

THE KIOSK FOR
DOCTORAL STUDIES IN
US [1986-2018]
PLUS SOME EXTENSION

KIYOUNG KIM

Professor of Law

AK.Edu Consulting

[www.youtube.com > UCBTLEjuPrBolPJZujvYtwng](http://www.youtube.com/UCBTLEjuPrBolPJZujvYtwng)

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 USNR, 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 USNR began and continues to rely on the journal classification austere- 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.¹ Unfortunately, the information below does not fully include most

¹ According to the IREG presentation by Moase on USNR 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.² 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 USNR 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.³ 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..."

² 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.

³ 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 influenceranking.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 humangenome 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 .⁴ 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.

⁴The 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 chine 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, USNR, 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: Per capita citation

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

Table 1: Final Rank

| | Harvard | Oxford | Yale | Chicago | Madison |
|------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Final Rank | 2 (tied) | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| Added/4 | 2.00 | 3.5 | 3.75 | 4.75 | 1.00 |
| Added | 2/2/2/2 | 3/3/4/4 | 5/4/3/3 | 4/5/5/5 | 1/1/1/1 |

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

| | Harvard | Oxford | Yale | Chicago | Madison |
|------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | ● Henry Hart Jr.-3,998 | ● Joseph Raz – 3,172 | ● Henry Manne – 1,523 | ● Lawrence Friedman – 6,546 | ● Wayne LaFave – 6,310 |
| | ● Louis Jaffe-1,566 | ● John Finnis – 1,890 | ● Myres McDougal – 1,947 | ● Mary Glendon – 4,054 | ● Kimberle Crenshaw- 3,669 |
| | ● Page Keeton – 6,958 | ● Charles Fried – 4,221 | ● James WM Moore – 2,253 | | |
| | ● Robert Keeton – 3,537 | * Jeremy Waldron-4,243 | | | |
| | ● Henry Monaghan-3,436 | * Ian Brownlie - 3,198 | | | |
| | ● Frances Olsen – 1,261 | | | | |
| | ● Mari Matsuda -3077 | | | | |
| | ● Erwin Griswold – 1,704 | | | | |
| M1-R | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|
| PC | 150 (10.46%) | 304 (21.21%) | 190 (13.25%) | 124 (8.65%) | 665 (46.40%) |
| Total | 27,920 (39.35%) | 16,724 (23.57%) | 5,723 (8.06%) | 10,600 (14.94%) | 9,979 (14.06%) |
| 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 6th 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 |
|-------|--|--|---|---|--|
| | ● Henry Hart Jr.-4,138 ● Louis Jaffe-1,628 ● Page Keeton – 7,421 ● Robert Keeton – 3,728 ● John Wade-2,577 ● Henry Monaghan – 3,469 ● Frances Olsen – 1,263 ● Mari Matsuda -3,088 ● Erwin Griswold – 1,833 | ● Joseph Raz – 3,185 ● John Finnis – 1,892 ● Charles Fried – 4,253 * Jeremy Waldron-4,254 * Ian Brownlie-3,208 | ● Henry Manne – 1,548 ● Myres McDougal – 1,950 ● JamesWM Moore –5,835 | ● Lawrence Friedman – 6,637 ● Mary Glendon – 4,065 | ● Wayne LaFave – 9,272 ● Kimberle Crenshaw- 3,671 |
| MII-R | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| PC | 157 (8.92%) | 305 (17.32%) | 311 (17.67%) | 125 (7.10%) | 862 (48.97%) |
| Total | 29,145 | 16,792 | 9,333 (11.82%) | 10,702 | 12,943 |

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|----------|----|----------|----------|
| | (36.93%) | (21.27%) | | (13.56%) | (16.40%) |
| YG | 185 | 55 | 30 | 85 | 15 |

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

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Henry Hart Jr.-5,508 ● Louis Jaffe-1,986 ● Page Keeton –19,421 ● Robert Keeton – 8,728 ● John Wade – 7,384 ● Henry Monaghan – 3,790 ● Frances Olsen – 1,289 ● Mari Matsuda -3,106 ● Erwin Griswold – 2,206 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Joseph Raz – 3,199 ● John Finnis – 1,902 ● Charles Fried – 4,529 * Jeremy Waldron-4,292 * Ian Brownlie-3,222 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Henry Manne – 1,606 ● Myres McDougal – 1,961 ● James WM Moore- 17,750 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lawrence Friedman – 8,692 ● Mary Glendon – 4,099 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Wayne LaFave – 28,989 ● Kimberle Crenshaw- 3,678 |
| MIII-R | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| PC | 288 (7.92%) | 311 (8.55%) | 710 (19.52%) | 150 (4.12%) | 2,177 (59.87%) |
| Total | 53,418 (38.89%) | 17,144 (12.48) | 21,317 (15.52%) | 12,791 (9.31%) | 32,667 (23.78%) |
| YG | 185 | 55 | 30 | 85 | 15 |

