paradigm as a prospective teacher. In any case, we would not be incorrect if we see our principal work at Walden learning the ways of independent scholar.

Why do we use “independent study” to attribute the graduate mode of education. It is independent, I think, because the graduate student needs to be creative and expected to make an original contribution to his or her scientific field. The creativity and original contribution to a specific field are the core theme at which the graduate or doctoral level study culminates. For this, the credit hours are reduced to give an enhanced approach as a scholarly way while the undergraduate students are largely indoctrinated on heavy class schedule. The seminars or conferences often are the way of learning other than classroom delivery of lectures. The term paper or written product on independent research would be most types other than the class exams within closed settings, on which the instructors require to assess the academic achievements. Under this basic assumption, I can make some points about the critical reading and note taking strategy, which could hopefully be shared with my peer students.

I explored the guiding principles to make an effective independent study over much of reading requirements and the aids from note taking. Those are (i) efficiency (ii) creativity (iii) scholarly ethics or conscience. Let us have time on the elements briefly on my personal experience.

The elements need to be shaped to accommodate the goals and commission of graduate study. We are generally disposed to acquire knowledge in the reading work, which is typical of undergraduate students. They are also practically required to undertake a cramming hours to combat for better grades. This mode of study would work in many contexts which can breed knowledgeable citizens and more open society on the freedom of expression concept (Paul & Elder, 2003). We know that the base of our society would come from this level of intelligent group. If the situation were to be a little better, we can illustrate the case of former president of the University of Chicago. He framed a paradigm where the students are highly recommended to read over 100 books of fame on the humanities and science. This initiative may be well coupled with the typical pattern of undergraduate education, which also could be constructive to prepare a creative scholar. Some commentators picked it up as one of important contributors to make the university's success on production of many nobelists (Jung-Ahang Daily, Dec. 17, 2012).

I agree, and thus the first tactics of critical reading should be exposing us to a wider spectrum of books and articles. The graduate student needs to be leveraged up from the small scope of cramming work. The ideas are spreading over vast sources, and it is also true that the main message of written product could be summed up beyond many avenues of specific nature. In this context, it is echoing to see why we read a book (Walden Study notes, 2012). The reading materials are just an object or in more truth may be a tool in the course of final written product of ours. We need to utilize it other than making a harbor to settle in. Therefore, we would be better to have a standing mind other than sucking the written target, which would be to critically analyze, synthesize, contextualize, evaluative and so forth (Edwards, 2012 & Salisbury University, 2009).

While we are not a memory genius, it would be far helpful to take a note for effective study and research. A most noteworthy point in taking a note is that the main text should be paraphrased in your own words. That would practically effect at later work on your writing up engagement, and also would substantiate your study to enrich a true understanding of main text (Walden Study notes, 2012).

That would also work to prevent a potential misfortune from the allegation of plagiarism. I realized that the manner of note taking forms a seminal attributes of prospective researcher. If we are less sticking, the consequence would generally be devastating on the entire life of his person. Over the years, I was surprised that many of social elites had an educational background of graduate study in Korea. I am not sure if it is the case of United States, but many of Korean politicians and state men have a graduate degree. Now it is one of social practices to problematize the originality of their research work, and the media usually gave their focus on alleged plagiarism about the course of election or appointment approval in the national congress. The hopefuls, in some cases, were practically forced to withdraw his status as a candidate or appointee. The kind of case also would occur in the dimension of academics although not frequent. So I suppose it to be helpful for the prospective scholar to form a determined habit on note taking at the bottom line. It is rewarding indeed to use my own words to grasp the ideas of author

It would also work to increase more chances of creative work while the dialectic and literal aspect of literature would make a say at a considerable extent. If the research work is on the field of science or humanity, the literature, a general form of final research product, is usually a sole recourse to know (other than the code or statute, in which the legislative history may reinforce its true meaning), and the language employed in it is decisive in its nature. We are not talking about inter-intelligence context or the kind of structuralist version, in which the words and languages would become more prominent factors. Even in the domestic setting, it seems to be important to be stubborn on the words of each own, and that needs to be a factor when we pursue the graduate work at Walden.

### References

Paul R., & Elder, L. (2003). Critical thinking: Teaching students how to study and learn (Part III). *Journal of Developmental Education*, 26(3), 36–37.

Study Notes: "Critical Reading", Walden University, 2012.

Edwards, P. N. (n.d.). How to read a book: Guidelines for getting the most out of non-fiction reading. Retrieved from University of Michigan's School of Information website: <http://rfrost.people.si.umich.edu/courses/reading.html>.

Salisbury University. (2009). 7 critical reading strategies. Retrieved from Salisbury University's Student Counseling Services website: [http://www.salisbury.edu/counseling/New/7\\_critical\\_reading\\_strategies.html](http://www.salisbury.edu/counseling/New/7_critical_reading_strategies.html).

### Some Meditation on the Scholarly Writings

For the doctoral studies, the students are required to write several forms of writing from the discussion post, assignment, and project thesis through the dissertation. The scholarly writing skills are not achieved overnight, but over the days and time, in which it is important to keep on the continued adherence and personal devotion to the style and manner of presentation observed by the writers of the circle. For understanding the context of scholarly writings, I believe that we need to have a time on some reflections about several points.

A first point revolves around their role and historical deliberation. In the nature of society and humanity, the scholar group had not been intrinsic to sustain the society at the time of its primitive form. They liked to tell the myth or Greek story of imaginary gods and others (Dickey, E., 2007). They generally were intuitive, naïve, easily gone, or physics adherent, and religious or absolute on the body and mind as well as the nature surrounded. Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek scholars would perhaps be one of superiors among the neighbors (Dickey, E., 2007). The sophists, what we usually call them, are typical to understand the nature of ancient scholars. While the virtue of religion through a learning, perception, and intelligence was held strongly by Durkheim, history tells that the religion generally militated against the scientific or scholarly minds and efforts. In the western context, scholasticism, as the word connote, would perhaps bring a clear cut from the religion and academics. But still noteworthy is that, Thomas Aquinas, the alleged founder of scholasticism made his contribution under the influence of then dominant Catholic rule. This religious subordination of scholars and the human quest for truth may also conflict with each other as we see in the case of Galileo. We would be not incorrect that the oriental context partly assimilates the evolution of western intellectuals. Still the Confucianism would be properly viewed as the kind of quasi-religious intelligence. They are absolute in general and emphasize the ontological dimension of society and humanity. Therefore, we can assume that it is quasi-religious on one hand and close to the German idealistic way of thinking on the other.

Under this background, I like to head on the style and forms of presentation within the scholarly writings. Their way of conveying their beliefs and understandings of truth in the world, until the medieval era and even the modern times, is rather descriptive, ontological or moralistic, logic patronizing, but still powerful or pioneering on the basic of humanity and society (Scruton R., 1996). Their style of writing is generally short and more perceptive, distinguishable from the modern form of scholarly writings. An essay style was prevalent which is currently dominant in the

undergraduate environment if we look at the contemporary times. This corroborates with the branches of academics on the evolution through history.

Until the modern times, the philosophy, theology and law would have been major sections of scholarly performance, which developed to settle on the modern six branches of some French origin classification. A creation of statistics into the realm of science also played a significant role for any scientific way of dealings. The horizon of science has expanded gradually over time, and more rapidly in contemporary terms. We can properly illustrate this trend with the recent studies of NRC published in 2010. For the previous studies, NRC had 40 categories of the fields on the research doctorates, but the 2010 version identified 62 fields for the doctoral studies awarded on the research based education (NRC, 2010). The nutritional science now stands as an independent field of science. This trend explained more specialized and diversified nature of contemporary science.

A historical trajectory on the development of science, horizontal expansion or vertically enriched autonomous within the academic fields, factor in any way the forms and style of scholarly writings. This never means that the work of Bentham over thousands pages of short manuscript in 18<sup>th</sup> is not scholarly (Scruton R., 1996). Rather, I prefer to get it on the interactive nature between the subject and style or forms of scholarly writing. Also can we hardly reject the pre-Marxian theorists as non-scholarly although Marx presented his thesis like the modern dissertation mode, which was also based on the scientific evidence or primitive form of statistical data. Therefore the issues on scholarly writing comes within three contexts, I suppose; (i) the environment a scholar is situated, (ii) the audience a scholar intends to reach (iii) the nature of message he or she wishes to deliver. Most importantly, we need to consider that a scholar himself is the person to interact on adjusting, learning and training.

The APA style is one of rules which the scholars comply with (APA, 2011). That is so in a couple of crucial reasons. First, it promotes the congruence of academic community. Second, It increases the clarity of information intended to convey, and facilitates more easy communication between the author and reader. That is particularly required if the readers are generally other experts who are the peers of author (Walden's Writing Center, 2013b). Third, it also works to enrich the belongings of individual scholar and preserves a uniform pattern of base for the data construction or scientific findings at the whole national scale. That would vary slightly over the national context, but I believe it largely true across the nations of world. For example, the Korean Journal of Human Rights has their rule about the scholarly writing as a condition for contribution. But I am dubious if graduate students in Korean universities are learning the course of this kind. Not only within the international context, but also across the disciplines, the scholarly writings may come on a little different basis. For example, scientific data or quantitative nature of evidence is less urged in the legal science as we encounter the Westlaw or LexisNexis articles. The content and ready experience of the law review articles would perhaps find some of differences about the scholarly writings. That is so although APA materials incorporate the citation method of legal materials. The issues of scholarly writings would perhaps be more keenly affiliated with early and middle career scholars given their high performance and strenuous interaction with their professional circle. For example, we would be more focused on their content than their style or forms, when aged nobelists like to teach or indoctrinate. Also Stephen Hawking would be let more generous about the needs of strict compliance with any rules of style if ever. Some scholars may employ a secretary or research assistant to make their articles fitting within the APA rules. This description would perhaps lead the scholars to be aware of their environment and his basic status of person in thinking about his or her scholarly writing (APA, 2011).

Then, we look into the aspect of audience and message. This is crucial if the type matters significantly about the substantive feature of writings. Most important for the contemporary scholars, the writing should be based on the critical reading and critical thinking ("Finding a Scholarly Voice," 2013). A creativeness is vital to the scholars, which principally distinguishes the scholarly from other context of writings. The audience is usually their peer who has a master's or doctoral degrees, whose expectation goes about the truth unearthed by the writers ("Audience, Purpose, and Evidence," 2013). Their experiences and even habits are never the same as those of lay readers. They do not like to spend their time reading the general knowledge or line-on-line excerpts of textbook or article. They like to share the truth and new findings which only the creative scholar can work out. That does not mean the writings should be sophisticated, erudite or based on difficult terms or extravagant expressions with a long sentence or paragraph ("Finding a Scholarly Voice," 2013). One of essence required for the scholars on the writing work is avoiding an opaque expression.

We also need to be aware that a simple sentence or paragraph would effect better to convey their findings. It increases the readability of articles which scholars tend to easily lose their sight on. The recent guidance even authorized the use of first person expression in the scholarly writings. That would make an impression of directness, which brings the readers within a close context about the findings and messages the author conveys. The traditional third person version tends to make the writings a mere description of exterior world, and the aspect of mind and concern are generally neglected. But the rule is never absolute in which the author needs to be careful of ill side about a potential naiveness or unscientific taste ("Finding a Scholarly Voice," 2013). One other illustration would go to the author's general temptation to use a passive sentence. A passive sentence usually evokes the reader's sense of being scholastic, inquisitive, and more intelligent. A simplicity and clarity concern, however, should be more emphasized. And the dominant rule now requires a preference on active voice ("Finding a Scholarly Voice," 2013)..

The other important aspect is concerned of the evidence issue of scholarly writings.

In some sense, this aspect is more stark than that of critical thinking or reading. If Renaissance enabled the modern context of intelligence and human emancipation, the professionalism and intense science also situated the contemporary world to incur an important transformation about the intelligent work. A quantitative or qualitative method of research forms the basic for the scientists. The citation work flourishes as like the limited scope of medieval annotators', but more in the uniform fashion and routine context. It also draws a line between the scholarly and non-peer reviewed articles. In cases, it offers the basis to rank the research performance as we see in "most cited law review articles or professors" Evidence presented in the scholarly writings plays to increase the credibility of information and more convincingly through the mind of readers ("Finding a Scholarly Voice," 2013).

That serves in many ways. For instance, it brings the readers to focus, and fosters a learning environment. Further, the readers work to analyze, compare, synthesize, criticize, and improve, would get far facilitated. In some context, citations only may enable the readers to understand and evaluate the articles based on the mainstream of current theories. Evidence also allows to trace the author's research for any future purpose of subsequent work. In this context, the APA requires to preserve the experimental or testing records (APA, 2011). Of course, the author may convey his message in the context of newspaper articles, comment or opinions, which is non-scholarly in nature.

## References

- APA (2011). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, APA. Washington D.C.
- Dickey, E. (2007). *Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Oxford University Press, New York: USA.
- Scruton R. (1996). *Modern Philosophy: An Introduction and Survey*. Penguin Books. New York: USA.
- Study Notes(2013): ["Introduction to Scholarly Writing: Finding a Scholarly Voice."](#)
- Study Notes (2013): ["Introduction to Scholarly Writing: Purpose, Audience, and Evidence."](#)
- Walden's Writing Center( 2013). Course Media: "Introduction to Scholarly Writing: Finding a Scholarly Voice."
- Walden's Writing Center (2013b). Course Media: "Introduction to Scholarly Writing: Purpose, Audience, and Evidence."
- Walden's Writing Center (2013c). Course Media: "Introduction to Scholarly Writing: Tips for Success."

## Peer-reviewed and Non-peer Reviewed Articles

As a prospective researcher, we would professionally involve in the publication of our research as well as literature review of others. For the experts being credible and accurate, it is required to comport with the way of scholarly dealings and to share a common forms of publication. That is one way to share and, on the other, facilitates the work of professionals and ensures a distinction for the readers or users of the published articles about the nature and quality. If

we pursue a truth and meaning of the world and humanity, the professional articles would constitute a most scientific, detailed, and exhausting source of data than any other mode of expressions.

For the literature review or data collection, we need to identify two major classifications of article, which is peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed. How could we distinguish those. With the help of dictionary, we can say that the peer reviewed journals are those which have gone through the process of evaluation involving qualified individuals to determine paper's suitability for publication. We also usually refer to the words "scholarly articles," which are near to the case of peer-reviewed, but not all scholarly articles are peer-reviewed. However, it would vastly not incorrect that most of scholarly articles are peer-reviewed. As for the nature of work, the researcher's prime and most important source of literature review and data collection need to be drawn from the peer-reviewed articles (Study Notes: Introduction).

Peer reviewed articles are authored by experts and targeted the professionals or academic researchers providing detailed analysis on a single discipline or academic field. A focus of dealings is academic and includes an original research. Most of the scholarly articles will be peer reviewed or refereed by external reviewers, and published by the professional association or an academic press. An essence of peer reviewed articles is that the articles undergo a rigorous assessment by the author's peers, who review and approve its contribution. The quality of articles can be ensured or improved by the editorial process and evaluation system of peers. Of course, some of articles in the peer review journal may not be reviewed by peers, which may be news items, editorials and book and article reviews. We are available of lots of professional journals in the library. We can find more easily if it is a peer review journal by examining the periodical in print or on line version. For the on-line version, it is best way to check the publisher's website (Study Notes : Identifying). And in print version, it is usual that the instruction for authors reveals the submission process about reviewers and referees. A typical of peer review articles are wide on their trait: limited advertisements, purported to share research results, special knowledge, practical and informative for professionals and experts, narrow in scope and moderate in length, structured sections, cite sources, and so on.

Non-peer reviewed articles can, then, be defined as all the rest of articles excluded from the scope of peer-reviewed ones. There could we identify, in a general matter, three classes of article which are depending on the extent of similarities to the scholarly writings, in terms of its way of expression, level of content in quality and quantity, and accuracy of information. From the guide of Webster and Cornell sources, the researchers generally encounter other than scholarly writings, substantive, popular, and sensational (Eagle, 2008). Substantive news and general interests include a substantial information on a solid base, which appear attractive, often heavily illustrated with photographs. Within this class of periodicals, you sometimes see citation of courses, and feel the tone of education-intended language, but the general purpose is to provide information to the public of interests (Eagle, 2008). Popular periodicals generally intend on the public at large which fit for the taste, reflection and intelligence thereof. Therefore, the articles are often short, and employed a common and simple language while the information being mostly second and third hand. It does not include citing references or bibliography, and the appearance suits to its commercial purpose to entertain and sell, or in some cases, to promote a same viewpoint (Eagle, 2008).

Popular means fit for or reflect the taste and intelligence of the people at large. Sensational periodicals generally intend to arouse curiosity, interest or reaction. Since, their language, assumption of audience, the style and way of dealings are adapted to that purpose. For example, it uses flashy headlines to astonish or occasionally being inflammatory in expression (Eagle, 2008).

### **The Credibility of Sources**

To discuss the credibility of sources, firstly, we need to consider the point of distinction between the peer-reviewed and edited articles. We generally note that the peer-reviewed articles are more credible since they are reviewed and allowed to contribute by professionals of same or similar field. A review is anonymous traditionally to ensure against a bias or slant. Within an updated context, this form of peer review has been intended to improve on the mixed form in which two ways of review are concurrently applied to decide the merits of articles. That is because the traditional review on anonymous basis falls short in some aspect, to ensure a most appropriate result of review. A credibility between the

peer-reviewed and edited articles, however, is controversial depending upon the individuals concerned. Some professionals see the editors' fame would be more credible to ensure the quality and accuracy of articles. That depends on the contingencies of case, i.e., how much involved the peer reviewers to read and assess, how the peers are selected, how the review process is shape and so on. It is largely correct, however, that the peers generally have more close specialties than the editors, and that the review process is more rigorous than editing. In other cases, edited articles came from already peer reviewed journals rendering the differentiating work meaningless.

The points of relevance in credibility assessment, in my personal viewpoint, are (i) directness and closeness to the theme explored (ii) nature of sources (iii) the quality and accuracy of reference (iv) general credibility of the authors and institutions.

Directness and closeness to the theme or message are my first point of emphasis. While there is a fair of importance about other points, they are generally available to the readers and researchers. If we refer to the article of *New York times* and those of *Nature* or *Science*, a citation plainly discloses the nature of sources, and its reputation or credibility of institutions. Most readers are easy on this while the corroborating work between the read articles and reference is not expressive in itself. Therefore, the author's duty at more priority needs to consider the directness and closeness of both to increase a credibility of their professional writings.

When we evaluate the credibility of source, it is also required to know the primary and secondary nature of source. While it depends on the field of research, the primary source bears a most accurate nature of information while being less organized or articulated. These sources generally exist in letters, diaries, laws, manuscripts, patents, novels or official records, and scholarly forms of article containing an original findings. These are original and created during the times being studied, and so, it is determinative of academic verity or merit in some subject fields. A secondary source is grounded basically on the former, and generally has a quality to offer an analysis or interpretation. This class includes review articles, literary criticism, textbooks, commentaries, and others.

A classification can be differentiated according to the character of concerned research. For example, the restatement of torts in the United States, as comports with the code and statute of civil law countries, is secondary and the case laws are primary since it is a common law country. On the contrary, the case laws are secondary in the civil law countries while the codes and statutes are a primary source of laws and legal research. Generally I would place a more precedence on the primary source under the normal condition. A supportive work to substantiate its shortage, however, tends to expose me to utilize the secondary sources. In that case, I normally follow the guideline, if judged of equal relevance among the type of scholarly articles, which is to favor the author's reputation in that field and, at next, credibility of the journals and, finally, that of the institutions in view of specific issues involved and also credibility in general context.

## References

Draper, D. A., et al (2008). *Health and wellness: The shift from managing illness to promoting health*. Retrieved from <http://www.hschange.com/CONTENT/989/989.pdf>.

Engle, M. (2008). *Distinguishing scholarly journals from other periodicals*. Retrieved from Cornell University's Library Department website: <http://olinuris.library.cornell.edu/ref/research/skill20.html>

Schoen, C., et al (2003). Comparison of health care system views and experiences in five nations, 2001: Based on commonwealth fund 2001 international health policy survey.

Study Notes: "Introduction to the Walden University Library"

Study Notes: "Identifying and Evaluating Online Resources"

Study Notes: Searching and Retrieving Materials in the Research Databases.

ProQuest Database Training. Retrieved from <http://training.proquest.com/trc/training/en/peerreview/scholarly.pdf>  
Walden Library: How to Evaluate Research Resources. Retrieved from <http://libraryguides.waldenu.edu/evaluating>.



## **Common Sense and Science**

For the thesis on common sense and science, my assessment needs to consider several elements to give them each distinct status. First, we see them between static and evolutionary in nature. The common sense is generally static while science would develop and change horizontally and vertically expanding its scope and concerns. This evolution corresponds with the advancement of society and upgrading of intelligence. As the society advances, the scale and level of human cogitation expands and deepens while the deepening process shares less than expansion does or is generally particularized to each man. Science is therefore dynamic and usually more progressive. Common Sense may evolve, but far less evolutionary or static to sustain the conventional nature of society and human cognition.

Invention of Steam or diesel engine enabled the people to use a locomotives which is due to scientific effort of inventors. They change a common sense of then people to travel a remote city in a day. Korean people abhorred the first launch of locomotive in late 1890's, saying it is a resurrection of devils. It was thousand years of common sense to ride a horse to travel longways.

Second, common sense is free, conventional, and works on a wider spectrum while science is of value, salient, and classified. We need not pay to acquire a common sense. That may mean that we have to pay the e-article while we do not have to in the dimension of common sense. It means more that the acquisition of common sense generally has gotten through a smooth and natural process over the daily lives. We would perhaps so easy to walk on the right of street. It costs the learner virtually nothing, but one time experience of mob walking on the street. This type of cognition is usually conventional to correct it at one time, and respected or practiced by wider scope of people. This account would make science observed mostly at opposite. Usually, the cognition or knowledge from scientific truth bears on supporting evidence, which keys it to be classified and of value. It initially constitutes a upper class of social intelligence, and may get universal to expand its horizon into the dimension of common sense. Therefore, the nature of cognition on science tends to be salient or professionally qualified, which requires a long times to the status of common sense. For the 18<sup>th</sup> century countries, smoking represents a higher social prestige. Upon the scientific findings, the common sense has changed that smoking is bad to health, and poor educated or lower class of society may like it. On the interim, the science stands initially for the classified scope of intelligence, and gradually turned to influence the base of society.

## **Common Sense and Beliefs**

First, we need to see the basics between the common sense and beliefs. At verbatim and bottom line, common sense is relational to share and in many ways influential over the society, which may be neither true nor scientifically unsupported. Beliefs are referred to the personhood, which forms the basis for cognition, understanding, acting, proposing or opposing, and arguing. We can, therefore, perhaps safely saying that most intelligent people have personal beliefs system.

Second, the common sense generally provides the basis for beliefs, which is more influential than scientific knowledge in creating the belief system of each personhood. In reverse, the beliefs are far weaker to create a common sense. It would perhaps so even if the believers are normal scientist other than vitamin or cancer finders. The only way of normal believers to propagate would perhaps rest within religious circle or dictatorship of political leaders.

Third, the connection between common sense and beliefs are enormous the first being inextricably infused into the latter in a prompted and unconditional way. According to the research, persons generally bent on accepting the allegation if it is not preposterous or awkward in patent or obvious way. Across the theory and others, the deviation from truth would develop to double if the believers of false information nevertheless hasten to accept other false information based on the former. In this case, the personal beliefs system would increase on tendency in wrong cognition.

## **Critical Thinking and Being a Scholar-Practitioner**

Critical thinking has risen as top priority of education since the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is full of lesson provided if the education plays to breed a thoughtful person to evaluate, interact, construct, suggest, and lead. We are always situated

in some of given context and circumstances. The creative thinker would perhaps only advances to know the nature and to act. Otherwise, we would stay in silence, and further be on mind in silence. Critical thinking usually presupposes a critical reading, but which, in many cases, are mutually interdependent. Critical reading requires, in definition, the reader to evaluate the expressed statement, which would come into the leverage through analyzing, criticizing, or constructing..

The graduate students are scholar practitioner. This brings a fine match for his devotion of work between common sense and science. As a scientist, we develop a scientific truth, and practice to disseminate the ideas of scientific ground into the base of common sense. This is never a full stop, since the common sense is open to evolution once more. Progress and recycling would be made further toward more quality of life and society. As I work as a professor, critical thinking may be considered in the context of instruction. Normally, we would be accustomed to the text pre-marshalled, and a considerable educators practice purveying the information to instruct in the classroom. Of course, the information or knowledge could be the response to an implicit series of questions. But more critical education would prefer to create the mind of curiosity and inquisitiveness on the student body. Constantly being inquisitive and practice questioning serve the classroom full of critical thinkers. Socratic method of legal instruction developed Landell would perhaps be one example.

### **Belief Perseverance and Critical Thinking**

Critical thinking would possess a universal virtue about the contemporary citizen, but perhaps being most important with the people concerning the knowledge production, dissemination and learning community. As a scholar practitioner, it should have to be basic and important, it is, however, difficult to get stuck in person over the night as in the case of APA style adaptation. Rather, it requires to persist over the days and now through the researcher's total life of work. That is, as noted, like the kind of basketball players who train themselves hard over the time period. Given its essential nature, most counter-posing force would perhaps be what we call belief perseverance. Belief perseverance pertains to critical researcher in that they are general proclivities of his or her audience or client of research findings on one hand. How to effectively convey his theory or truth would perhaps become a hard way through absent an understanding of it. The other pretense would rise that the researcher himself may hold a wrong beliefs or in the worse, belief perseverance. Two critical opposers, historically, may be illustrated in several cases, to refute the other's theory or proposition. Belief perseverance are such stronger once they enshrine within the personal beliefs system. It is interesting to see the irony of participants on debriefing paradigm test. Beliefs system is powerful to construct some way of cognitive building inside the humans. One other traits of beliefs in humans is that they tend resist changing his or her beliefs. In operation of his or her beliefs system, he quickly acquires other beliefs, but the beliefs perseverance bars him not to believe everything that he read, hear, and see.

### **A Strategy for Critical Thinking**

It seems useful to make the set of suggestions to be prioritized in the course of practicing the ways of research, application, organization change, social and institutional engagement as a scholar practitioner. Not only raising and raising questions through the reading, but also criticism even on the questions about its accuracy, relevance, essentiality to the theme and so, should be incorporated to become a creative thinker.

The beliefs may underlie the most of researcher's base, and also help to acquire a knowledge and information more instantly. As Durkheim guided, the kind of religious circle or minds would be more agile to efficient learning. Some kind of absent mindedness would easily alienate the learners to merely harbinger. Two ways of lesson, however, has gone fundamental. The researchers should be open, fair and unbiased, generous, and liberal. She and he needs to know that beliefs system may be prejudiced, and their job duty pertains exactly to this point. The other way is concerned of beliefs perseverance and critical thinking. To counteract this problem, one useful mind of approach can be suggested in some of French examples. Suicide may be properly picked up to research the social pathology which was challenging and thought-provoking against the beliefs perseverance on conventions and practices at the times of Durkheim. About the philosophy of body and mind, prison setting would perhaps be most striking to strip the unsupported beliefs system or perseverance. The post-modern approach could help to find the clues to restore the true identity of beliefs system. It is also generally encouraging to learn from the natural scientists for the scientists to strive being a creative and critical.

It would help, I speculate, “Keep objective eyes and concern on the phenomenon itself, and begin with the real beings to be critical.”

### References

Kenealy, D. & Kostagiannis, K (2013). Realist Visions of European Union: E.H. Carrand Integration, *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 41: 221.

Cheng Li, China at the Tipping Point, Top-Level Reform or Bottom-Up Revolution? *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2013.

LaCapra, D. (2003). *Emile Durkheim: Sociologist and Philosopher*, The Davies Group Publishers.

APA style: Learning APA Style, retrieved from <http://www.apastyle.org/learn/>.

Writing Center: APA Style, Retrieved from <http://writingcenter.waldenu.edu/APA.htm>.

### Plagiarism in General Consideration

Plagiarism is not a proper way which the scholars and researchers should avoid. The underlying ethics is rooted in the meritocracy that the academicians should be “creative and authentic, sacred, fair, and faithful.” Two contrasting elements probably interact to facilitate our understanding and to define the extent of plagiarism. That is, the dimension between “authoritative and communicative” would play to perceive the ethical guidelines about the issue. Plagiarism also involves, in the current context, an aspect of property right concept and the standard of social ethics (Blum S.D., 2009).. This means that we are not easy to give any definite dealings of the issue, but rather being flexible or transformative varying with the progress of society and the circumstances involved. You may see that there is this kind of issue even in the ancient times. The informative era, on the other hand, now enables the “turnitin” to check out the potential misconduct of students by an automated way. The circumstances may allow them a bit amorphous if the issue is dealt in a differing context.

While the infringement of intellectual property rights incurs the damages or preventive measure in civil actions, the court would find the rule from the statutes or case laws, and ultimately from the conscience of judges. Of course, the standard of professional society would guide principally. There have been lots of precedents in Korea surrounding the hopefuls of public office involving the issue. In this case, the extent of plagiarism means far less on the normal standard. For the nature of circumstances in traditional Korea, the standard is very harsh effectively tarnishing them in some popular dynamics. A plagiarism generally has presupposed the kind of written expression, and may get extended to the proper scope in concordance with the evolution of ways of expression. We may, in the future, have to consider the expression of videotapes concerning a plagiarism. In this complicated era of high technology, therefore, we are led to rethink the institution of plagiarism. I suppose that the issue is critically intertwined with “creative and authentic” against “common.” It often offers a drawing line between the common knowledge and author’s words whether we have to cite.

As we learn, then, critical thinkers are definitively free from any fear of or claims from the plagiarism. Critical thinkers stood, as a matter of definition outside from the author’s writing, that he could not be cast in any way of plagiarism accusation. They learn or read critically, who is other than the author, by analyzing, synthesizing, pointing to the bias or strengths of authors (Study Notes, 2013). They are not merged into the author, and still being far remote in chances if they submit themselves to the expression of author. They are “communicative,” but at the same time “authoritative,” to be well prepared to produce an original research and disseminate them by teaching, coaching, and mentoring.

### The Extent of Student Plagiarism

In assessing the extent of plagiarism, there seems to be some standard possible as guided by the viewpoints of Walden and the Indiana University (Walden Catalog, 2013). A most patent and serious way of plagiarizing would perhaps be a wholesale copying of the other's paragraph or sentences without an acknowledgement. In this case, APA guides the cited paragraphs or sentences should be quoted with an adequate form (APA, 2011). If more than forty words are directly cited, it should be presented in block. An accurate form of citation is required by providing the page number. The page number appears in parenthesis outside the quotation mark with the punctuation at the end.

They come in a delicate way, to say, using other ideas, including the views, opinions and insights, but often are considered as plagiarism if without an acknowledgement (Study Notes, 2013). Two aspects are pertinent. The researchers are free to present a common knowledge without an acknowledgement. On the other, APA style requirement squarely operates to govern (APA, 2011). The lessons through the weeks properly apply to this context, and a correct citation work would prevent any potential plagiarism. The acknowledgement, on this stream, should not be limited, rather be better to flourish demonstrating that we are interdependent, learning and informing as an expert on the field. It likely gets on dynamics that the researchers are "authoritative" on his independent and creative work, while showing we are "communicative" to lead the competitive knowledge from the past and for the future research efforts.

The third extent of plagiarism is concerned about the error, in which the researchers paraphrases the phraseology or metaphor to present the ideas as own (Study Notes, 2013). This extent of plagiarism generally has the nature of being feeble and less fundamental, but incurs a basic plane of misconduct. This plagiarism may rise to be serious as same above, however, if the extent is prevalent over the written work. Metaphor and characteristic or original phrases, in many cases, represent the art skills of author or contain an academic value in its own way. That may, in some cases, serve to create one independent preserve of science. We occasionally come across the wonderful words to direct and guide us to some of meditation. The author may sing the phrases to penetrate the whole of his delivery. For example, Justice Holmes famous phrase, "Law is nothing but the words delivered by the judges in the courtroom." That would allow us to be clear between the common law and civil law traditions. It also implies that the sociological way of legal dealings is realistic and demanding. The dissertators usually begin with famous words, which symbolize the mainstream of viewpoints in their specific field. The words and sentences, as in these, could even be used to cover the whole of discourse in the field. Then, they proceed to present their ideas and explain their findings. The famous phrases should be criticized for the case of dissertators working on new theory, never being that which could be cited without an acknowledgement. We, therefore, agree on its value to credit the sources. They possess value, in which the phrases, if original or characteristic, are not to be sung without payment. We can sing "Kang Nam style by Psy" freely, but should be paid in any context if it was used in other discography. We may be free in the lecture room, but it is impermissible in a scholarly written work. If it is so famous to amount to the level of common knowledge, we are exempt from the citing requirement.

The researchers would be discouraged to find a plagiarism from others. They feel unfair and regret his efforts to be futile (Renfrow, D., 2009). This would well be analogous to the context of peer students who are equal under the exam competition. For the students themselves, it is discouraging like the kind of impermissible early start at the line of hundred meter race. This aspect would now, in some cases, aggravate to the status of litigation when the copy right is secured.

### **Strategies to Avoid Plagiarism**

As mentioned, plagiarism could not survive if we are truly a critical thinker. It is definitely a way to avoid the scholarship of plagiarism, and we should keep in mind as principle through the course of research or writing up work. It is important to habituate the way of dealings in this direction, and that one of training issues as a research professional. I devised several points, in strategy, to avoid plagiarism.

#### ***Set the stages to get through your research work and strictly separate them untainted.***

We may be required to produce two articles per year. In some cases, we perform a funded research or engage in the

project to produce a written work. As in every case of humans, the engagement would perhaps operate in some of time sequence. If I was asked to research the leadership topic and turn it in within two months, I would plan, perform and write the article in some of time frames. Important is that we have to separate the review of literature and writing up for the final thesis. For my personal experience, the writer often falls to be merged into the phrases and ideas, which seduce the researcher to be easy on the expression of author. Reading for the literature review must be critical, and it is important to separate the reading work from two or three days writing up work. As nearer the literature referred to, more likely the researcher imbibes the ideas or words in an impermissible way.

### ***Utilize the note taking lessons seriously.***

If for any long scheme of research project, the separation above could make the researcher an essayist as unassisted on his every way of preparation. Worse, his or her reading or review, would, to some extent, become useless along with the passage of time. A note taking effectively saves this predicament, and constructively supports to write their thesis (Gilmore, B., 2008). A note taking would less serve if it was not critically made out. Critical reading requires the note to be summarized in his or her own words. Smart note taking would certainly help to prevent any intentional or unintentional plagiarism.

### ***Do not take a research work realistically pressuring. Originality of research findings are vital to give a lifeblood to every context.***

It would allow the researcher to feel the kind of job satisfaction and pride as a scholar. He or she needs not fear from any claim or reaction from the plagiarism. His compliance will also ensure authors and teachers to get stable and pleasant, who feel fair on the scholarly track. It also saves any redundancy of future researchers that could be possibly put by the way the plagiarizer created. In some cases, the wicked plagiarizer misleads the readers by not properly paraphrasing. In this case, they do not cite, but worse, the paraphrased words convey different ideas from the original work (Renfrow, D., 2009). Then, there would perhaps be no scholar to get audacious of plagiarism. Why, then, does plagiarism popularly sound on our ears and is available in many news stories? One of prime reasons seems to rise in the context of pressure, distraction and easy mind to abandon. Therefore, we need first to be wise when undertaking a duty. If a time constraint is harsh, avoid to undertake. Given the topic is hard and insurmountable in any sense, it is wise just to understand it, but better not to try it, who could be susceptible to impermissibly borrow other's splendid work. Large funds may be a variable to push the researchers, but should keep balanced to measure a practical context.

### ***Be a carnivore rather than feeble vegetarian.***

Plagiarism can frequently occur when the researchers are insipid and uninteresting on his or her topic. This group may easily practice transcribing the ideas with a minor cosmetic change (Renfrow, D., 2009). They feebly substitute the word "less" with "fewer" or change the terms using a computer code. They may change the order of sentence or paragraph, and spread the information within figure layout or so. It is basic and effective way to hone into the topic, and be amused into that with other interesting sources, but as a way of critical thinking.

Bear in mind that the competent and well prepared researchers are very willing to cite, and therefore, acknowledge the other's work (Gilmore, B., 2008). It is one strategy and should be a habit for us to be active on citing. That serves a communication among the experts in the field and increases the quality and merit of your article.

### **Judging the Plagiarism: Ways to Find!**

There could be a scope of guidance about judging a plagiarism. One may see it rather formalistic if he or she adopts the counting method to weigh. For example, as many as some number of same word in one sentence or paragraph may be found plagiarized. Word to word plagiarism or paraphrasing way to escape may be captured or prevented to use this type of approach. The sample test of Indiana University seems to fall within this type, and many other institutions also rely on this method (Frick, T., 2008). It is objective, as well as easy and fair to standardize. The other way may go in any qualitative, and thus may involve a kind of consideration about the dishonesty, academic integrity, or balancing of interests between the author and alleged plagiarizer. In this way of approach, we are required to assess the above points

of consideration covering sanctity, creativity and authenticity, and fairness. Walden's three dimensions also seem to be applicable properly (Study Notes, 2013).

The student's work under review seems to plagiarize at the modest extent. I would be gone to find it affirmative on the plagiarism misconduct if I am obliged to do. My concern can be focused on several points in violation.

Though the mechanic rule of "number counting" may not find it plagiarizing, it is problematic in the aspect of overall delivery. Two paragraphs under review intended the same message, which raised the ill aspect among three groups, i.e. doctors, biomedical researchers, and consumers. The basic view or opinion is the same, but the student work appears to convey it rather like that of author himself. This represented the wrong impression of originality about the paragraph. That is still true if the student author attached a citation at the end of paragraph. As worse in the context of professional community, the purveyance of same views presented largely the same, but in a curtailed way about some delicate points. In the original work, the author's information is not definite about the doctors in conflict of interest. Doctors usually, not all doctors though, are fair on the biomedical research by providing a precaution in any professional spirit. They may corrupt, but generally, rest in the kind of professional ethics to explain. The point, in any way, seems to be given principally to the biomedical research and commercial interests. Therefore, the student's message has the potential to be misled. The author of original work also implies that the misdirected research may be effectively countered by other researchers. This point was also curtailed to create an incomplete apprehension of reader. This kind of degradation and lowering of the quality of information could be said one aspect of evil consequence the plagiarizer could incur. The points of consideration above stated seem to apply negatively since the author seems not creative or authentic.

In specific, the problem lies between the "indirect v. direct quotation." For example, the last sentence is very informative to point the reasons for being warped. The readers probably like to know the exact nature of reasons, but they were curtailed to headline the original messages. It is partial and incomplete to tarnish the accurate nature of original message. Also perplexing is it of his five reasons if the original message presents six points by semi-quotation mark. It might perhaps be truncating the last two reasons into one. In my view, the student author should have to directly quote the passage, or keep up more minded dealings in any authentic way by indirect quotation. Also should the citation form previously learned be properly applied.

A citation work also seems inappropriate if it be limited. All the sentences include the same information to the original work. They all require a citation with the forms having an author and years in indirect citation, and the page numbers should be specified in direct quotation.

### Conclusion

The academic community has been "sacred and faithful," in which dishonesty or easiness is one of fatal vices. Plagiarism well contributes to disrupt the institutions they serve as well as to stigmatize the failure of individual. A self-supervision is required to shape a self to this dominant culture of academy (Blum S.D., 2009).. It is a pivotal ethics unless we work in the plane other than publication, unlike the politicians, businessmen, desk officers, and others. It might be a gossip if any president plagiarized the paragraph of scholarly work, but would perhaps develop in other ways. It is grateful to see the citing practice of common law judges in contrast the civil law counterparts. In some cases, therefore, plagiarism may be considered, but generally less serious in nature than the academicians. So the lesson is helpful to get it routine to be critical (it cannot be acquired over night), and to advance being positive for citing if dubious. It is sacred to breed the student's whole in person, and because his expression may be left extant for long centuries. It is sacred that is constructed in a scientific way of finding the truths, and supported in systemic way availing of the qualitative and quantitative methodology. The scholarly way of dealings require much toils and efforts, and on the best wisdom of methods, which is inviolable if not on the customs or standards of that specific community.

### References

APA (2011). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, APA. Washington D.C.

Blum S.D. (2009). *My Word!: Plagiarism and College Culture*, Cornell University Press; 1 ed. Ithaca: NY.

Frick, T. (2008). *How to recognize plagiarism*. Retrieved from Indiana University of Bloomington School of Education department website: [http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/plagiarism\\_test.html](http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/plagiarism_test.html)

Gilmore, B. (2008). *Plagiarism: Why It Happens and How to Prevent It*. Heinemann. Portsmouth: NH.

Renfrow, D. (2009). *Avoiding plagiarism*. Retrieved from the University of California Riverside's Library Department website: <http://library.ucr.edu/?view=help/plagiarism2.html>

Study Notes (2013): "Introduction to Scholarly Writing: Plagiarism and Academic Integrity"

Walden Catalog Statement on Academic Honesty and Plagiarism (2013). Retrieved from Walden University Website: <http://catalog.waldenu.edu>

### **Paraphrasing: Example and Reflection A Paraphrased Paragraph**

*O'Connor Argued that simplemindedness is the best way the author should employ in their work (O'Conner, P., 2003). As Greek Orators guide, the author has to have a clear idea to write (pp.195-196). We also need to distinguish between the confusion and complexities. An simpleminded author can express the complexities clearly and not to confuse the readers (pp. 195-196). The readers, however, usually do not blame the author, rather think the tougher expression means the brilliance of authorship (pp.195-196). In truth, however, the prime cause lies in the author himself, who is a positive actor. Simplemindedness is really important for the authorship, but can only be achieved by clear thinkers (pp. 195-196). It is pivotal as shared understanding is the basic purpose in writing.*

### **Reflection**

In paraphrasing, there are several points that the author needs to consider (Study Notes, 2013). Most importantly, the paraphraser should understand an original message clearly and convey the exact nature of it in his own words as best as possible. In some cases, the careless or unconvinced paraphraser intentionally or unintentionally commits a loose citing work, and applies a mere cosmetic change (Renfrow, D., 2009). This type of work may less accurately convey the original message, and, in some delicate conditions, may embroil an argument or core theme of whole research work. In some extremely dubious cases, the paraphraser could be better to employ a direct quotation even though we generally prefer indirect quotation. A drawing line, as I mentioned in the previous work, may involve the "authoritative and communicative" dualism in the professional society. We are an author, but communicate with our peer researchers. How could we face up if we inaccurately convey the friend's statement?

Second, paraphrasing is inextricable given the nature of work, but can be easier and amusing if we indulge in or are merged into our research and writing work. Given any potentially amass of extant work on the research topic, the researcher could not deal with their work as resting within his own domain. A creative or original work is grounded on the existing source and the mazes of extant research. Many researchers, not all though, depending on their field or other specific condition, usually begin with the literature review summarizing the existing work. We may need to rely on others' logic or expression to reinforce our message. It is inextricable, and in some cases, evidences the competence and quality of author. It could situate the right status of written work within the large ocean of that specific field. It can enable the sound and constructive stream of research theme, which is also meaningful to the future researcher. Given this nature of research work, it is best way to indulge in the work and the author would be wiser if not lingering around any impermissible efficiency by mere thieving or weak planting of others' work (Blum S.D., 2009). Being studious and amused, merging into the work, but standing on your critical mind, which are usual with the creative thinker, would be the most concrete way to prevent impermissible paraphrasing. A kind of soul-dom seems likely function to easily taste a difference between the writing of creative thinker and weak staffer to camouflage or just to fill the vacant pages (Blum S.D., 2009). That is so even if we do not have any official or some clear and objective guideline about an impermissible paraphrasing (Frick, T., 2008). Some paraphrasing would not summarize, but thesaurus-revision of original work. That would absolutely not the case if we are a critical thinker.

Third, it would be highly advisable and important to flourish the citing cases if the idea comes from others' work. That is one strategy to prevent a plagiarism controversy at the bottom line. That is also useful to construct a convenient traffic of communication within any professional circle (APA, 2011). It also enriches an effect of the research and reinforces the authoritative nature of writings. An aspect of authoritativeness is interdependent actually, and would not be realized as a kind of windfall from the heaven. Then, we see no reason why we would not patronize a citing of others' work. Again, the critical thinker would perform like a singer, musically entertaining the citing of sources, which, in the event, ends up with presenting his creative points of research.

Fourth, paraphrasing may face the author in different circumstances. In some cases, the author needs to summarize the whole of book by one sentence or small paragraph. On the other hand, he or she may entangle with one or two paragraphs. They also may have to deal with several pages to summarize. Each situation may lead the author to his own tactics or stratagem. In some cases of hurried worker, a book description or review comment may offer the basis of paraphrasing. A summary of article also gets the author to have the idea of whole message in the article. In any chances, most important is that the author should not present the idea of others, while misrepresenting as if they are his own words. If dubious, it is better to cite in an appropriate form of style (APA,2011).

### Conclusion

In preparing this work, I stepped through the above points in pondering. First, I inferred the core message which the author intended to convey around the key words. They would be "simpleminded, confusion and clear writing, misdealing between the author and readers." This would help not falsify the intention of original author. Second, I applied five cases of citing to give a proper credit for the original work. That being said as above, we more frequently cite in many purposes. Of course, I made a several times for reading to amuse the original message as well as for critical understanding of the message. Finally, I paraphrased the paragraph in my own words.

### References

APA (2011). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, APA. Washington D.C.

Blum S.D. (2009). *My Word!: Plagiarism and College Culture*, Cornell University Press; 1 ed. Ithaca: NY.

Frick, T. (2008). *How to recognize plagiarism*. Retrieved from Indiana University of Bloomington's School of Education department website: [http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/plagiarism\\_test.html](http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/plagiarism_test.html).

Renfrow, D. (2009). *Avoiding plagiarism*. Retrieved from the University of California Riverside's Library Department website: <http://library.ucr.edu/view=help/plagiarism2.html>

Study Notes (2013): "Introduction to Scholarly Writing: Plagiarism and Academic Integrity"

O'Conner, P. (2003). *Woe is I: The grammarphobe's guide to better English in plain English*. New York: Riverhead Books.



## Chapter 5

### Campus and Universities-The Kind of Military Camp or Arsenal

The following had been prepared in view of the principles and practicalities exchanged over the years of peer communication and data collection within the methodology classes. They had been generated along with the APPENDIX V from the longitudinal observations and by applying the data analysis techniques. You also can grasp a number of global rankings, which I imagine as a product from the international body managers.

#### [Typology of Global Rankings]

| University Wide + Subject |                         |                                  |  |                                       |                                  | University Wide  |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| US News                   | THE                     | QS                               | ARWU   | CWU R/URAP                            | NTU Ranking of Scientific Papers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● G-factor</li> <li>● Leiden Ranking (5 fields)</li> <li>● Nature Index</li> <li>● RUR Ranking (6 fields)</li> <li>● Webometrics</li> <li>● Others : uniRank:</li> </ul>  |
| Overall + 38 subjects     | Overall + 11 categories | Overall + 5 fields + 46 subjects | Overall (& Alternative ) + 5 Fields + around 54 Subjects | Overall + 227 subjects (largest) / 61 | Overall + 6 fields+24 subjects   | <a href="https://www.4icu.org/about/index.htm">https://www.4icu.org/about/index.htm</a><br>Eduroute <a href="http://www.eduroute.info/">http://www.eduroute.info/</a><br>Etc.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scholarly papers ex) <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.11648/j.edu.20150405.23">http://dx.doi.org/10.11648/j.edu.20150405.23</a>; Aguillo &amp; Orduna-Malea (2013). The Ranking web and the "World-Class" universities</li> </ul> |

#### Introduction to Exhibit I in the Appendix V

The academic strengths of institution were based on the NRC data that were released in 2010 and 1996. The data basically purported to provide the assessment of quality for the doctoral programs, but is considered to show the variety and commitment of institutions to teach and research. Given the specific ranks essentially came with the quality of doctorate programs, the number of programs evaluated and ranked indicates the width and depth of institutional performance as a whole. Often the institutions came with the first impression about the scope of offerings with the three levels of degree programs, such as 150 programs for bachelors, 100 programs for masters, and 60 programs for the doctorate. That is the first and last lens to look at the educational institutions, and is considered as foremost at the basic and most attribute. This is despite such popular perception from the rampant ranking schemes nationally and globally. It is related with the very basic function and role of institutions and shows the total level of intelligence and contribution which turns on the benefit of students eventually. Since the college education, especially at the undergraduate level, is liberal and interdisciplinary – of course, interdisciplinary nature had gradually come stressed with the graduate education – this aspect of institutions is viewed in emphasis.

The problem is how to draw the pertinent information to measure this reality. Besides the mere number of programs with the university website, the number of NRC rated programs would inform us more properly that there was set a practical limitations with the least number of doctorates at five and fits within the purpose of national scheme of doctoral studies. It shows the operability of programs and its academic meaning that was assigned most of value to measure the whole populace of institutions, say, faculty, undergraduate, masters and doctorates. It is unique with the educational administration of US, but in some cases over the global jurisdictions, the nations, such as Korea, would have a similar data compiled by the ministry of education. For example, we can confirm that Minnesota comes second with 74 programs rated or UC Berkeley with 52 programs for the tenth place, while Seoul National University doctoral programs are officially acknowledged at 50 indications of doctoral field and Yonsei will come with 45 indications. In other cases, perhaps more liberal or private without this kind of data, the measure would be based on the webpage of institutions to be adjusted specifically with the contingencies of each nation or region.

Another indicator to measure the academic strengths of institution is to look into the publications of faculty.

The number of publications, including the books and articles, indicate the quality of faculty and their commitment to the research. It could be measured as per capita of faculty or at gross that I applied the second method. The indicator shows the basic operation of academics for each institution, which could not be substituted with other applied point of angles, such as citation or major faculty awards. That is because such applied lens to view the institutions can lead us to the distortion heavily affected by the western dominance (Clifford & Marcus, 1986). The assessment of college and university comes different from that of graduate or research degree programs. It was principally oriented to measure the effect of institutions on the undergraduate education. It comes vastly with the national context of educational aims that an immense focus on the number of contributions to the internationally prestigious journals and quality of professional communication of faculty, often critical in rating the rankings of the global universities should be neither such determinative nor highly discriminative. In other aspect we may also challenge that it can be some outdated privileges if many on-line journals now serve the need of India and China, most populated countries in the world – hence implications of universal college education-- and lend a space to exchange the scholarly views. We would not say that their educational service is defunct merely because they work based on the less prestigious journals, especially in terms of college education other than graduate level. The articles or books, far from the Nobel prizes or massive scholarly attractions with citations, can well be more precious and valuable in terms of college education.

However, we cannot obtain a specific data with the integrity and system to measure any exactly the whole of institution's publications. Therefore, the Leiden ranking of publications were partly considered, which is based on some level of journals. In the case of US, 2007 studies from the Chronicle of Higher education was considered, in which the professor's publication was assessed on the basis of whole number of books and articles to yield the ranking of each programs. This type of data can be identified in other countries, of course, more probable in the developed countries. In the global scale, the indicators of Webometrics or institutional rankings compiled by the Spanish Academy can allow to refer to the similar nature of information in this concern. Although the rating agencies would request to offer the data for the basis of their assessment, the request often can possibly be neglected or responded unfaithfully at considerable extent as we may know previously from the rating scheme of Russian agencies. Then the ways of measure through the web search can provide any most comprehensive exposure of global institutions by the investigation of institution's website or on-line performance. It also is reflexive of the kind transformation sparked by the revolutionary change of electronic lives or professional communication. The international and national sources of information in this kind were combined and assessed to yield the final rankings of academic strength.

The other indicator to measure the academic strengths of institution stems from the consideration of research funding. As the money is most tangible evidence as a support of research, thus, very critical to measure the quality of research by the faculty. Besides the citation and faculty award, it could be more practical and competitive if money is an element. The weakness of this measure, however, is only covered in the planning stage of research, hence, input than output. In terms of graduate education, this indicator seems more highly relevant since the funding is essentially related with the recruitment of graduate students and common development as a professional researcher between the recruiting faculty and students (Gergen, 1994). Often the labs and groups can be formed on this basis to produce the kind of professional researchers with their nest. In terms of undergraduate education, it is seemingly less relevant, but I considered it still crucial since the funding competition becomes more intensified -- important point to view the strengths of faculty, who ultimately is responsible for the undergraduate students in the classroom. The measure of this indicator is not so challenging unlike other ones since the monetary terms are any more than universal at the global scale. And each nation certainly produces this type of data, and can be integral for the whole of global universities.

For example, Harvard may come eighth in this statistics with a little less than 1.0 billion dollars, Oxford and Cambridge or University of Tokyo may rise at the place of 19 or 22 with 700 million or 600 million dollars. Since I had a temporal factor to provide a view for the graduates of colleges and universities from 1990 through 2010, my assessment of data is longitudinal in coverage over more than twenty years roughly coming with such period. It means, for example, that the University of Michigan and Berkeley in California may fare at second and eleventh place in the 2014 statistics of National Science Foundation. Besides, I can consider the unique university, UW-Madison over than twenty years compilation, which had fared within the range of top five institutions. In this way, the global rankings were compiled to yield the final ranking of this qualitative inquiry on the college and university rankings. In this concern, we can refer to the patent statistics and number of doctorates awarded, which also comes as same that is an important

indicator for the graduate education, but comes less significant in terms of my basic perspective about the original role of university education. As the undergraduate populace is vast, we may properly be reflexive to contemplate what the colleges and universities are expected to play. The number of patent applications is related with the sense that the academic staffs are rather on the role of independent professional than educators.

The number of awardees at doctorate level implies that the graduate education flourishes and thus more creative and research- oriented often led to the quality of faculty. This kind of indicators reflects the competitive capitalism or elite education to wake after the transformative global community (Giddens, 1991). Nonetheless, the theme in my case is what the original role of colleges and universities is and what it means for the universal education at the undergraduate level, most crucial stakeholders in the university (Hatch, 2002). As the faculty is a primary player to engineer the colleges and universities, they have a plenty of reason for the creative research and innovation, and preferably with the earnings and profits. Hence, it is necessary to consider this factor, but not in any gross share. One challenge in the context of college ranking is that it is only related with the engineering or applied natural science. Of course, we generally share in awareness that the massiveness in terms of the college and university population, including the students and faculty, is also characteristics of current college education and, hence, most important discriminating factor in the international college ranking. That is a part of reason that Caltech may come a top ahead Harvard occasionally or similar with the UC Berkeley. This pattern of institutions may well be compared with the kind of institutions, such as University of Chicago, Yale, NYU and Brown University.

Between the overall citation statistics and that of humanity and social science available at 2008 Thomson Reuter, we can hint on this pattern, if the University of North Carolina comes as top class ahead of those institutions while it performed less strong in the citations of whole field. This aspect was considered as eclectic to evaluate the academic strengths of institution. The patent statistics have been compiled by concerned institutions, and not so challenging to confirm. Some institutional adjustment was made if the University of California comes first for the whole ten campus. Now we turn to see new nobelists this year -- considered as top honors for the faculty, which is some part of factors for the university rankings. Therefore, it can be a source of competition for the sensitive universities who invited even for the temporal period of time to increase the international awareness or priority in the college rankings. In this sense, I have assigned more value with the number of alumni than the faculty members, who received the prize. Of course, it should be corroborating with my focus that there can we consider many of faculty awards much implicated with the context of national education, such as the national medals of science from the global jurisdictions (Guba, 1989).

Finally, the social aspect of institution based on the ranking of Facebook and Twitter needs to be considered that it is essentially intertwined with the intellectual aspect of college people beyond the social activities (1989). It also partly relates with the broad impact of institutions at global and national scale. I also viewed that the happiness concept of institutions is another important theme as we occasionally experience with the concerned people. Most importantly, the Facebook or Twitter now partly is the space of intellectual exchange of views and public opinions. A short comment in such social media from the influential scholars would be any echoing than hundreds-page books. We, of course, including the college people, can learn the essence of public issues and point of contentions. The informed people also could raise his view and opinions that was not feasible in the earlier years without such space. Along the transformation of our living mode, this aspect explains some part of institutional strength although little in share. Besides the direct ranking from Klout or others, the above Webometrics was utilized to compile the ranking, despite minimally, although it is neither immediate nor direct in terms of data attribute. There are some countries, of course, developed countries oftentimes, which compiled and published this type of data. The sources of this kind, globally and nationally, were considered to yield the final ranking.

### **Introduction to Exhibit II in the Appendix V**

I consider the methodology is the kind of cornerstone to yield a creative knowledge and thus definitive in forming the better world views. Let me kindly illustrate one example about the college selection of prospective international students who explored an option to study in the university other than US institutions. His major was one subject within the humanity and social sciences, and considered a pertinent guide available. Nowadays, many national and international source of college guides are publicly available, but his times would have scanty resources that provided a view for the prospective students. Among them, the Gourman report is one of popular ranking source around

1990's. The current sources, such as QS and other international rankings would just follow that report around some years later in time sequence. The US news and world report, one other national source, would uniquely be in parallel with the report in terms of time span of reporting. Both began reporting around 1970's and 1980's while the current ranking sources were given a birth in the new millennium. The Gourman report was compiled and reported by Dr. Gourman, a counselor of Department of Education for the US government, and was published in the commercial version by the Princeton Review in 1997. My purpose here is twofold: (i) the qualitative method is one of best way to deeply look into the humans and universe; (ii) to provide the view of world best universities for the entering class around 1997 through 2003.

Since the rating of institutions in this report is based on the academic curriculum, quality of teaching, research performance and campus facilities, i.e., mostly on the university libraries, it may dominantly be of quantitative piece except for some portions. Nevertheless, we can find the strand of qualitative approach with the separate deals for a major respective region, such as US and International sections. As we see, the most determinative query, in terms of research method discourse, would be, "what the researcher actually likes to know?" This query can lead to an adequate selection of methods between the three holds in practice, say, quantitative, qualitative, and mixed. Now we have vastly been bent on the quantitative method in generating an international ranking, such as measure of faculty publications and citations or so. It would be very kind to put some qualitative description of specific institution or special advice for the selection of colleges or subjects. The quantitative generalization, however, has a weakness to remain merely within the general description of populace. Furthermore, the quantitative factors may massively be on the field of engineering or natural science as the international rating agency itself is submissive.

The fields are the kind of gold slot to generate the uniform scale of rating since the terms, versions and intelligence of those fields would be shared virtually at universal extent within the global professionals. From this attribute, the scale of measure can be uniform and persuasive for the stakeholders. This quality can no longer be held still strongly through the field of humanity and social science, in which the interest holders, such as prospective students in that area of study, would look for other more adequate guides or reference. Provided if the cultural, linguistic, and regional particulars are any more powerful factor that governs the area of such academics, their inquiry naturally turns on the qualitative nature (Huber & Whelan, 1999; Henry, 1989). The Gourman report can be seen responsive to this need, and provides a good point of reference for the qualitative understanding in terms of world view. It separated a region leading to the quality of acculturation, realistic view of world politics and discourse, and some of linguistic adaptation, though simply imperfect. As we note, the keys of qualitative studies may be illustrated with the kind of purposeful sampling in the stage of data collection or identification of patterns through the data analysis.

The Gourman report corroborates with this trait of qualitative inquiries if it is regional and grouped with an adequate details of presentation. Therefore, the studies of Dr. Gourman can be viewed as the mixed approach at exact terminology, and the blending and adaptation are a critical process to form a world view of his research findings. In this respect, we can see the kind of intrinsic from the current international rankings, so that they are not detailed through the faculty, master and doctorate and truncated into one unit, while the national rankings, particularly with the US sources, are gone otherwise. You can find the ranking of undergraduate institutions in the United States and that of international institutions below, which I blended to produce the global rankings, for example, between the Academia de Paris and Princeton University. The rest of blending and adapting can be elaborated with the concerned institutions or people who were the students in that period of time. Besides the particulars of humanity and social science, I also should be concerned of small colleges, such as Amherst, Oberlin, and others from the US institutions. This aspect is also pertinent, for example, the small or Grand Ecoles from France and special schools, such as Berkeley College or Julliard and conservatories for the European music schools. These schools are particularly the kind of exteriors that deserve a qualitative rating with the in-depth studies. Therefore, the USNWR will separate the ratings between the doctoral level universities and colleges. The special rating agency also may rate their field, for example, LA source for the world drama schools, and the National Jurist for the most affordable-library law schools (Hurteau, Houle, Mongiat, 2009).

The blending and adapting exemplified between the Academie de Paris and Princeton University have been based on several points of consideration that eventually came tied for the top place of world – for example, (i) they

are within a respective region that the liberal and social intelligence originated and now flourishes -- this quality was reflected in one case that the national research centers, such as CNRS, Chinese or Russian Academy, play a pivotal role leading their intelligence and understanding of the world so as to be rated in the SCImago (ii) Paris, the original state of modern university system traced back to early of 13<sup>th</sup> century, and Princeton university for the national identity of United States (iii) besides the Gourman ranking, the institutions contributed to the world civilization massively over the humanity and social science and via production of Nobelists (iv) I considered the balance of power, the terms of international politics, through the weighing of global intelligence on equal footing -- the view is the kind of art, as blended or adapted with uni/bi/multi-polarity, with the political scientists as if it would be with the qualitative researchers who rate the two distinct pans of intelligence, say, continental and US (National Academy of Science, 2000; Marty & Appleby, 1993; Koro-Ljungberg & Greckhamer, 2005).

The qualitative researcher also does a best practice to identify the pattern of data, which could be applied to the data analysis. For example, the universities or Ecoles in Paris generally would arise from the common level as we note in *Parisien* or numbered name of universities, and are expected of public concept concerning the pattern of academics, common interchange and uniform supervision of doctoral studies with the Sorbonne scholars, as well as a number of specialized Ecoles under the title of Academie de Paris (Armstrong, Gosling, Weinman, Marteau, 1997; Carter, 1993).<sup>7</sup> It is useful to consider one institution, CEDS Paris -- a small graduate oriented institution, hence, out of scope of global ranking (Connelly, 1990). The institution provides the form of title page of doctoral dissertation embossed with such logo, and often the doctoral supervisors are from the Paris universities.

Then the researcher could identify this pattern of academic phenomenon with the capturing name of institutions, Academie de Paris, when rating the institutions by means of blending and adapting, in which the expanded coverage might be feasible for the small institutions, especially in the case of doctoral studies as once shown in the Technical Report III (Boland, 1995; Eaves, 2001). I considered more salient importance from the undergraduate ranking for the US universities -- around 70 percent from the total -- since the essential role will be to educate the general level of intellectuals, and vast in student populace. That is in contrast while graduate ranking shall be made more projected (same percent from the total) in the international universities that often the source of international commonality or sharing -- especially if combined with the US universities -- most facile derives from the graduate level of education. The undergraduate education in this frame can be more adequately assumed as subject to the graduate level of student and faculty in the case of international universities. In this way, we finally yield the overall global ranking. Below do we see part of sources from the rankings.

I have made a brief exploration of qualitative method as well as the importance of blending and adapting to generate a deep knowledge of humans and universe. This type of approach could grow and be viewed as more adequate in this post-modern global village, and it would not be unwise that is to be encouraged of this way of research and awareness.

## Chapter 6

### Epilogue

On several momentum over professional career, I adventured to study further abroad and on-line connected to the US academia. That is currently pursued to complete a degree or already finished long years ago. My experience has been extensive and a kind of long arc to plunge into the YMCA mode of life welter with expenses and time consumption. I do not regret to spend time in that paradigm, since the graduate education is closely related with my main role and responsibility as a college professor. It requires to produce a thesis or dissertation and kind of incident that the college system recognizes to score for a tenure track professors, either for face or remuneration substantially. A theme taken with this piece and tried to be addressed with the information or my construction to refined result is not just ranking colleges, universities, or programs. A development from earlier effort through those of current major or secondary IREGs, ironically timely with my second decision to study in France around the beginning of new millennium, is fairly interesting and projected to reflect.

Given the informative age and global village on e-communication, many ranking businesses are doing a lapidary job for the students or their parents as well as investors while cultural minds might be dumbstruck or rarefied with their exposure. As saturated with the increase of ranking webs or minded professionals, their work might be not so ugly or affronting that people is now being peaceful or poised to accept as one of environmental ingredients. They seem no longer a netherworld for poorly rated institutions or programs and subjects, but also not so a high-toned gospel for graced results from the ranking agency. Given the splinters or sensitive analysis as accorded to each section of issues in this booklet, I may intrude a coyness of common readers, but can be agreed by some group of detailed identities. For example, the online colleges have a distinct character and process to educate . So truncated inclusion into a normal college ranking suited to the campus universities may subject them to be enthralled into established prestige without being given a due consideration. The principal mode of education for them and pattern of learning stand on its distinct environment for adult professionals and many devoted instructors other than dispassionate gurus or renowned published scholars. Their strength underlies this kind of distinct setting to educate, not a publication or citation as a measure of research impact. In case of doctoral research studies, instructors, other than guru in their field, could be more faithful and can establish a rapport with students as e-mates, which differs from a stiff, if face-to-face , or formalistic cycle of weekly or monthly presentation of doctoral chapters in campus universities . As distinctive , they are collaborators to produce a quality piece of dissertation with a mindfulness and focused engagement , which seldom would be frequent for established prestigious institutions.

My exploration absolutely had been limited and never exhaustive as you compare with the experiences of taking a journey through the ranking webs or other professional service. Nevertheless, it was aimed to show some paradigm of post-modern minds – hence in contrast with the kind of industrialization picture, for example, English factory on automated line of mass production, but akin to a pension old man at the corner of skyscrapers and shaded from industrialization or mass deals with the public. Given it being mainly connoted with economic injustice or social marginalization, my objective hoped to be shared with the audience of this piece is clear and straightforward that wish to leave a wow space for their esteem and motivation to achieve. The world of college or university ranking becomes more diverse and volatile while it seems to be reflexive on the social, political and economic implications. Once I adverted on a market paradigm as one factor to more fully understand the current global business around THE, QS and ARWU, CWUR and web rankings on second-hand data from the sources.

Once the minister of labor in UK government argued with the President of Republic of France in that the higher education can be more effective through English than French or in view of international rankings, which thrust a first impression implying to defend their cultural priority leading to national education economy. On the other hand, secondary sources may be affected by the wishes of funders or to a specific purpose of organization through their ranking scheme. That could not be so blameworthy if the assessment of colleges and universities is never amenable to any predetermined controlling factors, such as publications and citations as mainly used by the most influential rankers, and can be flexible to the focus or perspective of evaluators. For example, we are bragged with so many points of ranking provided by Princeton Review, such as top party school or least satisfaction form the students. The condition, however, is obvious that the data considered must be clearly presented to the users of ranking and applied consistently

through his schema. That is why we gladly accept the law school ranking of scholarly impact from prof. Sisk et al and admire THE college ranking as an authoritative source of reference. Given the educational rankings connected with a socio-political context of countries or regions, the audience needs to be wise to sense with outcomes and presentation. For example, the US rankings may imply of a picture associated with its history or regional politics no less significantly to poise three main part of civilizations, to say, east, Midwest and west. The global rankings also get to be same to reflect the world history or politics with a lagged consequence on time, but in this case, more crudely from the web of science or Scopus than national rankings.

The purpose of this small booklet is obvious that had been intended to respond with the rampant ranking manias or businesses for some level of enjoyable world with integrity and understanding. The current practice seems isolated or stiff without a common platform to share and communicate. The international cooperation through annual conference or presentation by IREGs may be placed regularly, and some principles, such as Berlin agreement, can work to provide a standard of conduct, if softly. Nevertheless, there is still irredeemable cleavage that disrupts the coherence to be versed or fitness to serve a human subject. As described above, the use of terms and requirements actually are delicate and nuanced if we go deeper. If you may argue that the area of interest would not be no sector of science, it would not be incorrect as we have no department or college discipline to deal with the ranking work of institutions or programs. Most close would be some interested actors within the business or education schools, but no actual curriculum or programs have thus far been installed in the college as far as I know. This piece of work certainly appears as a splinter of issues or ranking response as limited and less in scope. Nevertheless, I am proud to open a thread to develop the increasing culture of ranking practice globally in terms of epistemology and cultural or social psychology of human receivers. Most of all, this work arises from and entertains a convivial experience of my exchange with the academia and social exposure to ranked results. The kind of reflexivity as a teaching professional and post-modern being are a beginning and ending port of this work. Several pieces of ranking outcome certainly fall short except for those presented to cover the universities or graduate school as a whole.

Upon the NRC's classification (around 60 fields) or increasing trend of ranked subjects within major academic rankers (recent change from THE and ARWU), the ranking to follow up and update my earlier publication for graduate programs of law or research doctoral degree in law would be around one sixties or 1/120 (if half to JDs). If shabby in the manner of presentation, I just intend to evoke the commoners so as to be not only critical, but also receptive to enjoy and understand. I also hope that this report helps to boost the area of culture as a seminal work leading to philosophy of rankers, semantic or semiotic aspect of ranking practice. In view of current structure within the world of college and university rankings, it is simply phenomenological to identify three classes of interested actors, say, major providers including ARWU, THE, QS, USNW and so, as well as second-hand agents, such as Best Schools, Master-Finders, Graduate-hub, Value and etc, which may be finally through the academic group interested to monitor and discuss the topic (for example, you can see the number of researchers in Research-Gate or Academia.com with key words related with the topic). The academic group is less active to provide a specific ranking outcome although it is not absent. They are often philosophical or analytic to discuss the social implications of college ranking or the kind of leadership to monitor their departmental or college performance (ex) Brian Leiter, Sisk for law schools and *Labande* for economics department). I also might be one of researchers as the kind of such rare men.

As you see in the section of doctoral studies, I went to elaborate on the sensitivity of conceptual use to import a human agent into the perfection of humanity and liveliness. My response with an expanded graduate ranking beyond national domain also pursues a peaceful coexistence with other agencies to upgrade the information gleaned from major providers. Besides this conceptual austerity, we need to be aware that there exist a number of interesting humanity and social science within the world of CUR (College University Ranking). For example, we can feel like an imperial monument with a marvelous number of ranked CUs (colleges and universities) and four cadres of college people, say, bachelor, master, doctoral (in some cases five given higher doctorates, such as US SJD or British LLDs and DCL and so), and professorial, as compatible with a military rank, say, sergeant, lieutenant, major, and general. We may humanly feel of psychological affinity with the US Senate to do with the NRC or USNW graduate ranking, while US global rankings or other global ranking sources based on the journal subject can provoke the feel of world congress or House of Representatives for inclusion of global elites to boost their psychological persuasion. It is no less appropriate to develop the kind of psychology if the academicians

prefer to be idealistic or as Kantian and produce a number of works concerning global citizenship or moral standard as well as the possibility of world congress. An incrementalism and improvement to respond with the new area of human interests, society and culture can facilitate from a top-down delivery of rankers or authoritative freezing toward a psychologically and socially agreeable planet. The kind of effort can contribute to bring the idealistic end state, as proposed by Kant, to come into reality- if UN being a partially or paralyzed symbol - to transcend the power politics on center and periphery, isolation and discrimination. The international constitutionalism or world congress and global citizenship can be more expedited with an enhanced communication and sharing with enriched cultural element on CUR, which might be any more than top priority than other direction of efforts.

At national scale, we need to reinforce the cultural or public diplomacy beyond our traditional effort on international relations. Besides an issue of creating the departments or programs on CUR within the university, the participation of national actors into global education and CUR also can support this global priority for communicative democracy and integration through permeating the culture. The human framework will be improved or newly formulated to adapt with such changing culture. Given a conundrum and historical chaos within the inclusion and exclusion theme and world politics, it would be no less difficult and challenging. However, a glimpse of hope is not extinct by fortifying the channel of communication through CUR. In the rest of pages, I like to introduce some kind of initiatives and national system in United Kingdom surrounding the public diplomacy.

The term "public diplomacy"<sup>5</sup> is first coined by Nicholas J. Cull in his essay "'Public Diplomacy' Before Gullion: The Evolution of a Phrase." He expounded,

The earliest use of the phrase 'public diplomacy' to surface is actually not American at all but in a leader piece from the London Times in January 1856. It is used merely as a synonym for civility in a piece criticizing the posturing of President Franklin Pierce. As a distinguished scholar, Cull and Edmund Gullion, dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, would be received as the first to use the phrase in its modern meaning. As we can note from an early Murrow Center brochure provided with a convenient summary of Gullion's concept, the public diplomacy deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies while standard diplomacy might be described as the ways in which government leaders communicate with each other at the highest levels, the elite diplomacy we are all familiar with.

The concept covers dimensions of international relations beyond the traditional diplomacy that the public diplomacy can operate to exercise, for example, cultivation of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests; reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication among various different professionals including the process of intercultural communications. The main engineers are same with the traditional diplomacy as one country or multilateral organizations, but the subjects may be distinct to communicate with citizens in other societies. It cherishes a tool of dialogue to advance the foreign policy. Increasingly intercultural or borderless compression of global village requires a new way of diplomatic practice, in which the diplomatic state acts deliberately or inadvertently and through all pressing engagement officially and privately. In this aspect, it entails a two-way street with differing views as occasioned in the US context, where the private American individuals and organizations oppose the government views. Nonetheless, it is trending that most of global states exerted a diplomatic effort to stimulate the public diplomacy. As an original state to enliven this concept, the UK is illustrative as provided with well-organized system, such as Wilton Park and British council. Due to the support of various public and private participants, the foreign policy to subsidize the goal of public diplomacy also has been pursued in a consistent manner. The responsibility of public diplomacy ultimately falls within the ministry of foreign affairs, who acts to plan, implement and coordinate

---

<sup>5</sup> Wikipedia provides a definition of public diplomacy, "In international relations, public diplomacy or people's diplomacy, broadly speaking, is the communication with and dissemination of propaganda to the general public of foreign nations to establish a dialogue designed to inform and influence. As the international order has changed over the 20th century, so has the practice of public diplomacy. Its practitioners use a variety of instruments and methods ranging from personal contact and media interviews to the Internet and educational exchanges.



the determined prospect. The subsidiaries in line hierarchy within the ministry deals with a specific agenda and execute as a task force. Notable institutions to address the need of policy implementation include British council, BBC World Service and Wilton Park. The first two institutions are regularly funded by the government. They are empowered to play an independent role to the best practice of public diplomacy because of its insulation from stiff or ineffective line command. The institutions has achieved many accomplishments, for instance, financial support for foreign students, ESL, cultural exchange programs at private level and related governmental support.

Although a basic algorithm is led with the initiative of foreign ministry in UK, a number of specific agencies are currently acting to respond with a square aspect of national needs. The Wilton Park, one of two central actors in view of public diplomacy, is acting as a *Thinktank* for the ministry, and provide a solution for the world hottest issues through research projects or programs. Issues are covered widely and ways of approach are flexible and employs a diverse scale of perspective. An idea to create the institution was provoked by Winston Churchill with respect to foster German democracy at the end of World War II in 1944. The details were planned, which finally led to an inauguration of institution in January 1946. The name of institution originated from that of local community, Wilton Park Estate, the place of housing and converting 4,500 Germans. It acts vigorously to offer a world class forum as an executive agency for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). The agency, of course, has an extended global profile with over 50 events in UK and overseas, which leads to a focused discussion of each sectoral leaderships and face-to-face at one time gathering. The leadership encompasses all coverage of major social power groups, including politics, business, academia, diplomacy, civil society and mass media. Any contemporary issue in the world can be discussed in a manner consistent to boost the creative and constructive minds, which regularly concerns international security and economic growth, criminal justice, culture and sports and academics. This wide practice brings a brilliant accomplishment of institution beyond a typical stalemate or conflict on traditionalism. The institution, therefore, promotes a disclosure and public debate for the current crisis and challenge from increasing diversity and volatility within the global village. Since the participants are drawn from a wide pool of renowned international experts and scholars, the FCO can learn much and be given an opportunity to rethink and revise the diplomatic strategy.

In response with the ascending attention of public on higher education globally, the discussion forum was organized with the initiative of this institution. A recent event most stark to thrust the international community would be an international conference that was run from May 23 through 25 in 2014. The conference highlighted importance of higher education and its universalization so that it gathered a great deal of ideas and thoughts to meet that objective. It raised a concern to frame strategies and tactics as transparent and straightforward to boost the developing countries on this agenda. It made clear that the production of public values and wealth essentially intertwined with the universal and prosperous higher education. To that end, a network and partnership are necessary to pursue the goals with collaboration and common investment. In consideration of a worse condition within the low-key countries surrounding the corruption of government or disruption of higher education, provision of public education on the fairness and equity principle is any more foremost point of policy focus notwithstanding his or her wealth, race or ethnicity, gender, disability and other signifiers on possible discrimination. The conference also illuminated a symbiotic relationship between the higher education and quality job opportunity because it provides the knowledge and skills to breed caliber graduates necessary for the development of economy. On that stream of efforts, the lesson yielded from conference affirmed the need of open posture within the colleges and universities that gladly collaborate with the auditing authority, primarily because the institutions of higher education are responsible to improve to upgrade their quality of service. Given the long term consequence of public education, educational investors need to be aware that engineering through the stable and empowered societies should be their objective within the investment activities.

In comparison with the grand scale policy parameter of Wilton Park, British Council holds a focus on the micro scale and specific educational programs. The council advertises the information for prospective students eager to enter the British schools and universities. It would be a principal organ to achieve that end by way of dispensing with the research funds and providing the financial support for them. Its original goal had burgeoned with a goal of enhancing the global prestige of English as a foreign language. The spirit had been reinforced with various policy programs including the support of British student teaching English overseas as well as foreign learners. Through the efforts in this vein, its accomplishment has continued to prosper in view of advancement for the British art and culture.

A global evolution toward public communication or even democracy on that basis through the educational sector appears firmly to the common ground of understanding and sharing. It is even though we still feel sad of the mourning

or voice of litany from UNICEF to mobilize the funds for African starvation. It is still not uncertain if the educational concerns and commercial activities associated with them can rescue from terrorism to public peace within the international community. Nevertheless, we would not disagree that it considerably helps to promote the kind of idealistic end- state as corroborated with the thought of influential thinkers, such as distributive justice on global scale by John Rawls, Kantian dream for perpetual peace and international constitutionalism, as well as participatory or communicative concept of contemporary democracy by Habermas or British rationalists. Given the academic character with such theories or proposition on streamline, it may overlook the traditional concept concerning the politics on a national ground and to receive a realistic scene of democracy or as government-subjected. Hence, you may want to resort in other dimension as a matter of nature if you are illustrated with the bipolar or multipolar context of international politics affecting even the methodological approach in this booklet. Of course, the way of dealings generated obviously came through an analogy with the account of political discourse. By way of mixed approach to deal with the ranking puzzles, I may be creative to prosper a ranking paradigm which I believe to address the post-modern life style within global peers and interested people. That could help to refine a lingual, cultural, systemic or even religious aspect of variants through the process of evaluating a wide scope of institutions. It may, then, be the kind of qualitative touch beyond the number or some use as an exit from the currently massive reliance on publication or citation arguably most facile indicators to measure research impact. The globalization had been expedited over time as we chart many new born jurisdictions of WTO including the GATS and TRIPS in 1995 and rapidly revolutionized e-communication or related businesses. Bill Gates or Warren Buffet is no longer top admired richest person, but the owner of Amazon became for a first place on the list of world superrich. The fourth age of industrialization had surged as a top hyperbole to maintain their national economy and global fittest in many countries, particularly traditionally strategic states as Korea or upper middle rank of nations in economic terms. The issue of public education or important elements to promote our awareness through the service of ranking agency does not stay as idealistic only. On the other hand, it may be contended, in view of realistic projection, to breed their knowledge economy with a wide coverage of nationally related businesses, for example, ranking agency themselves, colleges and universities, broker institutions to advise and guide the prospective students, private tutoring of languages used to study abroad-notably ESL in Korea or globally and so. As one of global citizen, my path to explore the global edge of progress from the US graduate education around early of 1990's, European experience through three years of study at the dawn of new millennium, and current exchange with Walden-one of prominent on-line colleges in US ironically-seem to follow the changing world paradigm. The first case covers a temporal period with the rise of US, perhaps Clinton administration shortly after the Sinatra doctrine and known as a unitary pole of United States in terms of world politics. My second case overlaps the period of *deja vu* toward a bipolar or multipolar viewpoint of world politics within the scholarly circle on international relations. Obviously, the third case may emanate with a hottest projection of new mode of global market on cyber space or related development of technology. I am so humble if it likely mystifies my personal wake of history although it may have been to consume a tedious or boring time as a local professor in Korea or there would have been no other alternative but to choose my fate on such consequence. However, my experience may help to facilitate our shared understanding or hopefully leave a lesson for the modern lives or strategies of nations and institutions. On a hand on suggestion, it might be considered for Korea to institute a strategic pole to pursue the public diplomacy like Wilton Park in UK. On the other hand, colleges and universities may launch a special program to breed the working professional with a regular academic curriculum, which fosters more articulate or scientific ranking information.

**APPENDIX I: Top Quality Graduate School: US plus Find-Masters**

| Rank | Institution                                    |
|------|--|
| 1    | University of Wisconsin – Madison              |
| 2    | University of Michigan – Ann Arbor             |
| 2    | University of Oxford                           |
| 4    | Harvard University                             |
| 4    | Imperial College London                        |
| 6    | ETH Zurich                                     |
| 6    | Stanford University                            |
| 8    | MIT  |
| 8    | University College London                      |
| 10   | National University of Singapore               |
| 10   | University of California-Berkeley              |
| 12   | University of Minnesota-Twin Cities            |
| 12   | University of Toronto                          |
| 14   | London School of Economics                     |
| 14   | UCLA   |
| 16   | University of Edinburgh                        |
| 16   | University of Pennsylvania                     |
| 18   | Columbia University                            |
| 18   | Peking University                              |
| 20   | Tsinghua University                            |
| 20   | Yale University                                |
| 22   | Cornell University                             |
| 22   | University of Melbourne                        |
| 24   | University of British Columbia                 |
| 24   | University of Chicago                          |
| 26   | LMU Munich                                     |
| 26   | Princeton University                           |
| 28   | Johns Hopkins University                       |
| 28   | King's College London                          |
| 30   | École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne       |
| 30   | University of Washington- Seattle              |
| 32   | Karolinska Institute                           |
| 32   | University of Illinois –Urbana Champagne       |
| 34   | Ohio State University                          |
| 34   | University of Hong Kong                        |
| 36   | Duke University                                |
| 36   | Technical University Munich                    |
| 38   | McGill University                              |
| 38   | University of Texas – Austin                   |
| 40   | Hong Kong University of Science and Technology |
| 40   | Pennsylvania State University                  |
| 42   | University of Heidelberg                       |
| 42   | University of California – San Diego           |
| 44   | California Institute of Technology             |
| 44   | University of Tokyo                            |
| 46   | KU Leuven                                      |
| 46   | Northwestern University                        |
| 48   | Australian National University                 |

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 48 | University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill         |
| 50 | Nanyang Technological University Singapore         |
| 50 | New York University                                |
| 52 | University of Manchester                           |
| 52 | University of Pittsburg                            |
| 54 | Chinese University of Hong Kong                    |
| 54 | University of California – Davis                   |
| 56 | University of Amsterdam                            |
| 56 | University of Iowa – Iowa City                     |
| 58 | Kyoto University                                   |
| 58 | Michigan State University                          |
| 58 | Seoul National University                          |
| 61 | Fudan University                                   |
| 61 | University of Virginia – Charlotte                 |
| 63 | Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology |
| 63 | Purdue University – Lafayette                      |
| 65 | Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris                    |
| 65 | Georgia Institute of Technology                    |
| 67 | Rutgers University – New Brunswick                 |
| 67 | University of Bristol                              |
| 68 | Indiana University – Bloomington                   |
| 68 | University of New South Wales                      |
| 70 | University of Queensland                           |
| 70 | Washington University – Saint Louis                |
| 72 | Brown University                                   |
| 72 | City University of Hong Kong                       |
| 74 | University of Sydney                               |
| 74 | Vanderbilt University                              |
| 76 | Delft University of Technology                     |
| 76 | University of Rochester                            |
| 78 | Case Western Reserve University                    |
| 78 | Tokyo Institute of Technology                      |
| 80 | State University of New York –Buffalo              |
| 80 | University of Warwick                              |
| 82 | Ecole Polytechnique                                |
| 82 | University of Utah                                 |
| 84 | Monash University                                  |
| 84 | University of California – Irvine                  |
| 86 | Carnegie Mellon University                         |
| 86 | University of Copenhagen                           |
| 88 | Pierre & Marie Curie University – Paris 6          |
| 88 | University of Kansas                               |
| 90 | Rice University                                    |
| 90 | University Paris-Sud (Paris 11)                    |
| 92 | Rensselaer University (NY)                         |
| 92 | Utrecht University                                 |
| 94 | Brandeis University                                |
| 94 | University of Helsinki                             |
| 96 | Tulane University                                  |
| 96 | University of Zurich                               |
| 98 | University of Groningen                            |

|            |                          |
|------------|--------------------------|
| <b>98</b>  | University of Notre Dame |
| <b>100</b> | University of Geneva     |

## **APPENDIX II: Previous Global Ranking plus Find-Masters**

| <b>Rank</b> | <b>Institution</b>                    |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1           | Academie de Paris                     |
| 2           | California Institute of Technology    |
| 2           | University of Oxford                  |
| 4           | Stanford University                   |
| 4           | University of Cambridge               |
| 6           | Massachusetts Institute of Technology |
| 6           | University of Heidelberg              |
| 8           | Harvard University                    |
| 8           | U. of Montpellier I/II/III            |
| 10          | Princeton University                  |
| 10          | University of Munich                  |
| 12          | University of Chicago                 |
| 12          | University of Lyons                   |
| 14          | University of Pennsylvania            |
| 14          | University of Lillie                  |
| 16          | Yale University                       |
| 16          | University of Edinburg                |
| 18          | Johns Hopkins University              |
| 18          | University of Vienna                  |
| 20          | Columbia University                   |

\* As Table 8 (Appendix I) shows, the ranking above can be referenced for graduate study, especially in case that the institutions are international or on-line.

## **APPENDIX III: THE GRADUATE LAW DEGREE HOLDERS (transcribed from 2016 Pub.)**

### **[REINSTATEMENT OF THE APPENDIX A1, A6, A7 RANKINGS IN THE 2016 ARTICLE FOR THE LL.M/SJD GRADUATES 2016-2021]**

THIS IS TO REINSTATE THE RATING OF GRADUATE LAW PROGRAMS FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS DEVELOPED FROM THE BELOW ARTICLE "THE GRADUATE LAW DEGREE HOLDERS IN THE LEGAL EDUCATION MARKET: EVIDENCE FROM THE US, RANKINGS AND IMPLICATIONS." I HAD TRACKED THE DATA OVER YEARS AND CONFIRMED THAT NO SUBSEQUENT CHANGES TO IMPACT THE ORIGINAL RANKING WERE NOTICED. DESPITE SOME CHANGES ON THE DATA AT BELOW PRESENTED ARTICLE, THE RANKINGS CONTINUED TO STAND THROUGH THE YEARS AS ABOVE SPECIFIED. HENCEFORTH, WITH THE BEST OF KNOWLEDGE AND FIDELITY, THE APPENDIX A1, A6, A7 RANKINS IN THE ARTICLE ARE HEREBY REINSTATED FOR THE TERM 2016-2021 AS SUPPLEMENTED WITH THE ARTICLE.

**KIYOUNG KIM**  
**LEAD AUTHOR**  
**PROFESSOR OF LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY**

\* NOTE:

As presented in the second article of this book, I already published two articles dealing with the graduate programs in the law schools. The rankings of second article (2015), both of SJD or JSD (Ph.D in law) and Ph.D in international relations and diplomacy, are straightforward and short forms, which utilized the existing sources of Shapiro's ranking as well as Times Supplemental. Therefore, they were traced to follow up as you read in the Chapter II of this book. Hence, you can use the ranking on the basis of individual consulting as well as in consideration of their application credentials. Over the years of consulting practice, the results from the B-type students had been made firm that were fixed as final ranking of research doctoral study in both disciplines. The finding concerning the doctoral degrees in law specifically was included in the right upper corner of final ranking (Appendix A1) in the first article, "Kim, K., Borhanian, S., Chung, K. T., Park, Y. H., Lee, W. S., & Kim, J. H. (2016). The Graduate Law Degree Holders in the Legal Education Market: Evidence from the US, Rankings and Implications. *Beijing L. Rev.*, 7, 371."

The rankings in the first article (2016) require to examine an extensive investigation since the formula and methodology were designed to deal with the whole of parameters, to say, total of alumni APEs and their citations. However, it also can be feasible to rank on addition basis, which means to utilize the data of 2016 article and to follow up with new hires and their citations. In the approach of addition basis, you would bear with the already retired professors as APERs and their citation count would element with the final result of rating. The reduced investigation focused on new hires can alleviate the work of investigation and could curtail an unnecessary redundancy. The data could be accessed through the AALS (Association of American Law Schools) or AAUP (American Association of University Professors). A rationale for the addition basis not only lies with the economy of research operation, but also reflects the purpose of my ranking schema, i.e., all time and exhaustive since the modern system of scholarly citation network takes effect firmly around 1960's. The tradition and excellence rarely vanish even if the old influential scholars retire. Fortunately, the time paradigm coincides with the research design of 2016 articles, which will be added thereafter with the variables of new faculty. The investigation would begin sometime later, perhaps eight to ten years afterward because about five years need to mature if new hires of each law school promote to the status of associate professors or professors. Hence, I believe that you can safely consult the rankings of previous article for the students or other interested parties as hereby reinstated.

## 1. Introduction

Would a lawyer be the worst of neighbors? There is a traditional Korean proverb that says just that. Nevertheless, the profession is thought by some to be one of the oldest on earth, perhaps comparable in antiquity with priests, monks or emperors.<sup>6</sup> The practical use of laws also has had plenty of modern examples: we can ask for civil damages in case of an unfortunate traffic accident or seek recourse in case of an unexpected termination of pension benefits without due process of law. If aggrieved by unjust layoffs, we are entitled to fight for our rights with the assistance of a lawyer. Most importantly, many of us are beneficiaries of a democratically engendered legal process that helps to maintain our civilized lives with fundamental rights to protect life, limb and property being duly proclaimed and sustained by the polity or nation. The psychological benefits, alone, from a stable system of law, should be immeasurable if we take into consideration the resulting freedom from constant fear of non-predictable others. The kind of Hobbesian imagination of chaos if unchecked would be neither so radical nor remote if we see the turmoil of lawless communities in the movies or in a TV scene (Sherman & Cohn, 1989). The zombie ghosts from a contagious death -- as depicted in violent scenes in a recent Korean film, titled "*Train to Pusan*" -- would not be irrelevant to an imagination of real life lawlessness of humans living in an uncontrolled community. Since the current form of modern democracy and free market capitalism has been founded, legal professionals have turned out to be one of the most important societal groups to sustain it. Lawyers have always been politically involved and their job is the most probable to help lead the nations. While many lawyers have been inculcated with the values of revolutionary ideals, the greatest of them have even been destined to proclaim the vision of supreme national documents. Given that the law is helpful, essential and non-separable with our lives, we surely would like to know the people that make laws and who practice in the legal profession as well as generate the authority and prestige of law professionals (Glendon, Gordon & Osakwe, 1994; Pistor, Wellons & Sachs, 1999). This query is the recent theme we have pursued in this and other related projects.

In the background, the research was stimulated to address the trending diversity of global education, law disciplines and increasing attention for any ubiquitous terms of socio-cultural lives from the traditional economic or political world. This study purports to elucidate the grey area of legal education that generally had been neglected out of the main concern of legal educators. The transformation on professionalization or graduate level education also is correlated with the fast changing intensity and diversity of market demand or knowledge economy. The taught-based doctorate, what we know JDs in US law schools, perhaps would be unique, and the educational reform to crown the professionals with the graduate level degrees seemingly will continue to respond with the new market demand. Executive MBA or different deals with the Doctor of Education than the traditional PhD in education may be one example similar to JDs in law school. The sorting or ranking of graduate law degree holders, in this respect, can assist with a more refined understanding and could be a seminal work for the specters or interest holders of legal education market, such as graduate law students themselves, law teachers, investors and policy makers on this area (Korobkin, 1998). The traditional ranking source dealing with the law schools fortunately would be diverse or more specified given relatively popular attraction more than that of other departments. The National Jurist, Brian Leiter's and many other student guides actually produce to meet the kind of needs. The lacking, however, is serious about the graduate law degree holders. To address this gap, we have collected the data and evidence to assess the status and performance of LLMs and SJDs within the US law teaching market and analyzed them to rank the graduate law degree programs to appreciate the nature and quality of graduate law education. Thus, we also hope this research can be any pioneering role to motivate a further research. In Section 2, we will briefly state the problem leading to this research, the purpose of research, and how it was conducted. Though it is comprehensive in survey, the research has some limitations that are briefed in Section 3. In Section 4, we will present the analysis of data and implications of analyzed results. The short conclusion will be for Section 5.

## 2. Background of this Study

### 2-1 Problem

---

<sup>6</sup> It is sad, nevertheless, if the Empire of Law, as dreamed by R. Dworkin, is not perfect within the international community. The theme, "taking rights seriously," simply diverges from the political or public life although it evinced the epitome of legal academia.

Who is it that leads and shapes the important institutions and groups of people that are involved in the legal profession? More specifically to suit the purpose of this research purpose, who is in charge of developing their important frame of reference and the legal research that not only sustains the law schools, but also shapes legal education and the real world of law practice? One aspect of the answer to this question requires that we survey the educational background of law professors and legal practitioners and rate their performance (Laband, 1986; Masuoka, Natalie, Grofman & Feld, 2000; McCormick & Bernick, 1982; Schmidt & Chingos, 2007).<sup>7</sup> Interestingly within the US legal education system, we can find a dual class of degrees, JDs and graduate law ones, including those we denote as LLM, SJD or PhD in law. We have commonly in mind that legal education produces jurists, and law schools have long been held of import to the process of creating JDs, who would be deemed to be the majority in number and the foremost in providing professional legal services (Amsterdam, 1984; Wizner, 2001). The presumption is that the holders of this degree would become law professors, federal or state judges, state attorneys, and conduct the practice of law in large or medium size firms or in small firms or in the solo form. The expectation has been that graduate law classes would be for foreign lawyers and that they would return to their home countries to serve as international lawyers or professors. That has long been deemed as an undeniable given, but the precise reality has yet to be unraveled. Since the ranking of certain things in this inquiry would be an important beginning point to appreciate their nature and quality, we resolved to survey the reality of the above assumption to yield a ranking which hopefully could develop through further research concerning the students who attend graduate law schools and the outcome of their studies (Brian Leiter's 2016; Brophy, 2015; Fox, 2001; Sisk, Aggerbeck, Farris, McNevin & Pitener; 2007).

## 2-2 Purpose and Method

In this backdrop, the purpose of this research, firstly, is to assess the statistics and performance of LLMs, SJDs and PhD in laws within US law schools. Secondly, it will rank graduate law programs across those degrees to help the audience and interested players appreciate the nature and quality of the professionals with those training backgrounds. In order to address the purpose, we employed a quantitative method that investigated the whole of all of the US law school websites identified according to their ranking in US News and World Report (USWR).<sup>8</sup> Often quantitative researchers use public surveys with samples and scaled questionnaires (Creswell, 2013). However, such methodology would be less than relevant to the purpose since the theme does not pertain to the psychological or social perspectives. Therefore, the method of this study is similar to the national census for demographics, and this paper deals with the overall parameters relevant to our interest. Viewed globally, the research can be considered to deal with the most prominent cluster of relevant examples, namely, US law schools in some level of global prestige. The lead author of this paper had previously published the consulting-based SJD ranking (on fixed scale with 15/15/15/55), which was created from the Shapiro's and truly global since it was compiled on the basis of HeinOnline and ISI (Kim, Ju & Khatun, 2015). The investigation in this paper, on the other hand, is based on US law schools, but could be translated as global since the professionals are highly mobile to build their career paths. Also, the LLM program is a short year course, whose holders are more than widespread through the scope of the search and significantly internationalized. The SJD degree costs the students more years to complete – hence possibly less internationalized - but it still is not irrelevant since many holders are from the international context. The point is that the LLMs, SJDs or PhDs in law across the globe can be taken equal and analogous to those that pursue the law teaching market in the US in furtherance of their legal career. Therefore, the result can be read within the national context of US legal education on one hand, and could be viewed globally on the other or taken as the kind of ideal, “perfect market” conceived by Adam Smith.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Often the rankers tend to maintain a focus on the performance of faculty or credentials of admitted student, and other temporary variables. In comparison, the degree-based and all-time approach could be vested and durable in view of assessing and generating a ranking. Given the use of ranking sources, the approach can also have a strength to guide prospective students and investors, who essentially have to have a long-term view of years or decades in life management.

<sup>8</sup> One law school around a middle-low rank had a concise website without the educational background of professors and the website of another law school in Puerto Rico was defunct and could not be retrieved. Therefore, two law schools were unfeasible to investigate, which, however, is negligible in effect.

<sup>9</sup> According to our experience, the international rankers, such as QS, ARWU, THE, began their commitment on the assumption that the market of knowledge economy or university institution can be idealized and universal despite local contingencies-such as language or culture and other provincial impacts on the system. Hence the basic assumption is objectivized as supported by the perfect market thesis of Adam Smith. The idea may be



The investigation had been performed roughly two months this summer along with the assistance of research aides. 10 or 20 law school websites were analyzed on a daily basis except for a recess period of one week to allow for attending the international schedule arranged during the last days of July, 2016. Since our focus had been on the research impact of law professors, and to avoid undue expense in time and energy, the faculty labeled “clinical,” “visiting,” “adjunct” and “other classes” less relevant to the role of devoted research was discarded. Since their product and citations are often minimal, new law professors, labeled “lecturer” and “assistant professor” were also excluded out of the investigatory scope. Therefore, the data that captured the purpose was such that covered those, who were designated with the title of “associate professor of law,” “professor of law” and “emeritus (APEs).” We reasonably assumed that they would comprise the core of the people whose statistics would show the contemporary reality of professional research in the US law schools. As appears in the Table A1 of Appendix, the number of faculty per graduate had been made one component of four variables in the final ranking that the lecturers or assistant professors may be partly implicating. The assumption, however, is that the APEs could be proportional of new faculty recruitment. Contemporary raters popularly focus on the number of publications and citations, which often are converted into per capita productivity. This perspective basically guided the aura and direction of the paper’s methodology. Therefore, the ranking is essentially per capita, except for the total of citations, which, we believe, helps to see the whole picture of interest. This allows one to also use the number of faculty as an indication of publications given that the average law professor yielded 2-4 articles or books yearly.