Table 5: Model IV-Secondary sources + federal appellate

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Henry Hart Jr.-4,668 ● Louis Jaffe-1,816 ● Page Keeton – 12,323 ● Robert Keeton – 5,728 ● John Wade – 4,439 ● Henry Mongahn – 3,665 ● Frances Olsen – 1,275 ● Mari | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Joseph Raz – 3,196 ● John Finnis – 1,901 ● Charles Fried – 4,292 * Jeremy Waldron- 4,259 * Ian Brownlie-3,222 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Henry Manne – 1,555 ● Myres McDougal – 1,960 ● James WM Moore – 16,962 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lawrence Friedman – 7,649 ● Mary Glendon – 4,054 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Wayne LaFave – 14,772 ● Kimberle Crenshaw- 3,669 |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| | Matsuda -3,100 ● Erwin Griswold – 2,171 | | | | |
| MIV- R | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| PC | 208 (8.11%) | 306 (11.94%) | 682 (26.61%) | 137 (5.34%) | 1,229 (47.97%) |
| Total | 39,185 (36.76%) | 16,870 (15.74%) | 20,477 (19.21%) | 11,703 (10.97%) | 18,441 (17.30%) |
| 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 two times of NRC assessment and recent year of USNR graduate program ranking, hence 66% for NRC and 33 % for the latter rank. As said elsewhere, my rationale is that NRC is purely for doctorates so as to be doubled while the USNR presumably covers both masters and doctorates. The second part 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 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 likesto 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 hard parenthesis [] 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 variegates 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 |
| 6 | Yale | 5 | 7 | 6 |

● Unranked institutions including Cal Tech, U Chicago, Columbia, UCSF, Minnesota, and Penn State, UCLA can possibly range 5-20th 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 Pittsburg can possibly enter the 5-22th 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 12-40th

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

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

<2010 NRC + US News Education/Other 1>

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

● I included 1st and 2nd spot in the USNW because the programs marked 1st in both ranks of NRC often, if not always, fall within 1st and 2nd 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 (Rated Programs) | Number of Top Programs (1 st /2 nd) |
|-------|-------------|--|---|
| 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 6-14th 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 13th places overall.

- Within the different scale above, Cornell, U Texas, UNC, NYU, U Washington (Seattle), Ohio State, U Illinois, Purdue, U. Pittsburg, 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 15-40th

- 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 30th in other yardstick overall or pertaining to some specific programs.

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

| Faculty | Yale | | Stanford | | Harvard | | U. Michigan | | MIT | | Princeton | | UC-Berkeley | | UW-Madison | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 1 st | 2 nd | 1 st | 2 nd | 1 st | 2 nd | 1 st | 2 nd | 1 st | 2 nd | 1 st | 2 nd | 1 st | 2 nd | 1 st | 2 nd |
| Education | | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 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 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 4 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 |

<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)/ 1 [3] | | | [7] | (2)/ 8 [5] | | (2)/ 1[3] |
| 19 /5 [2] | 22 /6 [2] | Stanford | 7/1 9-40 (7) [5] | 4 /11- 26 (6) /1 [4] | | 2 /10- 33 (6) [3] | 5 /3-6 (1)/ 1 [2] | 1 /3- 19 (3)/ 1 [1] | | 8 /17- 57 (11) /5 [7] |
| 36 /5 [5] | 41 /6 [5] | Chicago | 2/1 9-40 (7) [4] | 2 /5- 11 (3) /7 [5] | | 6 /10- 28 (5) [5] | 6 /13- 33 (9)/1 2 [6] | 1 8/1 4- 60 (12) /17 [15] | 14- 34 (8) | 1 /17- 58 (12)/ 8 [6] |
| 23 /5 [3] | 36 /6 [4] | Michigan | 1/9 -25 (2) [1] | 1 3/34 -58 (20)/ 12 [14] | | 3 1/28 -66 (21) [13] | 4 /3-7 (3)/ 4 [3] | 2 /7- 31 (6)/ 3 [3] | 11- 35 (7) | 4 /12- 33 (5)/ 1 [2] |
| 43 /5 [8] | 58 /6 [10] | Yale | 8/3 2-71 (14) [8] | 6 /18- 34 (9) /1 [7] | | 3 0/42 -72 (25) [15] | 3 /10- 24 (5) /4 [4] | 3 /7- 25 (5)/ 3 [3] | | 1 9/73 -123 (35) /22 [21] |
| 37 /7 [4] | 41 /8 [3] | Berkeley | 1 3/1 1-31 (4) [3] | 7 /10- 18 (5) /1 [6] | 7 /13- 41 (7) [6] | 4 /9- 34 (6) [4] | 2 /15- 36 (10)/ 4 [5] | 9 /25 - 129 (27) /1 [12] | | 3 /36- 18 (16) /1 [4] |
| 58 /7 [7] | 70 /8 [8] | Wisconsin | 5 18/ 27-75 (13) [13] | 1 5/(2 0- 40(12) /12 [12] | 2 /4-14 (1) [1] | 3 2/24 -55 (14) [12] | 1 0/33 -57 (15)/ 15 [13] | 1 5/7 -37 (7)/ 13 [9] | | 2 /24- 57 (13) /6 [6] |
| Unranked | Unranked | MIT | | 3 /4-7 (1)/ 1 [2] | | 1 /NA | 1 2/14 -41 (11)/ 9 [11] | 5 -44 (8)/ 8 [6] | | |
| 52 /6 [9] | 53 /7 [7] | UCLA | 9/1 5-38 (6) [6] | 1 1/52 -93 (26)/ | 8 /4-15 (2) [2] | 3 /5- 21 (2) | 8 /34- 68 (16)/ | 4 /10 -41 (9)/ | | 5 /43- 84 (20) |