### 3. Limitations of Study

This investigation relies upon the scholarly works available on the Internet depository at “scholar.google.com (SGC)” or publicly open records in accordance with the best available evidence principle. While the concept of research impact is equivalent to that of Shapiro and is based on citations or the recently coined term, citology, the standard of quality obviously came out different, and is admittedly rough and less than ideally defined. A strict dividing line to preserve the distinct identity of legal science held faithfully by Shapiro was necessarily sacrificed due to the counting of the whole of the available data (2000; 2012).<sup>10</sup> Therefore, the citations of staff papers, unpublished SSRN materials and monographs or even informal writings as well as products or citations by non-legal sources were included (Black & Caron, 2006). For similar reasons, Joseph Raz and John Finnis -- British educated legal scholars -- had far more counts than that of the Shapiro’s article published in 2000. Nevertheless, Shapiro’s care to comply with the “less than half rule” for identification of the “legal scholars” as opposed to those of “social science” has been maintained since merging the social and legal science data would likely produce an egregious result. Such confounded data would efface the identity of the legal education system as a whole (2000; 2012). For this reason, Max Weber, a doctorate in law from Germany - - if assumed as an emeritus professor in US law schools -- has been excluded although he should have been counted based on the HeinOnline or law-related ISI data.<sup>11</sup> This same rationale has been applied to exclude B.S. Santos, who is a graduate law from Yale and currently has a post at UW-Madison law school. In this respect, the refinement of the classification by Shapiro, distinguishing such categories as law review articles, legal books, text writers, non-legal materials or method to determine the standard of law journals had a very good and vital cause. Generally, his method is crucial to preserve the identity of law, legal science, and the law school system, and we have partly and to the extent

---

married with globalization or neo-liberalization as a virtue of global capitalism, which has been a principle for decades, but with the inevitable resistance, adjustment and transformation. Many may agree that the thesis of “glocalization (global + local)” is better received more realistic and practical for the citizens of global village. In terms of the educational aspect, the regional ranking of QS and use of regional reputation by USWR for the ranking of global universities could be seen as one kind of adjustment or transformation. The paper begins to accept the reasoning of this theoretical phenomenon, but with a care for the growing conservative ethos of nationalism or conservative ideals in the world of real politics. Practically – we mean by this to be in comparison with the ideal or statistical assumption as abovementioned – and results can be taken as global to see who is more cognizant or is more scholarly in the US law than others among global LLMS or research doctorates in law.

<sup>10</sup> This way of dealing, therefore, is close to the approach of Webometrics that ranks global scholars and institutions.

<sup>11</sup> In this interest, you also can refer to the system of ranking law journals, for example, the website of Washington and Lee University Law School.

possible adhered to it through the work – and deviated from it, however, only to broadly sketch the area of contemporary exposure (Priest, 1983).<sup>12</sup>

It was also not possible to strictly filter the citations to reduce the numbers counted multiple times although they were made by one article, and the counts were made to the maximum as possible.<sup>13</sup> The accuracy of counts, however, was attended to the best of human effort. Nevertheless, it was true that we faced some difficulties when the authors did not have an author page on Google Scholar.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, a margin of error in counts might be present, but it is believed that the efficacy of the final ranking will not be affected. Since there are a number of law-related graduate law degrees, identifying them is not so simple, and they could have variant titles and distinct characteristics according to their program purpose. The MLS degree of Yale or Illinois and MLI of Wisconsin<sup>15</sup> are examples of degrees that serve the need of legal study by scholars of other disciplinary backgrounds or whose principal purpose is more to teach the basics of US laws to prepare participants for the LLM or SJD courses than it is to deepen legal knowledge. With this understanding, we have discarded the professors of those degrees who do not also hold traditional master of law degrees. One problem is that although the MAs, MPhils and diplomas from British or European institutions may well be no less significant, their confirmation was impossible unless the information best available, such as a resume of each professor, specified the same as comparable to an LLM or traditional master of law degree. Those professors as vague or impossible to confirm degrees have, therefore, been foregone without consideration. On the other hand, LLM programs are becoming more specialized to focus on topics of public interest or other special legal merit. Most notably, the LLM in taxations offered by NYU impacted much on the jurisprudence, and the environmental law program by Vermont notwithstanding its degree-based impact had a stark presence as a successful example of specialization.<sup>16</sup>

In some cases, even the SJD program is trending toward specialization as we see in the Pace University's program for environmental law, Case Western's program for health law and University of Florida's SJD for taxation.<sup>17</sup> The graduate law programs are diverse according to the context of each school and display varying gross size differences. The size of each graduating class was confirmed to the best of available evidence, for which the LLM Guide of World Universities was an invaluable help. The chatting space of interested students as well as each school's website also served as a source of verification about the LLM class size. The final number has been adjusted by adding five to six SJD

---

<sup>12</sup> For example, if the applicability of "less than half rule" is ambiguous because of close number, the citation count had been adjusted to portray the most proximate result for the impact of legal education.

<sup>13</sup> Therefore, the way differs from any popular standard to count the cites, say, "one count per paper than one count to cites."

<sup>14</sup> As we see in the Webometrics ranking, the personal or institutional account and webpage in the SGC is highly implicating for the performance of global scholars. The scholars from other disciplines, often with more than citations, tend to manage it, which is significantly less relating with the law professors. This means that most of counts had been hand-on carried, which consumed much time for accuracy and verification. It also implies the hybrid nature of law school or legal education as professional, while the legal science stands at the centre of knowledge economy along the growing economy and technology advancement.

<sup>15</sup> It was recently changed of name for the LLM-Legal Institution, but considered to be excluded because of the same characteristics as before and, more importantly, no relevance to this study scope for the change's recentness.

<sup>16</sup> Years recently, Dean of Vermont law school had a chance to visit South Korea, and remarked very proudly that an eager student of environmental law had dropped his admission to the JD program of Yale law school, and decided to accept the offer of Vermont. It implies that the research quality of law schools can affect not only graduate law students, but also the JD applicants.

<sup>17</sup> The SJD students are very few and a few law schools had offered the program as the website from the Lewis and Clark introduced, "Very few U.S. law schools offer this degree, and very few people obtain it, as it is very rarely required even for law professorships in the United States. However, if you must obtain a Ph.D.-level degree in order to become a professor or for other professional reasons, this is the degree for you." For example, the SJD program in UCLA had only recently been created in the new millennium. Around the time when the lead author was a graduate law student in 1990's, about 30 law schools have offered the program, which were prominent with respect to the university as a whole and the prestige of law school. Now more than 50 law schools boast of their SJD program that became more popular through the Wake Forest, Pace and Case Western. Still the University of Texas-Austin had no ads about the SJD program. Therefore, the consulting- based ranking of SJD program in the Table A1 would not be available in some cases or sharp against the usual law school rankings.

admissions, which is reflected in the whole size of the graduate law programs. Information from students and other interested actors was thought to be crucial to know the nature and quality of these programs. Across the webpages of alumni chatrooms, the LLMs seemingly had many interests about the admission policy and statistics of the programs, while the SJDs emphasized their scholarly experience along with the general prestige of law schools.<sup>18</sup> Besides the generalized law school rankings, a more focused ranking on LLM program was available as assessed by the American Universities Admission Program (AUAP).<sup>19</sup> My previous study on the consulting based-ranking of SJD program also could be referenced in this respect (Kim, Ju & Khatun).

#### 4. Analysis and Implications

As appears in the Table A3, NYU and Georgetown had the most sizable LLM class while Yale, Lewis & Clark<sup>20</sup> and Wisconsin had the smallest classes. Most law schools received 50-80 students yearly. The table shows that the class size is relevant to the production of law faculty as seen in the larger numbers in Columbia, NYU and Georgetown. However, Harvard excelled those schools producing 256 law faculty, although it had roughly half of those schools in terms of the total number of graduates. Yale produced around 121 law professors despite relatively small class size. Yale topped this variable, which would possibly influence the focus of other schools on legal academia, for example, UW-Madison, which also scored well in this category, ranking 2<sup>nd</sup> behind Yale. In a sense, the graduates and programmatic designers of these schools are likely to have more of an interest and focus on the prospect of academia in terms of career management and student selection policies. These could be compared with Harvard, Columbia, NYU, and Georgetown, where the graduates also hope to be able to land lucrative high profile law jobs besides their prospects of securing a teaching position. In either case, the statistics generally show the high impact of two most prestigious law schools on the US jurisprudence and legal teaching market. As we see, contemporary jurisprudence has a temperament of one of three groups in terms of scholarly vogue and elaboration, what may be classified as the law and economics, technology and critical legal studies groups – which serve as a kind of legal monitors of modern capitalism. The first two relate to the essentials of current capitalist production and the third would be either an antithesis or a category of American realism to expose negative or problematic judicial boundedness. Richard Posner and Mark Lemley would be a notable example for the first two and Catherine Mackinnon, Richard Delgado or Kimberle Crenshaw could be in the third group. As an approach to determine the importance of research to a law school system, the legal philosophy that breeds a particular kind of scholar could be one factor that renders a school program like that of UW-Madison a possible modality to inspire other law schools.<sup>21</sup>

That the graduate laws of Oxford have fared better than those of Cambridge corroborates our general recognition of a distinction between the humanity or social science and natural science modalities. Two schools also serving as the destination of Rhode scholars and enjoying the top caliber US college graduates, who are often related with their JDs, are Harvard and Yale. The British scholars are no less pertinent to the findings of this study. Nevertheless, they highly tend to focus on the subject of international law or social philosophy, which contrasts somewhat with the US-based

---

<sup>18</sup> In terms of research methodology, the research on law subject or law schools as a whole (as referred to the QS/USWR ranking in Table A1) could be more easily quantifiable (for example, undergraduate GPAs or faculty and student ratio), which is less pertinent to assess the nature and quality of graduate laws, especially for the SJD programs. The qualitative inquiry could reveal more than the quantitative method in the case of graduate laws and, in a sense, can be the proper mode to understand them. In this respect, it may be a good practice that the quotes of previous SJD students are provided by Washington University in Saint Louis in its school webpage.

<sup>19</sup> The website provides, “As a service to the International Law community, AUAP establishes....this classification . . . based on the program quality, admissions rate, world image of the university, average starting salary and satisfaction index of international students. This classification is global and does not reflect the comparative strength of each program in a specific field of Law (such as the international civil law, taxation, Internet, intellectual property etc).”

<sup>20</sup> The class size of Lewis Clark had not been presented here, but the number of faculty representation as well as citations is shown in the Table A6.

<sup>21</sup> As stated, the school showed strength with a high ratio of faculty to the production of graduates. This is indebted to the LLMs of Hastie fellowship, that is despite the considerable number of non-Hastie LLMs and SJDs. Beyond the aspect of program design, its Hastie fellowship program can have a precious purpose if law envisages the protection of minorities and promotion of social justice.

national legal scholars, whose productivity and impact largely comes within the constitutional, criminal or criminal procedure, administrative and civil law field areas. The distinction also is a factor determining the research impact of British scholars, which had been represented by a relatively small number in Shapiro's aforementioned article. Interestingly, Cornell and UCLA turned out to have a small share of faculty and consequently produced less citations, although they are considered leading law schools. Ironically, however, the Cornell LLM program, for most of the relevant years, had been rated a top school globally ahead of Harvard and Yale by AUAP.<sup>22</sup> UCLA law school, with four law faculty, has also consistently been rated around 15<sup>th</sup> amongst 200 US law schools, which makes the result a little surprising. However, the LLM graduates of both law schools appear to prefer obtaining a prestigious law job with a high salary or alternatively to work as a law professor back home. A similar context of low research performance can be found in this study at USC and Washington University in Saint Louis. However, the latter boasts of a 97 percent success rate for students landing a job upon graduation according to its webpage. Vanderbilt, UNC, Boston College, University of Iowa, Ohio State, College of William and Mary, UC-Irvine, UC-Hastings and other similarly ranked law schools also are internationally and regionally prominent with respect to the employment of graduates, and are steady with respect to their educational mission, although not visible here in the paper.

Therefore, this study is indicative, but not an absolute measure of performance since the preferences of graduates are not all inclusive and performance measures can be diverse. For example, Ruthann Robson, a Berkeley LLM graduate and professor of CUNY, was acclaimed as a best law professor in the nation by Harvard, which is squarely within the expected role of a law professor. She also is a very competent researcher with approximately 1,000 citations, but could not be so acclaimed if purely measured on the basis of her numbers and research impact. Other high ranked law schools showed good numbers as indicated by Table A5 below. Berkeley yielded 22 law professors with 20,996 citations in total, and Stanford was represented by 34 law professors with 32,260 citations in total. The graduate law ranking in this study reported that Berkeley rounded out at 12<sup>th</sup> overall and Stanford at 6<sup>th</sup>. The reputation of subject ranking by USWR is more than significant in some cases, such as Temple law school's LLM in trial advocacy, which performed highly with the production of 58 law faculty and 11,194 citations. This is comparable with the LLM in taxations of NYU. Temple University is ranked around 50<sup>th</sup> in the USWR law school assessment, but found at 15<sup>th</sup> for the assessment of graduate law program in this study. This implies that the specialization effort of law schools can have much more say to produce the quality LLMs than a 3.5 undergraduate GPA of the JD entering class.

The law schools of Midwestern region or Committee of Institutional Cooperation (CIC) schools fared well, and Illinois, Michigan, Chicago and Wisconsin were rated highly. That appears because these law schools have a strong research tradition university-wide and inherent passion in the region for academics. As has been introduced, this study is an all-time conceptualization as a kind of semi-Shapiro's. However, the earliness of university education could have some impact, but seems not definitive since Stanford already yielded LLMs and JSDs in the 1960s, which is the temporal foundation of this study. The region usually would be considered a rust belt in terms of econo-political transformation, and its impact on academia would not be minimal.<sup>23</sup> But the prospect is not entirely gloomy if the academia would have a lagged impact as we see in the cases of Oxford and Cambridge at the global rating, which are the universities of past global hegemony.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, the promise of redevelopment for the rust belt is often a top list for the presidential election. Given that the econo-political impact on the culture, intelligence and public education is not definitive, the strategy of each university and law schools in the region would be a more probable factor to address the challenges that they face, especially with respect to the quality of graduate law programs. Actually, the current trend of US college graduates shows a likely preference for medical schools or PhDs than JDs, which threatens the traditional business of

---

<sup>22</sup> Supra note 14.

<sup>23</sup> For example, UW-Madison law school was ranked around 19<sup>th</sup> nationally in the early 1990's, but now 33<sup>rd</sup> in 2016 USWR.

<sup>24</sup> As stated, many interested intellectuals perceive that the international rating of global universities and other educational performance could be hyped in support of the globalization thesis. The thesis also supports the need of global capitalism for any market expansion. On the other hand, it is one lesson that the classic theory of liberal economy culminates with a monopoly in the end. In a sense, the matter also may be cultural and political beyond the economics or liberal market and besides the indicators used if the QS, THE, ARWU, US global and national rating produce a separate top - no monopoly in other words - for any check and balances as well as other implications. The knowledge economy, in this aspect, would have a multifaceted character, say, economic, social, cultural and even political as we see in the names of UNESCO and UN.

law school administrators. The highly ranked law schools may not be affected, but those of upper-middle and middle range are pressed for a new response against the diminished number of applicants. Low ranked law schools may have to redefine their prospects with a new rationalization and inputs of professors or investment. Hence, the strategic aspect of school administration cannot be minimized merely because of the public esteem and dignity of legal education. It is needless to mention its importance when considering the educational effect of graduate laws programs.

Another noteworthy finding is that Yale has recently created a law PhD program besides the traditional research doctorate, JSD, which perhaps is similar to the PhD in Asian law provided by the University of Washington.<sup>25</sup> The title of PhD is more significant if we examine the astronomical number of citations from the economics or biological PhDs and the journals of other discipline, such as Physical Letters or IEES. Three recent graduates of Yale law PhD successfully landed law professorships in the job market this year, which could be a variable in the future to test the mode of graduate law in terms of scholarly productivity (Brian Leiter's, 2106). Of course, they were not included in this study since its scope is restricted to professors with years of engagement. The University of Washington, however, does not seem to reap much in this regard despite the degree name since the PhDs majoring in Asian law are less significant than other areas of legal topic. However, we can find a good society of Asian law research in Lung-chu Chen who has been active in New York Law School with nearly 2,000 citations and collaborated with his eminent peers, such as McDougal. In this context, the general prestige also visibly matters to a graduate's profile. Other strong law schools produce good professors with the LLM and SJD background, such as Northwestern, George Washington, Duke and Boston Universities, and University of Texas-Austin. The general law school rankings can be said less relevant at the University of Florida, which is relatively low in the law school ranking and is represented with 26 professors, but is above the University of Chicago and University of Berkeley in this variable. Nevertheless, the citations of Florida are more than small with 2,121, which comes in some contrast with those of traditionally strong law schools.

We often assume that LLMs or SJDs are for foreign attorneys who wish to learn about US laws and related specialized subjects. The ads and websites of law schools for their graduate law programs also express a penchant for the attraction of foreign attorneys. Duke, for example, so introduced its graduate law program, which may possibly create a misunderstanding if it is presumed to be exclusively for foreign lawyers. However, the study found good results at Duke, and a considerable number of Duke LLMs native of the US currently work as law professors. The citations of Duke amounted to 5,272. Another interesting finding is that the LLMs of the US Military's Judge Advocate School of Law are represented more than some law schools with 13 law professors, but with a relatively small number of citations, totaling around 1,348. John Marshall law school, a relatively low ranked law school boasts approximately 10,000 citations, which is a significant number. This is due in no small part to one productive scholar, and shows an important relevance of the popular approach in library science entitled "most cited" legal scholars, law review articles, and "most cited" journals of other disciplines. Most LLMs and SJDs perform better or comparably with the JD professors without an LLM degree. Assuming that, on average, the citations of a normal professor range around 150-300, the numbers are comparable with the professors of other backgrounds, such as JDs without an LLM degree. The most notable dual degree form was found to be JD/PhDs as expected - though not presented in this study. The reason for this mix is indicated to be a preference of students for exposure to the different modes of study between the taught-based and research-based degrees, and seems to reflect on the interdisciplinary context of legal research. Another reason seems to lie in the convenience that the mix would be popular or even commercialized as a set in American graduate education, as we also see in the case of MD/PhDs.

As visible in Table A 2, LLM or SJD graduates are not negligible among the whole class of APEs. In proportionality with the number of graduates from both programs, say, JD's and graduate law, their share is not grossly disparate. This indicates that the law graduates consider the graduate law degree not mere ornamental, but a chance to deepen their legal knowledge as career legal educators (Cf. Sheldon & Krieger, 2007). Nevertheless, the vein of legal academia in the US is still steered and dominated by JD degree holders, who often are great scholars of basic legal subjects, such as the constitutional and criminal laws, criminal procedure, administrative laws, torts and contracts -- a kind of Napoleonic rubric of modern laws and obviously the first year courses of law schools.

<sup>25</sup> The two schools are unique in conferring the PhD in law degree in the United States although the dual degree in collaboration with other departments, e.g., JD/PhD, is not unusual in the business of law schools.

<sup>26</sup> This summer, Marc D. Falkoff, a professor of Northern Illinois law school visited South Korea and presented the theme of legal education in the US. He described the three years of law school as felt by the typical

<sup>26</sup> LLM. Study seems a significant entry point of scholarship because of its specialization, and SJD degree can be a strong stimulus to accelerate scholarly devotion in other cases.<sup>27</sup> Such specialized study also bears relevance to address the needs of a scholar on his or her interdisciplinary conceptualization of research themes, such as law and economics.<sup>28</sup> Added to these factors inherent in the graduate law study is the finding that about all LLM degree holders had experienced the basic legal education of US law schools, while some of SJDs have no US law degree, but only LLBs of foreign law department or law schools.<sup>29</sup>

The distribution of faculty and citations had been tabulated specifically according to the rank of law schools except for the Extra group, and within six categories.<sup>30</sup> As appears in the Table A5, it is manifest that the law faculty of the top percentile, about thirty law schools in this study, produced many more citations than those of other percentiles. The implication is that the scholarship of LLM or SJD professors can be affected by the law schools they serve. Another significant finding is the importance of leadership within the scholarly community and professional communication through law reviews, which as we see in Shapiro's most cited legal scholars and text writer categories, are strong factors to determine the research impact of LLMs and SJDs as a whole. This correlative accords with previous studies based on review of Shapiro's three articles. The numbers of "most cited" law review articles also come very close to being determinative in accounting for the whole of citations by the same authors. In other words, citations of one most cited law review article possibly can excel the whole number of other articles of respective author and well over that of other authors. The citations from "most cited scholars" can even be ten or over twenty thousands, and the citations of top percentile law schools account to three times higher than other percentile law schools. This never means that the whole range of investigation would be meaningless. Provided that 100 or 200 citations indicates a good performance for law professors, we can confidently assert that 500-1000 citations should be interpreted as leaving a remarkable footprint in US jurisprudence. These numbers are steady and good indicators of the product of many law professors who are unlisted in the Shapiro's "most cited" category.

A final ranking, as shown Table1, has been produced for the least number, averaged with the rank of four variables -- per capita production of law faculty (representations), whole citations, per capita citations of faculty, and per capita citations of graduates. In the Appendix, you can refer to the statistics in details. Besides the final ranking in Table A1, Table 2 informs the share of faculty with the graduate law degree holders among the total APEs and Table 3 shows each school's number of yearly graduates and faculty representation. Table A4 includes the analyzed result of four variables with rankings. The Table A5 presents the detailed distribution of each school. Table A6 shows the faculty and total citations of global law school or department that has more than five representations. The Table 7 has penetrated all the rest, whose schools at least have one faculty representation in the US law schools.

student essentially as follows, "The first year is all the time that is available to learn the essential law...the second year of law school feels like a time for students to collaborate with their professors, and the third year is a period of waiting for completion and their employment prospects. "This implies the importance for the first year courses

<sup>27</sup> Once the lead author ranked the consulting-based ranking of SJD programs with much emphasis on the degree-based research impact. The high percentage of 55, as compared with the relatively small percentage of general reputation including the rank of law school's law review, faculty productivity or citations and so, was due to the fact that the graduate law degree implicates a quasi-status and character for scholars and their time is important to prepare themselves as independent researchers. One other consideration is that the doctoral degree is more durable than that of bachelor or master through the course of life-time career years, and should be consistent with "the benefit principle" or the "cost allocated to the benefit" principle. In other words, degree-based impact as a quasi-scholar or professor could be more "weightily translated" as the ranking indicator while the faculty impact "directly reflects" the productivity of each professor.

<sup>28</sup> In this area, a palpable trend is notable with combined degree holders. The trend can penetrate professors of economics PhD and SJD, as is the case with L.A. Bechuk and his peers at University of Tel Aviv.

<sup>29</sup> One example would be S.J. Cho, a full time faculty at the Chicago and Kent, who is interestingly a scholar of Korean origin. He is a high impact scholar in this study with around 2,000 citations, and has an LLB (JD equivalent) and MPA degrees from Seoul National University (his home country) as well as SJD from Harvard. His case also could support the conclusion that his study and successful completion of SJD degree stimulated his scholarly path, if without a JD degree.

<sup>30</sup> The Extra category had been arranged with around 15 mostly modest and low rank of law schools. Within the fifth percentile are the University of Hawaii, University of Maryland, Indiana University-McKinley, and one of two Penn States were included, which could possibly range around third and four percentiles.

## 5. Conclusion

Through the investigation, we have learned that a knowledge economy (savoir-faire) has entwined law and the actions of people in society, and growingly became edged to explain their behavior and moral and professional conduct. The growth of economy and development of technology are two essential horns leading them bullishly to a more competitive model of growth needing a constant mode of new learning. The knowledge economy has an indispensable ingredient, which is the “research” applied to each respective field, and that serves as a base or ultimate background to claim its cause for being and the participants’ identities within the community. As we see, law schools sell their educational services by sporting their own libraries independent from the university-wide ones, and their compilations of books and articles compiled through heritage and history have been critical assets to reap their relatively high tuitions. On the other hand, legal education also should serve to increase practical knowledge and ability to practice law instantly upon the graduation (Edwards, 1992). This combination has been a critical dyad, long embedded on the minds and hearts of legal educators and system builders. Through this hybrid, law professors hope to find their meaning and purpose, and judges and state attorneys enjoy their social status along with their affordable salaries. It is well known that income differentials upon graduation are a component of the law school’s ranking and also are predetermined in part by it. We generally do not dispute that the success of the legal education and its system are highly dependent on the research and the database they produce (Savoy, 1970). This would be a reason why almost all law schools recruit graduates with the master of library science (the other MLS than master of legal studies) degree for their library professorship. Their depository shelves are enormously stacked with scholarly sources and materials of law practice, such as federal reporters and state or regional legal documents. The authority and social interactions of law personnel are ultimately based on the research or practice products between the duality of practice and scholarship (Kennedy, 1980), and it has been hitherto unknown whether the graduate laws could perform comparably with O. W. Holmes, one of most impactful legal scholar and judge or with Richard Posner, Mark A. Lemley and C.R. Sunstein, and other most productive researchers with non-graduate laws. Is the graduate law degree merely an ornament or a dead casket found within the profiles of century old professors? Despite their relatively minority status, their share of representation within the whole faculty, their mindedness and mode of intellectual activity (i.e., more independent and subjective-yet scientific, and tending toward seminar-based learning and semi-scholarly term papers), their impact on specialization and aspects of personal stimulation through the scholarly decades, all seems still to be meaningful to the extent they impact the vestiges of scholarship. We hope that the findings and implications of this paper can help us to appreciate the nature and purpose of graduate law programs and the phenomenon of the lives and products of people relating with them (Patton, 1990; Reynolds, 2015).

As we see, the limitation of research must have been present as short of dealings. Since the work is exploratory to the extent, there would be many issues that need to be discussed further or refined. I just expect that the subsequent research could make this work more than perfect and developed to suit with the goal of legal education as well as the need of legal teaching market. Although it is designed to import the ideas of degree based research impact as well as the graduates versus entering professors, for example, the publications had been curtailed under the assumption that they will be produced as proportional to the number of faculty. That could be improved with further research. One note through this research is that the international ranking scheme had recently grown to show the socio- culturally ubiquitous terms of global village. The education market likely turned to be same as MacDonald through the global corner of neighborhood or community. The higher education is the most important public avenue to breed the leadership in each field and each level. The educators or readers of ranking source need to be minded to take care than the traditional national context of public education and consciousness. That is, the scientific indicators or field data has any more meaning in the international dimension, which differs from the compassion, love or general public consciousness in the nation or community. For example, it now has to be odd to say that Harvard or Yale and its departments are plenary to other schools or departments with any more competitive data. That is or should be the contemporary understanding of social or community leadership, which should have differed from that before early of new millennium, the burgeoning years of new international ranking sources, such as QS and ARWU, now through the Times and USWR. Without this change of mind, we merely had done any trash of pernicious propaganda or quandary to harm the national leaders or prospective national elites in various fields of nation, such as politics, business and academic world, who, of course, often are highly educated. That is because the substantial effect of such international dealings could be made on the local context, not to

mention the globalization thesis. this aspect can be related with the increasing science minds of global public or open access movement of scholarly community as well as implications with the growing competition within the knowledge economy. The paper hopefully can contribute to this area of interest that we expect for the further research to complement with, critique or develop it.

## Appendix

### A1. The Final Ranking (Above 7 and more than 1,000 citations)<sup>31</sup>

| Graduate Law Ranking | Institutions                | Average Column (Rankings of four variables in the Table A 4 added) | US News/QS <sup>32</sup> | AUAP Global LLM Ranking | Consulting - Based Research Doctorate in law Ranking (15/15/15/55) <sup>33</sup> |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 1 <sup>34</sup> (1)  | Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison  | 12   | 33/51-150                |                         | 1  |
| 2 (2)                | Yale Univ.                  | 14   | 1/4                      | 12                      | 2  |
| 3 (3)                | Harvard Univ.               | 15   | 2/1                      | 5                       | 3  |
| 4                    | Univ. of Oxford             | 16   | NA/2-3                   |                         | 5  |
| 5 (4)                | Univ. of Michigan-Ann Arbor | 31   | 8/30-31                  |                         | Around 9   |
| 6 (5)                | Stanford Univ.              | 33   | 2/5-7                    |                         | Around 7   |
| 7 (6)                | Columbia Univ.              | 37   | 4/10-11                  | 4                       | 6  |
| 7 (6)                | Univ. of Virginia           | 37   | 8/39-100                 |                         | Around 9   |
| 9 (8)                | Univ. of Chicago            | 40   | 4/9-15                   | 11                      | 4  |
| 10                   | Univ. of Cambridge          | 42   | NA/2-3                   |                         | 6  |
| 10 (9)               | NYU                         | 42   | 6/5                      | 3                       | Around 8   |
| 12 (10)              | UC-Berkeley                 | 44   | 8/9-17                   |                         | Around 9   |
| 13 (11)              | Univ. of Illinois-UC        | 49   | 40/151-200               |                         | Around 21  |
| 14 (12)              | Georgetown                  | 52   | 14/17-27                 | 20                      | Around 12  |
| 15 (13)              | Temple Univ.                | 53   | 50/Behind                |                         | Around 31  |

<sup>31</sup> The superannuated professors active with an emeritus title or other professorship in scope almost entirely were graduate law students around 1960's through 1990's. In order to understand this study in terms of a graduate law guide for the student's choice and investment decision on each school's graduate program, the temporal relevance could span from 1990 through 2020. The year of 1990 through the current would be a burgeoning or flourishing and culminating period of scholarly activity for the professors in scope, and the year of 2020 would be around the time of their diminished impact. The data compiled in this paper should be read as set for the time of late July, 2016, meaning that they constantly are changing and augmenting.

<sup>32</sup> The QS ranking has been proximate through four years of its production (2013-2016) for a law subject ranking.

<sup>33</sup> You may refer to the ranking at DOI: [10.11648/j.ijip.20150304.11](https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijip.20150304.11).

<sup>34</sup> The rank is global while the rank in parenthesis is national.



|         |                          |    |                        |   |                             |
|---------|--------------------------|----|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
|         |                          |    | the Top 200s           |   |                             |
| 16 (14) | George Washington        | 61 | 25/51-150              |   | Around 15                   |
| 17 (15) | Northwestern             | 64 | 12/45-100              |   | Around 11                   |
| 18 (16) | Duke Univ.               | 70 | 11/39-47               | 8 | Around 10                   |
| 19 (17) | US Military              | 72 | NA/NA                  |   | Not Pertinent <sup>35</sup> |
| 20 (18) | Univ. Florida            | 78 | 48/101-200             |   | Around 32                   |
| 21 (19) | SMU (Southern Methodist) | 81 | 45/Behind the Top 200s |   | Around 22                   |
| 22 (20) | Univ. Washington         | 83 | 33/101-150             |   | Around 20                   |
| 23 (21) | Univ. Pennsylvania       | 85 | 7/24-29                | 2 | 6                           |
| 24 (22) | Univ. Texas-Austin       | 93 | 15/51-100              |   | Not Pertinent               |
| 25 (23) | Boston Univ.             | 94 | 20/51-100              | 7 | Not Pertinent               |

#### A2. Status Table I

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Total of APEs within the Law School   | Around 6,000   |
| Faculty with the Graduate Law Degrees | 1,371 (Excluding the U of London, Paris and the rest of law schools) |
| Ratio                                 | 0.2285   |

#### A3. Status Table II (Alphabetical Order/Above 7 and more than 1,000 citations)

| 25 Institutions   | Graduates Yearly | Faculty Representations<br>(=Number of faculty with the graduate law degree from each institution) |
|-------------------|------------------|--|
| Boston            | 100              | 9  |
| Columbia          | 218              | 125  |
| Duke              | 78               | 15   |
| Georgetown        | 456              | 168  |
| George Washington | 305              | 40   |
| Harvard           | 185              | 256  |
| NYU               | 445              | 230  |
| Northwestern      | 95               | 19   |

<sup>35</sup> "Not Pertinent" means that the school does not offer the SJD program in any official manner.

|               |     |     |
|---------------|-----|-----|
| SMU           | 30  | 7   |
| Stanford      | 85  | 34  |
| Temple        | 49  | 58  |
| UC-Berkeley   | 85  | 22  |
| U. Cambridge  | 159 | 31  |
| U. Chicago    | 85  | 13  |
| U. Florida    | 65  | 26  |
| U. Illinois   | 76  | 26  |
| U. Michigan   | 35  | 39  |
| U. Oxford     | 55  | 25  |
| U. Penn       | 123 | 11  |
| U. Texas      | 60  | 8   |
| U. Virginia   | 55  | 39  |
| U. Washington | 80  | 9   |
| U. Wisconsin  | 15  | 40  |
| US Military   | 20  | 13  |
| Yale          | 30  | 121 |

**A4. Analysis Table (Alphabetical Order/Above 7 and more than 1,000 citations)<sup>36</sup>**

| 25 Institutions   | Total Citations | Rep./Graduates | Citations/Rep. | Citations/Graduates |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Boston            | 1,267 (23)      | 0.09 (24)      | 140.77 (22)    | 12.67 (25)          |
| Columbia          | 60,338 (5)      | 0.57 (8)       | 482.70 (13)    | 276.77 (9)          |
| Duke              | 5,272 (18)      | 0.19 (18)      | 351.47 (16)    | 67.59 (18)          |
| Georgetown        | 48,134 (7)      | 0.37 (13)      | 286.51 (17)    | 105.56 (15)         |
| George Washington | 24,825 (12)     | 0.13 (21)      | 620.63 (11)    | 81.39 (17)          |
| Harvard           | 228,863 (1)     | 1.38 (3)       | 894.00 (7)     | 1237.10 (4)         |
| NYU               | 80,984 (4)      | 0.52 (9)       | 352.10 (15)    | 181.99 (14)         |
| Northwestern      | 8,080 (17)      | 0.2 (17)       | 425.26 (14)    | 85.05 (16)          |
| SMU               | 1,057 (24)      | 0.23 (16)      | 151 (21)       | 35.23 (20)          |

<sup>36</sup> The number in parenthesis indicates a rank among 25 institutions. The Table A4 includes four variables (total citation/per capita faculty production/per faculty citation/per graduate citation) to yield a final ranking in Table A1.

|                 |                    |                 |                 |             |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Stanford        | 32,<br>260 (9)     | 0.40<br>(11)    | 948.8<br>2 (6)  | 379.53 (7)  |
| Temple          | 11,<br>194<br>(16) | 1.18<br>(4)     | 193<br>(20)     | 228.45 (13) |
| UC-<br>Berkeley | 20,<br>996<br>(14) | 0.26<br>(15)    | 954.3<br>6 (5)  | 247.01 (10) |
| U.<br>Cambridge | 37,<br>057 (8)     | 0.19<br>(18)    | 1195.<br>38 (4) | 233.06 (12) |
| U.<br>Chicago   | 30,<br>398<br>(10) | 0.15<br>(20)    | 2338.<br>31 (2) | 357.62 (8)  |
| U.<br>Florida   | 2,1<br>21 (21)     | 0.40<br>(11)    | 81.58<br>(25)   | 32.63 (21)  |
| U.<br>Illinois  | 18,<br>317<br>(15) | 0.34<br>(14)    | 704.5<br>(9)    | 241.01 (11) |
| U.<br>Michigan  | 26,<br>238<br>(11) | 1.11<br>(5)     | 672.7<br>7 (10) | 749.66 (5)  |
| U.<br>Oxford    | 90,<br>219 (2)     | 0.45<br>(10)    | 3608.<br>76 (1) | 1640.35 (3) |
| U.<br>Penn      | 2,6<br>76 (19)     | 0.09<br>(24)    | 243.2<br>7 (19) | 21.76 (23)  |
| U.<br>Texas     | 1,0<br>55<br>(25)  | 0.13<br>(21)    | 131.8<br>8 (23) | 17.58 (24)  |
| U.<br>Virginia  | 22,<br>990<br>(13) | 0.71<br>(6)     | 589.4<br>9 (12) | 418 (6)     |
| U. WA           | 2,2<br>45 (20)     | 0.11<br>(23)    | 249.4<br>4 (18) | 28.06 (22)  |
| U.<br>Wisconsin | 52,<br>023 (6)     | 2.66<br>(2)     | 1300.<br>58 (3) | 3468.2 (1)  |
| US<br>Military  | 1,3<br>48 (22)     | 0<br>.65<br>(7) | 103.6<br>9 (24) | 67.4 (19)   |
| Yale            | 86,<br>667 (3)     | 4.03<br>(1)     | 716.2<br>6 (8)  | 2,888.9 (2) |

**A5. Distribution Chart of LLM/SJD/PhD in Law- Alphabetical Order and Above 8<sup>37</sup>**

| 24 Institutions <sup>38</sup> | Representations (APEs)/Citations |                   |           |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Boston University             |                                  | Faculty           | citations |
|                               | 1 <sup>st</sup>                  | LNI <sup>40</sup> | LNI       |

<sup>37</sup> The listing was made in alphabetical order of school name. “Most cited” below had not been made of order that does not indicate more counts or comparison with other schools. The names had been cursorily selected that just were illustrative to represent each school.

<sup>38</sup> Another institution for the final ranking is the Southern Methodist law school as listed in Table A6, and could help to complete top 25 in Table A1.

<sup>40</sup> LNI means “least in number or non-identifiable.”

|                       |                            |   |           |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------|
|                       | percentile <sup>39</sup>   |   |           |
|                       | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                       | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 2   | 828       |
|                       | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                       | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 6   | 394       |
|                       | Extra                      | 1   | 45        |
|                       | Total                      | 9   | 1,267     |
|                       | Most cited                 | Paul L. Caron   |           |
| Columbia University   |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                       | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 9   | 21,530    |
|                       | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 16  | 7,844     |
|                       | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 37  | 11,501    |
|                       | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 17  | 4,996     |
|                       | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 34  | 8,385     |
|                       | Extra                      | 12  | 6,082     |
|                       | Total                      | 125   | 60,338    |
|                       | Most cited                 | Robert. P. Merges; Lea Brilmayer; M.A. Drumbl; LeilaN. Sadat; |           |
| Duke University       |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                       | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 4   | 2,570     |
|                       | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 4   | 2,388     |
|                       | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 3   | 173       |
|                       | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 1   | 21        |
|                       | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 2   | LNI       |
|                       | Extra                      | 1   | 120       |
|                       | Total                      | 15  | 5,272     |
|                       | Most cited                 | R. Krotoszynski; H.W. Baade; J.A. Tanford                     |           |
| Georgetown University |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                       | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 31  | 9,319     |
|                       | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 25  | 15,005    |
|                       | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 36  | 10,086    |
|                       | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 19  | 3,645     |

<sup>39</sup> The column represents law schools that the graduate laws are now serving, and percentiles are accorded with the USWR ranking of law schools -- with a minor exception as mentioned and besides Extra.

|                              |                            |   |           |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------|
|                              | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 49  | 6,982     |
|                              | Extra                      | 8   | 3,097     |
|                              | Total                      | 168   | 48,134    |
|                              | Most cited                 | D.A. Harris; J.A. Barron; J.G. Hodge; J. Dunoff; N.R. Cahn; A. Camacho  |           |
| George Washington University |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                              | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 3   | 4,005     |
|                              | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 4   | 1,200     |
|                              | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 12  | 5,177     |
|                              | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 7   | 3,689     |
|                              | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 11  | 10,174    |
|                              | Extra                      | 3   | 580       |
|                              | Total                      | 40  | 24,825    |
|                              | Most cited                 | M. Cherif Bassiouni; Michael Blumm; J. B. Ruhl; S.L. Schooner   |           |
| Harvard University           |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                              | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 66  | 144,000   |
|                              | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 35  | 17,803    |
|                              | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 53  | 26,343    |
|                              | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 27  | 10,273    |
|                              | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 53  | 14,614    |
|                              | Extra                      | 22  | 15,830    |
|                              | Total                      | 256   | 228,863   |
|                              | Most cited                 | Robert Howse; L.A. Bechuk; Paul Robinson; H. P. Monaghan; M. J. Matsuda; M. Wyman; Lynn M. Lopucki; M.S. Moore; Richard W. Wright |           |
| New York University          |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                              | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 31  | 46,979    |
|                              | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 34  | 8,242     |
|                              | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 45  | 6,542     |
|                              | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 27  | 3,996     |
|                              | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 63  | 6,625     |
|                              | Extra                      | 30  | 8,600     |
|                              | Total                      | 230   | 80,984    |
|                              | Most cited                 | John C. Coffee; Peter H. Schuck; L.C. McClain; B.E.   |           |

|                                   |                            |   |           |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------|
|                                   |                            | Hernandez; Susan Daicoff  |           |
| Northwestern University           |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                                   | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 1   | 20        |
|                                   | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 1   | 50        |
|                                   | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 8   | 4,135     |
|                                   | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 1   | 1,430     |
|                                   | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 6   | 345       |
|                                   | Extra                      | 2   | 2,100     |
|                                   | Total                      | 19  | 8,080     |
|                                   | Most cited                 | V.P. Nanda; F. Teson; Lung-chu Chen                               |           |
| Stanford University               |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                                   | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 5   | 19,608    |
|                                   | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 7   | 3,631     |
|                                   | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 5   | 4,118     |
|                                   | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 3   | 2,170     |
|                                   | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 14  | 2,733     |
|                                   | Extra                      | LNI   |           |
|                                   | Total                      | 34  | 32,260    |
|                                   | Most cited                 | Neil W. Netanel; Robin West; Dan L. Burk; Ted Schneyer; F. Valdes |           |
| Temple University                 |                            | faculty   | Citations |
|                                   | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                                   | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 1   | 180       |
|                                   | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 13  | 3,375     |
|                                   | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 13  | 3,435     |
|                                   | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 25  | 3,314     |
|                                   | Extra                      | 6   | 890       |
|                                   | Total                      | 58  | 11,194    |
|                                   | Most cited                 | E.S. Podgor; R.K. Neumann; Llewellyn J. Gibbons                   |           |
| University of California-Berkeley |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                                   | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 9   | 17,325    |
|                                   | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 2   | 410       |
|                                   | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 4   | 911       |
|                                   | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 1   | 1,170     |
|                                   | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 5   | 1,175     |

|                         |                            |   |           |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------|
|                         | percentile                 |   |           |
|                         | Extra                      | 1   | 5         |
|                         | Total                      | 22  | 20,996    |
|                         | Most cited                 | P.C. Mavroidis; Ugo Mattei; Francesco Parisi; Gideon Parchomovsky; Ruthann Robson |           |
| University of Cambridge |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                         | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 7   | 28,049    |
|                         | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 6   | 3,268     |
|                         | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                         | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 1   | 60        |
|                         | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 10  | 1,813     |
|                         | Extra                      | 7   | 3,867     |
|                         | Total                      | 31  | 37,057    |
|                         | Most cited                 | J.H.H. Weiler; John H. Langbein; S.D. Murphy; Ralf Michaels; Kevin Outtersson     |           |
| University of Chicago   |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                         | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 3   | 27,300    |
|                         | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 4   | 2,406     |
|                         | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 1   | 250       |
|                         | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 2   | 393       |
|                         | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 3   | 49        |
|                         | Extra                      | LNI   | LNI       |
|                         | Total                      | 13  | 30,398    |
|                         | Most cited                 | Lawrence Friedman; G.P. Fletcher; W.H. Page                                       |           |
| University of Florida   |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                         | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                         | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                         | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 5   | 1,312     |
|                         | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 5   | 223       |
|                         | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 11  | 451       |
|                         | Extra                      | 5   | 135       |
|                         | Total                      | 26  | 2,121     |
|                         | Most cited                 | G.L. Germain;   |           |
| University of Illinois  |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                         | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 3   | 3,500     |
|                         | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 4   | 9,500     |

|                            |                            |   |           |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------|
|                            | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 3   | 1,820     |
|                            | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 7   | 1,391     |
|                            | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 7   | 1,816     |
|                            | Extra                      | 2   | 290       |
|                            | Total                      | 26  | 18,317    |
|                            | Most cited                 | Dan Dobbs; J. Norton Moore; R.P. Malloy   |           |
| University of Michigan     |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                            | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 10  | 16,225    |
|                            | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 8   | 4,102     |
|                            | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 6   | 1,680     |
|                            | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 4   | 1,649     |
|                            | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 6   | 1,222     |
|                            | Extra                      | 5   | 1,360     |
|                            | Total                      | 39  | 26,238    |
|                            | Most cited                 | R. E. Scott; Gerald Torres; D. Rendleman; Harold G. Maier; ZJB Plater                               |           |
| University of Oxford       |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                            | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 14  | 85,437    |
|                            | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                            | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 6   | 1,033     |
|                            | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                            | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 2   | 949       |
|                            | Extra                      | 3   | 2,800     |
|                            | Total                      | 25  | 90,219    |
|                            | Most cited                 | Joseph Raz; John Finnis; Jeremy Waldron; Benedict Kingsbury; Stephanos Bibas; MW Janis; RN Gardner; |           |
| University of Pennsylvania |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                            | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 1   | 120       |
|                            | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 2   | 216       |
|                            | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 2   | 40        |
|                            | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                            | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 2   | 1,980     |
|                            | Extra                      | 4   | 320       |



|                          |                            |   |           |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------|
|                          | Total                      | 11  | 2,676     |
|                          | Most cited                 | David Kairys  |           |
| University of Texas      |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                          | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 2   | 700       |
|                          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 1   | 63        |
|                          | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 2   | 83        |
|                          | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 3   | 209       |
|                          | Extra                      | LNI   | LNI       |
|                          | Total                      | 8   | 1,055     |
|                          | Most Cited                 | Dennis J. Hutchinson                                |           |
| University of Virginia   |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                          | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 5   | 5,602     |
|                          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 6   | 4,890     |
|                          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 6   | 3,342     |
|                          | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 6   | 872       |
|                          | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 11  | 1,746     |
|                          | Extra                      | 5   | 6,538     |
|                          | Total                      | 39  | 22,990    |
|                          | Most cited                 | C. Slobogin; J.J. Paust; S.D. Murphy; Edward Brunet |           |
| University of Washington |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                          | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 4   | 2,200     |
|                          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | LNI   | LNI       |
|                          | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 2   | LNI       |
|                          | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 3   | 45        |
|                          | Extra                      | LNI   | LNI       |
|                          | Total                      | 9   | 2,245     |
|                          | Most cited                 | John O Haley; Toshiko Takenaka                      |           |
| University of Wisconsin  |                            | Faculty   | Citations |
|                          | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 9   | 45,860    |
|                          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 1   | 680       |
|                          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 16  | 3,118     |
|                          | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 7   | 736       |
|                          | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 1   | 96        |

|                              |                            |  |           |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------|
|                              | percentile                 |  |           |
|                              | Extra                      | 6  | 1,533     |
|                              | Total                      | 40   | 52,023    |
|                              | Most cited                 | W. LaFave; Kimberle Crenshaw; Catherine Fisk; M. Goodwin; Jan G. Laitos                          |           |
| US Military (Judge Advocate) |                            | Faculty  | Citations |
|                              | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 1  | 150       |
|                              | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 2  | 600       |
|                              | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 3  | 165       |
|                              | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 1  | 53        |
|                              | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 6  | 380       |
|                              | Extra                      | LNI  | LNI       |
|                              | Total                      | 13   | 1,348     |
|                              | Most cited                 | E. Talbot Jensen; Eugene R. Milhizer   |           |
| Yale University              |                            | Faculty  | Citations |
|                              | 1 <sup>st</sup> percentile | 31   | 44,493    |
|                              | 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile | 15   | 3,194     |
|                              | 3 <sup>rd</sup> percentile | 20   | 2,531     |
|                              | 4 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 10   | 8,578     |
|                              | 5 <sup>th</sup> percentile | 32   | 18,699    |
|                              | Extra                      | 13   | 9,172     |
|                              | Total                      | 121  | 86,667    |
|                              | Most cited                 | W. Michael Reisman; Gideon Parchomovsky; L.L. Riskin; Chinkin Christine; Henry Manne; L Brickman |           |

**A6. Other Schools above 5 (Faculty/CitationsOnly)<sup>41</sup>**

|                          | Faculty | Citations |
|--------------------------|---------|-----------|
| University of London     | 31      | 26,042    |
| University of Paris      | 10      | 10,510    |
| John Marshall Law School | 6       | 9,140     |
| Lewis & Clark            | 5       | 1,402     |
| NIU-Ireland              | 5       | 456       |
| Pace U.                  | 6       | 1,200     |
| SMU                      | 7       | 1,057     |
| Tulane U.                | 6       | 59        |
| U. of Arkansas           | 5       | 650       |
| U. of Denver             | 5       | 677       |
| U. of Houston            | 7       | 277       |

<sup>41</sup>The most cited graduate law degree holders are M. Cherif Bassiouni for John Marshall Law School and George C. Thomas for the Washington University St. Louis.

|                         |   |       |
|-------------------------|---|-------|
| U. of Missouri          | 7 | 672   |
| Washington U. St. Louis | 5 | 2,830 |

● U. Paris and U. London had just been given the statistics that were excluded from the final ranking scheme since the information of status was not confirmed. The ranking would be around the mid-low (15<sup>th</sup> ~ 20<sup>th</sup>) if approximate and included.

#### A7. The Rest of Schools (Faculty Representation/Citations)

|                                    | Result (Nothing implicated with order)   |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Schools<br>(Faculty/<br>Citations) | UCLA (4/1,590) <sup>42</sup> ; Hebrew University (2/22,550); U. of Vienna (1/600); Emory University (5/30); Goethe U. (1/0); Belgrade U. (1/110); U. of Sydney (1/320); U. of Warwick (2/300); U. of Edinburgh (3/2,400); Cornell U. (2/320); U. of Utah (2/450); U. of Toronto (4/1,695); UDC law school (1/0); Queens U. (1/597); Hamburg U. (2/170); U. of Arizona (1/145); U. of Cologne (2/850); Free U. Brussels (2/485); Pontifical U. (2/134); U. of Dares Salaam (1/0); U. of Brescia (1/110); U. of Georgia (1/30); Penn State (1/0); McGill U. (4/936); U. of Buenos Aires (2/524); UC Hastings (1/2); U. of Geneva (1/1050); York U. (3/2,352); U. of Hong Kong (1/0); U. of Exeter (2/370); U. of Telsa (1/392); U. of Freiburg (1/250); St. Johns U. (1/0); U. of New Hampshire-Franklin Pierce (4/92); College William and Mary (1/20); Cardozo Law School (1/0); U. of Amsterdam (2/19,780); Charles U. Prague (3/688); U. of Alabama (1/0); Jean Maria Lyon (1/0); Katholiek U. (1/160); Brooklyn U. (1/15); U. of Warsaw (1/270); U. of Freiburg (1/800); U. of Konstanz (2/83); U. of Oslo (1/120); UBC (3/410); U. of Wayne State (5/1,319); American U. (3/620); U. of Notre Dame (4/435); Catholic U. (1/719); Antioch-Washington D.C. (1/398); U. of Complutense Madrid (1/0); U. of Delhi (1/300); Fudan U. (1/0); U. of Manitoba (1/6); U of Santa Clara (2/60); U. of Bonn (1/900); U. of Sheffield (1/390); U. of Malawi (1/390); Case Western Reserve U. (1/100); U. of Nottingham (2/1,183); U of Miami (2/0); U del Pais Vasco (1/2); Pontifical U.-Italy (1/21); Indiana U.-Bloomington (1/0); U. of Queensland (1/0); U. of Vermont (2/434); Widener U. (1/0); Golden Gate U. (2/73); Kiev State (1/159); Free U. of Amsterdam (1/1,159); SUNY-Buffalo (1/0); U. of Singapore (1/104); U. of Aberdeen (1/22); U. of Lagos (1/11); Ohio Northern U (1/0); St. Thomas U. (1/33); U. of Tubingen (1/1230); U. of San Francisco (2/117); U. of Iowa (1/344); U. of Connecticut (2/62); Boston College (1/0); U. of Heidelberg (1/900); U. of Wellington (1/100); Frankfurt U. (1/5,000); U. Augsburg (1/700); U. of Ljubljana (1/3,000); U. of Louvain (1/300); Liege U. (1/1,300); Leiden U (2/2,494); Gottingen U. (1/200); U. of Marburg (1/200); Marquette U. (1/0); Kiel U. (1/855); Louisiana State U. (1/133); Bremen U. (1/60); Loyola U. Chicago (1/40); Bristol U. (1/800); U. of Montreal (1/1,600); U. de Nantes (1/1,600) |

The degree origin not included thus far had been distributed across the universities of European states, such as Poland (1/490), Euro Institute (2/265), Germany (1/105), Spain (3/0), Italy (1/3,000), and some others in a minimal number. India (1/850) besides the Puerto Rico (2/0) also had a representation.

#### References

Amsterdam, A. G. (1984). Clinical Legal Education—A 21st Century Perspective. *Journal of Legal Education*, 34(4), 612-618.

Black, Bernard S. and Caron, Paul L., Ranking Law Schools: Using SSRN to Measure Scholarly Performance. *Indiana Law Journal* (Symposium on The Next Generation of Law School Rankings), Vol. 81, 2006; U of Texas law, Law and Econ Research Paper No. 52; U of Cincinnati Public Law Research Paper No. 05-14. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=784764>.

Brian Leiter's Law School Report. Retrieved Aug. 26, 2016 from <http://leiterlawschool.typepad.com/>.

Brophy, Alfred L., Ranking Law Schools, 2015: Student Aptitude, Employment Outcome, and Law Review Citations (June 28, 2015). UNC Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2624399. Available at SSRN:

<sup>42</sup> The most cited graduate law degree holder is W.J. Aceves for UCLA.

<http://ssrn.com/abstract=2624399> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2624399>.

- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Fox, M. F. (2001). Women, science, and academia Graduate Education and Careers. *Gender & Society*, 15(5), 654-666.
- Edwards, H. T. (1992). The growing disjunction between legal education and the legal profession. *Michigan Law Review*, 91(1), 34-78.
- Glendon, M. A., Gordon, M. W., & Osakwe, C. (1994). *Comparative Legal Tradition: Text, Materials, and Cases on the Civil and Common Law Traditions, with Special Reference to French, German, English, and European Law*. West.
- Kennedy, D. (1982). Legal education and the reproduction of hierarchy. *Journal of Legal Education*, 32(4), 591-615.
- Kiyoung Kim, Hyun-Meong Ju, Marium Khatun. A Teacher and Researcher: A Scratch on the Science Community and Meaning of Evaluation with the Research Doctoral Programs Ranking. *International Journal of Philosophy*. Vol.3, No. 4, 2015, pp. 34-46. doi: 10.11648/j.ijp.20150304.11.
- Korobkin, R. B. (1998). In praise of law school rankings: Solutions to coordination and collective action problems. *Texas Law Review*, 77.
- Laband, David N. 1986. "A Ranking of the Top U.S. Economics Departments by Research Productivity of Graduates." *Journal of Economic Education* 17 ~1!: 70-6.
- Masuoka, Natalie, Bernard Grofman, and Scott L. Feld. 2007. "The Production and Placement of Political Science Ph.D.s, 1902-2000." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40~April: 361-6.
- McCormick, James M., and E. Lee Bernick. 1982. "Graduate Training and Productivity: A Look at Who Publishes." *Journal of Politics* 44 ~1!: 212-27.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. SAGE Publications, inc.
- Pistor, K., Wellons, P. A., & Sachs, J. (1999). *The Role of Law and Legal Institutions in Asian Economic Development, 1960-1995*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Priest, G. L. (1983). Social Science Theory and Legal Education: The Law School as University. *Journal of Legal Education*, 33(3), 437-441.
- 2012 Rankings of American LL.M/Master of Law. Retrieved August, 26, 2016 from <http://www.auap.com/llm.html>.
- Reynolds, P. D. (2015). *Primer in Theory Construction: An A&B Classics Edition*. Routledge.
- Savoy, P. N. (1970). Toward a new politics of legal education. *The Yale Law Journal*, 79(3), 444-504.
- Shapiro, F. R. (2000). Most-Cited Legal Scholars, The. *J. Legal Stud.*, 29, 409.
- Shapiro, F. R., & Pearse, M. (2012). The most-cited law review articles of all time. *Michigan Law Review*, 1483-1520.
- Sheldon, K. M., & Krieger, L. S. (2007). Understanding the negative effects of legal education on law students: A longitudinal test of self-determination theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(6), 883-897.
- Sherman, L. W., & Cohn, E. G. (1989). The impact of research on legal policy: The Minneapolis domestic violence experiment. *Law and Society Review*, 117-144.
- Schmidt, B. M., & Chingos, M. M. (2007). Ranking doctoral programs by placement: A new method. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 40(03), 523-529.
- Sisk, Gregory C. and Aggerbeck, Valerie and Farris, Nick and McNevin, Megan and Pitner, Maria, Scholarly Impact of Law School Faculties in 2015: Updating the Leiter Score Ranking for the Top Third (2015). 12 University of St. Thomas Law Journal 100 (2015); U of St. Thomas (Minnesota) Legal Studies Research Paper No. 15-12. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2642056> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2642056>.
- Wizner, S. (2001). Law School Clinic: Legal Education in the Interests of Justice, The. *Fordham L. Rev.*, 70, 1929.

**[REINSTATEMENT OF THE RANKINGS IN THE EXHIBIT II AND EXHIBIT IV FOR THE GRADUATES 2015-2021]**

THIS IS TO REINSTATE THE RATING OF SJD OR JSD (PH.D IN LAW) PROGRAM FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS DEVELOPED FROM THE BELOW ARTICLE "A TEACHER AND RESEARCHER: A SCRATCH ON THE SCIENCE COMMUNITY AND MEANING OF EVALUATION WITH THE RESEARCH DOCTORAL PRGRAMS." I HAD TRACKED THE DATA OVER YEARS AND CONFIRMED THAT NO SUBSEQUENT CHANGES TO IMPACT THE ORIGINAL RANKING WERE NOTICED. DESPITE SOME CHANGES ON THE DATA AT BELOW PRESENTED ARTICLE, THE RANKINGS CONTINUED TO STAND THROUGH THE YEARS AS ABOVE SPECIFIED. HENCEFORTH, WITH THE BEST OF KNOWLEDGE AND FIDELITY, THE RANKINGS OF THE EXHBIT II AND EXHBIT IV IN THE ARTICLE ARE HEREBY REINSTATED FOR THE TERM 2015-2001 AS SUPPLEMENTED WITH THE ARTICLE.

**KIYOUNG KIM  
LEAD AUTHOR  
PROFESSOR OF LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY**

**[REINSTATEMENT OF THE RANKINS IN THE EXHIBIT III AND EXHIBIT V FOR THE GRADUATES 2015-2021]**

THIS IS TO REINSTATE THE RATING OF PH.D PROGRAM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND DIPLOMACY FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS DEVELOPED FROM THE BELOW ARTICLE "A TEACHER AND RESEARCHER: A SCRATCH ON THE SCIENCE COMMUNITY AND MEANING OF EVALUATION WITH THE RESEARCH DOCTORAL PRGRAMS." I HAD TRACKED THE DATA OVER YEARS AND CONFIRMED THAT NO SUBSEQUENT CHANGES TO IMPACT THE ORIGINAL RANKING WERE NOTICED. DESPITE SOME CHANGES ON THE DATA AT BELOW PRESENTED ARTICLE, THE RANKING CONTINUED TO STAND THROUGH THE YEARS AS ABOVE SPECIFIED. HENCEFORTH, WITH THE BEST OF KNOWLEDGE AND FIDELITY, THE RANKINGS OF THE EXHBIT III AND EXHBIT V IN THE ARTICLE ARE HEREBY REINSTATED FOR THE TERM 2015-2021 AS SUPPLEMENTED WITH THE ARTICLE.

**KIYOUNG KIM  
LEAD AUTHOR  
PROFESSOR OF LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY**

## **APPENDIX IV: RESEARCH DOCTORAL PROGRAMS RANKING (transcribed from 2015 Pub.)**

### **A Teacher and Researcher: A Scratch on the Science Community and Meaning of Evaluation with the Consulting Illustration on the Research Program Rankings**

#### **1. On the Research Method**

One can ponder on the act or attitude, “why we research?” There would be a plenty of response. Somebody may say the organization he manages recently received a funded project on the poll of coming election to the profits of his survey firm. Others would admit, “He now prepares his credentials of tenure review in which the research performance and scholarly activities are crucial component for final decision.” Some others would introduce his clinic for consulting and program evaluation dealing with a particular conditions or specific purpose of in-depth situation. The graduate students should do it to complete his degree requirement (Kim-2, 2015). On the common attribute of whole of these cases, we see that they treat them a body in pursuit of some dimension on intelligent curiosity. They are driven to strike that agonistic into the kind of rational order. The subjective and objective conundrum involving the quantitative and qualitative studies partly relates with this backdrop (Patton, 2002; Saldaña, 2011). The body, mind, and spirit—such trilemma in the view of classic philosopher-- also has pertinence in terms of understanding the methodological debate. It is, for this reason, a threshold question to ask, “What do we like to know if we begin our research?” It is also in this context that the researcher himself is most determinative as someone like a seaman on the steering key of how to design a research plan and what method he chooses. As Patton guides, the status of researchers is one factor to choose among the traditional triad --quantitative, qualitative, mixed-- that the graduate students need to consider the supervisors of competence and auspice in progressing his dissertation work (2002). Nevertheless, the nature of inquiry and attribute of topic -- most importantly the “curiosity of researcher to know what”-- would preferably govern a selection from methods.

In the cross-section of different methods, there are a scope of points or views already debated on the trait, strengths and weakness. Even a contention is well noted in which each side could be skeptical of other way of knowledge in terms of the scientific force to vindicate on phenomenon or occurrence. I have some thought rather intuitively. As we see in the science citation index, most researchers work on natural or engineering science. The medical science had flourished and perhaps continues or will continue to prosper, which perhaps could be captured under the umbrella term of natural science. The two most leading journal titles, “Nature” and “Science,” are not irrelevant with this present status. The methods on social science, neighborly with the humanity, would actually be less sizable or organized—at least pluralistic in conception of researchers—enabling to stand on different approach to resolve the curiosity and to expel the thirst of our sensory agnosticism (Hunt & Colander, 2015). The reality of UFO is some of most popular thirst whether it actually exists or the aliens of other universe would live like us. We never undertake – or at least dislike -- the survey method in resolving such thirst which is perhaps because the survey method is received so as not to completely solve the question. This example thrusts several implications (i) the natural science or its method would be most accurate and convincing as we often agree (ii) the quantitative method is related with political or social context of knowledge which we could share with possible imperfection (iii) there are a wider scope of knowledge province actually blurring the traditional notion of method proponents.

#### **2. An Excuse for Qualitative Studies**

While we acknowledge the principal service of research is to compile the data basis and scientific knowledge, the evidence often is alleged a key strand to support the research work which point has been intensely argued by the quantitative circle (Laureate Education, 2010e). It is seemingly undeniable that the qualitative truths are some taste of literature or novel-like understanding of exterior world, which, however, differs from its systemic analysis of interview result and the kind of coding system with the aids of computerized program. Given the literature can possibly satisfy the curiosity of, and thirst for the deep humanity, it could stand alone on the utility as university department, but would be made a borderline case with the social science because of evidence. We normally would not expect an evidence for the novel writers. With a similar thought of dealings, the history and literature researchers would often be more descriptive and autocratic than evidence-reliant or without the quantitative information—but comparative in cases-- except for the sensitive issue of controversies. The setting of literature or novel writers would provide a useful comparison that brings our think-point around the strands of research method, such as fact, belief and knowledge. The literature and novel often would not be a fact -- of course with exceptions-that lacks the quality as science or social science (Gardner, Lawn, Ridi, Schakel, 2012). It also can be seen as separated from the normal understanding of knowledge if it is not fact- based. Generally we could not draw upon that source to form our belief system although we

may get hallucinated with a fantastic love scene of *Gone with the Wind* or ego forming of juveniles with the mighty Robocop in the cinema. Nevertheless, the human agent affected from the literature and cinema personally will experience or share the same intelligent process with the reality—in some deep dimension of his ego. It could be a fact, belief and knowledge—of course in his subjective dimension—to be utilized to determine his personality lifetime. As one fusion of our notions, we may illustrate the case of “science fiction” which is a popular source of Hollywood cinema. It combines the scientific backdrop with our imaginary story which shows the current intellectual taste of people.

Around these examples, perhaps extreme as bootstrapped with the methodology of social science (Hunt & Colander, 2015), we can imply a relativity and balance apart from any absolutism on methodological query (i) the scientific truths are constructive in concept and explains a part of human dimension besides the society—most immediate object to be investigated (ii) both methods probably are not definite, but instrumental to provide a professional platform for the social scientists. Given the imperfection around statistical assumption or bias of in-depth inquiry, we consider it nearest to the truth earned from the natural science, and we would be dormant to stress the use of natural knowledge for the better picture of scientific living. Nevertheless, it is surprising that EU and US, most advanced countries of science, do not agree on the impact of hormone-growing cows and meat on human body. It is one of medical issue, but had been disputed in the shoes of WTO laws-- perhaps pivotally related with the evaluation of desired human condition—the kind of social standard and professional belief. In *Wyeth v. Levine*, the use and labeling of gangrene injected with Phenergan, an anti-nausea drug made by Wyeth Pharmaceuticals, were debated that the social standard to provide a warning would differ varying with the locale and people—even the pharmacy or medical experts themselves for the extent of public interchange. This illustrates that even the absolute truths of natural science would turn to become relative in the force of persuasion given its application into the social and human dimension. The scientific truths have a meaning only when we can be constructive with the compromise and common assumption. It is a part of human dimension as we see them left with other working professionals or researchers, who make the people knowledgeable or create a belief system as in the case of literature or history students and judicial bench tasked with the comparative examination of documents and prior cases in relevance (Laureate Education, 2010e). I am not sure, nevertheless, if the history and judicial science can have a class as qualitative studies whatsoever. In this stream of understanding, we may also illustrate the psycho-therapy or analysis as a broach within the qualitative method. After all, however, we would be unwise if to miss emphasizing the thought process and general attitude embedded within the traditional two methods on social science. The attitudes “symbolize the community of social science as us” and allow the platform as a social scientist in the society. It needs no further mention that the training on this method is any more important for the research students and interested professionals.

### **3. A Comparative Thought on Two Methods**

One stigmatic focus on the methodological reflection can come contrasted between the number and story as Patton guides (2012). He also illustrated historic figures often held greatest in the world history, in which Marx on English factory, Darwin on Galapagos tortoise, Jung on dream and so, would be composed into the understanding of humanity and society (2012). The number is generally conceived as most accurate and certain that we even need not cite the greatness of *Pythagoras*. This probably would be a most element that the quantitative researchers could convince himself his intelligent process to prove his research question (Creswell, 2009). On the while, the qualitative researchers would focus directly on the human agent to unearth truths (2009). This leads to a comparative difference on the aura and propensity of research work.

First, the quantitative studies stretched outwardly -- hence more societal -- while the qualitative studies tend to project into the human agent, what is a determined component of society and end meaning of social science research.

Second, the scope of research coverage possibly could have a different characteristic between the average and selected class.

Third, as aforementioned, the quantitative investigation could bring a consequence that it would be more easily adaptive with the political and social context of research issue. This does not necessarily mean that the wider exposure always is guaranteed of quantitative studies because, for example, the media may intervene for the issue of African poverty or *Sepp Blatter* with the bribed FTO leaders in 2015—a good source of qualitative research-- more in focus leading to public awareness. Any popular research findings would not only stem from the quantitative investigation, but from the qualitative inquiry.

Fourth, the strengths of each method depends on the nature of topics and research design—hence, case by case basis to select for most effective research outcome. For example, the deep investigation of Supreme Court justices on his or her propensity could be more properly framed with a qualitative approach utilizing in-depth interviews and documentary examination with his timeline of significant decisions. The behavior and living mode of “aboriginal tribes”

could be delved more convincingly in ground theory and long observations than scaled survey inquiry since they would often not be susceptible of usual generalization from “original countries,” what we say of Europeans (Creswell, 2013).

Fifth, the difference in major tone of each method would explain its use that the quantitative studies would serve the test of existing theory while the qualitative researchers employ the method to develop into a theory building as we read in the article on negative leadership.

Sixth, both methods can share an eventual destination as we often encounter in the abstract of journal articles and key terms. The qualitative researchers seem to have a more trait in affinity with this style of presentation—i.e., abstract and key terms, since he primarily works on his key thesis and with a long indulgence or observation as illustrated in Patton’s historic scientists. In this phase, we may note the importance of lead author on the articles and linguistic differences in terms of the implications of scientific study. In this dimension, the qualitative methods could be convoluted more than quantitative one, but also could be a solution for any meaningful deals with the difficult process of coding or word magic in the research operation. As the terms of art are uttered to ascribe the work of Supreme Court justices, the qualitative researchers would be stuck on the key words and seek to supplement for the abnegation or reluctance in the interview process.

#### **4. A Focus on Qualitative Inquiry from Patton**

Given the distinction between two major traditions, the qualitative studies would be exposed to several tips for effective research operation (Patton, 2002). First, the qualitative researchers have to be more minded and focused, “how illuminate the meanings.” Second they need to study how things work as we see the evaluation of program. *Michael Scriven* gave an insight, “evaluation is the process of determining the merit, worth and value of things, and evaluation are the products of that process.” Third, capturing stories to understand people’s perspective and experiences has to constantly be minded which characterizes the qualitative studies qualitative. As Patterson cited from *Rukeyser and Gottschall*, the ending point would be a universe and human beyond the politics, “the universe is made of stories, not atoms,” and “stories make us human (p.7, 2002).” Of course, this is not to say the qualitative studies are totally irrelevant with the politics and social activism. Fourth, it is no fullest merely to take a part of system, but the qualitative studies are required to elucidate how systems function and their consequences for people’s lives. Fifth, the context has a central importance than numerical order that the qualitative researchers investigate how and why it matters. Sixth, as the kind of toppling, the qualitative researchers take an extra process or final touch so as to identify the unanticipated consequences (2002). This is the point that we admit an imperfection of social science research and honestly open the question for the future consideration. The attitude of federal government in their work process also underlies same element, for example, “niggardly but expansive on regulating the FCC authority by Congress” or waits to see on “deference rule” for the net neutrality policy by Supreme Court in the NCTA decision (*National Cable & Telecommunications Association et al. v. Brand X Internet Services et al.*, 2005). This attitude is progressive and incremental on the kind Darwinian beliefs. Seventh, the qualitative researchers make a case comparison to discover important patterns and themes, which emanates a same feel in terms of judicial analysis of precedents in the creation of judge-made law.

#### **5. Reflections**

These days I had time on my video lecture conducted in English. Since we teach in Korea, the Korean language is the most popular and natural medium of instruction. The Korean Open Course Ware is the public program managed by the government support foundation, which provides lectures of Nobel Laureate, members of the Korean Academy, university professors and lecturers. It collected over thousands of public lecture and scholarly articles at the public availability. It is the kind of Korean MOOK, the concept toward the universalized public education without a barrier. A small number of lectures are available at non-Korean language and subsidized from the foreign source, such as Indiana University and UC Santa Barbara. Some of Korean professors contributed his or her English lectures, one of whom is myself. The lecture was originally recorded with less than sound that embarrassed me about its disservice for the audience. I have not known if it could be cured. My wife readily helped that we could buy an amplifier from the computer store. It then could be audited in normal sound that we had an unusual time to listen the English-based lecture. It perhaps would be impressive if a mid-aged madam usually does not encounter the lecture of professors, even seldom with that of spoken English. Now it is the time of her precious comment, “It likely sounds your English.” I originally had expected to hear “It seems likely from native speaker” or “it is less proficient to allow a guess if the speaker is foreign-educated other than English speaking countries.” Her response was unique, but I soon realized in the context of weekly course objective.

The qualitative researchers are often described as subject oriented and put an emphasis on human’s whole story as a component of universe. It is projected and enduring, a part of deep dimension less frivolous nor rectifiable comparatively than the assumption of research sample of quantitative researchers (Kim-1, 2015). Simply, we maybe



less waked when we reply for the five scale of surveys. We would be more certain and affected deeply with the gunman incidents involved with narrative studies or ethnographic research. We generally ascribe as “intact cultural group” when we begin with our qualitative design of research. We perhaps speak “intact” to describe “unstudied or unearthed.” Ironically, “intact” seems more adequate to describe the subjects of quantitative studies if received in usual use. The participants of quantitative studies would truly be intact as if we respond with the Walden survey of class evaluation at the end of quarter, election poll or public survey about the policy aftermath upon the occurrence of *Sewol* ferry tragedy of Korea last year. The in-depth investigation of victims’ family and close friends concerning the essence of *Sewol* incident would undertake a different quality of research (May & Malcolm, 1996). In this case, the scope of participants would not be intact, but deeply affected, many of whom suffer from trauma and embarrassment. Some of them would feel like better to commit a suicide, but also truly intact if they are not studied. It seems the kind of equivalent with the gun shooting problem in US settings.

We often tell that the victims of this kind would be our neighbors and precious components of society. We often have a focus if the qualitative research has a worth of study more frequently than those of quantitative approach (Laureate Education, 2010e). Of course, professionally speaking, it may be contested in the competitive process of NSF grants or other funding institutions. My point is that they are not only neighbors of sharing, but also reveal the kind of intellectual destination that we are said to be truly intellectual. I have once introduced my studies on Korean constitutional court, and we know the modern focus of European philosophical curiosity, such as post-modernism, existentialism and so on. Creswell also illustrated the intellectual stream from Husserl through Heidegger, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty as to relate with the phenomenological research (2013). The modern being may be extant under the circumstances of affectation that the risk society from Ulrich Beck is not the story of others. We Korean people had long been affected to have a judiciary of advanced modality, and 1987 Korean reform of constitution had truly been momentous. The focus group or ethnographical scope would be less general nor normalized given its intensity on Korea, but thankfully was considered a worth of study. Without a deep awareness of affected people and sharing, the research scheme may eventually go futile (May, Malcolm, 1996).

The context above sketched can be summarized (i) in-depths dimension of truths (ii) affectation, rapport or sharing (iii) intellectual standard as pertinent to understanding the status of qualitative studies. In terms of sharing and intellectual standard, one note needs to remark on the current transformation of e-age that the rapid growth of on-line journals would be illustrative. For example, India or Chinese based on-line journals likely become rampant to create their own circle of professional communication beyond the traditionally indexed journals. The open access movement for professional sharing on articles and books is another trend as notable. KOCW is one of example now in service for the public.

Let me return to the first example to reflect on the philosophy of disciplines—perhaps – and basis of qualitative method. As known, Creswell perceived that, in terms of qualitative method or phenomenological studies, the subjective and objective dichotomy prevailed over the enlightenment age as a intellectual basis would be less adequate to understand the humans and universe, say, the kind of society on which we often elaborate if setting aside the inside space of *Space-shuttle or Moon Explorers* (2013). Plainly we can retrospect how the work of geography department, one of social science disciplines and adjacent with anthropology, would have an interest and we come to realize that their concerns are not merely a work of cartography or description of physical trait between the urban and rural areas. The element of human is common across the disciplines of social science although the assumption of human is made a little different between two methods (Creswell, 2009; Patton, 2002). In the qualitative studies, the assumption would be thicker, particular and dimensional that may be ascribable to the Greek paradigm, say, whole of being, but more prototypical than social. This may be used as a basis of skepticism from the quantitative circle of adherents. The qualitative researchers may counter if the essence of humans could be so abstract and neutral between the subject and object. For them, the exterior world, perhaps object for the subjects, is likely consumable to the life and humanity. The object is theirs as affected and less separable, perhaps said less cool, but heated. A journal writing in the previous lesson would have a focus on this aspect. One other factor could be related with the medical facts of human element, who would be aged, infirm and eventually die. The phenomenological studies would have a service for the discipline of nursing science, public health and education (Dahnke & Dreher, 2010). In this aspect, we may see if the practical reality of humans would be more persuasive with the interviews and lengthy observations than computer aided marking of public survey.

The instant utterance of my wife is very interesting to disappoint my expectation. It was “your English” than general comment. The object and subject are immersed in this case as the qualitative focus would highlight. The comment also survive many potential Korean English speaking persons, perhaps herself, who should speak English in this highly

globalized community. The comment entails “sharing of English” and “affectation” as a Korean foreign. It showed a “deep engagement” since we had time for twenty minutes in listening. Most importantly, the object and subject were not coolly separated that “immersed me and general context of English-based lecture.” My expected comment would go otherwise to make me stand among the two objects --lectures of native speaker, English lecture generally, and one subject -- myself. In her comment, no objective scale can intervene about proficiency or native manner of lecture, but merely one man of existentialism. Her comment eventually made me laugh, but it seems to locate the attribute of qualitative research, and the kind of philosophical understanding. The qualitative research is surely to be attested to by multivocal discourse.

## **6. About the Program Evaluation**

In the strategic changing process, the managers or leaders wish to know how they go or what programs are implemented in a satisfactory or unsatisfactory manner (Merriam, 1998). This would be important to assess the wake of progress, the present status of organizations or programs, as well as to explore any plan to improve them. The concept of evaluation recently turned to be highly attended in the face of increasing complexities of human, organizational or public performance. The concept may begin with a class evaluation of instructors at colleges and universities, rating of assembly or congressmen, evaluation or rating of countries and firms for their credit and so on. The work on evaluation, most powerfully organized into the work frame of program evaluation, is seen, in my view, to be most proximate with the intrinsic and attribute of teaching and researching. It likely is the culmination of methodological theory and concerns that was applied to the community. Hence, my focus turns on the program evaluation and their role of student counseling or consulting for the further study within the college and graduate programs

The philosophy and frameworks are crucial in studying the social science since the researcher is an agent, not a discoverer, who is neither absolutely intact nor prototypical and innate to approach, interpret, analyze, constructive and should be consistent and integral through the end of research (Patton, 2002). He himself is one of social constituents, and learned being (Hayes, Barnes-Holmes, Roche, 2001). Two points are remarked (i) the issue of philosophy and frameworks generally influence or govern, in many senses, not only part of research -- such as literature review and headfirst discussion on the independent section of philosophical assumptions or interpretive frameworks -- but the whole of research process, say, data collection, analysis, discussion and suggestions (ii) the philosophy as a lens for the scholarly taste would not only be variable objectively, but also possibly change subjectively with the career development of individual researcher (iii) the claims of grounded theory research would take a researcher more seriously that generally desires of him as one active participant and that is expected of no bias or predisposition from the standing mainstream of knowledge (Creswell, 2013).

For example, we can consider the first point relating with the data collection. The feminist or disability researchers may prefer a photo or audiovisual materials to make their assertion more concrete. The pragmatist may prefer the case study to solve a practical solution for the bounded system. The post-positivism user will be more oriented to the documentary examination, for example, as related with the legal research, than other approach of data collection since the elements would be reductionistic, logical, empirical, cause and effect-oriented and deterministic on a priori theories. On the second aspect, I may illustrate between the juridical scientists and jurists. Within the system of law school, the doctoral degree on juridical science is a highest degree that the JD degree holders will study after his graduation. We say, therefore, a graduate or research degree in law for the students who study within those programs -- LL.M and SJD -- other than JD program, often called as law school. Both degree holders conduct a legal research. The frameworks or philosophy may keenly be related each other on one hand since they treat the law or legal subject commonly, but little differs from other aspect. The statistical data and interdisciplinary perspectives are more demanded of such higher degree, and the style of research product may apparently be discriminating in cases. The diverse lens can be employed and encouraged to employ by the supervisors, ironically normally professors with the JD degree. A later development of law faculty in his career path may breed them to be interdisciplinary and diverse in terms of scholarly lens, but vastly unlikely in reality, which implies that the LL.M and SJD are principally a foreign purported degree by teaching the basic of American concept of law, expecting the art and science intelligence than professional education as comingled with the basic legal knowledge, and finally seeing them to become a professor in their home countries. In other cases, the growth of scholarly career would often allow a wider and open or interdisciplinary perspective in dealing with the philosophies and interpretive frameworks (Gardner, 2011). I may further be on the LL.M/SJD and PhD (International relations and diplomacy) studies with an illustration concerned of program evaluation and consulting of prospective students. In this case, two theories can be referred as most adequate lens to research, which of course works as a basis of evaluation and consultation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Mertens, 2009; Phillips & Burbules, 2000). One article is very pertinent with my scheme that I summarized the perspective of author to guide on the work of my illustration. As I

said, I also remind that these two qualities -- evaluation and consultation -- are intrinsic for their work, i.e., teaching and researching (Kincheloe, 1991).

First, the transformative framework seems to inform his research that he charted vast data over period and was enthusiastic to argue on the inseparable relationships between the psychotherapeutic research and practice. This perspective often focuses on the marginalized individuals or groups rather than imposing structural laws and theories. Although the clinicians may not be such discrete group within the circle of clinical psychology, it was taken to be challenged by the author from the mainstream of knowledge since their belief, value and knowledge are highly individualized or particular. In the introduction, it seems conceded, "as a practitioner myself, it occurred to me that perhaps one of the reasons psychotherapy research is often ambiguous and inconclusive is that it was trying to model itself on the quantitative investigatory paradigms of the physical sciences (1996)." In this framework, the basic tenet is that knowledge is not neutral and it reflects the power and social relationships within society. This lens seems to highly influence the author's attitude through the article standing between the subjective knowledge on therapeutic practice and quantification-oriented general knowledge from the therapeutic research. For example, he introduced his methodology, "The use of my own personal and professional experience as client, teacher and supervisor of psychotherapists as locus of exploration... (1996)."

Second, the author partly employed the post-modernist frame as explicit in his statement, "to explore a postmodern qualitative research methodology, context and content which was grounded in a moral universe where issues of values, ethics .... (Clarkson, 1996)." According to Thomas, the postmodernist are "armchair radicals" who focus on changing ways of thinking than calling for action based on these changes (Creswell, 2013). This can make as distinct from the transformative framework where the latter goes far enough in advocating action to help individuals. This aspect of frame is fairly penetrating through the article, but eclectic by relating the effect and utility through the theory, supervision and practice. This is so even while he placed the heart of study with the felicitous phrase, the therapeutic relationships—the focus for the case under investigation in the instance. He also seems to be influenced from the post modern way of thinking, as we read in the Discourse analysis, "First, there was the thorough exploration of the diversity of meaning, the different contradictory ways of speaking that govern what we do (Clarkson, 1996)." He also was expressly iterative of his position, by commenting, "I would submit that this study has not only been post-modern in the diversity and particularities of its components drawing from a multiplicity...." His main suggestion on the enduring and reinforced ties between the research and practice had been stressed in a sense of diversity within the universe. In his belief, the client is a major source of new or confirmable knowledge "Learning with the client in such a way introduces a praxis of the recovery of knowledge which is surely at the very heart of the therapeutic endeavor itself(1996)."

## **7. Evaluation or Consultation and Research Methodology**

We generally, however, do not include all of those rating or evaluation activities in the strict sense of evaluation. Evaluation, in a meaningful term, needs to be systematic in the least, but often is treated as scientifically by using a criteria governed by a set of standards, hence, closely entwined with the three methods, i.e., quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods (Creswell, J.W., 2009). Therefore, when we talk about evaluation, its quality tends to be scientific and generally exhaustive about the subject's merit, and the aim, objectives, results of program are considered to ascertain and assess. It could help a decision making, enable reflection, and identify a future change (Laureate Education, Inc., 2008). In practice, we can see two forms of evaluation which are formative and assumptive. The formative evaluation precedes the programs, events or organizations to develop the concept or proposal. The assumptive one primarily takes place to draw lessons upon the completion of project or implementation of programs. What, then, is the main purpose of an evaluation or program evaluation? As Marthe said, the purpose can be defined in view of the systemic process to "determine the quality of a program by formulating a judgment" (Hurteau, Houle & Mongiat, 2009; Patton, 1980).). The essences of evaluation in its definition would be (i) structured interpretation, (ii) giving of meaning, (iii) comparison with the original objectives, and (iv) understanding of what and how. A more fine definition may further include these; (i) systematic, rigorous, and meticulous application of scientific methods, (ii) resource-intensive process (such as, evaluate expertise, labor, time, and a sizable budget) (iii) critical assessment and objective manner (iv) attainment of objective knowledge (v) scientific or quantitative measuring (vi) objects merit and worth and assistance of audience (evaluand-client).

For the rising attention to the field of evaluation, we can see a tremendous progress of theoretical and methodological developments during the last three decades (Babchuk, 2011; Reynold, 2007). For example, the role of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation and the American Evaluation Association is notable. A set of

Guiding Principles for evaluators developed by the latter elicited several of important elements to be respected by the evaluation researchers (i) systematic inquiry: evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries about whatever is being evaluated. (ii) competence, (iii) integrity/honesty. In this guideline, the evaluation research is required of quality data collection, defensible indicators, and eventually the credibility to findings. It is a duty for the evaluators to provide competence performance to the interested parties. All these elements described have a bearing to be interconnected with the aspect of three methods.

#### **8. On the Professional Competence through the Process**

Although we said the three methods are viewed to fit or be required within the field of evaluation, this does not necessarily mean that any method will yield a best result for the evaluators. As we had learned through the course, each method has the strengths and weaknesses as submissive to the professional way of suitable selection (Creswell, J.W., 2009). The experimental approach, for example, can be best to disclose the causal relationships of event or program evaluation. The quantitative study may be matched with the management information system and can serve more effectively for the dynamic operations of complex programs. The content analysis may be undertaken as related with the qualitative study, and provides an evaluation if to include a judgment. The mixed method can be employed, in any most effect, to provide a “model building” for the programs evaluated. That is partly because the mixed method often begins with some predisposed stance of researchers. Consumer-oriented studies generally would be conducted on the basis of quantitative method, which can be seen “objectivists, mass and true evaluation.” The objectivists and elite perception in program or organizational evaluation can be viewed as quasi-evaluation since it tends to entail a high share of data itself or knowledge other than a value or assessment. The qualitative or mixed methods probably can be connected with the subjectivists perception. It also is classed into the elite and mass aspects like the objectivists. The subjectivists and elite perception provides a true evaluation, which is typically represented in the certification and accreditation process. The connoisseur studies would be one branch to yield a more nuanced and refined findings to address the client’s needs, which usually may be seen in the qualitative or mixed undertaking of evaluation research. The adversary approach is interesting to unearth the truths, which would impliedly be embedded on all the three methods (Maxwell, 2005; Mills, 1959). In the quantitative, this way of thinking could enable a current status of theories or tenets, and facilitates the understanding of vast literature. This point would also be true with the mixed method when they consider a grand theory or frame of the themes or propositions. The adversary approach would be a little less minded if the natural settings are primary to begin with the qualitative method. However, the coding work or documents review may require this basic of mindset. The adversary approach, as occasioned in a mock of legal proceedings, represents the dialectic exchange of ideas to inner-subsidize the three methods. It, nonetheless, independently provides a subjectivist, mass, true evaluation by exposing the two opposing positions. One illustration involved with the program evaluation and consultation was presented herein forth.

#### **9. Problem Statement**

In a variety context of public institution, the program evaluation is practiced. For example, the famous magazine of The National Jurist in the US legal education would produce the useful information for the legal education besides the US News and Report or those of global rating institutions. A rating for the best public service law schools, practical training program or clinical learning program would be the kind of examples. Some concerned lawyers or experts may individually rate the program, for example, the ranking of LL.M program on the basis of recruitment statistics for the major law firms upon graduation. The evaluation expertise seems rapidly be made abundant over various sectors and interests which explains for our contemporary public lives. In this trend, the research degrees in law (LLM or SJD and MA/PHD in Law) other than JD had not been specifically addressed, which I enchanted to exemplify (Stringer, 1993). That is also the case, for example, about my research doctorate in the “international relations and diplomacy” although the adjacent area, such as “political science” or “international studies”-- perhaps massively language or history and oriented of each nation and in coverage of the whole of three level of degrees – may appear in the NRC or QS ranking. In this concern, many experts would stress on the importance of consulting process as the QS graduate guide suggested. The illustration now onward has been prepared to give a formula for the consulting process and one ranking source for the programs given no perfect ranking source is available or inadequate as a matter of the degree's trait. It will likely be the kind of rankings on the business doctorate of Financial Times along with the traditional MBA-focused business school rankings. In use of the ranking within this illustration, we may situate the consulting students for his years relevant with the base year of 2007. Since the quality of information is longitudinal, we can suppose if 1993 through 2014 graduates with the degree of research master or doctorate in law and PhD in the international relations and diplomacy can be covered. This kind of temporal factor in the evaluation setting can be applied in this way for various events of

evaluation project. The issue of evaluation and consulting subject is related with the kinds of discipline, such as the program evaluation, education, sociology, psychology, legal education, and therapeutic studies.

## **10. A Mixed Research and Consultation with the Forms of Use**

Two students, described B type, asked to seek a guide for their further studies in above two research programs (Hatch, 2002). I made an initial contact, and audit their gist of referrals, which appears to be very concerned on their part. I thought that the research was necessary, and the core issues had been summarized as in the problem statement. One week research seems deemed that I scheduled for the day of three months later to give the final result of investigation and outcome of evaluation. As a focus of evaluation, I considered several important themes that most pertains to the problem and solution. First, they are exploring the study opportunity as a research student, not a college or law schools generally bending on the education of JD students. Second, they would be flexible in their final selection decision between the popular law school or LLM rankings and research-oriented ranking. These two basic qualities of evaluation lead to many subtlety of considerations about the factors of evaluation. The usual rankings, for instance, are massively based on the academic credentials of admitted student, such as GPAs or scores of law school admission test, which is not relevant with the research programs. In the case of B-2, such data are even unavailable or less immediate given that his plan is suited with the study abroad. The challenge also arises in the B-1 since the other rating, such as QS is massively faculty oriented, although the student is much excited with the performance of alumni trained from same degree courses. You also may consider my note on the transformative framework or post-modernism with this aspect of challenge. Now we live on the post-modern context of global community with the rapid rate of technological advancement and new mode of communication, and the individualization or vulnerability of ego seems starker (Barritt, 1986; Bloland, 1995; Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Most importantly, with the increasing exchange of students in the global context, the foreign educated graduate will subsist as even looks like the people of Diaspora across the global jurisdictions. In their life path perhaps not easy on the long way, the degrees achieved in the foreign countries or in the graduate and research programs are the kind of source of enjoyment or even life-time meaning in reflection (Husserl, 1931; Hunt & Colander, 2015; Spiegelberg, 1982). This type of personal development, often within the foreign research students as said, needs to be cast on the framing of evaluation with the factors assigned with different values. They had a focus most sensitively with the degrees they expect to obtain relatively very higher than other side of considerations, such as labor market and settlement in that country (Colaizzi, 1978). This seems a typical phenomenology involved with this kind of cultural group. The reflection on this point leads me to yield a sharp focus on the degree-based impact ranking as considerably of higher value than other factors. Also the framing and assignment of value has a relevance with the quality of research programs. For example, 3.8 GPA students may perform well in the taught based program, but is not always true if the creative work on research is a trait in the programs (Fay, 1987). Of course, this is also because the comparison of undergraduate achievement generally is not practiced only with a rare exception, such as NRC rankings from the US source. The small nature of class would be irregular in view of student population and yield a less meaningful consequence as distinct from the law school or national business school rankings. The data collection was performed based on the examination of documents and records, in which the existing data from the sources are utilized. As the degree-based research impact ranking is rarely compiled that exhaust me too much work for independent investigation that I decided to exploit the data compiled by Shapiro from the Yale law school. Other sources are plentiful and easy access was made, for example, peer review result of law schools in the USNWR or QS research quality of faculty and many others (Barbour, 2000; Lather, 1993). On the process, I was impressed that the degree-based research impact ranking seems most direct and immediate to my case beyond the ratings of other factors, say, one reason to assign a high value for the factor. The data collection and analysis as well as preparation of forms devoted to the practice of consulting on this issue were finally made ready on the sixth day. The compilation of data on the productivity and citations from Shapiro's, for example, was conducted with the aid of my assistant for 20 minutes of exhaustive search about the background of scholars within the top 100 all time list. In order to ensure the accuracy of data, all the ways possible were used. In the stage ahead, the journal writings and reference to the memos of stakeholders were analyzed, and the consulting day was full to share much time of exchanging opinions and views with the students. Through the process, the rigor and rapport are a crucial touchstone for the credibility and trustworthy of qualitative or mixed method that the "best possible way" standard and "nothing to be left unlearned" often held as a principle of qualitative method always guided my research and evaluation. Also very importantly, the purposive sampling or bracketing of research through the data collection and analysis had been minded and held importantly that is the kind of major attribute of qualitative or mixed inquiry and evaluation as Patton guided. This aspect is reflexive with the same eventual destination

as you see in the Exhibits between the degree-based research impact ranking and pro-choice one. Some sources of data I utilized through the process, one journal writing in my previous travel – hence research is also a participant in this data – findings of degree- based research rankings -- were shown as Exhibits on the back of this article and the forms for the future use also was attached (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Strauss, 1987; Neyman, 2011).

## References

- Baradaran, Shima (2014). Teaching Research Methods to Understand Business Crimes. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2014; University of Utah College of Law Research Paper, No. 81. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2442358> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2442358>.
- Babchuk, W. A. (2011). Grounded theory as a “family of methods”: A genealogical analysis to guide research. *US-China Education Review*, 8(2), 1548–1566.
- Barbour, R. S. (2000). The role of qualitative research in broadening the “evidence base” for clinical practice. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 6(2), 155–163.
- Barritt, L. (1986). Human sciences and the human image. *Phenomenology and Pedagogy*, 4(3), 14–22.
- Boland, H. G. (1995). Postmodernism and higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66, 521–559.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Clarkson, P. (1996). Researching the ‘therapeutic relationship’ in psychoanalysis, counselling psychology and psychotherapy—a qualitative inquiry. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 9(2), 143–163.
- Colaizzi, P. F. (1978). Psychological research as the phenomenologist views it. In R. Vaile & M. King (Eds.), *Existential phenomenological alternatives for psychology* (pp. 48–71). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2–14.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009), *Research design :Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approach*, (Laureate Education, Inc., custom ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dahnke, M.D., Dreher, H.M. (2010). *Philosophy of science for nursing practice: concepts and application*, New York. NY: Springer.
- Fay, B. (1987). *Critical social science*. Ithaca, N Y: Cornell University Press.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hunt, E.F., Colander, D.C. (2015). *Social Science: An Introduction to the Study of Society*, New York. NY: Routledge.
- Hurteau, M., Houle, S., & Mongiat, S. (2009). "How Legitimate and Justified are Judgments in Program Evaluation?". *Evaluation* 15 (3): 307–319. [doi:10.1177/1356389009105883](https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389009105883).
- Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology* (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Kim, Kiyong (2015). *Concerning the Research and Science*. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2592858> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2592858>

Kim, Kiyong (2015). Some Temperance on the Doctoral Studies and On-Line Education, Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2589531> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2589531>.

Kincheloe, J. L. (1991). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path of empowerment*. London: Falmer Press.

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 673–693.

Laureate Education, Inc. (2008). *Research theory, design, and methods*. Baltimore, MD: Author. "Doctoral Research : Social Change."

Laureate Education, Inc. (Executive Producer). (2010e). *Doctoral research: Preparing for qualitative research*. Baltimore: Author.

Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

May, T., Malcolm, W. (1996). *An introduction to the philosophy of social research*, London. UK: Routledge.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mertens, D. M. (2009). *Transformative research and evaluation*. New York: Guilford Press.

Mills, W. C. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

*National Cable & Telecommunications Association et al. v. Brand X Internet Services et al.*, 545 U.S. 967 (2005).

Neyman, V. L. (2011). *Give my heart a voice: Reflections on self and others through the looking glass of pedagogy: An auto-ethnography*. Doctoral dissertation, National-Louis University.

Reynold, P. D. (2007). *A primer in theory construction*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. C. (2000). *Postpositivism and educational research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Saldaña, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spiegelberg, H. (1982). *The phenomenological movement* (3rd ed.). The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stringer, E. T. (1993). Socially responsive educational research: Linking theory and practice. In D. J. Flinders & G. E. Mills (Eds.), *Theory and concept in qualitative research: Perspectives from the field* (pp. 141–162). New York: Teachers College Press.

### **Exhibit I A Piece of Journal Writing**

A meditation July 2013

Having a busy schedule last week in Houston, Texas, I am now enjoying a slight margin with my family in Los Angeles. In the afternoon, we plan to visit the Hollywood, and I am thought to spend true holidays for a few days. When I return home this Saturday July 6<sup>th</sup>, my time schedule is full of publication contract, preparation of exam questions for the national bar examiners and other backlogs that it probably seems hard to enjoy this summer vacation. The United States seems to have become quiet and of serenity around the upcoming Independence Day because it actually is a few days holiday for the Americans. Perhaps because I stay here in the US, it seems natural to be reminiscent of students and peer professors who wrestled with the west law, and books and articles in law for their research and preparation for the bar exam and various national civil service examinations. Actually I am seemed that we, the law professors, have to be responsible for the future of legal culture and system. Although we are part of a stately Republic of Korea, we may be evoked if we are any kind of minority in the world that we think the superpowers in the world, including the US, China and Japan, As I stay in the US for two weeks in this vacation, I likely come to sense that the minority issue is not the story of others, but also of a great significance to our nationals. We are dignified and proud to possess the national territory and independence, and the stay in this foreign country reminds me of the preciousness of home.

We, Korean legal system, had come under a lot of German influence since we were acculturated with the legal implantation of German laws through the rule of imperial Japan. Therefore, in selection of graduate school, we have preferred Germany and the students, who wish to study abroad, often were destined at the country. However, it has been trending that the recent students also prefer to study law in the United States much in share, and virtually all of law libraries in Korean law schools have a subscription to the West Law or other paid basis of on-line provision of law. As I stay in the United States, it is also natural to reflect the days of graduate studies in the United States around the mid of 1990's and with some impulse to remark the minority issues. That is to bring up this piece of journal writing in my old bulletin board of personal webpage available with the ChosunLaw.

The law professors in the United States mostly are JD degree holders. However, the foreign students interested in studying abroad and ultimately wanting to become the law school professors and researchers generally enter the LLM or SJD degree programs. The JD program is taught-based for the three-year course, and LLM program often seminar based for scholarly experience with some depth of specialization on law and advanced concept. In some cases, it would be research-based as in the LLM program of UW-madison law school. The SJD program had been available with the 20-30 among more than 200 law schools in the United States, and the number has slightly increased over the decades. It is, of course, research-based that we class one type of research doctorate in the educational awareness. The United States is a typical country with the spirit of minority protection, Protestantism, the virtue of frugality and fidelity, which is admirable and can be helped to learn. Notwithstanding my alumni status, the graduate studies in the Wisconsin Law School seems to show the context of their public spirit and philosophy a whole. The campus news told that the Hastie fellowship program, one of LLM course, had a memorial reunion to celebrate the 40 years of anniversary in worship and enjoyment. I did not attend, but in an effort spanning 40 years by professor E. Jones, the program was known to produce the largest number of minority law professors with the advanced degree of law among the law schools in US. Another recent study, such influential work by Shapiro, Yale professor of law and citation studies, about 2012 ranking on most cited law review articles shows that the two articles made a top 100 all time list by the alumnus of Hastie fellowship with an LLM degree. It is amazing given it may well be comparable with the Nobel Prize for the professors of law in the world. While most of 100 articles were authored by the JD degree holders of Harvard and Yale and other prestigious law schools, it is a significant achievement that only could be feasible with the kind of respectable American spirit of E. Jones (The Shapiro's research impact studies in law are similar to the general citation studies in basic quality, such as Leiden ranking or others, but differ and are interesting to show the ranking of degree production institutions. It is one of influential and authoritative studies that provide the landscape of legal research in the United States and its trend). Since I usually hold a common interest to legal scholars, I made the time to investigate the fare of LLM and SJD degree holders in the top 100 list on the basis of Shapiro's studies, and the outcome turned out that they are truly the minority in that share as compared to the JD degree holders. That's because the LLM / SJD degree holders are those of minority in the US law schools. Provided that the number of LLM / SJD students is small, the result should be viewed that could not be made any reality without the deep concern and over 40 years of undisclosed effort by professor E. Jones. I also consider it relevant that the entering into the job market of legal teaching by LLM degree holders in the United States and their scholarship is a very good sign to protect the rights and status of minorities. If we plan to rank the quality of research doctorate in law, then the criteria and context are considered to produce important elements as



a factor (For example, the business PhD ranking compiled by the Financial Times, unlike the conventional MBA Ranking, is based on the "post-doctoral degree entrance into the teaching position of business schools, i.e., the number of recruitment as a business professor/number of PhD graduates).

Studying within the graduate program of law in the US law schools is learning the American pragmatism and the Protestant spirit. If you want to learn the spirit to protect the minority, perhaps the ideals of law ultimately, and pragmatism and Protestantism of Americans it is good alternative to study law in the US. Often the applicants consider the rankings of law school as a single variable if they are thinking to study in the US law schools as a single variable (the usual ranking source of US law schools are JD-oriented, or entirely in coverage of whole three degrees and faculty. Of course, some ranking source is specialized in LLM. Nonetheless, the research doctorate in law has not been treated independently even in 2010 NRC rankings, buy only with some statistical data. That is perhaps because the program is small and oriented to the minority education). Of course, a focus in the selection of SJD program can be different depending on the context and preference of individual, but if you think of the studies in the research degree in law, the implications that is shown by the Shapiro's citation studies in 2010 and 2012 are thought very significant to select the programs that you wish to study.

What is good and advisable is to select the programs appropriate to their own beyond the consideration of usual law school rankings. For example, the UW-madison law school manages the east Asian legal studies center, and the university has the US or possibly world top record of 78 programs registered as ranked in the 2010 NRC studies on the assessment of research doctorate programs. Also the LLM program is research based as said. Given the interdisciplinary studies of law are stressed to quality legal research, this backdrop is one important aspect that the consulted students and parents share and be informed adequately.

Tomorrow, I am going to visit the Hollywood with the family, and have the time of enjoyment for repose and reinvigoration. Early in the morning today, I was sudden to recall on the peer professors, who are to be connected to the west law portal and my dear law students, junior researchers now in the graduate programs of law and prospective students for those programs. What do we think between the minorities and law? This is perhaps the eternal question that the inquirers of law are to be challenged constantly.

#### **Exhibit II Research Impact Ranking of LLM/MA in law and SJD/PhD in law(All Time)**

| Institution                         | Research Impact                            |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
|                                     | Per Productivity (Books/Articles/A uthors) | Per Capita Citatio n                           |
| 1. UW-Madison                       | .1388                                      | 131.2  |
| 2. Yale                             | .1081                                      | 127.6  |
| 3. Harvard                          | .0727                                      | 96.47  |
| 4. U. of Chicago                    | .1026                                      | 82.56  |
| 5. Oxford                           | .0833                                      | 39.1   |
| 6. Cambridge /Columbia/UPenn/London | 1-2 units present (per capita waived)      | around 400-4000 citations at total (per capita |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | waived<br>)  |
| <p><b>7. (Tier I) English Speaking Countries and Nation-Based Rankings will be sectioned here:</b><br/> (US)Stanford/NYU/Virginia/Duke/Michigan/Berkeley/Georgetown/Cornell/Northwestern/Vanderbilt and so on (England) LSE/UCL/King's College/Sheffield/Cardiff and so on (Canada) (Australia) and other English Speaking Countries -- The order of rank will be marshaled on the basis of USNWR law school rankings because of no meaningful data in this scheme of rating. In the cases of other English Speaking countries as well as the countries as pertain to 8 and 9 below, the national rankings of QS data may be utilized in identifying their specific ranking.</p> | 0 | 0  |
| <p><b>8. (Tier II ) Non-English Speaking Universities in the West</b><br/> (European countries including Russia and east Europe) made ordered as the regional ranking of QS or based on the same linguistic group of countries depending on the preference or priority of the evaluators.</p> <p>(Latin America) made ordered as the regional ranking of QS or based on the same linguistic group of countries depending on the preference or priority of the evaluators.</p> <p>(Africa and Middle East Asia) made ordered as the regional ranking of QS or based on the same linguistic group of countries depending on the preference or priority of the evaluators.</p>      |   | <p>* French or German scholars are present to count 1, 2 in frequencies in unit, but largely 0 or 1 in the university indication. A total number of citation is considerably less since they are generally non-legal scholars.</p>   |
| <p><b>9. (Tier III) Asian Universities</b><br/> (East Asia) made ordered as the regional ranking of QS or based on the same linguistic group of countries depending on the preference or priority of the evaluators.</p> <p>(South Asia) made ordered as the regional ranking of QS or based on the same linguistic group of countries depending on the preference or priority of the evaluators.</p> <p>(Pacific Islands other than Australia) made ordered as the regional ranking of QS or based on the same linguistic group of countries depending on the preference or priority of the evaluators.</p>   |   | <p>*Since Shapiro's citation studies is based on the SSCI journals based on the web of science, the LLM or SJD and PhD in law degree holders in non-English speaking countries, such as the alumni of college of law in Asian countries are difficult to make a top 100 all time list.</p> |

**LLM/SJD or MA/Ph.D in law: Research Impact Ranking Based on the Degree Indication\* Not Faculty Based\* and Expanded to Cover the World Universities.**

\* The data are based on the two 2000 and one 2012 studies of Shapiro from Yale Law School, "Most cited legal books (2000), authors (2000), legal articles (2012): All Time List.

\* The data can be partially produced on the raw basis from the HeinOnline or other websites (For example, it is notable that one scholar with a doctoral degree in law from the German university and now in teaching position for the US law school made a list as one of top cited authors in the HeinOnline/And Prof. Coffee from NYU would be stark in this method). But Shapiro's method is distinct to keep on integrity and consistence to measure.

\* Total Number of LLM/SJD: Compared in the median year of three articles: based on 2007 LLM/SJD entering class of the law schools (One LL.D degree researcher from Edinburg was excluded since it is not-training based).

\* If in conflict of rank order among two factors, per capita citation had been considered in priority.

\* The category "Additionally" "Younger" "Very Younger" was excluded in consideration of fairness, consistency, and integrity.

**Exhibit III Research Impact Ranking of PhD in the Humanities and Social Science (All Time)**

| Institution          | Research Impact       |                                    |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
|                      | Frequencies of Author | Total citations                    |
| 1. Academie de Paris | 6                     | 1874 + 2521 + 2465 + 897 + 662 + @ |
| 2. Harvard U.        | 3                     | 694 + 596 + 519 + @                |
| 3. U. Cambridge      | 2                     | 1303 + 723 + @                     |
| 4. Freiburg U.       | 2                     | 874 + 566 + @                      |
| 5. U. Iowa           | 1                     | 1536 + @                           |
| 6. U. Chicago        | 1                     | 1066 + @                           |
| 7. Goethe U.         | 1                     | 1049 + @                           |
| 8. U. Berlin         | 1                     | 971 + @                            |
| 9. Yale U.           | 1                     | 960 + @                            |
| 10. Vienna U.        | 1                     | 903 @                              |
| 11. Konigsberg U.    | 1                     | 882 + @                            |
| 12. U. Penn          | 1                     | 812 + @                            |
| 13. U. Munich        | 1                     | 733 + @                            |
| 14. U. Neuchâtel     | 1                     | 725 + @                            |
| 15. Princeton        | 1                     | 708 + @                            |
| 16. Groningen U.     | 1                     | 700 + @                            |
| 17. Heidelberg       | 1                     | 593 + @                            |
| 18. U. Bern          | 1                     | 583 + @                            |
| 19. Columbia U.      | 1                     | 577 + @                            |
| 20. MIT              | 1                     | 577 + @                            |
| 21. Johns Hopkins U. | 1                     | 575 + @                            |
| 22. Cornell U.       | 1                     | 573 + @                            |
| 23. Yena U.          | 1                     | 566 + @                            |

**~MA/Ph.d (Humanity and Social Science): Research Impact Ranking Based on the Degree Indication\* Not Faculty Based\* and From the 2007 Citation Information from Thomson Reuter.**

\* Barthes, Tajefel, Wittgenstein, and Nietzsche are hard to confirm and thus unclear if they graduated with a master or doctorate. Barthes had undertaken as the research officer in the CNRS over the long period time, but did not obtain the graduate degree. Tajefel is known to obtain the bachelor degree from the Birbeck college, London university, and his career can only be made clear that he taught the social psychology at the University of Cambridge for the long term. Wittgenstein is just as well that he studied in the Yena University of Germany and Cambridge University in England, who later taught at that university. It is unclear if he is a holder of master or doctorate degree. Nietzsche also seems to have not acquired a master or doctorate, but merely known to study at the University of Leipzig.

\* If the number of author is equally among the institutions, the ranking is discriminated on the basis of citation. " + @ " indicate the annual amount of citations added, thus, uncertain but on some steady rate of increase, as assumed that it would increase every year at a constant rate (In the case of law review articles or books, the citation tends to increase at more than constant rate than other context of disciplines. In the case of the humanities and social sciences, the annual trend of citation increase is less predictable, but seems to be increasing each year with a significant correlative).

#### Exhibit IV Pro-choice Ranking for the B-1 Student

| Institution   | (Summary of Consultation) B-1   |
|---|---|
| 1. Wisconsin (Madison)  | student finished the LL.M course, now is considering to attend PhD studies in law or SJD. Because he focused on the research impact on the degree-based citation indicators than the faculty members, the above Research Impact Ranking (it is related with the rankings of LL.M or MA in law and SJD or Phd in law as combined – hence graduate programs in law -- and is considered as any most proximate data in considering the quality of research doctorate program in law. It is because the pattern and structure of legal academia are close to be interwoven with both degrees) can have a share of 55 % as a factor and 15 % from the measure of faculty members based on the USNWR or QS rankings of law school and law subject. The remaining share can be composed of overall research capabilities of university such as NSF and the overall reputation of law schools (30% for their share to explain for the final ranking), which eventually yields the pro-choice ranking of consulted student. In this process, the attribute of research degree in law is contingent and volatile that the range or scale of distribution to be assigned with the score or value can be classed possibly at considerable margin (for example, the overall reputation of law schools may assign a value with one point in discrimination, such as 10 and 9, for the rankings 30 or 50 of USNW in margin; that could be wider in the case of QS considerations; the consulting process can be done with either option). This concept is relevant with the intrinsic of studies of the research degree in law program and the GPAs or undergraduate academic credentials, often importantly referred to the law |
| 2. Yale   |   |
| 3. Harvard  |   |
| 4. U. of Chicago  |   |
| 5. Oxford   |   |
| 6. Cambridge/NYU/Columbia/Penn/London/Edinburgh   |   |
| 7. Nation-Based Rankings will be sectioned here:<br>Stanford/NYU/Virginia/Duke/Michigan/Berkeley/<br>Georgetown/Cornell/Northwestern/Vanderbilt and so on<br>(The order of rank will be marshaled on the basis of USNWR law school rankings because of no meaningful data in this scheme of rating. In the cases of other countries as pertain to 8 and 9 below, the national or regional rankings of QS data may be utilized in identifying their specific ranking). |   |

school admission and taught-based instruction, could significantly turn as less a factor for the new mode of scholarship on the research-based work. On the other hand, the citation and productivity of unit indicators in the RIR can be estimated in a range more closely.

#### 8. Non-English Speaking Universities in the West

\* French or German scholars are present to count 1, 2 in frequencies in unit, but largely 0 or 1 in the university indication. A total number of citation is considerably less since they are generally non-legal scholars.

#### 9. Asian Universities

\* Since Shapiro's citation studies is based on the SSCI journals based on the web of science, the LLM or SJD and PhD in law degree holders in non-English speaking countries, such as the alumni of college of law in Asian countries are difficult to make a top 100 all time list.

#### Exhibit V Pro-choice Ranking for the B-2 Student

| Institution          | (Summary of Consultation) For the B-2 student,  |
|----------------------|---|
| 1. Academie de Paris | although the idealistic road of international politics is important, he prefers to increase his viewpoint of realist international politics, such as the essence of the state power, as well as the diplomatic importance of such realist international politics. It is to be studied based on philosophy and in order to deepen his undergraduate studies dealing with the international relations and foreign affairs (hence, for example, such degree course in the PhD in international relations and diplomacy). As the degree name implies, the philosophy is elementary to gear up with the research doctoral studies and was encouraged to think of the importance of interdisciplinary research. B-2 student also put an emphasis on the citations of degree holder more than faculty members in exploring the selection of programs. So the 2007 statistics of Thomson Reuter was the basis of consultation, which comes as |
| 2. Harvard U.        |   |
| 3. U. Cambridge      |   |
| 4. Freiburg U.       |   |
| 5. U. Iowa           |   |
| 6. U. Chicago        |   |
| 7. Goethe U.         |   |
| 8. U. Berlin         |   |
| 9. Yale U.           |   |
| 10. U. Vienna        |   |
| 11. Konigsburg U.    |   |
| 12. U. Penn          |   |
| 13. U. Munich        |   |

14. U. Neuchâtel
15. Princeton U.
16. Groningen U.
17. Heidelberg U.
18. U. Bern
19. Columbia U.
20. MIT
21. Johns Hopkins U.
22. Cornell U.
23. Yena U.

proportioned in 55% of share. Other recent criteria, such as most cited scholars of articles in the SSCI comes into consideration as a factor with the assigned share, 15% and other 15 % may stem from the subject ranking as most proximate with his degree name. The latter ratios are less than the former since the research impact from the book authors in the humanities and social sciences is more significant, and the ranking of international relations and diplomacy is not directly related to the subject ones ("international studies" - language and history oriented -- or "political science"). The subject ranking also needs to be considered that it is not focused on a research PhD, which, however, will be common to bachelor, master and PhD. Furthermore, since the United States and the European perspective of the diplomatic analysis tend to expose the different lens and frames of understanding so that the student was advised to think about the country of study in the first. The various factors in this kind explains for the 15% of parameters, and the final outcome for the Pro-choice ranking of B-2 student was yielded at left column.

#### Exhibit VI Forms Usable for the Future Consultation

[A type]

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Institution | Left Blank for the Consultants or Counselors |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |

[B type]

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Institution | Left Blank for the Consultants or Counselors |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |

[C type]

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Institution | Left Blank for the Consultants or Counselors |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |
|             |  |



**[REINSTATEMENT OF THE RANKING IN TABLE 1 FOR THE GRADUATES 2011-2021]**

THIS IS TO REINSTATE THE RATING OF GLOBAL UNIVERSITIES FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS DEVELOPED FROM THE BELOW ARTICLE "A REFLECTION ON THE RESEARCH METHOD AND EXEMPLANY APPLICATION TO THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY RANKINGS." I HAD TRACKED THE DATA OVER YEARS AND CONFIRMED THAT NO SUBSEQUENT CHANGES TO IMPACT THE ORIGINAL RANKING WERE NOTICED. DESPITE MINOR CHANGES ON THE DATA AT BELOW PRESENTED ARTICLE, THE RANKING CONTINUED TO STAND THROUGH THE YEARS AS ABOVE SPECIFIED. HENCEFORTH, WITH THE BEST OF KNOWLEDGE AND FIDELITY, THE RANKING OF TABLE 1 IN THE ARTICLE IS HEREBY REINSTATED FOR THE TERM 2011-2021 AS SUPPLEMENTED WITH THE ARTICLE.

**[REINSTATEMENT OF THE RANKING IN TABLE 2 FOR THE STUDENTS 2003-2021]**

THIS IS TO REINSTATE THE RATING OF GLOBAL UNIVERSITIES FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS DEVELOPED FROM THE BELOW ARTICLE "A REFLECTION ON THE RESEARCH METHOD AND EXEMPLANY APPLICATION TO THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY RANKINGS." I HAD TRACKED THE DATA OVER YEARS AND CONFIRMED THAT NO SUBSEQUENT CHANGES TO IMPACT THE ORIGINAL RANKING WERE NOTICED. DESPITE MINOR CHANGES ON THE DATA AT BELOW PRESENTED ARTICLE, THE RANKING CONTINUED TO STAND THROUGH THE YEARS AS ABOVE SPECIFIED. HENCEFORTH, WITH THE BEST OF KNOWLEDGE AND FIDELITY, THE RANKING OF TABLE 2 IN THE ARTICLE IS HEREBY REINSTATED FOR THE TERM 2003-2021 AS SUPPLEMENTED WITH THE ARTICLE.

**KIYOUNG KIM  
LEAD AUTHOR  
PROFESSOR OF LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY**



## **APPENDIX V: THE GLOBAL UNIVERSITY RANKINGS (transcribed from 2015 Pub.)**

### **A Reflection on the Research Method and Exemplary Application to the College and University Rankings**

#### **1. Introduction**

It had been a precious opportunity as a teacher and researcher that I have completed two research method classes with the peers of Laureate Education Inc. Since the generation of creative knowledge and meaningful contribution to the field is charged on the professional researcher, the classes are foundational, but unfortunately with less an attention with the scholars, and if more problematically lack of courses for some graduate or training programs. With this paper, I can be gladly reminiscent of the course learning, and can present a work of demonstration by employing the issues of global college rankings. Throughout this work, I may be indebted to the robust instruction or helpful insight and feedback with my peer participants. Generally, the kind of valuable terms and methodological debate had truly affected what is the responsibility of scientist, and especially on the qualitative method, how they highlight the theme or purpose as a social scientist in order to raise a voice of intact cultural group or deal with the phenomenological, narrative and case studies. All the ways through, we can see the science bull's watch as elaborated on what is verity and has social meaning. In this article, my purpose is gone with two basic aims (i) the brief summary of my experience on the two method classes (ii) suggest a new perspective and mindset within the changing technology and post-modern transformation of society (iii) finally present two examples of mixed method involved with the global college rankings and provide a view for the students situated within the temporal boundary I had set forth.

#### **2. Reflection on the Research Method**

##### ***1 Introduction***

Through the classes, I have recognized a primacy and importance of research method as well as its variability to address the goals of researcher. The education and training session about this scholarly basics should enter a more weight of graduate education, particularly for the developing nations. Often researchers in this scope lack the formal hours of class to meditate on the research methodology. They rather acquire the skills and competence after they graduate and serve as a professor or professional researcher. Except for the natural science or engineering, this point seems to factor a relatively poor performance of those nations' researchers in the international context of social science and humanity studies. As a Korea-based scholar, this point seems to be complicated since Korea will no longer be a developing country in terms of world economy (Mills, W. C., 1959). Intellectually, however, I may not be definite if Korea can lead or influence the concerned of world, generally the circle of scholars in the specific fields (1959). The melting signs may seem gradually into the center of world and region when we bred a world renowned pop star, *Psy* and K-pop, commercially in the region as well as ambitiously in the Europe. An aboriginal scene of sweat labor could bring the industrialization of Korea in 1970's, and its consequence to bell the international society was demonstrated in the 1988's Seoul Olympic. For the new millennium, the cultural and intellectual advance can be Koreans', but with some care about the tendency. I may call the context as a "Korean fate of quintet (KFP: 70-80-10-60)." As said, the natural science, medicine or health and engineering sectors in the academy had been and will be a plane for good in terms of Korean share. It is highly dubious, however, if that could be true about the humanity and social science, which should be ameliorated until 2060. As this context fairly relates with my case as a researcher, the class of research theory and design is believed really challenging and ambitious in view of the personal aim. I suppose if the trained writer on these methods can produce an article of high scholarly impact as much cited as *Psy* and viewed as many as 200 million people through the Y-tube. This context can be same with the scholars of similar states historically, economically, socially and politically. The classes on this purpose, I consider, is also helpful to the established scholars and authorities that we can philosophically retrospect the kind of our lifetime works.

##### ***2 Self-assess your current research mind-set and skills.***

The classes will certainly be highly helpful to improve the research mind-sets and skills. First, it provided a good opportunity to eliminate a fear or ambiguities from lack of accurate knowledge about the methodology. We often name or talk about the research methods, but without a general exposure about the subject. That would be a strand to bring the fear or unsettlement on ambiguities. Second, the class systemically developed and enriched my understanding of research method and skills (Creswell, 2009). With the time for this course, we come to know a philosophical angle to support the research methods, theory and its construction, the ingredients of three basic methods, the ethics involved

in the research as well as other useful issues (Reynold, 2007). It has been impressive to shape the worship of profession in the assignment about an NHS certificate. This worship did not stop there, but to inflame a curiosity of what is the research and its practice in the methodological aspect. We thankfully received a good system to increase of the research skills by processing weeks of experimental work covering the quantitative, qualitative, mixed and evaluation (Creswell, 2009). Third, the class seems not to finish in the personal context, but relays my interest into an adjacent area of disciplines. For example, we could learn the use of statistics or psychology, at least their basics, to realize a complete grasp concerning the quality of respective method (Patton, 1999). According to P. Serdyukov, a doctor is a carrier of high culture, expertise, and knowledge for their respective field of science. This statement can well corroborate with the view of *habitus* proposed by P. Bourdieu, and also comes lighted to explain the global status including Korea and other countries. Once I have pointed out the econo-political view of research profession, but that would be a particle though it might be essential for the pure materialists (Kim, 2015, 1). This aspect of profession anyhow seems to be interwoven from those elements of methodology in some extent of combination. Certainly the research can exploit the market and lead to the increase of demand economically in the higher or lesser extent from the perspectives. It, on the other, is related with the aspect of souls for decency and nobility. The laborers in the 1970's sweat shop of Korea now are led to entertain an innovative quality of K-pop or Y-tube classics. The researchers in Korea, perhaps as teamed with the policy makers, could bring the social change, and the invention of Y-tube, from the root efforts of research technicians, could realize such amazing *habitus*. The researchers of public administration and economy in Korea now implore on a high priority of creative economy as the national strategy, which we can acknowledge a positive sign of benefit.

### ***3 Evaluate a relationship between the research and social change.***

Concerning the relationship between the research and social change, I may state several points of relevance; (i) originality and application in the form of interplay (ii) comprehensiveness in the subjects of interplay (iii) strategic collaboration in the interest of interplay. First, the research pioneers the concern and curiosity, hence essentially creative or original (Kim, 2015-2; Parson, 2009). The great findings can be, and must be applied to improve our reality. Second, their interplay or relationship is comprehensive to take the researchers of specific discipline into any staunch of track in parallel and shared. For example, professors or researchers of economics devote their lifetime commission in parallel with the Federal Reserve. The legal scientists' usual work would arise from the cases and court opinions to be shared in their lifetime. The public policy students or researchers may get their concern or involvement related with the government or specific branches of public service. The educators may devote to the development of curriculum or method on college rankings that are concerned to be paired with the schools and universities. Probably we may well imagine its comprehensive picture in accordance with the scope of various governmental departments. Third, the contemporary practice of national or public organizations often views two facets as the kind of strategic alliance. This point is delicate if the researchers' ethics and standard are something different or sanctified. They need to be neutral and objective, and uphold the value of humanities. It is also highly capricious in its extent that some research will enjoy a buy-in, which means them productive in view of strategic alliance. The context will come in a comparison if the research were to be opposed or subject to public criticism, deemed less significant or as away from the strategic aspect.

### ***4 Plan next steps to take in becoming a researcher and scholar-practitioner.***

The plan to progress is to be guided so as to respond with the goals of researcher. The paradigm of scholar practitioner is really appreciable from the contemporary context of post-modern living. The lifetime concept of education and professional training are inevitable to improve and adapt with (Laureate Education, Inc., 2008). We are required, on the other, to prepare for the dissertation as a student or journal articles for the faculty or professional researchers. Hence, we are exposed to a multiple context of benefit to cross the work responsibility, learning, socialization and the research work. We can exploit the learning and knowledge to better perform our work duty as a scholar practitioner while the cumulative effect academically and from job experiences are believed to produce a high quality of research (2008). First, the partnership concept of dealing seems to yield a better result, which, I suppose, will be foundational to plan over the progress and academic success. We are a "scholar practitioner" – I mean in contrast "scholar in book" -- both to learn and teach, and the classes certainly would be an opportunity to refurbish the practical arms enabling to implement our value and scholarly conviction. We exchange ideas, valuable information and thoughts, not to be directed nor delivered in the unilateral lead of certain influence. This is an important assumption that may be embedded generally on the quality of graduate education. In some cases, the graduate students play as a teaching or research assistant, and their collaborative experience in the research labs often effects a lifetime alliance about the professional career of researcher. They are advised to rise beyond the attitudes as a student, but actively and positively

engage as a scholar-practitioner (2008). Second, they need look into the research methods more in depth. Some higher level of methodology courses is essential to make a progress. Third, the law and public policy, through the years, had provoked my curiosity involving how to locate properly two disciplines in the transformative society. As a scholar practitioner, it will trouble much on time span since I had been interested in that name of specialty. A qualified status to be well-versed of research methods will facilitate my aim to look into both disciplines. The inquiry, “how do they excavate the knowledge to nurture their discipline?” will be basic and penetrates the different two into one string of commonality, i.e., methodology. Of course, the substantive issues will be dominant, but the hindsight only available for the methodologists will certainly happen to see the nature and essence of my interdisciplinary purpose. Fourth, the junior researchers may practice better by actively exploring a publication opportunity about their writing and collecting information about their studies and research method. This advice would allow the time to meditate on many basics, but must be foundational about the lifetime devotion as a researcher. It could help to share the information and experience with the peers so that will make the story of research profession as popular to know. The class of research theory seems to serve several purposes, and I feel much indebted respectfully from Creswell, Reynolds and the National Academy of Science. I have learnt much of information useful to understand the method itself, the nature of theory and its construction, and important lessons for the research professionals. Dr. DeParis’ leadership and devotion to teaching had been impressive.

### **3. A Thought on the Qualitative Method**

The kind of relationship or public tendency likely ascends as we are informed by the post-modernism, technology advancement and trajectory toward the informative society or creative economy (Husserl, 1931; Husserl, 1970; Rosenau, 1992). Now we seldom give a focus on the manufacturing, once the point of contest for the world economy. The kind of rhetoric, “world factory,” is now the second title for the world economy, and the middle class within such income range perhaps would be less stimulating or likely approach dormant for the policy makers. They likely remain with them as main, but appear to be elusive with an expectation of same consequence in their thought or public process. That probably would not be wrong at least if we are simple and honest of economic aspect of their lives. The economy is powerful indeed-- and perhaps most urgent for humans -- if it is only field to enlist in the Nobel prize from the social science. The Thomson Reuter reports the SSCI statistics that separately classes from social science to deal with the Economics and Business along the general social science in total. Economically, we may safely defer to their assumption of middle class, perhaps common and generalized, if we are lovers of human. I do not argue for the use of qualitative research more widely for the public studies or suggest the cut of quantitative studies since the middle class is quite good at all (Scott, 1985). Humans are complex as we note in the Maslow’s and we draw the data from the subjects in the qualitative method. We had got through the data collection and their analysis is staged somewhere, which obviously is very important to elevate the research plan. While humans are complex, only way to collect the data stems from his or her expression, hence, the kinds of occurrences, i.e., observation and interviews, documents (Creswell, 2013; Strauss, 1987). While man may not be exactly the expression of his or her statement, the coding lesson generally highlights such importance of “significant statement” to understand and analyze the data (Kvale, 2006). In the KTV, I had a moment of fantasia that one policy can create such significant words and statements not only from the interviewees and but also from the producers. To say, the title tears with impressive words, “Faith of Sons and Daughters,” which seemingly is effective in struggling with the growing criticism as compared with the unemployment rate of young college graduates. The statements from the interviewees are capturing indeed with one aged male, 68 years old, who has no job expressing the savory support of small money in his later life. He seems still robust to work in the construction site, but the age actually impedes to turn away every opportunity for earned work. The statutory retirement age or pension plan of nations can be the work of “quantitative researcher,” but must be inadequate for this person in my observation and according to his statement. Next hours shortly, the acting prime minister and head of business association featured in the press meeting that announced the policy programs and basic direction to improve the unemployment problem of young generations. Actually they learn and would be best to craft various policy measures. They would be ombudsman to report and assess as well as rule that are most needed of and exposed to the creative knowledge beyond the textbooks. In other words, the kind of case studies and grounded theory would likely work, and must be necessary for them as well as the government, one of biggest employers within the nation and perhaps major employer of professional researchers. While conducting a qualitative research as one of important instruments to staff the knowledge of government in the US – gradually within the context of Korea and other nations -- we need to have a thought why the research findings are seldom adopted to enforce. On the progress of my meditation, I also come to wake up if two persons with 100,000 dollars a year as their income are absolutely same deserving a good livelihood award and what are differences between

top GDP country per capita and “perfect” or “graceful” from the words of interviewees collected from the research project dealing with the middle income earners of the top nation (Patton, 2002). Once we had been about the extended use of qualitative method in the studies of US government, and the kind of tendency has increasingly emerged over time in Korea. The newspapers highlight the importance of story-telling or episode relating with the public policy of government. The entitlements of aged people had been implemented last year, a hyperbole to be fought in the national assembly as concerned of the fiscal feasibility and social justice along the increasing restructuring into the aging society. Korean cable TV channels are in wide coverage and one of them, named KTV, deals with the specialty of national policy. In one program aired yesterday, several aged people had featured and gave their narrative or words of graceful experience for the provision of entitlements. The amount is as small as 200 dollars a month, but had impacted likely astronomically for the poor and aged persons. The administrators or policy makers would learn during the course of their official duty. It is their trait, and most vigil than any other commoners. The top managers in the nation-owned enterprises may reflect like a person in the temple stay, one learning process on meditation. A tedious head of department may shame with his small of public activities that he likes to read and learn humans or community and wisdom for his responsibility (Patton, 2002). Most aids would be received from his working horses in the active rank and files that he would rather be enthralled as philosophical, humanistic, and communitarian than specifics. The learning occurs and essentially undergirds the contemporary society. The tendency is more impressive that the congressmen or policy makers in the executive are in the vortex of that reality. They would also be creators -- at least in the Korean context, as we know from Y.S. Kim in the 1990's, announcing that now is the age of life-time learning. It likely shows how we are related among another. Above all, the importance of their learning lies in the fact that it is not merely cultural or the kind of personal enrichment. It also is not such personal if we gird the ignorant or absent minded congressmen. It is crucially trusted with the paradigm of deliberative democracy. They have to shape their competence and be required to come with the exposure to the humans and community (Saldaña, 2011). The reelection possibility would be one motivating factor to push them to learn and to have awareness that we see them to be politically responsible. It was cited in the recent Korean source that Obama had the character of policy wonk, who would be an avid of every aspect of policy issues and agendas. This is no surprise at all when we consider his role and responsibility. Needless to illustrate the “marginalized and greatest approach” or “purposeful sampling” in the qualitative studies, the contrast often is quite useful to create the views or frames of social issues. The poverty and superrich would be one frame embedded with the intellectuals along the growth rate of economy. The kind of frame is also an avenue to testify the effect of policy programs or project as we see in the aged persons featuring in the KTV. It also demonstrates a continuing relevance with the lifetime learning that humans and community are inseparable or subjects of which politicians are fated.

#### 4. The Data Analysis

The data analysis technique is constantly evolving, not a static repository with typical methods.<sup>43</sup> For example, Eaves suggests that the synthesis approach in the ground theory could increase understanding and enhance the quality of GT data analysis techniques (2012). While he noted that there has been a steady rise in the number of published research reports that use the GT method, he viewed that the current method in prevailing use lacks the clarity and inconsistencies. It is needless to mention in the field of natural science that researchers reported a new data analysis technique to rapidly identify the region of stable crack growth in crack tip opening angle (CTOA) testing of a modified double cantilever beam (Hashemi, Dastani, Sadri, 2013). The method could replace for the visual analysis of the individual photographs, which is tedious and rather lengthy. This implies that the data analysis is considered in terms of cost and convenience of researchers in common with both sciences. The data analysis technique also occurs involved with the literature review which represents the most important step of the research process in all three methods of social science. Boote and Beile expounded, “A thorough, sophisticated literature review is the foundation and inspiration for substantial and useful research.” Therefore it is the kind of crucial concern of qualitative researchers how to construct a research synthesis aptly. In this context, four types of data in connection with the five qualitative data analysis techniques have been studied by three scholars, who drew on any most optimally rigorous way concerned of literature review (Onwuegbuzie, Leech,

<sup>43</sup> For example, the fifteen methods may be suggested, i.e., typology, taxonomy, constant comparison, analytic induction, logical analysis or matrix analysis, quasi-statistics, event analysis or microanalysis, Metaphorical analysis, domain analysis, hermeneutical analysis, discourse analysis, discourse analysis, semiotics, content analysis, phenomenology or heuristic analysis, and narrative analysis.

Collins, 2012). This study implies the relevance of data analysis technique with the literature review, which are inseparable, but into the research synthesis and on iterative process among the data and literature.

### 5. Techniques of Qualitative Data Analysis

According to Merrill et al, the techniques of qualitative data analysis are commonly shared among the approaches, which includes (i) documentation of the data and the process of data collection (ii) organization/categorization of the data into concepts (iii) connection of the data to show how one concept may influence another (iv) corroboration/legitimization, by evaluating alternative explanations, disconfirming evidence, and searching for negative cases (v) representing the account (reporting the findings) (2000). It is grossly intertwined with the collection and documentation of data, and it is important to note that the data analysis actually begins at the time of observation, interviewing or both. The researchers always get the data as central for validity and reliability of research that analytic process bases by simply hinging on the notes or transcripts with repeated reading (Kvale, 2006). The concept could be the kind of oasis sublimating the raw data into a cohesive scientific message that he or she creates by organizing and categorizing the data into concepts. Important is the need to develop the relationship or hierarchy of concept that is essential to structure his theme and produce a due density of scholarly presentation as normalized to the intelligence of audience, perhaps, supervisor of dissertation or referees and peers of professional journal. In this process, they may use the concept map. Then the positive steering from the raw data into major profile of assertions would likely be completed that the researchers will make an enhancement of theme with corroboration and legitimization (2000). He or she evaluates alternative explanations or discuss disconfirming evidence and may search for negative cases. This may simply show the process to deal with the data, but would be most important technique to be minded. There will be a tack of collected data in the form of observed results or interview transcriptions as well as public or private documents. The photos and video materials may not be planned at some stage, but the possibility of inclusion is not unlikely along the development of theme. We have surveyed the benefit of NVivo, and the data storage and analysis would obviously be facilitated with such modern technology. At the center of dynamism do the codes, themes or concepts underlie that important statement of participants should not be missed or gone as unattended. Weekly team meetings among the key participants and researcher can be arranged that keys on the progress of research including the evaluation and analysis of data. As once stated, documentation from the interviews and observations of sites, photos, and videos are a major form of data source to represent the empiricism that requires a care and focus for management and analysis. Miles and Huberman proposed useful tools named the summary contact form that shows the flow model of qualitative data analysis components, which are applicable to the various research plans (Creswell, 2013). For example, we may prepare the contact summary form structured with the flow of relevant questions or points of consideration i.e., (i) what were the main issues or themes that struck us in this contact (ii) summarize the information we got (or failed to get) on each of the target questions we had for this contact (iii) anything else that struck us as salient, interesting, illuminating or important in this contact (iv) what new (or remaining) target questions do we have in considering the next contact with this site (Merill et al, 2000).

In consideration of analysis technique, a considerable amount of data may be produced in the aboriginal language, and we may think how the translation into English language is viewed. It would be no seldom for researchers given the scope of deals in the international case studies or ethnography and narrative studies of significant person. The website of Johns Hopkins University provides a tip on this interest (2015). At first, it needs to be determined whether to translate or not, in which the researchers consider various factors, such as logistical,<sup>44</sup> validity,<sup>45</sup> customer, ownership and control, and implicit or unintended message from the original data (2015). The researcher also considers the benefit and drawback of translation. For example, the researcher may plan to conduct the data collection in English which obscures the issue originally, and the multi-sites investigation often allow to have a common language for analysis. Most of all, he has to know that the interpretation is very time consuming. The common view is that the translation leads the raw data or theme to be too literal and insipid, which may, in some case, be inaccurate as differs from the original nuance or authentication of phenomenon. The translation of raw data into language within the process of analysis and publication also entails a delicate problem of privacy or indecency with no use at all. In that case the research may use “Do Not Translate List,” which includes, for example, words for friend or friendship, words for HIV, or terms referring to the act of sexual intercourse (2015).

---

<sup>44</sup> For example, he inquires of how much time it will take.

<sup>45</sup> For example, he considers how much time it will take, if the translation is accurate, if the original meaning is distorted, or if anything is omitted?

## 6. Blending and Adapting

As per the qualitative method, it seems to me that the challenges and subtleties arise from two properties of qualitative studies. That is, the qualitative researcher has to play as an unobtrusive observer in the data collection stage, and should be a good surveyor who competently and persuasively triangulates the findings. The issue of triangulation occurs in dimensions and relating with the enhancement of credibility as we are aware. In other words, it may be exercised involved with the stages of qualitative research, i.e., among the data collection, analysis and write-up as well as different methods, such between quantitative and qualitative methods. To say, the qualitative findings can improve the trustworthiness and credibility by triangulating their findings with the empirical evidence gained from the quantitative studies. Triangulation is the kind of properties intrinsic with the humans and universe provided if they are evolutionary or fluid on one hand and stagnant on the other.<sup>46</sup> Hence, we can be assumed to have a better understanding by blending or adapting the stories generated from both sources. Patton guides four kinds of analytical triangulation which covers triangulation of qualitative sources, mixed or qualitative-quantitative methods triangulation, analyst triangulation and theory/perspectives triangulation (2002). Creswell also depicts a simple, but capturing three elements in the diagram showing three elements are intersected to produce the qualitative knowledge (2013). In this showing, the world views, assumptions, theories are one sector while the qualitative researchers also are responsible for the other two, say, research design and approaches to inquiry. All the elements would be evolutionary or fluid, but stagnated commonly, and varying with the different degree. For example, the assumptions, research design and approaches to inquiry would be more evolutionary or fluid than others seen more stagnated. The blending or adaptation is the kind of art in which the qualitative researchers are to be measured and creativity or value competes for the quality piece of articles or books. Given the researcher himself would be a learner through his project, it might be the zone of proximal development (ZPD) as if one junior researcher defined, “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under...guidance or in collaboration with more (Heinze, 2008, p.3).” Along our understanding of qualitative method, it likely would be felt to us that we experience many blind alleys, dead ends and treacherous terrains (Gay, 2000). The blending and adaptation would incur on these challenges and possible incongruity so as to be destined within the treacherous terrains. We have seen the importance of heuristic process within the learning and research, and the blending or adaptation would be some kind of culminating stage that turns the story into conclusion (Atkinson, Coffey, Delamont, 2003). While the blending or adaptation is presumed of empirical data collected, this never denies the importance of qualitative strands. As we learn, purpose guides the analysis of data, and well prepared mind is necessary to orient and define the quality and more refined dealings of qualitative research. The focus and lens of analysis within the subjective minds would not be an evil, and the action research or voice for the minority group to increases the awareness of audience are popular in this method. As Pascal preached, the zeal and knowledge would be the quality with which the archaic of new knowledge emerges and the blending or adapting is practiced by the researcher (Patton, 2002).<sup>47</sup> In consideration of blending or adaptation as the kind of creative final touch for the work, the qualitative studies, as we know, has a distinct aura or trait that had been argued over hundreds of pages in the textbook. It is truly discriminative to make the studies qualitative indeed. As we see the post-modern reality of contemporaries, whether marginalized or super-marked, both turn to be qualitative (Holmes, 1962). The exchange of public discourse now transcends the general and often overwhelming proposition based on the quantified data, but the contexts, stories or themes can express more in-depth and be suited with the reality. For instance, the Smith College recognized that the faculty takes on new teaching challenges and viewed that they learn best from one another. With the difficulties of physical gathering of faculty and challenge of limited resources, they developed online series of case study modules with the participation of “blended faculty.”<sup>48</sup> This corroborates with the suggestion of triangulation from the perspective by

---

<sup>46</sup> This kind of strand may be ideated, for example, the most recent NRC studies on the assessment of doctoral programs that the frame was developed within two dimensions, regression quality and survey quality.

<sup>47</sup> Pascal, in the *Pensees*, illustrated four kinds of persons in the universe, who would have zeal without knowledge, knowledge without zeal, neither knowledge nor zeal, both zeal and knowledge.

<sup>48</sup> This might be seen superficial or just on the reality of ours without the quantitative verification. I consider if the qualitative research has a strength of depth or rich data from the field, I consider, on the other side, it may have the kind of superficiality, say, less on the description of general populace, but on the ethnos, cultural groups or minorities, which, however, would be realistic and cultural. The context likely revives the embedded dichotomy from the age of Platonic discourse, what social psychologists call “the principle of superficiality versus depth.” For example, Lyotard challenged the Platonic view of a true meaning hidden behind surface. He instead insisted that sense manifestations had their own reality which necessarily impacted upon the general world view. I feel

“multiple analysts” in Patton, and shows the contentious process to the collective intelligence which might be dialectic or teleological (2002). As we note, the collective intelligence is shared or group intelligence is formed that emerges from the collaboration, collective efforts, and competition of many individuals and appears in consensus decision making. Creswell discussed the concluding stage of qualitative research, and illustrated the importance of blending or adaptation between the contents and methodology (2013). Therefore, it often occurs in two contexts in which the research can be more credible or confirmable with analytical triangulation and where the concluding stage led to conclusion requires for sublimation from the contents and methods.

## 7. Application Example

The following two Exhibits had been prepared in view of the principles and practicalities exchanged over the years of peer communication and data collection within the methodology classes. They had been generated from the longitudinal observations and by applying the data analysis techniques.

### Exhibit I

The academic strengths of institution were based on the NRC data that were released in 2010 and 1996. The data basically purported to provide the assessment of quality for the doctoral programs, but is considered to show the variety and commitment of institutions to teach and research. Given the specific ranks essentially came with the quality of doctorate programs, the number of programs evaluated and ranked indicates the width and depth of institutional performance as a whole. Often the institutions came with the first impression about the scope of offerings with the three levels of degree programs, such as 150 programs for bachelors, 100 programs for masters, and 60 programs for the doctorate. That is the first and last lens to look at the educational institutions, and is considered as foremost at the basic and most attribute. This is despite such popular perception from the rampant ranking schemes nationally and globally. It is related with the very basic function and role of institutions and shows the total level of intelligence and contribution which turns on the benefit of students eventually. Since the college education, especially at the undergraduate level, is liberal and interdisciplinary – of course, interdisciplinary nature had gradually come stressed with the graduate education – this aspect of institutions is viewed in emphasis. The problem is how to draw the pertinent information to measure this reality. Besides the mere number of programs with the university website, the number of NRC rated programs would inform us more properly that there was set a practical limitations with the least number of doctorates at five and fits within the purpose of national scheme of doctoral studies. It shows the operability of programs and its academic meaning that was assigned most of value to measure the whole populace of institutions, say, faculty, undergraduate, masters and doctorates. It is unique with the educational administration of US, but in some cases over the global jurisdictions, the nations, such as Korea, would have a similar data compiled by the ministry of education. For example, we can confirm that Minnesota comes second with 74 programs rated or UC Berkeley with 52 programs for the tenth place, while Seoul National University doctoral programs are officially acknowledged at 50 indications of doctoral field and *Yonsei* will come with 45 indications. In other cases, perhaps more liberal or private without this kind of data, the measure would be based on the webpage of institutions to be adjusted specifically with the contingencies of each nation or region.

Another indicator to measure the academic strengths of institution is to look into the publications of faculty. The number of publications, including the books and articles, indicate the quality of faculty and their commitment to the research. It could be measured as per capita of faculty or at gross that I applied the second method. The indicator shows the basic operation of academics for each institution, which could not be substituted with other applied point of angles, such as citation or major faculty awards. That is because such applied lens to view the institutions can lead us to the distortion heavily affected by the western dominance (Clifford & Marcus, 1986). The assessment of college and university comes different from that of graduate or research degree programs. It was principally oriented to measure the effect of institutions on the undergraduate education. It comes vastly with the national context of educational aims

---

that his attribution to a “theatrical world view” and the “purely verbal order of intelligibility” can be seen the quality of knowledge generated from the quantitative studies. In other words, it would be hyped to rule and be ordained with some textual order of verbs, and he sends the message that the post-modernist may work on the apparent reality or distinct cultural group. The blending or qualitative adaptation may be qualitative or even purposive in some aspect that, nevertheless, would be zone of art and skills, values and valorization of critical thought on the part of researchers. This view can also be shared with the deconstructionists, who have increasingly sought to undo the depth/surface hierarchy, proposing in ironic style that superficiality is as deep as depth.

that an immense focus on the number of contributions to the internationally prestigious journals and quality of professional communication of faculty, often critical in rating the rankings of the global universities, should be neither such determinative nor highly discriminative. In other aspect we may also challenge that it can be some outdated privileges if many on-line journals now serve the need of India and China, most populated countries in the world – hence implications of universal college education-- and lend a space to exchange the scholarly views. We would not say that their educational service is defunct merely because they work based on the less prestigious journals, especially in terms of college education other than graduate level. The articles or books, far from the Nobel prizes or massive scholarly attractions with citations, can well be more precious and valuable in terms of college education. However, we cannot obtain a specific data with the integrity and system to measure any exactly the whole of institution's publications. Therefore, the Leiden ranking of publications were partly considered, which is based on some level of journals. In the case of US, 2007 studies from the Chronicle of Higher education was considered, in which the professor's publication was assessed on the basis of whole number of books and articles to yield the ranking of each programs. This type of data can be identified in other countries, of course, more probable in the developed countries. In the global scale, the indicators of Webometrics or institutional rankings compiled by the Spanish Academy can allow to refer to the similar nature of information in this concern. Although the rating agencies would request to offer the data for the basis of their assessment, the request often can possibly be neglected or responded unfaithfully at considerable extent as we may know previously from the rating scheme of Russian agencies. Then the ways of measure through the web search can provide any most comprehensive exposure of global institutions by the investigation of institution's website or on-line performance. It also is reflexive of the kind transformation sparked by the revolutionary change of electronic lives or professional communication. The international and national sources of information in this kind were combined and assessed to yield the final rankings of academic strength.

The other indicator to measure the academic strengths of institution stems from the consideration of research funding. As the money is most tangible evidence as a support of research, thus, very critical to measure the quality of research by the faculty. Besides the citation and faculty award, it could be more practical and competitive if money is an element. The weakness of this measure, however, is only covered in the planning stage of research, hence, input than output. In terms of graduate education, this indicator seems more highly relevant since the funding is essentially related with the recruitment of graduate students and common development as a professional researcher between the recruiting faculty and students (Gergen, 1994). Often the labs and groups can be formed on this basis to produce the kind of professional researchers with their nest. In terms of undergraduate education, it is seemingly less relevant, but I considered it still crucial since the funding competition becomes more intensified -- important point to view the strengths of faculty, who ultimately is responsible for the undergraduate students in the classroom. The measure of this indicator is not so challenging unlike other ones since the monetary terms are any more than universal at the global scale. And each nation certainly produces this type of data, and can be integral for the whole of global universities. For example, Harvard may come eighth in this statistics with a little less than 1.0 billion dollars, Oxford and Cambridge or University of Tokyo may rise at the place of 19 or 22 with 700 million or 600 million dollars. Since I had a temporal factor to provide a view for the graduates of colleges and universities from 1990 through 2010, my assessment of data is longitudinal in coverage over more than twenty years roughly coming with such period. It means, for example, that the University of Michigan and Berkeley in California may fare at second and eleventh place in the 2014 statistics of National Science Foundation. Besides, I can consider the unique university, UW- Madison over than twenty years compilation, which had fared within the range of top five institutions. In this way, the global rankings were compiled to yield the final ranking of this qualitative inquiry on the college and university rankings. In this concern, we can refer to the patent statistics and number of doctorates awarded, which also comes as same that is an important indicator for the graduate education, but comes less significant in terms of my basic perspective about the original role of university education. As the undergraduate populace is vast, we may properly be reflexive to contemplate what the colleges and universities are expected to play. The number of patent applications is related with the sense that the academic staffs are rather on the role of independent professional than educators. The number of awardees at doctorate level implies that the graduate education flourishes and thus more creative and research-oriented often led to the quality of faculty. This kind of indicators reflects the competitive capitalism or elite education to wake after the transformative global community(Giddens,1991). Nonetheless, the theme in my case is what the original role of colleges and universities is and what it means for the universal education at the undergraduate level, most crucial stakeholders in the university(Hatch,2002). As the faculty is a primary player to engineer the colleges and universities, they have a plenty of reason for the creative research and innovation, and preferably with the earnings and profits. Hence, it is necessary to consider this factor, but not in any gross share. One



challenge in the context of college ranking is that it is only related with the engineering or applied natural science. Of course, we generally share in awareness that the massiveness in terms of the college and university population, including the students and faculty, is also characteristics of current college education and, hence, most important discriminating factor in the international college ranking. That is a part of reason that Caltech may come a top ahead Harvard occasionally or similar with the UC Berkeley. This pattern of institutions may well be compared with the kind of institutions, such as University of Chicago, Yale, NYU and Brown University. Between the overall citation statistics and that of humanity and social science available at 2008 Thomson Reuter, we can hint on this pattern, if the University of North Carolina comes as top class ahead of those institutions while it performed less strong in the citations of whole field. This aspect was considered as eclectic to evaluate the academic strengths of institution. The patent statistics have been compiled by concerned institutions, and not so challenging to confirm. Some institutional adjustment was made if the University of California comes first for the whole ten campus. Now we turn to see new Nobelists this year -- considered as top honors for the faculty, which is some part of factors for the university rankings. Therefore, it can be a source of competition for the sensitive universities who invited even for the temporal period of time to increase the international awareness or priority in the college rankings. In this sense, I have assigned more value with the number of alumni than the faculty members, who received the prize. Of course, it should be corroborating with my focus that there can we consider many of faculty awards much implicated with the context of national education, such as the national medals of science from the global jurisdictions (Guba, 1989).

Finally, the social aspect of institution based on the ranking of Facebook and Twitter needs to be considered that it is essentially intertwined with the intellectual aspect of college people beyond the social activities (1989). It also partly relates with the broad impact of institutions at global and national scale. I also viewed that the happiness concept of institutions is another important theme as we occasionally experience with the concerned people. Most importantly, the Facebook or Twitter now partly is the space of intellectual exchange of views and public opinions. A short comment in such social media from the influential scholars would be any echoing than hundreds-page books. We, of course, including the college people, can learn the essence of public issues and point of contentions. The informed people also could raise his view and opinions that was not feasible in the earlier years without such space. Along the transformation of our living mode, this aspect explains some part of institutional strength although little in share. Besides the direct ranking from Klout or others, the above Webometrics was utilized to compile the ranking, despite minimally, although it is neither immediate nor direct in terms of data attribute. There are some countries, of course, developed countries oftentimes, which compiled and published this type of data. The sources of this kind, globally and nationally, were considered to yield the final ranking.

- (I) A Scope of Intelligence on the Offerings (30%)
- (II) A Scope of Intelligence on the Publications (20%)
- (III) A Quality of Research on the Research Funding, Patent and Number of Doctorates Awarded (20%)
- (IV) A Quality of Research on the Citations and Awards of Faculty (20%)
- (IV) A New Mode of Intellectual and Social Exchange (10%)

**Table 1 *A Rating of Global Universities***

| 1  | University of Wisconsin-Madison       | (90.5) |
|----|---------------------------------------|--------|
| 2  | Harvard University                    | (90.0) |
| 3  | Stanford University                   | (87.0) |
| 4  | Massachusetts Institute of Technology | (86.5) |
| 4  | University of California-Berkeley     | (86.5) |
| 4  | University of Michigan-Ann Arbor      | (86.5) |
| 7  | Cambridge University                  | (85.5) |
| 7  | Oxford University                     | (85.5) |
| 9  | University of California-Los Angeles  | (83.0) |
| 10 | Cal Tech                              | (82.0) |
| 11 | University of Minnesota               | (81.0) |
| 11 | University of Pennsylvania            | (81.0) |

|    |                                    |        |
|----|------------------------------------|--------|
| 13 | Cornell University                 | (80.5) |
| 14 | Columbia University                | (80.0) |
| 15 | University College London          | (79.5) |
| 15 | University of North Carolina       | (79.5) |
| 15 | Yale University                    | (79.5) |
| 18 | Duke University                    | (78.5) |
| 19 | Johns Hopkins University           | (78.0) |
| 20 | Northwestern University            | (78.0) |
| 21 | University of California-San Diego | (77.0) |
| 22 | University of Washington-Seattle   | (76.5) |
| 23 | New York University                | (76.0) |
| 24 | University of Chicago              | (74.5) |
| 24 | King's College London              | (74.5) |
| 26 | University of British Columbia     | (72.5) |
| 26 | Australia National University      | (72.5) |
| 28 | University of Southern California  | (72.0) |
| 28 | University of Tokyo                | (72.0) |
| 28 | ETH-Zurich                         | (72.0) |
| 31 | University of Munich               | (71.0) |
| 32 | University of Heidelberg           | (70.5) |
| 33 | University of Illinois-Urbana C.   | (70.0) |
| 33 | Complutense University of Madrid   | (70.0) |
| 35 | University of Manchester           | (69.5) |
| 36 | Seoul National University          | (69.0) |
| 36 | University of Freiburg             | (69.0) |
| 36 | Beijing University                 | (69.0) |
| 39 | University of Vienna               | (68.5) |
| 40 | Moscow State University            | (68.0) |

- For the View of Graduates around 1990-2010years

### Data Considered

- (I) Two NRC assessments (1996/2010) of research doctorate (Other similar nature of national sources)
- (II) 2005-2013 Leiden ranking on the number of publications/2007 ranking from the Chronicle of Higher Education on the faculty productivity/SCImago institutional rankings (School's website and other similar nature of sources)
- (III) Over 20 years NSF ranking of research funding and the number of doctorates awarded (Other similar nature of national sources)/National and international patent statistics
- (IV) Wikipedia page for the Nobel recipients according to the institutional affiliation (School's webpage for the information of faculty awards)/ 2008 Thomson Reuter citation report of institutions
- (VI) Klout ranking of the colleges and universities on the social media and other similar nature of ranking sources on Twitter and Facebook/ Partly with the Webometrics ranking of world universities

### Exhibit II

I consider the methodology is the kind of cornerstone to yield a creative knowledge and thus definitive in forming the better world views. Let me kindly illustrate one example about the college selection of prospective international students who explored an option to study in the university other than US institutions. His major was one subject within the humanity and social sciences, and considered a pertinent guide available. Nowadays, many national and international source of college guides are publicly available, but his times would have scanty resources that provided a view for the prospective students. Among them, the Gourman report is one of popular ranking source around 1990's. The current

sources, such as QS and other international rankings would just follow that report around some years later in time sequence. The US news and world report, one other national source, would uniquely be in parallel with the report in terms of time span of reporting. Both began reporting around 1970's and 1980's while the current ranking sources were given a birth in the new millennium. The Gourman report was compiled and reported by Dr. Gourman, a counselor of Department of Education for the US government, and was published in the commercial version by the Princeton Review in 1997. My purpose here is twofold: (i) the qualitative method is one of best way to deeply look into the humans and universe; (ii) to provide the view of world best universities for the entering class around 1997 through 2003. Since the rating of institutions in this report is based on the academic curriculum, quality of teaching, research performance and campus facilities, i.e., mostly on the university libraries, it may dominantly be of quantitative piece except for some portions. Nevertheless, we can find the strand of qualitative approach with the separate deals for a major respective region, such as US and International sections. As we see, the most determinative query, in terms of research method discourse, would be, "what the researcher actually likes to know?" This query can lead to an adequate selection of methods between the three holds in practice, say, quantitative, qualitative, and mixed. Now we have vastly been bent on the quantitative method in generating an international ranking, such as measure of faculty publications and citations or so. It would be very kind to put some qualitative description of specific institution or special advice for the selection of colleges or subjects. The quantitative generalization, however, has a weakness to remain merely within the general description of populace. Furthermore, the quantitative factors may massively be on the field of engineering or natural science as the international rating agency itself is submissive. The fields are the kind of gold slot to generate the uniform scale of rating since the terms, versions and intelligence of those fields would be shared virtually at universal extent within the global professionals. From this attribute, the scale of measure can be uniform and persuasive for the stakeholders. This quality can no longer be held still strongly through the field of humanity and social science, in which the interest holders, such as prospective students in that area of study, would look for other more adequate guides or reference. Provided if the cultural, linguistic, and regional particulars are any more powerful factor that governs the area of such academics, their inquiry naturally turns on the qualitative nature (Huber & Whelan, 1999; Henry, 1989). The Gourman report can be seen responsive to this need, and provides a good point of reference for the qualitative understanding in terms of world view. It separated a region leading to the quality of acculturation, realistic view of world politics and discourse, and some of linguistic adaptation, though simply imperfect. As we note, the keys of qualitative studies may be illustrated with the kind of purposeful sampling in the stage of data collection or identification of patterns through the data analysis.

The Gourman report corroborates with this trait of qualitative inquiries if it is regional and grouped with an adequate details of presentation. Therefore, the studies of Dr. Gourman can be viewed as the mixed approach at exact terminology, and the blending and adaptation are a critical process to form a world view of his research findings. In this respect, we can see the kind of intrinsic from the current international rankings, so that they are not detailed through the faculty, master and doctorate and truncated into one unit, while the national rankings, particularly with the US sources, are gone otherwise. You can find the ranking of undergraduate institutions in the United States and that of international institutions below, which I blended to produce the global rankings, for example, between the Academia de Paris and Princeton University. The rest of blending and adapting can be elaborated with the concerned institutions or people who were the students in that period of time. Besides the particulars of humanity and social science, I also should be concerned of small colleges, such as Amherst, Oberlin, and others from the US institutions. This aspect is also pertinent, for example, the small or Grand Ecoles from France and special schools, such as Berkeley College or Julliard and conservatories for the European music schools. These schools are particularly the kind of exteriors that deserve a qualitative rating with the in-depth studies. Therefore, the USNWR will separate the ratings between the doctoral level universities and colleges. The special rating agency also may rate their field, for example, LA source for the world drama schools, and the National Jurist for the most affordable-library law schools (Hurteau, Houle, Mongiat, 2009).

The blending and adapting exemplified between the Academie de Paris and Princeton University have been based on several points of consideration that eventually came tied for the top place of world – for example, (i) they are within a respective region that the liberal and social intelligence originated and now flourishes -- this quality was reflected in one case that the national research centers, such as CNRS, Chinese or Russian Academy, play a pivotal role leading their intelligence and understanding of the world so as to be rated in the SCImago (ii) Paris, the original state of modern university system traced back to early of 13<sup>th</sup> century, and Princeton university for the national identity of United States (iii) besides the Gourman ranking, the institutions contributed to the world civilization massively over the humanity and social science and via production of nobelists (iv) I considered the balance of power, the terms of international politics,

through the weighing of global intelligence on equal footing – the view is the kind of art, as blended or adapted with uni/bi/multi-polarity, with the political scientists as if it would be with the qualitative researchers who rate the two distinct pans of intelligence, say, continental and US (National Academy of Science, 2000; Marty & Appleby, 1993; Koro-Ljungberg & Greckhamer, 2005). The qualitative researcher also does a best practice to identify the pattern of data, which could be applied to the data analysis. For example, the universities or Ecoles in Paris generally would arise from the common leverage as we note in *Parisien* or numbered name of universities, and are expected of public concept concerning the pattern of academics, common interchange and uniform supervision of doctoral studies with the Sorbonne scholars, as well as a number of specialized Ecoles under the title of Academie de Paris (Armstrong, Gosling, Weinman, Marteau, 1997; Carter, 1993).<sup>49</sup> It is useful to consider one institution, CEDS Paris -- a small graduate oriented institution, hence, out of scope of global ranking (Connelly, 1990). The institution provides the form of title page of doctoral dissertation embosomed with such logo, and often the doctoral supervisors are from the Paris universities. Then the researcher could identify this pattern of academic phenomenon with the capturing name of institutions, Academie de Paris, when rating the institutions by means of blending and adapting, in which the expanded coverage might be feasible for the small institutions, especially in the case of doctoral studies as once shown in the Technical Report III (Boland, 1995; Eaves, 2001). I considered more salient importance from the undergraduate ranking for the US universities -- around 70 percent from the total -- since the essential role will be to educate the general level of intellectuals, and vast in student populace. That is in contrast while graduate ranking shall be made more projected (same percent from the total) in the international universities that often the source of international commonality or sharing -- especially if combined with the US universities -- most facile derives from the graduate level of education. The undergraduate education in this frame can be more adequately assumed as subject to the graduate level of student and faculty in the case of international universities. In this way, we finally yield the overall global ranking. Below do we see part of sources from the rankings.

I have made a brief exploration of qualitative method as well as the importance of blending and adapting to generate a deep knowledge of humans and universe. This type of approach could grow and be viewed as more adequate in this post-modern global village, and it would not be unwise that is to be encouraged of this way of research and awareness.

**Table 2 *A Rating of Global Universities***

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | <b>Academie de Paris/Princeton University (tied as completed)</b>  |
| 2. |  |
| 3. |  |
| 4. |  |
| 5. |  |
| 6. |  |
| 7. | <b>* For example, Vienna and Cornell can be matched at 7<sup>th</sup> or Munich and Caltech may come at 12<sup>th</sup> after the qualitative evaluation are to be completed by the interested evaluators/This way can be ahead for the blanks through, as left with them.</b> |
| 8. |  |
| 9. |  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |

<sup>49</sup>This attribute also corroborates with the national uniformity of research mission as noted with the CNRS and the agencies of socialistic nations.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31-100

● For the View of Students around 1996-2003years

**Table3 A Part of Data: The Gourman Ranking (1997, Princeton Review/same ranking from the Korean guidebook around the 1990's)**

| A Rating of International Universities |                               | A Rating of Top 50 Undergraduate Institutions |                     |
|--|-------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1 (4.92)                               | Academie de Paris             | 1.  | Princeton           |
| 2 (4.91)                               | U. of Oxford                  | 2   | Harvard             |
| 3 (4.90)                               | U. of Cambridge               | 3.  | Michigan(Ann Arbor) |
| 4 (4.89)                               | U. of Heidelberg              | 4.  | Yale                |
| 5 (4.85)                               | U. of Montpellier I/II/III    | 5.  | Stanford            |
| 6 (4.83)                               | U. of Munich                  | 6.  | Calif, Berkeley     |
| 7 (4.81)                               | U. of Lyons I/II/III          | 7.  | Cornell             |
| 8 (4.80)                               | U. of Lillie I/II/III         | 8.  | Chicago             |
| 9 (4.79)                               | U. of Edinburgh               | 9.  | Wis. (Madison)      |
| 10 (4.77)                              | U. of Vienna                  | 10.   | UCLA                |
| 11 (4.75)                              | U. of Aix-Marseilles I/II/III | 11.   | MIT                 |
| 12 (4.73)                              | Free U. of Brussels           | 12.   | CAL TECH            |
| 13 (4.71)                              | U. of Zurich                  | 13.   | Calif. San Diego    |
| 14 (4.70)                              | U. of Gottingen               | 14.   | Northwestern        |
| 15 (4.68)                              | U. of Bordeaux I/II/III       | 15.   | Pennsylvania        |
| 16 (4.65)                              | U. of Nancy I/II              | 16.   | Columbia            |
| 17 (4.64)                              | U. of Toronto                 | 17.   | Minn. (Minneapolis) |
| 18 (4.61)                              | McGuill U.                    | 18.   | Brown               |
| 19 (4.59)                              | U. of Geneva                  | 19.   | Duke                |
| 20 (4.56)                              | U. of Tübingen                | 20.   | Dartmouth           |
| 21 (4.54)                              | U. of Erlangen-Nuremberg      | 21.   | Illinois (Urbana)   |
| 22 (4.53)                              | U. of Grenoble I/II/III       | 22.   | Brandeis            |
| 23 (4.52)                              | U. of Burgundy Dijon          | 23.   | Ind. (Bloomington)  |
| 24 (4.49)                              | U. of Marburg                 | 24.   | Johns Hopkins       |
| 25 (4.45)                              | U. of Rennes                  | 25.   | Notre Dame          |

|           | I/II/III                         |     |                                 |
|-----------|----------------------------------|-----|---------------------------------|
| 26 (4.44) | U. of Toulouse                   | 26. | Wash. (Seattle)                 |
| 27 (4.42) | U. of Rouen-Haute<br>-Normandie  | 27. | Rice                            |
| 28 (4.41) | U. of Clermont-<br>Ferrand I     | 28. | NC (Chapel Hill)                |
| 29 (4.36) | U. of Friedrich-<br>Wilhelm      | 29. | NYU                             |
| 30 (4.35) | U. of Bonn                       | 30. | SUNY (Buffalo)                  |
| 30 (4.35) | U. of Cologne                    | 31. | IOWA (Iowa City)                |
| 31 (4.33) | U. of Nice                       | 32. | Calif. Davis                    |
| 32 (4.32) | Hebrew U. of<br>Jerusalem        | 33. | Texas (Austin)                  |
| 33 (4.30) | Johann Wolfgang<br>Goethe        | 34. | OHIO State<br>(Columbus)        |
| 33 (4.30) | U. of Frankfurt                  | 35. | Carnegie-Mellon                 |
| 34 (4.24) | Catholic U. of<br>Louvain        | 36. | Calif. Irvine                   |
| 35 (4.20) | Stockholm U.                     | 37. | Penn State<br>(University Park) |
| 36 (4.17) | U. of Munster                    | 38. | Calif. Santa Barbara            |
| 37 (4.16) | U. of Copenhagen                 | 39. | Vanderbilt                      |
| 38 (4.15) | J. Gutenberg U.<br>Mainz         | 40. | Rochester                       |
| 39 (4.14) | U. of Wurzburg                   | 41. | Virginia                        |
| 40 (4.13) | U. of Franche- Comte<br>Besangon | 42. | Georgia Tech                    |
| 41 (4.12) | U. of Amsterdam                  | 43. | Michigan State                  |
| 42 (4.11) | U. of London                     | 44. | Purdue (Lafayette)              |
| 43 (4.10) | U. of Tokyo                      | 45. | Tufts                           |
| 44 (4.09) | U. of Nantes                     | 46. | Rutgers (New<br>Brunswick)      |
| 45 (4.08) | U. of Potiers                    | 47. | SUNY (Stony<br>Brook)           |
| 46 (4.07) | U. of Oleans                     | 48. | Tulane                          |
| 47 (4.05) | U. of Caen                       | 49. | Washington (St.<br>Louis)       |
| 48 (4.04) | U. of Bologna/U.                 | 50. | R.P.I.                          |
| 49 (4.03) | Madrid                           |     |                                 |

● Very Strong = 4.51-4.99 Strong = 4.01-4.49 Good = 3.61-3.99 Acceptable Plus = 3.01-3.59 Adequate = 2.51 – 2.99 Marginal = 2.01 – 2.49

## References

[1] Armstrong, D., Gosling, A., Weinman, J. & Marteau, T. (1997). The place of interrater reliability in qualitative research: An empirical study. *Sociology*, 31, 597–606.

[2] Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., & Delamont, S. (2003). *Key themes in qualitative research: continuities and changes*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

- [3] Bloland, H. G. (1995). Postmodernism and higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66, 521–559.
- [4] Carter, K. (1993). The place of a story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 22, 5–12, 18.
- [5] Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [6] Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2–14.
- [7] Creswell, J.W. (2009), *Research design :Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approach*, (Laureate Education, Inc., custom ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- [8] Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- [9] Eaves, YD (2001). A synthesis technique for grounded theory data analysis. *J. Adv. Nurs.* 35(5), 654-63.
- [10] Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- [11] Gergen, K. (1994). *Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- [12] Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- [13] Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- [14] Hashemi, S.H., Dastani, H. Sadri, J. (2013). A new data analysis technique to examine crack tip opening angle values tested in API X65 pipe steel. Retrieved July 28, 2015 from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264636060\\_A\\_new\\_data\\_analysis\\_technique\\_to\\_examine\\_crack\\_tip\\_opening\\_angle\\_values\\_tested\\_in\\_API\\_X65\\_pipe\\_steel](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264636060_A_new_data_analysis_technique_to_examine_crack_tip_opening_angle_values_tested_in_API_X65_pipe_steel)
- [15] Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- [16] Heinze, A. (2008). Blended learning: An interpretive action research study. Retrieved Aug. 11, 2015 from [http://usir.salford.ac.uk/1653/1/Heinze\\_2008\\_blended\\_e-learning.pdf](http://usir.salford.ac.uk/1653/1/Heinze_2008_blended_e-learning.pdf).
- [17] Henry, T. 1989. *Break all rules! Punk rock and the making of a style*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Research Press.
- [18] Holmes, U.T. (1962). *Daily living in the twelfth century*, Madison. WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- [19] Huber, J., & Whelan, K. (1999). A marginal story as a place of possibility: Negotiating self on the professional knowledge landscape. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 381–396.
- [20] Hurteau, M., Houle, S., & Mongiat, S. (2009). "How Legitimate and Justified are Judgments in Program Evaluation?". *Evaluation* 15 (3): 307–319. doi:10.1177/1356389009105883.
- [21] Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology* (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

- [22] Husserl, E. (1970). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology* (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- [23] JHSPH OPEN COURSEWARE. Qualitative Data Analysis. Retrieved July, 29, 2015 from <http://ocw.jhsph.edu/index.cfm/go/viewCourse/course/QualitativeDataAnalysis/coursePage/index/>.
- [24] Kim, K., Concerning the Research and Science (April 10, 2015). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2592858> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2592858>
- [25] Kim, K., Some Temperance on the Doctoral Studies and On-Line Education (April 3, 2015). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2589531> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2589531>
- [26] Koro-Ljungberg, M., & Greckhamer, T. (2005). Strategic turns labeled “ethnography”: From description to openly ideological production of cultures. *Qualitative Research*, 5(3), 285–306.
- [27] Kvale, S. (2006). Dominance through interviews and dialogues. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12, 480–500.
- [28] Laureate Education, Inc. (2008). *Research theory, design, and methods*. Baltimore, MD: Author. "Doctoral Research : Social Change."
- [29] Marty, M. E., and R. S. Appleby, (eds.) (1993). *Fundamentalism and the state*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [30] Mills, W. C. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [31] Merrill et al (2000). Qualitative Data Analysis Chapter 10, Retrieved from July 28, 2015 from [http://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/43454\\_10.pdf](http://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/43454_10.pdf).
- [32] National Academy of Sciences. (2000). *Scientific research in education*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- [33] Onwuegbuzie, A.J., Leech, N.L., Collins, K.M.T. (2012). Qualitative Analysis Techniques for the Review of the Literature *The Qualitative Report* 2012, Vol. 17, Art. 56, 1-28. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17/onwuegbuzie.pdf>.
- [34] Parson, T., (2009). The role of theory in social research. *American Sociological Review*, 3(1), pp.13-20.
- [35] Patton, M.Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Serv. Res.* 1999 Dec; 34(5 Pt 2): 1189–1208.
- [36] Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- [37] Ratcliff, D. (2015). Methods of Data Analysis in Qualitative Research. Retrieved July 28, 2015 from <https://connect.ssri.duke.edu/sites/connect.ssri.duke.edu/files/upload/help-resource/Ratcliff.15%20methods%20of%20qualitative%20data%20analysis.pdf>.
- [38] Reynold, P. D. (2007). *A primer in theory construction*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon
- [39] Rosenau, P. M. (1992). *Post-modernism and the social sciences: Insights, inroads, and intrusions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [40] Saldaña, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



- [41] Scott, J. 1985. *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- [42] Sanjek, R. (1990). *Fieldnotes: The makings of anthropology*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- [43] Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

## Corrections and Supplementary Notes

\* The final rank in table 1 only portrayed five institutions, which were considered to most probably top over the global law schools. Along with Cambridge as mentioned, Columbia University, University of Pennsylvania, University of London (tied at 6th place) can remain on the previous rankings in Exhibit II from my 2015 article on research doctoral programs in law. As you may conjecture, however, John. C. Coffee for New York University School of Law and Robert E. Scott for University of Michigan Law School may effect change on previous ranking according to the frame of researcher. Given that variable, Columbia, NYU and Michigan would be at 6th position as tied, and Cambridge, Penn, and London would be placed 7th (if tied means a group) or 9th (tied focused on an individual institution as usually practiced by IREGs). In this case, Robert P. Merges, as a new rookie for Columbia and Albert A. Ehrenzweig (earned SJD degree later in his years) peered to highlight Columbia case. You may note that a cook on such distinction between group or individual and social or capitalistic also permeated into my ranking formula. As you read, I applied a total number- based approach for Humanities and Social Science impact ranking in Exhibit III from above article. The justice for the quality of main group or society deserves a gravitation. Unlike a law discipline, the picture of Exhibit III is contaminated with many of European institutions, the kind of socialistic tradition of community. Given the educational ranking stands on the soil of addresses and consumers of ranking, it is thought to be more apposite to treat as a group or based on total number, which is other than the community of individual purse. As I linked above to my article in chapter 3, please visit if you are interested.

\* The chapter 2 is primarily designed to follow up with my previous publication for two doctoral programs, "A Teacher and Researcher: A Scratch on the Science Community and Meaning of Evaluation with the Research." Therefore, the presentation in that article remains valid to complement with this book content. First, the reason to rank underlies the lack of precise ranking source for two doctoral programs. Second, degree impact ranking in the article and book may be an important factor for consideration (55%), which is not perfect though. Third, other factors, such as faculty productivity or scholarly impact(15%), general reputation of law school (15%), and overall research performance of university, should come into play to yield a final doctoral ranking for the B-type student group, for example. Fourth, I reinstated, therefore, the previous ranking of 2015 publication and 2016 ranking shown at Table A1 "Consulting-Based Research Doctorate in law Ranking." However, you need to consider a possible slight change about the institutions from sixth through seventh or ninth as above-mentioned. The 2016 ranking was compiled within the article titled "The Graduate Law Degree Holders in the Legal Education Market: Evidence from the US, Rankings and Implications," which also was linked in chapter 3.

\* Under each category of factors, of course, variables can be schemed according to a respective rater, for instance, fellowships for Guggenheim, ALI, AAAS and many others-often entailed to a resume of law professors or peer review score or law journal rankings and etc. under the general reputation category. In that case, the evaluators or consultants need to be wiser as well as lenient to consider the particular national context of variables. For instance, excessive ratio for ALI or AAAS membership may foil other basis of researchers, a Russian or Chinese legal scholars when the ranking goes global. In any case, the approach with publication statistics seems most universal about persuasion at this point of time concerning scholarly excellence measurement. That is simply valid when we take account of practice from other ranking sources. So I also started with Most Cited as a basis of educational consulting or evaluation. For some cases, a rater may discard the overall aspect of university research performance when he or she works entirely in the end to rate the strength of legal research program in law (i.e., 20%-faculty, 25%-law school, 55%-degree impact). Four factors above would do good when the evaluator advises applicants for their preference to select the program institutions. As a reminder, my ranking formula was designed to highlight the effectiveness of degree holders, which comes to contrast with usual deals, what we see as faculty-oriented. The high ranked graduates or students in my case would be proud, "we learned from the caliber of faculty." The high ranked graduates or students in my case would be proud, "we are able to be a good legal researcher or professor if to follow the senior alumni faithfully." So I simply affirmed that there could be a plethora of formula leading to a different rank, which I am granted to expect.

\* As you see in Appendix I and II, I had been consistently equal for the two sources of ranking so that you will find two rankings tied through the end of list. An exception will be noted for the top two institutions in both appendices. My rationale is to assimilate both ranking lists with other usual commercial products in forms and style, to say, usually one institution at top. Additionally, the number of graduate students between US and UK was considered to decorate the top in Appendix I (more graduate students for US, hence, viewed more prosperous). The current status and practice of science world on publication and journals concerning scholars' language was taken into account to determine a solo top in Appendix II. The kind of idea, reversed discrimination or affirmative action in US terms of justice, was applied to give a preference to the French school provided that publication outlets mostly would be in English.

\* Given my all time approach, the pattern of scholarly impact is interesting on trend. It is relatively consistent and steady as years continue, which is because the law studies fall somewhere between the arts or humanities and social science. On one hand, old pieces of work can be taken as a classic to draw the scholarly attractions notwithstanding the time of publication. Nevertheless, such aspect is a matter of degree that the decline also occurs as same to the works of natural science or engineering. My assumption here is that the landscape and classification within Shapiro's formula stands good to understand the scholarship of jurisprudence and legal science. For example, Most Cited 50 can mean more than total of authors' citation in a specific institution because of its impression and subject identity to the scholars and students. Ranking most cited articles (other than authors or scholars) also has an independent consort despite a small number of total among all legal scholars. So my approach is very delicate and post-modernistic to measure the institutional strength of law discipline. Given this work is based on Most Cited, the range may come to picture - 50 or 100 as HeinOnline, I suggest that 50 can work fairly effectively. The degree year, say about LLM or SJD, PhD in law, also needs to be considered provided that those degrees may be earned later in lifetime so that works after the year should only be included for counting cites. If evaluator believes that the graduate law degrees later achieved is insubstantial or unrelated with academic accomplishment as per training, the scholars of sort may be excluded from ranking consideration even about the works afterward. As Shapiro hinted, no error to include all most cited workers could not be warranted so that researcher has to plunge to hear, feel and espionage for any unearthed cite monsters. For example, he may note Eugene Volokh for his amounting wake to earn citations recently. As said, new 50s for the list Most Cited could change because time intervened. Therefore, alteration could be feasible which is thought neither extensive or traded off as in Harvard case. The range can be newly set according to the judgment of respective author (which I encourage to deal with our post-modern reality) or all degree holders may be investigated as I attempted on my 2016 article. The researcher may set a cut-off number for inclusion, for instance, 3,000, 4,000, 5,000 and so for journal citations with yearly increase, 3,200 (of course, 4,200, 5,200), 3,400, 3,600 and on.

\* In the table 1, John Wade was originally omitted. The total number of cites (2,383 should be added) and percentage for yielding a rank was adjusted although his name did not appear due to the editing challenge. Carol Smart originally from Shapiro's was not considered for Sheffield because her degree was PhD in Socio-legal studies. The kind of ambiguity in degree name as in Professor Smart's case may resolve at the discretion and judgment of respective evaluator concerning whether to include or not. If included, Sheffield may come up with 8 or 10th place although her cites count might be nanny. Again, her impression and impact on British or global academia is precious in my case, although there could be other degree institutions with authors of more cites at total while she was on the list for one book as most cited. My formula, of course, does not cruelly oust other institutions, which I hate as you feel in my book title. The rest of unranked institutions would not be farther so that Stanford or Berkeley, Duke, and so (based on other ranking sources, such as USNW, ARWU, THE or QS) should follow immediately after University of Pennsylvania or Sheffield, whose ranks then appear as usually around. Global truncation is not desired as this work is post-modernistic and against mass deals fueling a desperation, derangement or discrimination, which is never preferred with the cause of globally familial community and consequent humanity. Of course, you will imagine, then, the ranks of other global institutions according to many plausible groups of comparison, which should come shoulder to shoulder with US law schools, considered most prominent at Westlaw or Lexis /Nexis.

\*Given a national group preferred by evaluator for reasons (such as language or distinct legal system), Seoul National University or Korea and Yonsei universities may come right after Penn or Sheffield with equal ranks to Stanford, Duke and Berkeley or so. This model of ranking design may multiply on the selection of evaluators with their cause and rationale about the group of law schools or program institutions. The ranked institutions in each group should not be discriminated with rationale and global policy of universalism, philanthropy, as well as idealistic and humane constitutionalism for oneness. For Asian case other than Korean group, Beijing or Tsinghua university, of course, may have no reason to be deranged from top 12 law schools or graduate degree programs. This context of new ranking parade may extend to Heidelberg or Munich, University of Complutence, McGill, Toronto and so on, according to the language scholars mainly use or legal system as well as national culture and system of legal education.

\*In Chapter 5, U-Multirank has been available for reference since 2014. It is a part of EU educational project and covers 850 higher educational institutions in 70 countries. The strength of this ranking resides in its flexibility to read the data enabling to create his or her own ranking, and now lately is added as one of global ranking for the box of global typology. Meanwhile, it is corrected that the RUR ranking provides a couple of subject ranking.

\* In history, the rating doctoral education is known to be exercised three times, 1982, 1996 and 2010. As common and sympathetic to the interested parties and public concerning the ranking materials, disagreement and criticism are not unusual. From the research doctorate, national and global rankings, intellectuals and experts are not few tantalizing to discuss the methodology and criticize the weaknesses or flaws of methodology. For example, the survey method is prone to mislead the goal of rating for various reasons, e.g. the pro-state or flagship university bias in the federal system of United States, less exposed, unserious or even pranking respondents to the surveyed area, and so. This does not mean if other ways of rating based on documentary evidence or scholastic record, for example, publications and citations, research funding, faculty award, SAT and GRE score is perfect and credible that one can be entirely relied. Despite its often sophistication and complexness, the method can be criticized for far-changeable regression or structural bias to distill new proposal as construction problems for final ranking, to say a few. In some cases, the report of ranking may be discredited for the methodological problem. In the main text, I have provided meta-information and ranking results as aided with the NRC assessment and USNW graduate programs ranking. With respect to the historic insights, I have added the doctoral ranking of publication dimension compiled by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils(CBARC) in 1982. It was the first time exercise that NRC participated with other three educational organizations and overcome the flaws of previous efforts addressing the increasing need to assess the doctoral education systemically and in an organized manner. Around the ethos and concern to national workforce committed to rank, Goldberger, Maher, & Evert described,

“The Studies of Huges, Keniston, Cartter and Roose and Anderson, relied entirely on reputational measures and were criticized for this (See for example, Dolan 1976; Harnett, Clark, and Baird, 1978) .... Participants at a 1976 conference on the Assessment of Quality Graduate Education Program organized by the CBARC identified some of the uses to be....What was needed, 1976 conference concluded, was a study “limited to research-doctorate programs and designed to improve the methodologies in earlier studies (John, Lindzey and Coggeshall, 1982...”

#### **Number of Top Score Doctoral Programs**

| Rank | Institution | 1 <sup>st</sup> ranked programs (A +B)* |
|------|-------------|---|
| 1    | UW-Madison  | 10                                      |
| 2    | UC-Berkeley | 9                                       |
| 3    | MIT         | 8                                       |
| 3    | Harvard     | 8                                       |
| 5    | UCLA        | 6                                       |
| 6    | Michigan    | 4                                       |
| 6    | Minnesota   | 4                                       |
| 6    | Stanford    | 4                                       |
| 9    | Cal Tech    | 3                                       |
| 9    | Yale        | 3                                       |

|    |                  |   |
|----|------------------|---|
| 11 | Chicago          | 2 |
| 11 | Illinois         | 2 |
| 11 | Princeton        | 2 |
| 11 | UC-Davis         | 2 |
| 15 | Colorado State   | 1 |
| 15 | NYU              | 1 |
| 15 | Purdue           | 1 |
| 15 | UC-San Francisco | 1 |
| 15 | U.Penn           | 1 |

**[A] Table 1**

| Rank | Institution    | 1982Report***<br>(pub.) | USNWR** | 1 <sup>st</sup> ranked |
|------|----------------|-------------------------|---------|------------------------|
| 1    | UW-Madison     | 2                       | 4       | 6                      |
| 2    | UC-Berkeley    | 4                       |         | 4                      |
| 2    | UCLA           | 2                       | 2       | 4                      |
| 4    | Michigan       | 2                       | 1       | 3                      |
| 4    | Harvard        | 2                       | 1       | 3                      |
| 6    | Illinois       | 2                       |         | 2                      |
| 6    | Minnesota      | 2                       |         | 2                      |
| 8    | Chicago        | 1                       |         | 1                      |
| 8    | Colorado State | 1                       |         | 1                      |
| 8    | MIT            | 1                       |         | 1                      |
| 8    | Purdue         | 1                       |         | 1                      |
| 8    | Stanford       |                         | 1       | 1                      |
| 8    | UC-Davis       | 1                       |         | 1                      |
| 8    | U-Penn         | 1                       |         | 1                      |
| 8    | Washington**** | 1                       |         | 1                      |

**[B] Table 2**

| Rank | Institution      | 1982 Report (rpu.)*** | USNWR** | 1 <sup>st</sup> ranked |
|------|------------------|-----------------------|---------|------------------------|
| 1    | MIT              | 7                     |         | 7                      |
| 2    | UC-Berkeley      | 5                     |         | 5                      |
| 3    | Harvard          | 4                     | 1       | 5                      |
| 4    | UW-Madison       |                       | 4       | 4                      |
| 5    | Cal Tech         | 3                     |         | 3                      |
| 5    | Yale             | 3                     |         | 3                      |
| 7    | Stanford         | 2                     | 1       | 3                      |
| 8    | Minnesota        | 2                     |         | 2                      |
| 8    | Princeton        | 2                     |         | 2                      |
| 8    | UCLA             |                       | 2       | 2                      |
| 8    | Michigan         | 1                     | 1       | 2                      |
| 12   | Chicago          | 1                     |         | 1                      |
| 12   | NYU              | 1                     |         | 1                      |
| 12   | UC-Davis         | 1                     |         | 1                      |
| 12   | UC-San Francisco | 1                     |         | 1                      |

### Number of Top 10 Doctoral Programs

| Rank | Institution    | 1982 Report** | USNWR*** | Total |
|------|----------------|---------------|----------|-------|
| 1    | UW-Madison     | 16            | 7        | 23    |
| 2    | UC-Berkeley    | 17            | 4        | 21    |
| 3    | Illinois       | 13            | 4        | 17    |
| 3    | UCLA           | 13            | 4        | 17    |
| 5    | MIT            | 12            | 1        | 13    |
| 6    | Minnesota      | 10            | 3        | 13    |
| 7    | Michigan       | 7             | 5        | 12    |
| 8    | Washington**** | 8             | 4        | 12    |
| 9    | Stanford       | 7             | 4        | 11    |
| 10   | Cornell        | 9             |          | 9     |
| 10   | Penn           | 7             | 1        | 8     |
| 10   | Yale           | 7             | 1        | 8     |
| 10   | Purdue         | 7             |          | 7     |

- \* Program integrity approach meaning no divide between reputation and survey. In other words, 10 means 5 professors as a top rank doctorate, 9 to 4.5 professors, 8 to 4 and 1 to 0.5.
- \*\* Monitored since 1990 and sample year plus adjustment made (1982-Present): Education & Other NRC uncovered subjects.
- \*\* B-School, Law School, Nursing School, and Medical School are not included for they are MBA/JD/MD focused-taught based mainly.
- \*\*\* The data 1982 report: sourced from RANKING OF UNIVERSITIES' REPUTATIONS AND NUMBER OF FACULTY PUBLICATIONS Jan. 17, 1983, New York Times.
- Between two dimensions on publication and reputation, the table shows *PUBLICATION LEADERS*.
- \*\*\*\* Seattle, WA

### Historical Chart for Select Research Universities

| Rank | Institution | 1925/1957/1965*  | 1970* | 1982 ** +USNW | 1996+US NW*** | 2010+US NW*** | Total Score |
|------|-------------|------------------|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1    | UW-Madison  | 97 (4/8/7)       | 42    | 100 (1/1)     | 100           | 100           | 439         |
| 2    | Harvard     | 100 (2/1/1)      | 48    | 96 (3/3)      | 94            | 100           | 438         |
| 3    | Stanford    | 95.5 (14/13/5.5) | 49    | 94 (2/7)      | 100           | 98            | 436.5       |
| 4    | UC-Berkeley | 99 (9/2/2)       | 50    | 99 (2/1)      | 94            | 94            | 436         |
| 5    | Yale        | 99.5 (5/4/3)     | 45    | 92 (5/6)      | 95            | 93            | 424.5       |
| 6    | Michigan    | 96.5 (8/5/8)     | 42    | 91 (4/8)      | 96            | 95            | 420.5       |
| 7    | Princeton   | 98 (6/7/4)       | 45    | 90 (8/6)      | 92            | 95            | 420         |
| 8    | UCLA        | 92 (NA/14/11)    | 45    | 97 (2/3)      | 92            | 93            | 419         |
| 9    | Chicago     | 98.5 (1/6/6.5)   | 45    | 90 (6/8)      | 90            | 84            | 407.5       |
| 10   | Columbia    | 97.5 (3/3/9)     | 42    | 86 (N/6)      | 90            | 89            | 404.5       |
| 11   | Illinois    | 95 (11/10/12)    | N     | 94 (6/3)      | 90            | 90            | 369         |

|          |                        |                   |    |           |    |    |       |
|----------|------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------|----|----|-------|
| 12       | Cornell                | 96 (10/9/11)      | N  | 84 (N/10) | 93 | 92 | 365   |
| 13       | Minnesota              | 95.5 (13/12/14.5) | N  | 91 (6/6)  | 90 | 85 | 361.5 |
| 14       | Penn                   | 94 (12/11/13.5)   | N  | 88 (8/10) | 90 | 86 | 358   |
| 15       | Washington (St. Louis) | 89 (N/N/24)       | N  | 89 (8/8)  | 79 | 79 | 336   |
| 16       | MIT                    | (N/N/N)           | 43 | 96(1/5)   | 96 | 92 | 327   |
| 17       | Texas                  | 91.5 (N/N/17.5)   | N  | N         | 91 | 92 | 274.5 |
| 18       | WA (Seattle)           | 92 (N/N/16.5)     | N  | N         | 90 | 87 | 269   |
| 19       | UNC                    | 91.5 (N/N/17.5)   | N  | N         | 88 | 87 | 266.5 |
| 20       | J. Hopkins             | 94.5 (7/16/10.5)  | N  | N         | 85 | 86 | 265.5 |
| 21       | Ohio State             | 92.5 (15/18/22.5) | N  | N         | 88 | 85 | 265.5 |
| 22       | Duke                   | 90 (N/N/22.5)     | N  | N         | 87 | 85 | 262   |
| 23       | Cal Tech               | (N/N/N)           | N  | 87(6/N)   | 90 | 80 | 257   |
| 24       | NYU                    | 90 (N/N/17.5)     | N  | N         | 83 | 83 | 256   |
| 25       | Northwestern           | 93.5 (17/17/16.5) | N  | N         | 80 | 80 | 253.5 |
| 26       | Indiana                | 93 (19/15/17.5)   | N  | N         | 79 | 81 | 253   |
| 27       | Purdue                 | N                 | N  | 88(8/10)  | 80 | 83 | 251   |
| 28       | Brown                  | 90.5 (N/N/21)     | N  | N         | 79 | 79 | 248.5 |
| 29       | Cal S.F.               | N                 | N  | 83(12/N)  | 83 | 78 | 244   |
| 30       | Penn State             | N                 | N  | N         | 89 | 91 | 180   |
| 31       | Pittsburg              | N                 | N  | N         | 83 | 83 | 166   |
| 32       | Pittsburg              | N                 | N  | N         | 83 | 83 | 166   |
| 33       | UC-SD                  | N                 | N  | N         | 81 | 83 | 162   |
| 34(tied) | Case Western           | N                 | N  | N         | 80 | 78 | 158   |

- \* A systemic assessment of doctoral programs is known to begin 1982 report, which was provoked with the recognition of latent flaws from pure reputational measure and agreed by the conference of four key institutions (CBARC) including NRC. Hence, 1970 result is taken into account in half (subjective and reputational only) or 20-30 percent (for the number of auspice institutions) against other recent reports. By the same token, 70-100 percent seems adequate for the reports 1925/1957/1965, which were (i) made in the context of no national auspice or (ii) technical schools, such as Cal Tech or MIT and state universities, such as Iowa State or Michigan State, were not considered. The scores for oldest three reports are calculated on the rank yielded by average of three reports (least number for rank order) and 0.5 points are subtracted per one slot differential from the top score, 100.
- For overall score, the threshold for selection of list institutions requires to be scored more than one time in each of five ranking tables (two tables in Model I Chapter 3, 1982 report +

USNW, 1970 report, 1925/1957/1967 reports).

- \*\* For 1982 scores, four ranking schemes (pub/reputation, top/top ten) were considered and the institutions above two lists of tables qualify for final result. Then, the scores are given to account for two best results. Two best results (indicated in parenthesis) are averaged to receive the ranking. The top institution is given 100 scores. The institutions are given 90 scores if the average ranges between 2-6th and are given 80 scores if between 7-11th. Adjustment is made from the given score in due context.
- \*\*\* For two most recent ranking tables, top institutions (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup>) are given 100 scores.. The institutions are given scores as yielded from the formula Breadth/Depth dichotomy in Model I and scaled to the top score 100. Unranked institutions in the first Table are scored. Many institutions still are left as not scored. The second table is even shorter for this book mainly intended to turn up for lead research universities, hence, could possibly jeopardize other institutions left NA or blank. That is left for work of later generations. Nevertheless, I believe that the current rank tabulated in this historical chart will not change if the formula and methodology are same to this book. Adjustment is made from the given score in due context. .
- N or blank means no significant data for institutions. The aim of this historical chart is to show the historical development of research institutions and corresponding wake of doctoral ratings. Therefore, the final ranking does not indicate the current strength of list institutions as enchanted in MIT or Cal Tech. On the other hand, it needs to be noted that the breadth or diversity of programs were much more emphasized than micro-scale of quality jumbles, which could penalize the institutions with a small number of competitive programs. Given the informative society and increasing congruence among the doctoral education, I believe that the diversity or breadth of programs needs to be spoken more starkly if we like to know the overall rank of doctoral education, let alone that of specific program. This way of approach was especially experimented in the reference to 2010 NRC and USNW graduate programs ranking, which follows next.
- Data Source : 2010 NRC report/1996 NRC report/NY Times Jan. 17, *RANKING OF UNIVERSITIES' REPUTATIONS AND NUMBER OF FACULTY PUBLICATIONS*
- *National Research Council. (1995). Research doctorate programs in the United States: Continuity and change. National Academies Press.*
- Smith, W., & Bender, T. (Eds.). (2008). *American higher education transformed, 1940–2005: Documenting the national discourse.* JHU Press.
- Keniston, H. (1959). Graduate Study and Research in the Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania. *History of the University of Pennsylvania*, 4.
- The purpose of this book is to compile the ranking data and provides a rating for the research doctorate programs. Hence, the professional programs, for example, law schools for JD degree or business schools for MBA was not intended to deal with. In this chart, therefore, the data source and cited authorities above - rated as most systemically or with popularity, are referenced to compile the final ranking. From other sources, you can be helped out for professional schools or more inclusively about the graduate level study. The information of professional school or more information for the graduate level study is available, for example, A Rating of Professional School Dean in 1974, Gourman Report of Graduate Programs: A Rating of Graduate and Professional Programs in the US and International Universities and USNW Graduate Programs Ranking.

I appreciate that a concerned reader continually informed the errors and suggestions for improvement, especially with respect to the Chapter 3 (8th edits, June 12, 2019; 9th edits, January 14, 2020; 10th edits, January 25, 2020).



## **A Reference to the Graduate Studies in the United States**

### **2010 National Research Council Study**

\* The table shows the top universities according to the number of programs, whose possible highest rating is placed within the range 1<sup>st</sup> -17<sup>th</sup> in either R or S rank of most recent 2010 NRC assessment. It was prepared from the revised NRC report published in 2011.

**Table 1 The Research Doctorate Ranking on Diversity and Quality**

| Rank | Institution          | Number of<br>Top Programs | Rated<br>Programs | Scores<br>(PTDS-6,000) |
|------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| # 1  | Wisconsin(Madison)   | 59                        | 78                | 5,9xx                  |
| # 2  | Michigan(Ann Arbor)  | 57                        | 65                | 5,7xx                  |
| # 3  | UCLA                 | 53                        | 59                | 5,3xx                  |
| # 4  | Harvard              | 51                        | 52                | 5,1xx                  |
| # 5  | UC-Berkeley          | 50                        | 52                | 5,0xx                  |
| # 6  | Texas (Austin)       | 48                        | 63                | 4,8xx                  |
| # 7  | Cornell              | 48                        | 61                | 4,8xx                  |
| # 8  | Penn State           | 47                        | 65                | 4,7xx                  |
| # 9  | Stanford             | 46                        | 47                | 4,6xx                  |
| # 10 | Yale                 | 43                        | 48                | 4,3xx                  |
| # 11 | Illinois (Urbana)    | 42                        | 58                | 4,2xx                  |
| # 12 | Columbia             | 40                        | 47                | 4,0xx                  |
| # 13 | Washington(Seattle)  | 39                        | 59                | 3,9xx                  |
| # 14 | UNC (Chapel Hill)    | 37                        | 51                | 3,7xx                  |
| # 15 | Johns Hopkins        | 36                        | 51                | 3,6xx                  |
| # 16 | U. Penn              | 36                        | 41                | 3,6xx                  |
| # 17 | Duke                 | 34                        | 39                | 3,4xx                  |
| # 18 | Princeton            | 34                        | 35                | 3,4xx                  |
| # 19 | Minnesota            | 33                        | 69                | 3,3xx                  |
| # 20 | Maryland             | 33                        | 56                | 3,3xx                  |
| # 21 | Chicago              | 31                        | 37                | 3,1xx                  |
| # 22 | UC (Davis)           | 30                        | 50                | 3,0xx                  |
| # 23 | NYU                  | 30                        | 37                | 3,0xx                  |
| # 24 | U. Arizona           | 27                        | 55                | 2,7xx                  |
| # 25 | Purdue               | 27                        | 46                | 2,7xx                  |
| # 26 | MIT                  | 27                        | 27                | 2,7xx                  |
| # 27 | UC (San Diego)       | 25                        | 33                | 2,5xx                  |
| # 28 | Indiana(Bloomington) | 24                        | 44                | 2,4xx                  |
| # 29 | Pittsburg            | 24                        | 38                | 2,4xx                  |
| # 30 | Michigan State       | 23                        | 54                | 2,3xx                  |
| # 31 | Northwestern         | 23                        | 31                | 2,3xx                  |
| # 32 | Cal Tech             | 23                        | 24                | 2,3xx                  |

|             |                       |    |    |       |
|-------------|-----------------------|----|----|-------|
| # 33        | Washington(St. Louis) | 22 | 35 | 2,2xx |
| # 34        | Brown                 | 22 | 33 | 2,2xx |
| # 35        | U. Georgia            | 21 | 48 | 2,1xx |
| # 36        | Colorado              | 20 | 47 | 2,0xx |
| # 37        | Texas A&M             | 20 | 46 | 2,0xx |
| # 38        | Florida               | 19 | 60 | 1,9xx |
| # 39        | USC                   | 19 | 46 | 1,9xx |
| # 40        | UC (Irvine)           | 19 | 36 | 1,9xx |
| # 41        | SUNY (Stony Brook)    | 19 | 32 | 1,9xx |
| # 43        | Rutgers (New Bruin.)  | 18 | 46 | 1,8xx |
| # 44        | UC (Santa Barbara)    | 18 | 32 | 1,8xx |
| # 45        | Carnegie Mellon       | 17 | 22 | 1,7xx |
| # 46        | Iowa                  | 16 | 49 | 1,6xx |
| # 47        | Rochester             | 16 | 31 | 1,6xx |
| # 48        | Emory                 | 16 | 27 | 1,6xx |
| # 49        | Virginia              | 15 | 38 | 1,5xx |
| # 50        | Virginia Polytech     | 15 | 34 | 1,5xx |
| # 51        | Vanderbilt            | 15 | 31 | 1,5xx |
| # 52        | Georgia Tech          | 15 | 22 | 1,5xx |
| # 53        | Boston Univ.          | 14 | 39 | 1,4xx |
| # 54        | Connecticut           | 13 | 57 | 1,3xx |
| # 55        | North Carolina State  | 13 | 42 | 1,3xx |
| # 56        | Oregon State          | 13 | 40 | 1,3xx |
| # 57        | Washington St.        | 13 | 37 | 1,3xx |
| # 58        | LSU and Agri.         | 13 | 36 | 1,3xx |
| # 59        | Massachusetts         | 12 | 39 | 1,2xx |
| # 60        | Arizona State         | 12 | 26 | 1,2xx |
| # 61        | Baylor College Med.   | 12 | 12 | 1,2xx |
| # 62        | Case Western Res.     | 11 | 30 | 1,1xx |
| # 63        | UC (San Francisco)    | 11 | 12 | 1,1xx |
| # 64        | Kentucky              | 10 | 43 | 1,0xx |
| # 65        | Missouri (Columbia)   | 10 | 42 | 1,0xx |
| # 66        | Illinois (Chicago)    | 10 | 34 | 1,0xx |
| # 67        | Nebraska (Lincoln)    | 10 | 29 | 1,0xx |
| # 68        | UC (Riverside)        | 10 | 28 | 1,0xx |
| # 69        | Rice Univ.            | 10 | 27 | 1,0xx |
| # 70        | SUNY (Buffalo)        | 9  | 33 | 9xx   |
| # 71        | Rensselaer Polytech   | 9  | 17 | 9xx   |
| # 72        | Texas (Houston)       | 9  | 12 | 9xx   |
| # 73        | Utah                  | 8  | 35 | 8xx   |
| # 74        | Miami                 | 8  | 26 | 8xx   |
| # 75        | Oregon Health & Sci.  | 8  | 13 | 8xx   |
| # 76        | Hawaii (Manoa)        | 7  | 31 | 7xx   |
| # 77 (tied) | Delaware              | 7  | 27 | 7xx   |

|                     |                      |   |    |     |
|---------------------|----------------------|---|----|-----|
| <b># 77 (tied)</b>  | Kansas State         | 7 | 27 | 7xx |
| <b># 79</b>         | Brandeis             | 7 | 18 | 7xx |
| <b># 80</b>         | Notre Dame           | 7 | 16 | 7xx |
| <b># 81</b>         | CUNY                 | 6 | 36 | 6xx |
| <b># 82</b>         | Florida State        | 6 | 25 | 6xx |
| <b># 83</b>         | Texas (Dallas)       | 6 | 20 | 6xx |
| <b># 84</b>         | Dartmouth            | 6 | 11 | 6xx |
| <b># 85</b>         | Kansas               | 5 | 41 | 5xx |
| <b># 86</b>         | Alabama (Birming.)   | 5 | 34 | 5xx |
| <b># 87</b>         | Cincinnati           | 5 | 28 | 5xx |
| <b># 88</b>         | New Mexico           | 5 | 26 | 5xx |
| <b># 89 (tied)</b>  | Arkansas             | 5 | 24 | 5xx |
| <b># 89 (tied)</b>  | Syracuse             | 5 | 24 | 5xx |
| <b># 90</b>         | Tufts                | 5 | 23 | 5xx |
| <b># 91</b>         | Oregon               | 5 | 21 | 5xx |
| <b># 92</b>         | Bowling GSU          | 5 | 10 | 5xx |
| <b># 93</b>         | Tennessee            | 4 | 37 | 4xx |
| <b># 94</b>         | SUNY (Binghamton)    | 4 | 23 | 4xx |
| <b># 95</b>         | George Washington    | 4 | 20 | 4xx |
| <b># 96</b>         | Georgetown           | 4 | 16 | 4xx |
| <b># 97 (tied)</b>  | Boston College       | 4 | 15 | 4xx |
| <b># 97 (tied)</b>  | Central Florida      | 4 | 15 | 4xx |
| <b># 99</b>         | Wake Forest          | 4 | 11 | 4xx |
| <b>#100</b>         | Thomas Jefferson     | 4 | 6  | 4xx |
| <b># 101</b>        | Louisiana-La Fayette | 4 | 4  | 4xx |
| <b># 102 (tied)</b> | S. Carolina (Colum.) | 3 | 25 | 3xx |
| <b># 102 (tied)</b> | SUNY (Albany)        | 3 | 25 | 3xx |
| <b># 104</b>        | Colorado State       | 3 | 22 | 3xx |
| <b># 105</b>        | Mississippi State    | 3 | 21 | 3xx |
| <b># 106</b>        | South Florida        | 3 | 20 | 3xx |
| <b># 107</b>        | Loyola U. Chicago    | 3 | 19 | 3xx |
| <b># 108</b>        | Tulane               | 3 | 15 | 3xx |
| <b># 109</b>        | Memphis              | 3 | 14 | 3xx |
| <b># 110</b>        | Idaho                | 3 | 13 | 3xx |
| <b># 111</b>        | College Wil & Mary   | 3 | 6  | 3xx |
| <b># 112 (tied)</b> | Houston              | 2 | 26 | 2xx |
| <b># 112 (tied)</b> | Temple Univ.         | 2 | 26 | 2xx |
| <b># 114</b>        | Clemson Univ.        | 2 | 24 | 2xx |
| <b># 115</b>        | Drexel Univ.         | 2 | 20 | 2xx |
| <b># 116</b>        | Catholic Univ.       | 2 | 18 | 2xx |
| <b># 117</b>        | Georgia State        | 2 | 17 | 2xx |
| <b># 118</b>        | Leigh Univ.          | 2 | 16 | 2xx |
| <b># 119 (tied)</b> | New Mexico State     | 2 | 15 | 2xx |
| <b># 119 (tied)</b> | North Dakota State   | 2 | 15 | 2xx |

|              |                       |   |    |     |
|--------------|-----------------------|---|----|-----|
| # 121        | New Jersey Tech       | 2 | 14 | 2xx |
| # 122        | Michigan Tech         | 2 | 12 | 2xx |
| # 123        | Ohio Univ.            | 2 | 11 | 2xx |
| # 124 (tied) | Alaska (Fairbank)     | 2 | 8  | 2xx |
| # 124 (tied) | Miami Univ.           | 2 | 8  | 2xx |
| # 124 (tied) | Rhode Island          | 2 | 8  | 2xx |
| # 124 (tied) | San Diego State       | 2 | 8  | 2xx |
| # 128 (tied) | Med. & Den (New J.)   | 2 | 7  | 2xx |
| # 128 (tied) | Rutgers (Piscataway)  | 2 | 7  | 2xx |
| # 130        | Wayne State           | 1 | 33 | 1xx |
| # 131        | Auburn Univ.          | 1 | 30 | 1xx |
| # 132        | Oklahoma              | 1 | 25 | 1xx |
| # 133        | North Texas           | 1 | 22 | 1xx |
| # 134 (tied) | Kent State            | 1 | 17 | 1xx |
| # 134 (tied) | New Hampshire         | 1 | 17 | 1xx |
| # 136        | Texas Tech            | 1 | 15 | 1xx |
| # 137 (tied) | Indiana/Purdue        | 1 | 14 | 1xx |
| # 137 (tied) | Maryland (Bal. Coun.) | 1 | 14 | 1xx |
| # 139 (tied) | Univ. Vermont         | 1 | 11 | 1xx |
| # 139 (tied) | Wisconsin (Mil.)      | 1 | 11 | 1xx |
| # 141 (tied) | Baylor Univ.          | 1 | 9  | 1xx |
| # 141 (tied) | Claremont             | 1 | 9  | 1xx |
| # 143        | Clark Univ.           | 1 | 7  | 1xx |
| # 144        | American Univ.        | 1 | 6  | 1xx |
| # 145 (tied) | N. Carolina (Char.)   | 1 | 5  | 1xx |
| # 145 (tied) | Univ. Dayton          | 1 | 5  | 1xx |
| # 147 (tied) | Wright state          | 1 | 4  | 1xx |
| # 147 (tied) | Wyoming               | 1 | 4  | 1xx |
| # 149 (tied) | Adelphi Univ.         | 1 | 1  | 1xx |
| # 149 (tied) | Cold Spring Harbor    | 1 | 1  | 1xx |
| # 149 (tied) | Drew Univ.            | 1 | 1  | 1xx |
| # 149 (tied) | Graduate The. Union   | 1 | 1  | 1xx |
| # 149 (tied) | Maryland (Baltimore)  | 1 | 1  | 1xx |
| # 149 (tied) | Maryland (East Sho.)  | 1 | 1  | 1xx |
| # 149 (tied) | Mt. Sinai Sch. Med.   | 1 | 1  | 1xx |
| # 149 (tied) | Rockefeller Univ.     | 1 | 1  | 1xx |
| # 157        | Nevada (Reno)         | 0 | 22 | xx  |
| # 158        | Southern Illinois     | 0 | 21 | xx  |
| # 159        | Virginia Common.      | 0 | 20 | xx  |
| # 160 (tied) | Florida International | 0 | 18 | xx  |
| # 160 (tied) | Univ. Alabama         | 0 | 18 | xx  |
| # 162 (tied) | Univ. Toledo          | 0 | 17 | xx  |
| # 162 (tied) | Western Michigan      | 0 | 17 | xx  |
| # 164 (tied) | Northeastern Univ.    | 0 | 16 | xx  |

|                     |                       |   |    |    |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---|----|----|
| <b># 164 (tied)</b> | Uni. Louisville       | 0 | 16 | xx |
| <b># 166 (tied)</b> | Old Dominion Univ.    | 0 | 15 | xx |
| <b># 166 (tied)</b> | Univ. Mississippi     | 0 | 15 | xx |
| <b># 168 (tied)</b> | Howard Univ.          | 0 | 14 | xx |
| <b># 168 (tied)</b> | Utah State            | 0 | 14 | xx |
| <b># 170</b>        | Missouri (Rolla)      | 0 | 13 | xx |
| <b># 171 (tied)</b> | Montana (Missoula)    | 0 | 12 | xx |
| <b># 171 (tied)</b> | Missouri (Kan. City)  | 0 | 12 | xx |
| <b># 171 (tied)</b> | Southern Mississippi  | 0 | 12 |    |
| <b># 171 (tied)</b> | Univ. Akron           | 0 | 12 | xx |
| <b># 175 (tied)</b> | Alabama (Huntsville)  | 0 | 11 | xx |
| <b># 175 (tied)</b> | Illinois Tech         | 0 | 11 | xx |
| <b># 175 (tied)</b> | Marquette Univ.       | 0 | 11 | xx |
| <b># 178 (tied)</b> | Fordham Univ.         | 0 | 10 | xx |
| <b># 178 (tied)</b> | Montana State         | 0 | 10 | xx |
| <b># 178 (tied)</b> | Northern Illinois     | 0 | 10 | xx |
| <b># 178 (tied)</b> | Southern Methodist    | 0 | 10 | xx |
| <b># 182 (tied)</b> | Florida Atlantic      | 0 | 9  | xx |
| <b># 182 (tied)</b> | North Dakota          | 0 | 7  | xx |
| <b># 182 (tied)</b> | SUNY H. Sci. Cntr.    | 0 | 7  | xx |
| <b># 185 (tied)</b> | Cleveland State       | 0 | 6  | xx |
| <b># 185 (tied)</b> | Loma Linda Univ.      | 0 | 6  | xx |
| <b># 185 (tied)</b> | Massachusetts (Wor.)  | 0 | 6  | xx |
| <b># 188</b>        | Texas Christian Univ. | 0 | 5  | xx |
| <b># 189 (tied)</b> | Clarkson Univ.        | 0 | 4  | xx |
| <b># 189 (tied)</b> | Florida Tech          | 0 | 4  | xx |
| <b># 189 (tied)</b> | Uninformed Service    | 0 | 4  | xx |
| <b># 192</b>        | Univ. Dallas          | 0 | 3  | xx |
| <b># 193 (tied)</b> | Duquesne Univ.        | 0 | 2  | xx |
| <b># 193 (tied)</b> | Rutgers (Newark)      | 0 | 2  | xx |
| <b># 193 (tied)</b> | UNC (Greensboro)      | 0 | 2  | xx |
| <b># 196 (tied)</b> | Hebrew Union (Jew.)   | 0 | 1  | xx |
| <b># 196 (tied)</b> | NY Medical College    | 0 | 1  | xx |
| <b># 196 (tied)</b> | Seton Hall Univ.      | 0 | 1  | xx |
| <b># 196 (tied)</b> | Stevens Ins. Tech.    | 0 | 1  | xx |
| <b># 196 (tied)</b> | Tennessee Theo.       | 0 | 1  | xx |

**Table 2 The Graduate Programs Ranking on Diversity and Quality**

| GP Rank | Institution           | Rank (National) | Rank (Global) | Tuition           | Enrollment | Test Scores         | Programs Reported | Programs (#1-#34) | Variables & Remark  | Scores (PTDS - 3,800) |
|---------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|
| # 1     | Wisconsin (Madison)   | # 46            | # 37          | 37,785/<br>10,725 | 32,648     | 1300-1480/<br>27-32 | 36/47             | 33/44             | 25 programs   | 3,3xx                 |
| # 2     | Washington (Seattle)  | # 62            | # 10          | 38,796/<br>11,465 | 32,099     | 1220-1460/<br>27-32 | 37/48             | 33/44             | 22 programs (tie-break by number of top 20 programs)                                  | 3,3xx                 |
| # 3     | Michigan, (Ann-Arbor) | # 25            | # 17          | 51,200/<br>15,558 | 30,318     | 1330-1510/<br>30-34 | 32/43             | 32/43             |   | 3,2xx                 |
| # 4     | UNC-Chapel Hill       | # 29            | # 33          | 36,222/<br>9,043  | 19,117     | 1270-1470           | 35/39             | 31/35             |   | 3,1xx                 |
| # 5     | Univ. Minnesota       | # 70            | # 47          | 33,325/<br>15,027 | 34,633     | 1270-1480/<br>26-31 | 37/48             | 30/41             | #unranked (1)   | 3,0xx                 |
| # 6     | Columbia              | # 3             | # 7           | 61,850            | 6,202      | 1450-1560/<br>33-35 | 30/38             | 30/38             | # 31 Medical school-Primary care<br># 27 Statistic                                    | 3,0xx                 |
| # 7     | Ohio State (Columbus) | # 54            | # 45          | 32,061/<br>11,084 | 46,820     | 1240-1450/<br>27-32 | 35/46             | 28/39             |   | 2,8xx                 |
| # 8     | UCLA                  | # 20            | # 14          | 42,218/<br>13,226 | 31,557     | 1270-1520/<br>28-34 | 28/38             | 28/38             | # 31 Statistics<br># 27 Statistics (Biostatistics)                                    | 2,8xx                 |
| # 9     | Texas (Austin)        | # 48            | # 34          | 38,228/<br>10,828 | 40,804     | 1230-1480/<br>27-33 | 31/42             | 27/38             | #5 library science<br>#7 pharmacy<br>#8 psychology<br>#50 statistics<br>#unranked (2) | 2,7xx                 |
| #10     | Univ. Penn            | # 6             | # 16          | 57,700            | 10,183     | 1440-1560/<br>32-35 | 30/40             | 27/37             | #58 public affairs<br>#68 earth science   | 2,7xx                 |

|     |                               |      |      |                   |        |                       |       |        |   |       |
|-----|-------------------------------|------|------|-------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------|--------|---|-------|
| #11 | Yale                          | # 3  | # 12 | 55,500            | 5,964  | 1,450-1560/<br>33-35) | 26/32 | 24/29  | #1 law<br>#1 history  | 2,4xx |
| #12 | Duke                          | # 10 | # 22 | 58,198            | 6,682  | 1450-1570/<br>33-35   | 26/33 | 24/31  | #1 physician assistant<br>#46 earth science   | 2,4xx |
| #13 | UC (Berkeley)                 | # 22 | # 4  | 43,176/<br>14,184 | 30,853 | 1300-1530/<br>28-34   | 24/35 | 24/35  | #20 Education   | 2,4xx |
| #14 | Harvard                       | # 2  | # 1  | 51,925            | 6,788  | 1460-1580/<br>33-35   | 23/32 | 23/31  | #22 engineering   | 2,3xx |
| #15 | Illinois (Urbana)             | # 48 | # 59 | 33,352/<br>16,210 | 33,915 | 1220-1480/<br>26-32   | 28/39 | 22/33  |   | 2,2xx |
| #16 | Northwestern                  | # 9  | # 24 | 56,691            | 8,231  | 1430-1550/<br>33-35   | 27/36 | 22/31  | #55 Statistics<br>#75 Fine Arts   | 2,2xx |
| #17 | Johns Hopkins                 | # 10 | # 11 | 55,350            | 6,064  | 1470-1560/<br>33-35   | 24/35 | 21//30 | #49 Political Science<br>#Unranked (1)  | 2,1xx |
| #18 | Cornell                       | # 17 | # 23 | 57,222            | 15,182 | 1390-1540/<br>32-34   | 23/31 | 21/29  | #34 public affairs<br>#27 biological science  | 2,1xx |
| #19 | Stanford                      | #6   | #3   | 53,529            | 7,087  | 1420-1570/<br>32-35   | 21/32 | 21/32  | #32 Fine Arts<br>#21 Physician Assistant  | 2,1xx |
| #20 | USC (Southern California)     | # 22 | # 69 | 58,195            | 19,907 | 1350-1530/<br>30-34   | 31/42 | 20/30  | #unranked nursing-master's<br>#1 occupational therapy<br>#4 physical therapy<br>#61 physics | 2,0xx |
| #21 | Washington (St. Louis)        | # 19 | # 31 | 55,292            | 7,751  | 1470-1570/<br>32-35   | 26/34 | 20/22  |   | 2,0xx |
| #22 | NYU                           | # 29 | # 28 | 53,308            | 26,733 | 1310-1510/<br>29-34   | 30/41 | 19/22  |   | 1,9xx |
| #23 | Univ. Maryland (College Park) | # 64 | # 51 | 36,890/<br>10,778 | 30,762 | 1290-1480/<br>28-33   | 24/35 | 19/29  |   | 1,9xx |

|     |                       |       |       |                   |        |                     |       |       |   |       |
|-----|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|-------|-------|---|-------|
| #24 | Univ. Chicago         | # 6   | # 13  | 59,298            | 6,552  | 1490-1570/<br>33-35 | 21/21 | 19/19 | #30 computer science<br>#42 fine arts<br>#unranked engineering        | 1,9xx |
| #25 | Univ. Pittsburgh      | # 57  | # 47  | 33,746/<br>19,718 | 19,330 | 1270-1430/<br>28-33 | 38/47 | 18/22 |   | 1,8xx |
| #26 | Univ. Iowa            | # 84  | # 161 | 31,658/<br>9,605  | 23,989 | 1120-1330/<br>23-28 | 36/45 | 18/20 | #1 physician assistant<br>#2 audiology                                | 1,8xx |
| #27 | UC (Davis)            | # 39  | # 64  | 43,484/<br>14,492 | 30,872 | 1150-1410/<br>25-31 | 26/34 | 18/26 | #1 veterinary medicine<br>#9 political science<br>#50 statistics      | 1,8xx |
| #28 | Vanderbilt            | # 15  | # 72  | 52,070            | 6,861  | 1450-1560/<br>33-35 | 26/36 | 18/22 | #1 audiology<br>#1 nursing-midwifery<br># 1 speech-language pathology | 1,8xx |
| #29 | Indiana (Bloomington) | # 79  | # 136 | 36,515/<br>10,949 | 33,301 | 1150-1360/<br>24-31 | 26/29 | 17/20 | #unranked (1)   | 1,7xx |
| #30 | Emory Univ.           | # 21  | # 71  | 53,804            | 7,086  | 1350-1520/<br>31-34 | 24/24 | 17/17 |   | 1,7xx |
| #31 | Univ. Florida         | # 34  | # 105 | 28,658/<br>6,380  | 35,491 | 1280-1440/<br>27-32 | 34/45 | 15/26 | #5 pharmacy<br>#62 math   | 1,5xx |
| #32 | Univ. Virginia        | # 28  | # 107 | 50,920/<br>17,891 | 16,777 | 1330-1500/<br>30-34 | 24/35 | 15/23 |   | 1,5xx |
| #33 | UC (San Diego)        | # 37  | # 19  | 43,162/<br>14,170 | 30,285 | 1250-1470/<br>26-33 | 21/29 | 14/21 | #9 political science<br>#89 business                                  | 1,5xx |
| #34 | Princeton             | # 1   | # 8   | 51,870            | 5,428  | 1440-1570/<br>32-35 | 14/21 | 14/21 | #21 engineering   | 1,5xx |
| #35 | Univ. Utah            | # 104 | # 139 | 30,132/<br>9,498  | 24,743 | 1130-1350/<br>22-29 | 34/42 | 12/13 |   | 1,2xx |
| #36 | Univ. Arizona         | # 117 | # 85  | 36,366/<br>12,467 | 32,533 | 1070-1310/<br>21-28 | 30/39 | 12/16 |   | 1,2xx |
| #37 | Virginia              | # 162 | # 402 | 35,244/<br>12,467 | 24,058 | 1070-               | 29/35 | 12/13 | #1 nursing-   | 1,2xx |



|     |                             |       |       |                   |        |                         |       |       |  |       |
|-----|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------|-------|--|-------|
|     | Commonwealth Univ.          |       |       | 14,596            |        | 1260/<br>21-28          |       |       | anesthesia<br>#unranked<br>business                  |       |
| #38 | Boston Univ.                | # 40  | # 51  | 55,892/           | 18,515 | 1330-<br>1500/<br>30-33 | 28/34 | 11/12 | #1<br>occupational<br>therapy                        | 1,1xx |
| #39 | UC (Irvine)                 | # 36  | # 78  | 43,481/<br>13,727 | 29,736 | 1180-<br>1440/<br>N/A   | 24/32 | 11/13 | #3<br>criminology<br>#45<br>political<br>science     | 1,1xx |
| #40 | Colorado (Boulder)          | # 104 | # 50  | 38,318/12<br>,500 | 30,152 | 1150-<br>1360/<br>25-30 | 21/32 | 11/21 |  | 1,1xx |
| #41 | MIT                         | # 3   | # 2   | 53,790            | 4,602  | 1500-<br>1570/<br>34-36 | 11/19 | 11/19 | #9 political<br>science                              | 1,1xx |
| #42 | Illinois (Chicago)          | # 117 | # 217 | 27,672/<br>14,816 | 20,873 | 1020-<br>1220/<br>21-27 | 32/40 | 10/10 | #unranked<br>(1)                                     | 1,0xx |
| #43 | Arizona State-<br>Tempe     | # 117 | # 146 | 29-428/<br>11,338 | 42,844 | 1070-<br>1310/<br>21-28 | 26/37 | 10/19 | #35<br>business                                      | 1,0xx |
| #44 | Brown                       | # 14  | # 102 | 58,504            | 7,043  | 1420-<br>1550/<br>32-35 | 18/24 | 10/11 | #51<br>business                                      | 1,0xx |
| #45 | Carnegie Mellon             | # 25  | # 82  | 57,119            | 6,947  | 1450-<br>1550/<br>33-35 | 15/23 | 10/18 | # 1<br>computer<br>science<br>#4<br>engineering      | 1,0xx |
| #46 | Rice Univ.                  | # 17  | # 108 | 49,112            | 3,992  | 1450-<br>1560/<br>33-35 | 15/23 | 10/18 | #13 part-<br>time MBA<br># 20<br>computer<br>science | 1,0xx |
| #47 | Univ. Kansas                | # 130 | # 279 | 27,358/<br>11,148 | 19,596 | NA/<br>23-29            | 35/46 | 9/13  | #unranked<br>(2)                                     | 9xx   |
| #48 | George Washington Univ.     | # 70  | # 255 | 56,935            | 12,546 | 1280-<br>1460/<br>29-32 | 29/36 | 9/9   |  | 9xx   |
| #49 | Purdue (West Lafayette)     | # 57  | # 114 | 28,794/<br>9,992  | 32,672 | 1180-<br>1410/<br>25-32 | 26/35 | 9/17  |  | 9xx   |
| #50 | Texas A&M (College Station) | # 70  | # 134 | 37,726/<br>11,232 | 53,743 | 1170-<br>1380/<br>25-31 | 21/32 | 9/20  | #4<br>veterinary<br>medicine<br># 13<br>engineering  | 9xx   |
| #51 | Rutgers-New                 | # 62  | # 105 | 32,189/<br>15,407 | 36,039 | 1190-<br>1410/          | 21/29 | 9/10  | #7 library<br>&                                      | 9xx   |

|     |                            |       |       |                   |        |                       |       |      |  |     |
|-----|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------|------|--|-----|
|     | Brunswick                  |       |       |                   |        | 25-31                 |       |      | information studies<br>#15 English                                 |     |
| #52 | Georgetown Univ.           | # 24  | # 298 | 56,058            | 7,459  | 1370-1530/<br>31-34 ) | 18/18 | 9/9  |  | 9xx |
| #53 | Michigan State Univ.       | #84   | # 101 | 39,766/<br>14,460 | 39,423 | 1110-1310/<br>23-29   | 28/39 | 8/12 | #unranked<br>(1)   | 8xx |
| #54 | Penn State-Univ. Park      | # 57  | # 72  | 35,514/<br>18,450 | 40,363 | 1160-1360/<br>25-30   | 26/37 | 8/19 |  | 8xx |
| #55 | Georgia Inst. Tech         | # 29  | # 62  | 33,794/<br>12,682 | 16,049 | 1390-1540/<br>31-34   | 12/20 | 8/16 |  | 8xx |
| #56 | Univ. Georgia              | # 50  | # 290 | 31,120/<br>12,080 | 29,611 | 1240-1410/<br>27-32   | 26/27 | 7/11 |  | 7xx |
| #57 | Cal Tech                   | # 12  | # 6   | 54,600            | 948    | 1530-1580/<br>35-36   | 7/15  | 7/15 | #1 earth science<br>#11 computer science                           | 7xx |
| #58 | Univ. at Buffalo-SUNY      | # 79  | # 266 | 27,850/<br>10,180 | 21,607 | 1160-1330/<br>24-29   | 34/42 | 6/9  |  | 6xx |
| #59 | Florida State              | # 57  | # 190 | 21,673/<br>6,380  | 35,491 | 1200-1350/<br>26-30   | 29/39 | 6/9  | #5 criminology<br>#99 earth science<br>#unranked nursing-master's  | 6xx |
| #60 | Temple Univ.               | # 104 | # 319 | 34,126/<br>19,748 | 29,484 | 1130-1320/<br>24-30   | 29/35 | 6/6  | #10 clinical psychology<br>#RNP economics                          | 6xx |
| #61 | Stony Brook-SUNY           | # 91  | # 171 | 28,528/<br>10,076 | 17,522 | 1230-1420/<br>26-31   | 25/32 | 6/6  | #3 clinical psychology<br>#15 physician assistant<br>#unranked (2) | 6xx |
| #62 | Case Western Reserve Univ. | # 40  | # 155 | 50,904            | 5,262  | 1350-1520/<br>30-34   | 25/33 | 6/8  | #9 social work<br># 13 nursing-master's                            | 6xx |
| #63 | Boston College             | # 37  | # 536 | 57,910            | 9,377  | 1320-1490/<br>31-34   | 16/19 | 6/9  | #10 social work<br>#19 education<br>#22                            | 6xx |

|     |                          |       |       |                   |        |                     |       |     |   |     |
|-----|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|-------|-----|---|-----|
|     |                          |       |       |                   |        |                     |       |     | nursing-anesthesia  |     |
| #64 | UC (Santa Barbara)       | # 34  | # 41  | 43,383/<br>14,391 | 23,070 | 1230-1480/<br>26-32 | 16/19 | 6/9 | #10 physics<br>#19 earth science<br>#27 engineering<br>#67 statistics       | 6xx |
| #65 | USC (South Carolina)     | # 104 | # 305 | 33,928/<br>12,688 | 26,733 | 1190-1360/<br>25-30 | 35/42 | 5/6 | #unranked (2)   | 5xx |
| #66 | Northeastern Univ.       | # 40  | # 200 | 53,507            | 13,909 | 1360-1490/<br>32-33 | 26/34 | 5/8 | #13 criminology<br>#22 nursing-anesthesia                                   | 5xx |
| #67 | Massachusetts (Amherst)  | # 64  | # 136 | 35,710/<br>16,389 |        | 1200-1390/<br>26-31 | 26/34 | 5/6 | # 20 computer science<br>#26 audiology<br>#unranked (1)<br>#RNP economics   | 5xx |
| #68 | Univ. Miami              | # 57  | # 235 | 51,930            | 11,117 | 1250-1430/<br>29-32 | 25/33 | 5/6 |   | 5xx |
| #69 | Univ. Alabama-Birmingham | # 166 | # 175 | 25,380/<br>10,710 | 13,836 | 980-1240/<br>21-29  | 24/28 | 5/5 | #1 health care management<br>#13 physical therapy<br>#15 nursing-anesthesia | 5xx |
| #70 | Univ. Rochester          | # 29  | # 125 | 56,026            | 6,535  | 1320-1500/<br>30-34 | 22/28 | 5/5 | #unranked (1)   | 5xx |
| #71 | San Diego State Univ.    | # 147 | # 599 | 19,390/<br>7,510  | 30,393 | 1110-1310/<br>22-28 | 18/24 | 5/5 | #4 rehab. psychology<br>#unranked (1)                                       | 5xx |
| #72 | Notre Dame               | # 15  | # 223 | 55,553            | 8,617  | 1450-1560/<br>33-35 | 17/25 | 5/7 | #73 biological science<br>#99 fine arts                                     | 5xx |
| #73 | UT (Dallas)              | # 147 | # 273 | 38,168/<br>13,442 | 19,872 | 1220-1440/<br>25-32 | 16/21 | 5/5 |   | 5xx |

|     |                           |       |       |                   |        |  |       |      |  |     |
|-----|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|--------|--|-------|------|--|-----|
| #74 | Univ.<br>Cincinnati       | # 139 | # 196 | 26,994/<br>11,660 | 26,932 | 1160-<br>1370/<br>24-29                  | 33/41 | 4/4  | #3<br>criminolog<br>y<br>#RNP (1)<br>economics   | 4xx |
| #75 | Univ.<br>South<br>Florida | # 104 | # 310 | 17,324/<br>6,410  | 32,238 | 1170-<br>1330/<br>25-29                  | 32/40 | 4/4  | #16 public<br>health<br>#RNP math<br>#RNP<br>economics   | 4xx |
| #76 | Univ.<br>Tennessee        | # 104 | # 217 | 31,454/<br>13,264 | 22,815 | 1150-<br>1330/<br>25-31                  | 28/36 | 4/6  | #17 library<br>science   | 4xx |
| #77 | Syracuse<br>Univ.         | # 54  | # 346 | 53,849            | 15,226 | 1180-<br>1370/<br>25-30                  | 23/32 | 4/5  | #1 public<br>affairs<br>#2 library<br>science  | 4xx |
| #78 | NC State<br>(Raleigh)     | # 84  | # 232 | 29,220/<br>9,101  | 25,119 | 1250-<br>1390<br>(SAT)<br>27-31<br>(ACT) | 17/28 | 4/15 |  | 3xx |
| #79 | Univ.<br>Kentucky         | # 132 | # 349 | 30,680/<br>12,360 | 22,136 | 1080-<br>1300/<br>23-29                  | 33/40 | 3/4  | #6<br>pharmacy   | 3xx |
| #80 | Univ.<br>Missouri         | # 139 | # 369 | 28,348/<br>10,477 | 22,503 | 1090-<br>1290/<br>23-29                  | 32/42 | 3/6  | #19<br>veterinary<br>medicine<br>#22 library<br>science<br>#unranked<br>(i)  | 3xx |
| #81 | Univ.<br>Connecticu<br>t  | # 64  | # 325 | 39,894/<br>17,226 | 19,133 | 1210-<br>1420/<br>26-31                  | 29/39 | 3/5  | #24<br>audiology<br>#29<br>pharmacy<br>#32<br>speech-<br>language<br>pathology   | 3xx |
| #82 | Washingto<br>n State.     | # 166 | # 299 | 26,419/<br>11,841 | 260,98 | 1020-<br>1210/<br>20-26                  | 27/34 | 3/4  | #14<br>veterinary<br>medicine<br>#unranked<br>(4)  | 3xx |
| #83 | Drexel<br>Univ.           | # 97  | # 405 | 54,516            | 13,490 | 1170-<br>1380/<br>25-30                  | 23/31 | 3/3  | #10<br>physician<br>assistant<br># library &<br>information<br>studies<br>#RNP (1)<br>economics<br>#unranked<br>(1) business | 3xx |

|     |                    |       |         |                   |        |                     |       |      |  |     |
|-----|--------------------|-------|---------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|-------|------|--|-----|
| #84 | Baylor Univ.       | # 79  | # 353   | 47,364            | 14,188 | 1190-1370/<br>26-31 | 23/26 | 3/4  | #13 physical therapy<br>#17 health care management   | 3xx |
| #85 | Auburn Univ.       | # 104 | # 678   | 31,124/<br>11,492 | 24,628 | 1150-1310/<br>25-30 | 21/31 | 3/7  | #14 veterinary medicine<br>#15 rehab. psychology<br>#RNP (2)                                       | 3xx |
| #86 | Virginia Tech      | # 74  | # 253   | 32,835/<br>13,691 | 27,811 | 1180-1390/<br>25-31 | 21/29 | 3/11 | #17 veterinary medicine<br>#19 Part-time MBA<br>#94-112 medical-primary care<br>#unranked business | 3xx |
| #87 | Univ. Oregon       | # 104 | # 220   | 36,615/<br>12,710 | 19,101 | 1080-1310/<br>22-28 | 20/21 | 3/4  |  | 3xx |
| #88 | Marquette Univ.    | # 84  | # 1,129 | 43,936            | 8,435  | 1150-1320/<br>24-30 | 18/24 | 3/3  | #13 physical therapy<br>#unranked (1) business   | 3xx |
| #89 | Tufts Univ.        | # 29  | # 190   | 58,578            | 5,643  | 1380-1530/<br>31-34 | 17/25 | 3/3  | #10 occupational therapy<br>#12 veterinary medicine<br>#unranked (1)                               | 3xx |
| #90 | Oregon State Univ. | # 139 | # 266   | 31,314/<br>11,709 | 25,699 | 1080-1310/<br>22-28 | 17/25 | 3/5  | #24 veterinary medicine<br>#31 earth science<br>#99-131 business                                   | 3xx |
| #91 | Dartmouth          | # 12  | # 104   | 57,204            | 4,417  | 1420-1560/<br>31-35 | 12/19 | 3/3  | #67 Chemistry  | 2xx |
| #92 | Wake Forest Univ.  | # 27  | # 401   | 54,440            | 5,225  | 1310-1470/<br>29-33 | 10/10 | 3/3  | #unranked (1)  | 3xx |
| #93 | Univ.              | # 132 | # 405   | 27,144/<br>11,492 | 22,152 | 1140-1310/<br>25-30 | 27/35 | 2/3  | #28 library  | 2xx |

|     |                             |       |       |                   |        |                         |       |     |  |     |
|-----|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------|-----|--|-----|
|     | Oklahoma                    |       |       | 11,763            |        | 1350/<br>23-29          |       |     | science #31<br>pharmacy  |     |
| #94 | Saint<br>Louis<br>Univ.     | # 97  | # 651 | 45,424            | 7,167  | 1180-<br>1370/<br>25-31 | 24/30 | 2/2 | #13 health<br>care<br>managemen<br>t<br>#34<br>physical<br>therapy<br>#37<br>physician<br>assistant<br>#unranked<br>(1) business   | 2xx |
| #95 | Univ.<br>Alabama            | # 153 | # 419 | 30,250/<br>10,780 | 33,028 | 1060-<br>1280/<br>23-31 | 24/31 | 2/2 | #28 library<br>science<br>#31 law<br>#unranked<br>(2) nursing-<br>master's/D<br>NP   | 2xx |
| #96 | Univ.<br>Louisville         | # 192 | # 544 | 26,958/<br>12,458 | 15,642 | 960-<br>1205/<br>22-29  | 24/31 | 2/2 | #30<br>criminolog<br>y<br>#34<br>audiology<br>#RNP (1)<br>sociology  | 2xx |
| #97 | Ohio Univ.                  | # 185 | # 671 | 22,406/<br>12,612 | 22,275 | 1070-<br>1270/<br>21-26 | 23/29 | 2/2 | #94-112<br>medical<br>school-<br>research/pri<br>mary care<br>#unranked<br>(3)   | 2xx |
| #98 | Tulane<br>Univ.             | # 40  | # 469 | 56,800            | 6,773  | 1350-<br>1490/<br>30-33 | 22/25 | 2/2 | #13 public<br>health<br>#17 health<br>care<br>managemen<br>t# RNP (1)<br>#unranked<br>(2)<br>medical-<br>research/pri<br>mary care | 2xx |
| #99 | Univ.<br>Houston            | # 185 | # 385 | 26,936/<br>11,276 | 38,348 | 1130-<br>1310/<br>22-28 | 22/30 | 2/3 | #22 social<br>work<br>#31<br>pharmacy  | 2xx |
| 100 | Univ. at<br>Albany-<br>SUNY | # 147 | # 298 | 26,666/<br>10,026 | 13,598 | 1100-<br>1260/<br>22-27 | 22/22 | 2/2 | #2<br>criminolog<br>y #19<br>public<br>affairs   | 2xx |

|     |                               |       |       |                   |        |                         |       |     |  |     |
|-----|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------|-----|--|-----|
|     |                               |       |       |                   |        |                         |       |     | #99-131<br>business<br>school  |     |
| 101 | Univ.<br>Nebraska-<br>Lincoln | # 139 | # 290 | 25,828/<br>9,522  | 20,830 | 1130-<br>1360/<br>22-29 | 20/27 | 2/3 | #20<br>audiology<br>#20 speech-<br>language<br>pathology<br>#unranked<br>(1) business            | 2xx |
| 102 | Univ.<br>Delaware             | # 91  | # 311 | 34,310/<br>13,680 | 19,117 | 1170-<br>1350/<br>25-30 | 19/29 | 2/5 | #1<br>physical<br>therapy<br>#99-131<br>business<br>#unranked<br>(1)<br>#RNP<br>economics        | 2xx |
| 103 | Iowa State                    | # 121 | # 220 | 24,508/<br>9,320  | 29,621 | 1092-<br>1334/<br>22-28 | 17/25 | 2/7 |  | 2xx |
| 104 | Quinnipiac<br>Univ.           | # 153 | # NR  | 49,280            | 7,425  | 1090-<br>1260/<br>23-28 | 14/14 | 2/2 | #15<br>physician<br>assistant<br>#17<br>occupational<br>therapy                                  | 2xx |
| 105 | Texas<br>Christian<br>Univ.   | # 97  | # NR  | 49,250            | 9,445  | 1150-<br>1343/<br>26-30 | 14/14 | 2/2 | #28<br>nursing-<br>DNP<br>#29<br>nursing-<br>anesthesia<br>#unranked<br>(1)<br>#RNP (2)          | 2xx |
| 106 | Thomas<br>Jefferson<br>Univ.  | # 153 | # 394 | 41,715            | 3,604  | 1060-<br>1240/<br>22-28 | 13/13 | 2/2 | #6<br>occupational<br>therapy<br>#17<br>nursing-<br>midwifery<br>#unranked<br>(1)<br>engineering | 2xx |
| 107 | American<br>Univ.             | # 77  | # 692 | 49,889            | 8,287  | 1220-<br>1380/<br>27-31 | 13/13 | 2/2 | #13 public<br>affairs #21<br>Criminology<br>#RNP (1)<br>economics<br>#unranked<br>education      | 2xx |
| 108 | Fordham<br>Univ.              | # 74  | # 968 | 54,093            | 9,645  | 1250-<br>1430/          | 12/12 | 2/2 | #25 social<br>work   | 2xx |

|     |                             |       |         |                   |        |                     |       |     |  |     |
|-----|-----------------------------|-------|---------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|-------|-----|--|-----|
|     |                             |       |         |                   |        | 28-32               |       |     | #27 law<br>#RNP<br>economics   |     |
| 109 | Creighton Univ.             | # 104 | # 841   | 41,400            | 4,446  | 1150-1350/<br>24-30 | 11/11 | 2/2 | #9 physical therapy<br>#unranked<br>(3) business                                     | 2xx |
| 110 | Rutgers-Newark              | # 132 | # 706   | 31,608/<br>14,826 | 9,142  | 1020-1190/<br>19-24 | 9/17  | 2/3 | #9 criminology<br>#34 public affairs<br>*(#4 top performers on social mobility)      | 1xx |
| 111 | College William & Mary      | # 40  | # 250   | 46,283/<br>22,922 | 6,377  | 1310-1490/<br>30-33 | 9/10  | 2/3 | # 27 history<br># 31 law   | 2xx |
| 112 | Villanova Univ.             | # 46  | # 1,096 | 55,430            | 6,917  | 1300-1470/<br>30-33 | 8/8   | 2/2 | #unranked<br>(2) business, engineering   | 2xx |
| 113 | George Mason                | # 153 | # 434   | 36,024/<br>12,564 | 26,192 | 1120-1320/<br>24-30 | 26/32 | 1/2 | #1 criminology<br>#RNP (1) chemistry<br>#unranked<br>(1) business                    | 1xx |
| 114 | Louisiana State-Baton Rouge | # 153 | # 383   | 28,639/<br>11,962 | 25,361 | 1070-1290/<br>23-29 | 24/31 | 1/3 | #22 veterinary medicine<br>#37 library & information studies                         | 1xx |
| 115 | Univ. Central Florida       | # 166 | # 477   | 22,467/<br>6,368  | 58,913 | 1160-1340/<br>25-29 | 24/33 | 1/2 | #26 criminology<br>#38 public affairs<br>#unranked programs<br>(3)<br>#RNP economics | 1xx |
| 116 | Howard Univ.                | # 104 | # 774   | 27,206            | 6,243  | 1140-1285/<br>22-27 | 24/28 | 1/1 | #25 social work<br>#53 fine arts<br>#RNP   | 1xx |



|     |                                      |       |            |                   |        |                         |       |     |   |     |
|-----|--------------------------------------|-------|------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------|-----|---|-----|
|     |                                      |       |            |                   |        |                         |       |     | chemistry,<br>physics,<br>political<br>science<br>#unranked<br>nursing-<br>master's                   |     |
| 117 | Univ.<br>Mississippi                 | # 162 | # 364      | 25,090/<br>8,818  | 18,007 | 1050-<br>1270/<br>21-29 | 21/27 | 1/2 | #24<br>pharmacy<br>#RNP (1)<br>economics<br>#unranked<br>(2)<br>medical-<br>research/pri<br>mary care | 1xx |
| 118 | Univ.<br>Arkansas                    | # 153 | # 671      | 25,872/<br>9,384  | 23,386 | 1100-<br>1290/<br>23-29 | 21/29 | 1/3 | #27 rehab.<br>counseling<br>#unranked<br>(3)  | 1xx |
| 119 | Oklahoma<br>State Univ.              | # 192 | # 493      | 24,539/<br>9,019  | 20,574 | 1060-<br>1280/<br>22-28 | 20/28 | 1/3 | #26<br>veterinary<br>medicine<br>#RNP (2)<br>economics,<br>statistics                                 | 1xx |
| 120 | Kansas<br>State Univ.                | # 162 | # 388      | 35,887/<br>10,383 | 17,869 | NA/<br>22-28            | 18/27 | 1/4 | #19<br>veterinary<br>medicine<br>#RNP<br>economics<br>#unranked<br>business                           | 1xx |
| 121 | Brigham<br>Young<br>Univ.<br>(Provo) | # 77  | # 692      | 5,790             | 31,441 | 1190-<br>1420/<br>26-31 | 18/23 | 1/1 | #30<br>business   | 1xx |
| 122 | Loyola<br>Univ.<br>Chicago           | # 104 | # 739      | 45,543            | 11,919 | 1120-<br>1310/<br>25-30 | 18/18 | 1/1 | #33 social<br>work<br>#RNP(1)<br>#unranked<br>(1)   | 1xx |
| 123 | Duquesne<br>Univ.                    | # 132 | #<br>1,351 | 39,992            | 6,013  | 1140-<br>1280/<br>24-29 | 16/16 | 1/1 | #29<br>occupational<br>therapy<br>Unranked<br>(1) business  | 1xx |
| 124 | UC (Santa<br>Cruz)                   | # 84  | # 76       | 43,046/<br>14,054 | 17,792 | 1170-<br>1400/<br>24-31 | 15/18 | 1/1 | #19 earth<br>science<br>#89<br>psychology   | 1xx |
| 125 | Hofstra<br>Univ.                     | # 162 | # 938      | 47,510            | 6,701  | 1150-<br>1330/<br>24-30 | 14/14 | 1/1 | #27 rehab.<br>psychology  | 1xx |
| 126 | Catholic                             | # 139 | #          | 47,746            | 3,332  | 1140-                   | 14/19 | 1/1 | #32 library   | 1xx |

|     |                           |       |         |               |        |                 |       |     |  |     |
|-----|---------------------------|-------|---------|---------------|--------|-----------------|-------|-----|--|-----|
|     | Univ. America             |       | 1,072   |               |        | 1320/24-30      |       |     | science #RNP (3)                             |     |
| 127 | Brandeis Univ.            | # 40  | # 250   | 57,561        | 3,639  | 1280-1500/29-33 | 13/13 | 1/1 | #unranked business                           | 1xx |
| 128 | Illinois Inst. Technology | # 117 | # 682   | 49,280        | 3,026  | 1220-1440/26-31 | 12/20 | 1/1 | #unranked (1)                                | 1xx |
| 129 | Univ. Denver              | # 97  | # 727   | 52,515        | 5,801  | 1170-1370/26-31 | 11/18 | 1/2 | #17 social work                              | 1xx |
| 130 | Massachusetts (Lowell)    | # 179 | # 1,053 | 32,827/15,180 | 14,005 | 1150-1320/24-29 | 11/19 | 1/2 | #27 criminology #unranked (1)                | 1xx |
| 131 | Univ. Detroit Mercy       | # 179 | # NR    | 28,840        | 2,880  | 1050-1250/21-27 | 10/14 | 1/1 | #1 nursing-anesthesia #unranked (1) business | 1xx |
| 132 | Seattle Univ.             | # 139 | # NR    | 46,950        | 4,764  | 1130-1320/24-30 | 8/8   | 1/1 | #17 nursing midwifery #unranked (3)          | 1xx |
| 133 | Towson Univ.              | # 197 | # NR    | 24,334/10,198 | 19,818 | 1060-1200/20-25 | 8/8   | 1/1 | #29 occupational therapy #unranked (1)       | 1xx |
| 134 | The New School            | # 153 | # NR    | 50,594        | 7,444  | 1150-1360/24-30 | 7/7   | 1/1 | #15 fine arts #RNP (1) economics             | 1xx |
| 135 | Gallaudet Univ.           | # 179 | # NR    | 17,038        | 1,138  | 792-1077/15-20  | 7/7   | 1/1 | #26 audiology                                | 1xx |
| 136 | Colorado School of Mines  | # 84  | # 503   | 39,762/19,062 | 4,954  | 1290-1450/28-33 | 7/15  | 1/5 | #28 earth science #RNP economics             | 1xx |
| 137 | Simmons Univ.             | # 125 | # NR    | 42,066        | 1,837  | 1130-1300/24-30 | 6/6   | 1/1 | #12 library science #unranked (1) business   | 1xx |
| 138 | Gonzaga Univ.             | # 79  | # NR    | 45,140        | 5,317  | 1183-1350/25-30 | 6/6   | 1/1 | #18 nursing-anesthesia #unranked (3)         | 1xx |
| 139 | Rochester Inst. Tech      | #104  | # 641   | 45,890        | 13,513 | 1200-1400/27-32 | 6/6   | 1/1 | #23 fine arts                                | 1xx |
| 140 | Santa                     | # 54  | # NR    | 53,634        | 5,520  | 1270-           | 4/7   | 1/1 | #25 part-                                    | 1xx |

|     |                          |       |       |               |        |                 |       |     |  |     |
|-----|--------------------------|-------|-------|---------------|--------|-----------------|-------|-----|--|-----|
|     | Clara Univ.              |       |       |               |        | 1440/28-32      |       |     | time MBA<br>#unranked (1) business   |     |
| 141 | Bethel Univ.             | # 197 | # NR  | 38,460        | 2,857  | 1033-1286/22-28 | 4/4   | 1/1 | #33 nursing-midwifery<br>#unranked (2) education, nursing-master's                           | 1xx |
| 142 | Hawaii (Manoa)           | # 166 | # 379 | 34,002/11,970 | 12,968 | 1055-1240/20-25 | 29/33 | 0/0 | # RNP (1)<br>#unranked (2)   | xx  |
| 143 | Univ. New Hampshire      | # 125 | # 532 | 35,409/18,879 | 12,782 | 1090-1280/23-28 | 24/31 | 0/0 | #36 occupational therapy   | xx  |
| 144 | UC (Riverside)           | # 91  | # 149 | 42,819/13,827 | 20,581 | 1110-1330/23-29 | 20/27 | 0/0 | #46 earth science<br>#79 history<br><br>#1 top performers on social mobility                 | xx  |
| 145 | Binghamton-SUNY          | # 79  | # 808 | 27,291/10,201 | 14,021 | 1310-1440/28-32 | 19/25 | 0/0 | #37 clinical psychology  | xx  |
| 146 | Univ. Rhode Island       | # 166 | # 774 | 31,686/14,566 | 13,865 | 1090-1260/23-27 | 19/25 | 0/0 | #40 pharmacy<br>#RNP (2)<br>#unranked (1)  | xx  |
| 147 | Seton Hall Univ.         | # 139 | # NR  | 43,780        | 6,136  | 1150-1310/24-28 | 17/17 | 0/0 | #37 physician assistant<br>#46 health care management<br>#RNP (1) chemistry<br>#unranked (4) | xx  |
| 148 | SMU (Southern Methodist) | # 64  | # 477 | 56,560        | 6,479  | 1210-1390/27-31 | 17/23 | 0/0 | #41 business<br>#55 economics  | xx  |
| 149 | Univ. Vermont            | # 121 | # 477 | 43,690/18,802 | 11,328 | 1180-1360/26-31 | 17/22 | 0/0 | #43 medical-primary care<br>#unranked (1) business   | xx  |
| 150 | St. John's               | # 179 | # 769 | 43,000        | 16,884 | 1070-           | 15/15 | 0/0 | #40 library  | xx  |

|     |                           |       |            |                   |        |                         |       |     |   |    |
|-----|---------------------------|-------|------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------|-----|---|----|
|     | Univ.                     |       |            |                   |        | 1270/<br>23-29          |       |     | science<br>#RNP (2)<br>chemistry,<br>history<br>#unranked<br>(1) business                         |    |
| 151 | Univ.<br>Idaho            | # 179 | # 769      | 27,540/<br>8,304  | 9,568  | 1010-<br>1220/<br>20-26 | 15/22 | 0/2 | #55 rehab.<br>counseling<br>#152-200<br>engineering<br>#RNP (3)<br>#unranked<br>(1)               | xx |
| 152 | Lehigh<br>Univ.           | # 50  | # 799      | 55,240            | 5,047  | 1270-<br>1450/<br>29-33 | 14/22 | 0/2 | #39<br>part-time<br>MBA<br>#56<br>education<br>#RNP<br>economics<br>#unranked<br>(1) business     | xx |
| 153 | Mercer<br>Univ.           | # 153 | # NR       | 37,808            | 4,797  | 1180-<br>1340/<br>25-30 | 14/14 | 0/0 | #46<br>physician<br>assistant<br>#53<br>pharmacy<br>#unranked<br>(4)                              | xx |
| 154 | Clemson<br>Univ.          | # 70  | # 669      | 38,112/<br>15,120 | 19,669 | 1220-<br>1400/<br>27-32 | 14/22 | 0/1 | #72<br>economics<br>#83<br>business<br>#unranked<br>(2) nursing<br>master's/D<br>NP               | xx |
| 155 | DePaul<br>Univ.           | # 125 | #<br>1,303 | 41,202            | 14,507 | 1080-<br>1290/<br>23-29 | 13/13 | 0/0 | #36<br>nursing-<br>anesthesia<br>#unranked<br>(3)   | xx |
| 156 | Miami<br>Univ.-<br>Oxford | # 91  | # 987      | 34,307/<br>15,232 | 17,326 | 1200-<br>1380/<br>26-31 | 13/13 | 0/0 | #55 speech-<br>language<br>pathology<br>#RNP<br>political<br>science<br>#unranked<br>(1) business | xx |
| 157 | Illinois<br>State         | # 197 | #<br>1,255 | 26,040/<br>14,516 | 18,107 | NA/<br>20-26            | 12/20 | 0/0 | #46<br>audiology<br>#RNP (1)<br>#unranked   | xx |

|     |                                   |            |       |                   |        |                         |       |     |  |    |
|-----|-----------------------------------|------------|-------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------|-----|--|----|
|     |                                   |            |       |                   |        |                         |       |     | (2)  |    |
| 158 | Univ.<br>Tulsa                    | # 121      | # NR  | 42,238            | 3,296  | 1180-<br>1410/<br>25-32 | 12/16 | 0/1 | #67 English<br># RNP (1)<br>chemistry<br>#unranked<br>(2)  |    |
| 159 | Rensselaer<br>Poly. Inst.         | # 50       | # 519 | 55,378            | 6,628  | 1330-<br>1500/<br>29-33 | 11/19 | 0/6 | #43<br>engineering<br>#54 earth<br>science<br>#RNP (1)<br>economics<br>#unranked<br>(1) business                                 | xx |
| 160 | Maryland<br>(Baltimore<br>County) | # 166      | # 660 | 27,662/<br>12,028 | 11,260 | 1190-<br>1360/<br>24-29 | 11/16 | 0/0 | #69<br>statistics<br>#79<br>public<br>affairs  | xx |
| 161 | Samford                           | # 147      | # NR  | 32,850            | 3,535  | 1072-<br>1270/<br>23-29 | 10/10 | 0/0 | #unranked(<br>3)   | xx |
| 162 | Yeshiva<br>Univ.                  | # 97       | # 262 | 44,900            | 2,682  | 1140-<br>1400/<br>22-30 | 9/9   | 0/0 | #39<br>biological<br>science<br>#40<br>medical-<br>research<br>#unranked(<br>2) business,<br>education                           | xx |
| 163 | Ball State<br>Univ.               | #<br>1,133 | # NR  | 26,984/<br>10,080 | NA     | 1080-<br>1240/<br>20-24 | 9/11  | 0/2 | #46<br>audiology<br>#47 rehab.<br>counseling<br>#RNP<br>English<br>#unranked<br>(3)<br>business,<br>nursing-<br>master's/D<br>NP | xx |
| 164 | Univ.<br>Dayton                   | # 132      | # NR  | 44,100            | 8,617  | 1110-<br>1310/<br>25-30 | 9/14  | 0/0 | #46<br>engineering<br>#102<br>physical<br>therapy<br>#RNP (2)<br>#unranked<br>(1)  | xx |
| 165 | Univ. the<br>Pacific              | # 125      | # NR  | 49,588            | 3,701  | 1120-<br>1350/<br>22-30 | 9/9   | 0/0 | #55<br>audiology<br>#59<br>pharmacy  | xx |

|     |                                   |       |       |                   |       |                     |      |     |  |    |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|-------|---------------------|------|-----|--|----|
|     |                                   |       |       |                   |       |                     |      |     | #RNP (1)<br>#unranked<br>(2)   |    |
| 166 | Univ. San Francisco               | # 97  | # NR  | 50,282            | 6,704 | 1130-1330/<br>23-29 | 9/9  | 0/0 | #55 nursing-master's<br>#62 public health<br>#unranked (1)                               | xx |
| 167 | Clark Univ.                       | # 91  | # NR  | 47,200            | 2,304 | 1200-1390/<br>28-31 | 9/9  | 0/0 | # 80 clinical psychology<br>#RNP (2) chemistry, economics                                | xx |
| 168 | Clarkson Univ.                    | # 117 | # NR  | 51,128            | 3,091 | 1160-1350/<br>25-31 | 9/15 | 0/0 | #93 physician assistant<br>#RNP math   | xx |
| 169 | Pacific Univ.                     | # 185 | # NR  | 46,402            | 1,894 | 1060-1250/<br>21-27 | 8/8  | 0/0 | #36 occupational therapy<br>#64 physician assistant                                      | xx |
| 170 | Drake Univ.                       | # 130 | # NR  | 42,840            | 3,015 | 1140-1280/<br>24-29 | 8/8  | 0/0 | #37 rehab. Psychology<br>#46 pharmacy<br>#unranked (1) business                          | xx |
| 171 | Belmont Univ.                     | # 166 | # NR  | 35,650            | 6,656 | 1120-1300/<br>24-29 | 8/8  | 0/0 | #58 occupational therapy<br>#90 pharmacy<br>#unranked (1) business                       | xx |
| 172 | Missouri Univ. Science Tech-Rolla | # 179 | # 789 | 29,601/<br>10,653 | 6,848 | 1180-1380/<br>25-31 | 8/16 | 0/2 | #83 engineering<br>#103earth science<br>#RNP (2) math, physics<br>#unranked (1) business | xx |
| 173 | Union Univ.                       | # 185 | # NR  | 33,900            | 2,191 | 1110-1360/<br>23-30 | 8/8  | 0/0 | #88 nursing-anesthesia<br>#119 pharmacy<br>#unranked (1) business                        | xx |

|     |                       |       |         |                   |        |                         |      |     |   |    |
|-----|-----------------------|-------|---------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------|------|-----|---|----|
| 174 | Michigan Tech Univ.   | # 147 | # 745   | 35,196/<br>15,960 | 5,828  | 1170-<br>1360/<br>24-30 | 8/16 | 0/0 | #89 engineering<br>#90 earth science<br>#RNP (2)<br>#unranked (1)             | xx |
| 175 | UC (Merced)           | # 104 | #667    | 42,530/<br>13,538 | 7,881  | 1000-<br>1190/<br>18-24 | 8/14 | 0/0 | #90 psychology<br>#119 computer science<br>#RNP history                       | xx |
| 176 | Montclair State Univ. | # 166 | # NR    | 21,033/<br>13,073 | 16,988 | 990-<br>1170/<br>19-24  | 7/7  | 0/0 | #44 audiology<br>#105 education<br>#unranked (1) business                     | xx |
| 177 | Chapman Univ.         | # 125 | # NR    | 54,924            | 7,281  | 1190-<br>1370/<br>25-30 | 7/7  | 0/0 | #74 business<br>#92 speech-language pathology                                 | xx |
| 178 | Stevens Inst. Tech.   | # 74  | # 1,121 | 54,014            | 3,230  | 1330-<br>1480/<br>30-33 | 7/15 | 0/0 | #77 business<br>#80 engineering<br>#RNP chemistry                             | xx |
| 179 | UNC-Wilmington        | # 185 | # 1,312 | 21,246/<br>7,181  | 14,452 | 1190-<br>1320/<br>23-27 | 7/7  | 0/0 | #77 social work<br>#141 public affair<br>#3 unranked                          | xx |
| 180 | New Jersey Inst. Tech | # 97  | # 803   | 32,750/<br>17,338 | 8,532  | 1190-<br>1380/<br>25-30 | 7/15 | 0/0 | #87 engineering<br>#91 computer science<br>#99-131 business<br>#RNP chemistry | xx |
| 181 | Univ. San Diego       | # 91  | # NR    | 51,186            | 5,855  | 1190-<br>1360/<br>25-30 | 6/6  | 0/0 | #36 nursing-master's<br>#53 nursing-DNP<br>#unranked (1)                      | xx |
| 182 | Adelphi               | # 166 | # NR    | 38,660            | 5,391  | 1080-                   | 6/6  | 0/0 | #44 social  | xx |

|     |                             |       |            |                   |        |                         |      |     |  |    |
|-----|-----------------------------|-------|------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------|------|-----|--|----|
|     | Univ.                       |       |            |                   |        | 1270/<br>22-27          |      |     | work<br>#131<br>nursing-<br>master's<br>#unranked<br>(1) business  |    |
| 183 | Pepperdine<br>Univ.         | # 50  | # NR       | 55,892            | 3,627  | 1220-<br>1420/<br>26-32 | 6/6  | 0/0 | #47 law<br>#65 public<br>affairs   | xx |
| 184 | Univ. St.<br>Thomas         | # 139 | # NR       | 42,736            | 6,395  | 1130-<br>1380/<br>24-29 | 6/6  | 0/0 | #61 health<br>care<br>managemen<br>t<br>#70 social<br>work<br>#unranked<br>(1) business                              | xx |
| 185 | Worcester<br>Poly. Inst.    | # 64  | #<br>1,003 | 52,322            | 4,668  | 1300/1<br>460/<br>29-33 | 6/14 | 0/0 | #82<br>computer<br>science<br>#89<br>engineering<br>#unranked<br>(1) business  | xx |
| 186 | Bellarmino<br>Univ.         | # 197 | # NR       | 42,430            | 2,552  | 1060-<br>1270/<br>22-28 | 6/6  | 0/0 | #83<br>physical<br>therapy<br>#196-255<br>education<br>#unranked<br>(3)<br>business,<br>nursing-<br>master's/D<br>NP | xx |
| 187 | Rowan<br>Univ.              | # 166 | #<br>1,420 | 22,832/<br>14,000 | 16,120 | 1005-<br>1225/<br>20-27 | 6/6  | 0/0 | #94-122<br>medical-<br>primary<br>care #193<br>clinical<br>psychology<br>#unranked(<br>1) business                   | xx |
| 188 | Seattle<br>Pacific<br>Univ. | # 192 | # NR       | 45,078            | 2,876  | 1030-<br>1240/<br>20-27 | 6/6  | 0/0 | # 178<br>clinical<br>psychology<br>#211<br>psychology<br>#unranked<br>(4)  | xx |
| 189 | Elon Univ.                  | # 84  | # NR       | 36,571            | 6,196  | 1150-<br>1330/<br>25-30 | 5/5  | 0/0 | #37<br>physician<br>assistant<br>#49<br>physical   | xx |



|     |                          |       |      |               |       |                 |     |     |  |    |
|-----|--------------------------|-------|------|---------------|-------|-----------------|-----|-----|--|----|
|     |                          |       |      |               |       |                 |     |     | therapy<br>#unranked(1) business   |    |
| 190 | Chatham Univ.            | # 185 | # NR | 38,738        | 1,105 | 1040-1250/21-26 | 5/5 | 0/0 | #74 physician assistant<br>#93 occupational therapy<br>#unranked (2) nursing-master's/D NP   | xx |
| 191 | St. John Fisher College  | # 166 | # NR | 35,150        | 2,752 | 1080-1250/22-26 | 5/5 | 0/0 | #89 nursing-master's<br>#90 pharmacy   | xx |
| 192 | Loyola Univ. New Orleans | # 197 | # NR | 40,952        | 2,982 | 1060-1240/22-28 | 5/5 | 0/0 | #124 part-time<br>#126 law<br>#unranked (3) business, nursing-master's/D NP                  | xx |
| 193 | Loyola Marymount Univ.   | # 64  | # NR | 50,283        | 6,700 | 1210-1390/27-31 | 4/4 | 0/0 | #50 part-time MBA<br>#58 education<br>#62 law<br>#unranked (1) business                      | xx |
| 194 | Rutgers-Camden           | # 166 | # NR | 31,500/15,264 | 5,776 | 1000-1180/17-23 | 4/4 | 0/0 | #66 part-time<br>#80 nursing-DNP<br>#unranked (1)  | xx |
| 195 | Misericordia Univ.       | # 192 | # NR | 34,560        | 2,030 | 1040-1200/23-26 | 4/4 | 0/0 | #79 occupational therapy<br>#132 speech-language pathology<br>#unranked (1) nursing-master's | xx |
| 196 | Univ. St. Joseph         | # 147 | # NR | 40,286        | 903   | 1030-1210/20-25 | 4/4 | 0/0 | #117 pharmacy<br>#168 social work  | xx |

|     |  |       |      |                  |       |                         |     |     |   |    |
|-----|--|-------|------|------------------|-------|-------------------------|-----|-----|---|----|
|     |  |       |      |                  |       |                         |     |     | #unranked<br>(2) nursing-<br>master's/D<br>NP   |    |
| 197 | Valparaiso<br>Univ.  | # 153 | # NR | 41,820           | 3,218 | 1070-<br>1270/<br>23-29 | 4/4 | 0/0 | #178<br>part-time<br>MBA<br>#unranked<br>(3)  | xx |
| 198 | SUNY<br>College of<br>Environmental<br>Science &<br>Forestry | # 121 | # NR | 18,644/<br>8,864 | 1,779 | 1120-<br>1310/<br>23-29 | 3/4 | 0/0 | # 98<br>biological<br>science<br>#145<br>chemistry<br># 152-200<br>engineering                          | xx |
| 199 | Univ. La<br>Verne  | # 132 | # NR | 44,500           | 2,798 | 1020-<br>1205/<br>20-26 | 3/3 | 0/0 | # 101<br>public<br>affairs<br>#196-255<br>education<br>*(#4 top<br>performers<br>on social<br>mobility) | xx |
| 200 | Biola<br>Univ.   | # 185 | # NR | 41,976           | 4,010 | 1060-<br>1260/<br>21-27 | 2/2 | 0/0 | #RNP (1)<br>Psychology  | xx |

### **Terms of First Row in the Table 2**

The 11 columns in this table are as follows.

- (i) GP Rank: Graduate Programs Ranking on Diversity and Quality
- (ii) Institution
- (iii) Rank (National): The US News and World Report College Rankings
- (iv) Rank (Global): The US News and World Report Global Universities Ranking
- (v) Tuition: The public university normally has two schemes of tuition rates for out-of-state and in-state students. The first and expensive tuition sets for the out-of-state students and next cheap one is for in-state students.
- (vi) Enrollment
- (vii) Test Scores: The first number range indicates SAT scores on 25-75 percentile scale while the second number range indicates ACT scores on 25-75 percentile scale.
- (viii) The number of reported programs (second number if the specialties of education

and engineering included)

- (ix) The number of top programs (between #1-#34 and second number if the specialties of education and engineering included).
- (x) Variables and Remark
- (xi) Scores in the last column indicates the frame of calculation for the scores of this graduate ranking. PTDS means Possible Top Diversity Score. The score has a ceiling limit for their number of top programs. The reader rates from the number of top programs multiplied with 100, which cannot exceed the calculated scores plus 100. On this formula, the 30 programs within 1-34<sup>th</sup> in the USNW or NRC ranking can only attain the scores between 3,0xx and 3,100. Given 37 programs in the USNW at total, PTDS for USNW should be 3,800 while the PTDS in Table 1 of NRC study has an upper ceiling limit of 6,000 because the top institution has 59 programs at most.

### **Statement of Reference**

Upon decades of college career as a faculty, one of routine experience comes with the works of ranking experts for the strength and quality of institutions, departments or programs. The ranking business recently flourished through the new millennium that Wikipedia pages are even utilized to rank the institutions or disciplines. A traditional source of scholarly information, such as web of science, Scopus, NSF and membership or awards might be hackneyed to catapult a variety of perspectives for the users of ranked publication. They are generally perennial while some ranked results are deceased on a specific year or in period likely to claim as declaratory or permanent in that ranking scheme of methodology. The rankers are certainly a protagonist for the users of their product. Without the wisdom as a user, I suppose if he falls likely someone as a leper or ponce. Boys, be ambitious! A kind of famous encouragement almost always triggers the students in the real world, who, however, often have lack of resources and mostly should be dependent on his parents. He or she seems likely a ship in ballast that is expected to sail a long lifetime voyage. This reference is a work to communicate with such enclaves of people, who are interested in the ranked publications. I already published several pieces of subsidizing data or work product. In some cases, a tirade of explanation and user tips was wrought to taste or get more specific. As an academic, my effort hopefully could mine as a good reference to shed a light on unattended minds and perspectives.

A theme on this data focuses on the graduate programs that could be coupled to refer with the previous table of 2010 NRC. My approach allows a big scale of margins, which, I think, is persuasive in consideration of the number of research universities according to the classification of Carnegie Foundation. Around over 400 institutions, I guess about a moment of Eureka if I count on 17<sup>th</sup> criterion in either of R or S rank (roughly 34<sup>th</sup> as combined). Same

mind was rejuvenated to yield the graduate programs rank on the basis of USNW. Some tips needs to be given to clarify this unique graduate programs ranking.

First, it is distinguishable from many national or international sources in that it exclusively focuses on the graduate studies leading to the degrees, i.e., masters and certificates, MBAs, professional doctors, such as JDs or MDs DNP's or Dr. Audiology, as well as Ph.Ds.

Second, it also differs from the NRC study on the assessment of research doctorates, which is exclusively devoted to the Ph.Ds as well as most authoritative and exhaustive to cover all the specific programs of each institution.

Third and as a corollary, the users could not be complete to perfect their views concerning the graduate programs of each institution until they read through the two sources of ranked publications, i.e., NRC and USNW.

Fourth, the ranked results naturally can come in conflict with each other provided that their methodology is different. Since the USNW reports several of common Ph.D programs-hence no Ph.D ranking in French or oceanography, for example-the conflict may arise less extensively among 62 NRC fields. The conflict does not occur within a vast of professional programs, of course, in terms of classification and methodology itself. Hence, the graduate programs ranking of USNW provides a good source of reference in this ambit.

Fifth, this unique ranking stems from the thought of diversity philosophy, inclusion and on the basis of common intellectual clusters. Through a modest cut of ranks on 34<sup>th</sup> criterion bearable with all 200 institutions, the focus was given to the diversity strength besides quality consideration. A traditional group of strong institutions on graduate education, such as Wisconsin, Michigan, Berkeley, Harvard, MIT, Columbia, are still surfaced, but in a slightly less different type, which I call "Diversity G-type ranking of graduate programs." Some users may receive 30 programs for 3,050 diversity points at total while 22 programs for those of 2,270 in consideration of number of rated programs and each specific programs ranking, yet with a ceiling of 3,100 and 2,300 points. Since it depends on each mind of readers, I just put the anonymous score appearing as 25xx, 33xx in the above Table. This way of approach and mindset can also be practical with the previous reference to 2010 NRC study and I done same tally to put the scores in the Table of 2010 NRC study.

Sixth, the ranking was produced on the number of programs within 34<sup>th</sup> at a first priority (column 9 in the table titled "Programs #1-#34"). In next, the number of reported programs is considered at a second consideration when the first number is tied (column 8 titled "Programs Reported"). Provided if two numbers are equal and indistinct among institutions-frequent around the last of list, the rank of top programs is compared and I prefer the institution of higher rank (column 10 titled "Variables & Remarks"). Given it still is same, the next ranked programs are compared, and so forth, which became final to enable

distinguishing.

Seventh, you will find two numbers in each of column 9 and 8. The second number divided after the slash sign (/) indicates the rated specialties of education and engineering. The maximum number will be assigned for three in education and eight in engineering so that a maximum number of eleven at total can be attained in Column 8. In those ranked programs, I applied same standard to count for the latter number of Column 9 if each of specialties falls within #34 in rank. The rationale to incorporate the number of rated and quality programs underlies the breadth of two colleges and extent of survey practiced by USNW. So the specialties of English, history or sociology, physics, chemistry, and etc. are not considered that they are unitary with one scheme of ranking in NRC and generally considered as departmental. The specialties of other colleges, such as law, business, medicine and so, also are treated as same that they do not fall apart and are not considered independent for counting. It is because they are usually viewed as a unitary intellectual cluster as well as share an integral admission process of new students. The specialties of biological science are rated as similar to the NRC typology. However, the list of ranked schools is rather shorter with a small ambit of survey result, which, in turn, makes my PTDS ranking approach as less persuasive. For this slot, therefore, it seems more appropriate that you will refer to the ranked programs of NRC doctoral assessment in 2010. Nevertheless, the inclusion and exclusion of specialties beside the number stemmed from the graduate school ranking of USNW does not affect the PTDS score and final ranking of overall graduate programs in Column 1. In this point of consideration, the original frame of USNW is respected and the second number yielded from education and engineering can be supplemental to correspond with the diversification of expertise and intelligence. The upper limit of included specialties, e.g., eleven, was decided with respect to the practice of NRC and education school.

Eighth, you are informed that the USNW provides 37 colleges, departments, programs ranking at total that enable to guess the width of graduate programs and their viability across the institutions. Along with the classifications, more than minute information is available as titled "specialty." For the big departments or colleges, such as engineering or education, the specialty ranking can possibly equal with the fields of NRC study while it is just informative in most cases as deviated from the classification formula of fields in the NRC study. The programs in USNW including English, history or political science, physics and chemistry and so, fall within this category. The rationale concerning a selection of 37 programs underlies their commonality as an intellectual cluster of graduate education as we consider the strength of graduate schools comprehensively, which is somewhat distinctive from the NRC assessment of specific research doctorate programs. This thought also corroborates the schema of USNW report, which introduces 9 colleges and departments, 14 programs under the title of Health, 7 programs in Science, and 7 programs in Social Sciences and Humanities. The USNW graduate programs ranking is unique and distinct if it deals with exclusively the graduate programs on tangible elements including colleges,

departments and programs, who are staffed with the interested people, i.e., faculty, master and doctorate students. It is discernable from the mass of global reports that often rely on the classification of journals and faculty publication. This reference is hoped to facilitate a grasp of the complete picture of graduate schools in US. I like to welcome a suggestion about errors and wishes to improve the data or ranking scheme.

### **A reference to the US News ranking on the law school and law subjects**

The purpose of college and university ranking mainly resides to assist with the students in choosing their schools and programs at the level they wish to study. Most ranking sources nationally and globally hold a focus largely on the colleges and universities in general. As I addressed in chapters of my book “Piece to text on the monument and one,” the ranking source actually became rampant over the continents and countries from the commercial newspapers, tutoring websites, public organizations through individual scholars. One often subsists reciprocally and is accustomed to manage on the contractual basis. We are on *do ut des* and lively. However, with respect to the grace of such many educational services, student minds of man are apprehended regularly in time, browse and chuck the material presented to his desk produced to inform about the schools and programs. Without the sources, the interested persons in the schools and academics should have tried his needs whatsoever, on the zeroth whitehead. So the ranking source is thought to be generally useful for its informative and advisory role. On the other hand, men may criticize or even decry the methodology that they avow for more appropriate and fair assessment of schools and programs. The US News and World Report (USNWR) graduate programs ranking is notable that evaluates the graduate level programs uniquely and in contrast with other general subject rankings. Along with the reputation of source, this specificity enables to enjoy a number of subscribers in making an application decision about which school or program is competitive and personally fits. Given the study of national research council is most comprehensive and authoritative ranking source on research doctorates, called Ph.Ds, the ranking of professional schools, for instance, law schools, medical schools, nursing schools and on, as presented to the students in USNWR is very determinative in deciding which school I choose.

What I like to emphasize here is concerned with the user minds of given ranking information. I worked on the published book to expand the time elements and developed the insights as a wise and personified context to talk with the insipid ranked tables. More humanly and biological approach can improve our experience of lives exposed passively and unilaterally to the rankers on steering stand. This way of approach can be connected to subject rankings enriched through most of ABA approved 212 law schools in number. USNWR publish ten subject rankings, for instance, constitutional law, international law, the kind of slate of subjects expected to study in the first year of law schools, legal writing basically and broadly to impact his or her professional lives. For the users of this information, I would give some tips for leniency and in order to digress or broaden the message of information for each fit of persons.

First, as the epistemology of subject implies, the ranking is oriented to the teaching and

studying of students that is more flexible to refer rather than the general law school rankings. As the diploma of law school with JD degree can capitalize on his or professional lives, it does not go wrong to say that a weight may be given to the law school rankings, as clicked on the slot “all specialties.”

Second, the subjects can be more preciously considered when the school endorses as marking the specialty for his concentration in the form of certificate or corner of JD diploma.

Third, the context may come as similar to graduate law applicants, such as LL.M. or research doctorates in law. Most major law schools offer the general LL.M. programs and especially in case of research doctorate programs, such as SJD or Ph.D in law. The academic finality resides in his achievement as a legal scholar at the level, not his or her thesis topic. Therefore, it is academically more than convinced to refer to the guides or sources on LL.M or graduate law study including the doctorate level. As read previously, I am also one of participants to look into the statistics and quality of law schools on the data and analysis. The article, titled “The graduate law degree holders in the legal education market,” can be one of source if the students or applicants prefer to capitalize on this general nature of diploma. Of course, the LL.M. program can be administered in the academic title of specific program, for instance, environmental or public health, which is considerable in number. Notably, Stanford Law School has the kinds of program as focused and in official nomenclature to specify its concentration, which is unlike the general LL.Ms from Wisconsin, Harvard, Berkeley and so. In case of Berkeley, however, four certificate programs are available to the students eager to highlight his focus of study on the respective fields.

Forth, the subjects are mainly concerned with the JD students as most data suggests and as accustomed to the law school system of United States. The Juris Doctorate is taught-based, and the information of subject rankings for each law school can tell in the job market, for instance, recruitment process of big law firms, or career path for each JD graduate. The survey formula to ask for top institutions on respective subjects also is prepared and dominates the kind of compassion for JD education. Therefore, the applicants for the LL.M or research doctorate firstly diversify his source of consultation with other specific ranking source, and secondarily complement with the information on their study subject.

Fifth, the study subjects are not easy to clearly identify since the legal problems or research topics require the knowledge and information from adjacent subjects. For example, my research is devoted to investigate the new system of constitutional adjudication requiring an exposure to many scholarly fields that covered critical legal theory, criminal procedure, administrative law, social insurance law, and even civil law. In this context, it is not improper to remark that one would read the information more than fittingly to address the status of each user. So the respective users can combine the rank subjects, from two through four or five, in order to suit with his study plan in selecting his LL.M or graduate law study, for example.

In this light, the following table I shows a ranking that has been yielded by combining

the ranking of environmental law with that of legal writing. Same formula was applied to rank other subjects including the business/corporate law, constitutional law, and criminal law, which measure the strength of law schools in teaching to prepare all types of legal documents from court briefs, memorandum, court opinion through law review articles or texts and treatises. Therefore, the tables can be referred to not only by JD students, but also by researchers in the graduate law programs. Since some small or exclusively JD-oriented law schools are not available of LLM or graduate study, the users of table are expected to read consciously. The ranking table has a threshold to qualify so as to be enlisted that the top 44 law schools in all specialties exclusively had been selected and ranked according to the average of two subjects. As said, it could be used secondarily to refer in deciding the schools on the application of general LLM program. Given the junior scholarly nature of LLM or graduate law programs, it is considered that the legal writing program is half factored to select the schools. The column 1 and 2 transcribes the US ranking, which are added for a sum in column 3. Least number is placed at top and less number attains a high ranking correspondingly thorough the end of institution.

### **I. Environmental Law & Legal Writing**

| #         | Law School                                | Legal Writ. | Env. Law | Rank added | averaged |
|-----------|---|-------------|----------|------------|----------|
| 1.        | Georgetown University                     | 12          | 10       | 22         | 11       |
| 2.        | Arizona State University (O'Connor)       | 7           | 20       | 27         | 13.5     |
| 3(tied).  | University of California—Irvine           | 11          | 33       | 44         | 22       |
| 3(tied).  | University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill | 7           | 37       | 44         | 22       |
| 5.        | Wake Forest University                    | 6           | 41       | 47         | 23.5     |
| 6.        | University of Michigan--Ann Arbor         | 12          | 37       | 49         | 24.5     |
| 7.        | George Washington University              | 44          | 15       | 59         | 29.5     |
| 8.        | Duke University                           | 44          | 19       | 63         | 31.5     |
| 9.        | University of Texas—Austin                | 44          | 26       | 70         | 35       |
| 10.       | Boston College                            | 38          | 33       | 71         | 35.5     |
| 11.       | Northwestern University (Pritzker)        | 24          | 49       | 73         | 36.5     |
| 12(tied). | Indiana University--Bloomington (Maurer)  | 51          | 31       | 82         | 41       |
| 12(tied). | New York University                       | 76          | 6        | 82         | 41       |
| 12(tied). | University of Washington                  | 51          | 31       | 82         | 41       |
| 15.       | University of Wisconsin—Madison           | 51          | 41       | 92         | 46       |
| 16(tied). | Emory University                          | 44          | 49       | 93         | 46.5     |
| 16(tied). | Ohio State University (Moritz)            | 38          | 55       | 93         | 46.5     |
| 18(tied). | University of Florida (Levin)             | 76          | 20       | 96         | 48       |
| 18(tied). | University of                             | 76          | 20       | 96         | 48       |



|           |   |     |     |     |       |
|-----------|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | Minnesota                                 |     |     |     |       |
| 20(tied). | Stanford University                       | 92  | 10  | 102 | 51    |
| 20(tied). | University of Virginia                    | 76  | 26  | 102 | 51    |
| 22.       | University of California--Los             | 101 | 4   | 105 | 52.5  |
| 23        | Boston University                         | 51  | 55  | 106 | 53    |
| 24.       | Cornell University                        | 70  | 41  | 111 | 55.5  |
| 25        | Washington University in St. Louis        | 51  | 73  | 124 | 62    |
| 26        | University of California—Berkeley         | 127 | 1   | 128 | 64    |
| 27(tied). | Brigham Young University (Clark)          | 76  | 55  | 131 | 65.5  |
| 27(tied). | University of Notre Dame                  | 76  | 55  | 131 | 65.5  |
| 29        | University of Pennsylvania (Carey)        | 101 | 41  | 142 | 71    |
| 30        | William & Mary Law School                 | 101 | 41  | 142 | 71    |
| 31        | Vanderbilt University                     | 136 | 17  | 153 | 76.5  |
| 32        | University of California—Davis            | 136 | 20  | 156 | 78    |
| 33        | University of Iowa                        | 106 | 51  | 157 | 78.5  |
| 34        | Columbia University                       | 154 | 6   | 160 | 80    |
| 35        | Fordham University                        | 101 | 63  | 164 | 82    |
| 36        | Harvard University                        | 167 | 10  | 177 | 88.5  |
| 37        | University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign   | 101 | 79  | 180 | 90    |
| 38        | Washington and Lee University             | 101 | 79  | 180 | 90    |
| 39        | University of Georgia                     | 101 | 85  | 186 | 93    |
| 40        | Yale University                           | 167 | 20  | 187 | 93.5  |
| 41        | University of Alabama                     | 127 | 63  | 190 | 95    |
| 42        | University of Southern California (Gould) | 114 | 96  | 210 | 105   |
| 43        | University of Chicago                     | 154 | 63  | 217 | 108.5 |
| 44        | George Mason University                   | 148 | 136 | 284 | 142   |

## **II. Business/Corporate Law & Legal Writing**

|    |  |    |    |    |      |
|----|--|----|----|----|------|
|    |  |    |    |    |      |
| 1. | Georgetown University                    | 12 | 8  | 20 | 10   |
| 2. | University of Michigan-Ann Arbor         | 12 | 12 | 24 | 12   |
| 3. | University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill | 7  | 26 | 33 | 16.5 |
| 4. | Northwestern University                  | 24 | 12 | 36 | 18   |
| 5. | Wake Forest                              | 6  | 37 | 43 | 21.5 |

|           |   |     |    |     |      |
|-----------|---|-----|----|-----|------|
|           | University                              |     |    |     |      |
| 6.        | University of California-Irvine         | 11  | 37 | 48  | 24   |
| 7.        | Duke University                         | 44  | 12 | 56  | 28   |
| 8.        | Arizona State University (O'Connor)     | 7   | 52 | 59  | 29.5 |
| 9.        | University of Texas-Austin              | 44  | 17 | 61  | 30.5 |
| 10.       | Boston College                          | 38  | 26 | 64  | 32   |
| 11 (tied) | Boston University                       | 51  | 19 | 70  | 35   |
| 11 (tied) | Emory University                        | 44  | 26 | 70  | 35   |
| 13 (tied) | Indiana University—Bloomington (Maurer) | 51  | 23 | 74  | 37   |
| 13 (tied) | George Washington University            | 44  | 30 | 74  | 37   |
| 15.       | Ohio State University (Moritz)          | 38  | 37 | 75  | 37.5 |
| 16.       | Washington University in St. Louis      | 51  | 26 | 77  | 38.5 |
| 17.       | University of Iowa                      | 51  | 30 | 81  | 40.5 |
| 18.       | New York University                     | 79  | 3  | 82  | 41   |
| 19.       | University of Virginia                  | 76  | 8  | 84  | 42   |
| 20.       | Brigham Young University (Clark)        | 76  | 19 | 85  | 42.5 |
| 21.       | Cornell University                      | 70  | 16 | 86  | 43   |
| 22.       | University of Minnesota                 | 76  | 19 | 95  | 47.5 |
| 23.       | Stanford University                     | 92  | 5  | 97  | 48.5 |
| 24.       | University of Wisconsin-Madison         | 51  | 48 | 99  | 49.5 |
| 25.       | University of Pennsylvania (Carey)      | 101 | 6  | 107 | 53.5 |
| 26.       | University of Chicago                   | 101 | 7  | 108 | 54   |
| 27.       | University of California-Los Angeles    | 101 | 8  | 109 | 54.5 |
| 28.       | University of Washington                | 51  | 61 | 112 | 56   |
| 29 (tied) | University of Florida (Levin)           | 76  | 37 | 113 | 56.5 |

|           |   |     |    |     |      |
|-----------|---|-----|----|-----|------|
| 29 (tied) | University of Notre Dame                  | 76  | 37 | 113 | 56.5 |
| 31.       | Fordham University                        | 101 | 17 | 118 | 59   |
| 32.       | University of Georgia                     | 101 | 23 | 124 | 62   |
| 33.       | University of California-Berkeley         | 127 | 4  | 131 | 65.5 |
| 34.       | University of Illinois—Urbana Champaign   | 101 | 30 | 131 | 65.5 |
| 35.       | University of Southern California (Gould) | 114 | 22 | 136 | 68   |
| 36.       | William & Mary Law School                 | 101 | 37 | 138 | 69   |
| 37.       | Vanderbilt University                     | 136 | 12 | 148 | 74   |
| 38.       | Washington & Lee University               | 101 | 52 | 153 | 76.5 |
| 39.       | Columbia University                       | 154 | 1  | 155 | 77.5 |
| 40.       | University of California-Davis            | 136 | 23 | 159 | 79.5 |
| 41.       | Harvard University                        | 167 | 1  | 168 | 84   |
| 42.       | Yale University                           | 167 | 8  | 175 | 87.5 |
| 43.       | University of Alabama                     | 127 | 61 | 188 | 42   |
| 44.       | George Mason University                   | 148 | 48 | 196 | 98   |

### **III. Constitutional Law & Legal Writing**

|    |  |    |    |    |      |
|----|--|----|----|----|------|
|    |  |    |    |    |      |
| 1. | Georgetown University                      | 12 | 9  | 21 | 10.5 |
| 2. | University of Michigan—Ann Arbor           | 12 | 13 | 25 | 12.5 |
| 3. | University of California—Irvine            | 11 | 19 | 30 | 15   |
| 4. | University of North Carolina — Chapel Hill | 7  | 25 | 32 | 16   |
| 5. | Northwestern University (Pritzker)         | 24 | 13 | 37 | 18.5 |
| 6. | Arizona State University (O'Connor)        | 7  | 38 | 45 | 22.5 |
| 7. | Duke University                            | 44 | 9  | 53 | 26.5 |

|           |   |     |    |     |      |
|-----------|---|-----|----|-----|------|
| 8.        | University of Texas--Austin               | 44  | 11 | 55  | 7    |
| 9.        | Wake Forest University                    | 6   | 54 | 60  | 30   |
| 10.       | Ohio State University (Moritz)            | 38  | 28 | 66  | 33   |
| 11 (tied) | Boston College                            | 38  | 31 | 69  | 34.5 |
| 11 (tied) | George Washington University              | 44  | 25 | 69  | 34.5 |
| 13 (tied) | Boston University                         | 51  | 19 | 70  | 35   |
| 13 (tied) | Washington University in St. Louis        | 51  | 19 | 70  | 35   |
| 15.       | Emory University                          | 44  | 28 | 72  | 36   |
| 16.       | New York University                       | 76  | 5  | 81  | 40.5 |
| 17 (tied) | Cornell University                        | 70  | 13 | 83  | 41.5 |
| 17 (tied) | University of Virginia                    | 76  | 7  | 83  | 41.5 |
| 19 (tied) | University of Iowa                        | 51  | 38 | 89  | 44.5 |
| 19 (tied) | University of Wisconsin – Madison         | 51  | 38 | 89  | 44.5 |
| 21        | University of Notre Dame                  | 76  | 18 | 94  | 47   |
| 22 (tied) | Indiana University – Bloomington (Maurer) | 51  | 44 | 95  | 47.5 |
| 22 (tied) | University of Minnesota                   | 76  | 19 | 95  | 47.5 |
| 22 (tied) | Stanford University                       | 92  | 3  | 95  | 47.5 |
| 25.       | University of Washington                  | 51  | 59 | 110 | 55   |
| 26.       | University of Pennsylvania (Carey)        | 101 | 11 | 112 | 56   |
| 27.       | University of California-Los Angeles      | 101 | 13 | 114 | 57   |
| 28.       | William & Mary Law School                 | 101 | 19 | 120 | 60   |
| 29.       | Fordham University                        | 101 | 25 | 126 | 63   |
| 30.       | Brigham Young University (Clark)          | 76  | 54 | 130 | 65   |
| 31.       | University of Georgia                     | 101 | 31 | 132 | 66   |
| 32.       | University of California-                 | 127 | 7  | 134 | 67   |

|           |   |     |    |     |      |
|-----------|---|-----|----|-----|------|
|           | Berkeley                                  |     |    |     |      |
| 33.       | University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign   | 101 | 35 | 136 | 68   |
| 34.       | University of Florida (Levin)             | 76  | 67 | 143 | 71.5 |
| 35.       | University of Southern California (Gould) | 114 | 31 | 145 | 72.5 |
| 36.       | Washington and Lee University             | 101 | 44 | 145 | 72.5 |
| 37.       | Vanderbilt University                     | 136 | 17 | 153 | 76.5 |
| 38.       | University of California --Davis          | 136 | 19 | 155 | 77.5 |
| 39 (tied) | University of Alabama                     | 127 | 31 | 158 | 79   |
| 39 (tied) | University of Chicago                     | 154 | 4  | 158 | 79   |
| 41.       | Columbia University                       | 154 | 5  | 159 | 79.5 |
| 42.       | Yale University                           | 167 | 1  | 168 | 89   |
| 43.       | Harvard University                        | 167 | 2  | 169 | 89.5 |
| 44.       | George Mason University                   | 148 | 38 | 186 | 93   |

#### **IV. Criminal Law & Legal Writing**

|          |                                     |    |    |    |      |
|----------|-------------------------------------|----|----|----|------|
|          |                                     |    |    |    |      |
| 1.       | Georgetown University               | 12 | 5  | 17 | 8.5  |
| 2.       | University of Michigan – Ann Arbor  | 12 | 10 | 22 | 11   |
| 3.       | University of California – Irvine   | 11 | 17 | 28 | 14   |
| 4.       | University of North Carolina        | 7  | 22 | 29 | 14.5 |
| 5.       | Wake Forest University              | 6  | 29 | 35 | 17.5 |
| 6 (tied) | Arizona State University (O'Connor) | 7  | 33 | 40 | 20   |
| 6 (tied) | Northwestern University (Pritzker)  | 24 | 16 | 40 | 20   |
| 8.       | Ohio State University               | 38 | 15 | 53 | 26.5 |
| 9.       | Duke University                     | 44 | 10 | 54 | 27   |
| 10.      | University of Texas -- Austin       | 44 | 17 | 61 | 30.5 |
| 11.      | George                              | 44 | 22 | 66 | 33   |

|           |   |     |    |     |      |
|-----------|---|-----|----|-----|------|
|           | Washington University                     |     |    |     |      |
| 12 (tied) | Emory University                          | 44  | 33 | 77  | 36.5 |
| 12 (tied) | New York University                       | 76  | 1  | 77  | 36.5 |
| 12 (tied) | Washington University in St. Louis        | 51  | 26 | 77  | 36.5 |
| 15 (tied) | Boston College                            | 38  | 43 | 81  | 40.5 |
| 15 (tied) | Boston University                         | 51  | 30 | 81  | 40.5 |
| 17.       | University of Virginia                    | 76  | 6  | 82  | 41   |
| 18.       | University of Wisconsin – Madison         | 51  | 33 | 84  | 42   |
| 19.       | Cornell University                        | 70  | 17 | 87  | 43.5 |
| 20.       | Stanford University                       | 92  | 1  | 93  | 46.5 |
| 21 (tied) | Indiana University – Bloomington (Maurer) | 51  | 43 | 94  | 47   |
| 21 (tied) | University of Iowa                        | 51  | 43 | 94  | 47   |
| 21 (tied) | University of Washington                  | 51  | 43 | 94  | 47   |
| 24.       | University of Minnesota                   | 76  | 22 | 98  | 49   |
| 25.       | University of Pennsylvania (Carey)        | 101 | 6  | 107 | 53.5 |
| 26.       | University of Florida (Levin)             | 76  | 33 | 109 | 54.5 |
| 27.       | University of California-Los Angeles      | 101 | 10 | 111 | 55.5 |
| 28 (tied) | Fordham University                        | 101 | 17 | 118 | 59   |
| 28 (tied) | William & Mary Law School                 | 101 | 17 | 118 | 59   |
| 30.       | University of Notre Dame                  | 76  | 43 | 119 | 59.5 |
| 31.       | University of California-Berkeley         | 127 | 3  | 130 | 65   |
| 32 (tied) | University of Georgia                     | 101 | 33 | 134 | 67   |
| 32 (tied) | University of Illinois—Urbana Champaign   | 101 | 33 | 134 | 67   |
| 34 (tied) | Brigham Young University                  | 76  | 68 | 144 | 72   |
| 34 (tied) | Washington and Lee University             | 101 | 43 | 144 | 72   |

|           |   |     |    |     |      |
|-----------|---|-----|----|-----|------|
| 36.       | Vanderbilt University                     | 136 | 10 | 146 | 73   |
| 37.       | University of Southern California (Gould) | 114 | 33 | 147 | 73.5 |
| 38.       | University of California – Davis          | 136 | 22 | 158 | 79   |
| 39.       | Columbia University                       | 154 | 6  | 160 | 80   |
| 40.       | University of Chicago                     | 154 | 10 | 164 | 82   |
| 41 (tied) | Harvard University                        | 167 | 3  | 170 | 85   |
| 41 (tied) | University of Alabama                     | 127 | 43 | 170 | 85   |
| 43.       | Yale University                           | 167 | 6  | 173 | 86.5 |
| 44.       | George Mason University                   | 148 | 74 | 222 | 111  |

- All three sets of this reference could be revised with the suggestions and criticism. Your support with advice and suggestions will also improve my initial publication within the social media of global researchers, i.e., SSRN, Academia.edu, Researchgate.net and Philpapers.org. It will be part of my consulting reference and school guide. At any time, the comment and suggestion are welcome for the data errors or any constructive goodness. Any questions or inquiries will be directed to the author of this data sheet: Kiyoun Kim, Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, Chosun University. E-mail) [kiyoungkim@chosun.ac.kr](mailto:kiyoungkim@chosun.ac.kr)

## **AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY**

### **Kiyoung Kim (born 1963)**

Professor of Law and Public Policy, Chosun University; Bar Membership, New York State, US Court of Appeals Ninth Circuit, Republic of Korea; Dr. Iuris, Seoul National University/Korean Judicial Research Institute, 1987; LL.M., East Asian Legal Studies Center at University of Wisconsin Law School, 1994; Doctor of Juridical Science, East Asian Legal Studies Center at University of Wisconsin Law School, 1995; PH.D(International Relations and Diplomacy), Academie de Paris, INSEEC(Grande Ecole), Centre des Etudes Diplomatiques et Strategiques, 2003; D.PHIL(Public Policy), Walden University(Flagship University of Laureate International), 2018; Doctor of Philosophy(Business Administration), Chosun University, 2020. For more information, please visit

(1) <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCBTLEFjuPrBolPJZujvYtwvg>

(2) <http://www.chosun.ac.kr/user/indexSub.do?codyMenuSeq=293044&siteId=%7Elaw&dum=dum&prfId=298957&page=1&command=view&prfSeq=574864&search&column&fbclid=IwAR0owJFWQ7aXXifqsgyt-5JlKqHgvbKSmRBGIItZuasRX4EdsqAR4f3oaI>