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

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

20-53 (12)

- 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]

| Ranks | Institution | Aerospace | Biomedical | Chemical | Civil & Environmental | Electrical & Computer | Material Science | Mechanical | Industrial | Total |
|-------|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | MIT | 2/9-24 (6)/1 [3] | 1/4-18 (4)/1 [1] | 2/4-14 (4)/1 [1] | 1/9-40 (3)/7 [3] | 2/11-31 (7)/1 [2] | 1/5-20 (3)/1 [1] | 2/8-22 (5)/1 [2] | 5/3-9 (2)/NA [3] | 16 (sum)/8 (programs) |
| 2 | UC-Berkeley | NA/N A/NA | 8/5-12 (3)/6 [3] | 3/5-12 (3)/2 [2] | 2/4-16 (1)/1 [1] | 4/9-28 (6)/3 [3] | 4/8-23 (5)/5 [4] | 3/6-17 (4)/3 [3] | 3/4-19 (4)/2 [2] | 18/7 |
| 3 | Stanford | 3/3-6 (2)/2 [2] | 12/N A/3 [4] | 7/11-35 (7)/4 [4] | 3/6-26 (2)/4 [2] | 1/2-4 (1)/2 [1] | 6/1-0-33 (8)/4 [5] | 1/4-11 (1)/1 [1] | 7/2-8 (1)/7 [4] | 23/8 |
| 4 | Cal Tech | 1/2-4 (1)/4 [1] | NA/ (2-9) 1/NA | 6/ (2-5) 1/2 [3] | 5/19-71 (12)/NA [7] | 5/ 4/4 [3] | 12/ 2/5 [6] | 4/2-0-94 (14)/4 [8] | NA/N 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 | Theatre | Total |
|---|-------------|----|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|
| 1 | Princeton | | 4 /4-20 (3) [2] | 5 /2-27 (4) [2] | 1 3/3-17(3))/8 [8] | 2 /5-17(3)) [1] | 2 /12-42 (11) [4] | 3 /2-10 (1)/1 [1] | 6 /8-28 (3) [3] | 6 /8-28 (9) [4] | 1/3-14 (2) [1] | 3 /7-26 (6) [2] | 4 /13-64 (11) [4] | | 32(sum)/12(program) |
| 2 | Harvard | 2 | 1 /3-17 (2) [1] | 4 /8-26 (5)/ [2] | 2 /2-15 (1)/8 [2] | 1 7/10-34(6)) [9] | 4 /7-34 (5) [2] | 4 /2-12 (2)/4 [3] | 4 /9-32 (5) [3] | 1 /4-11 (2) [1] | 3/27-67 (17) [11] | 2 /9-27 (8) [5] | 1 0/N/A | | 41/11 |
| 3 | UC-Berkeley | | 2 /7-25 (5) [2] | 1 0/3-22 (2)/ [4] | 3 /24-63(13)/1 [6] | 7 /21-45(14) [8] | 1 /5-21 (2) [1] | 2 /15-38 (10)/4 [5] | 3 /3-14 (2) [1] | 3 /17-51 (14) [5] | 4/5-21 (5) [2] | N/D | 9 /9-40(6) [4] | 7 | 45/11 |
| 4 | Stanford | | 1 6/2-10 (1) [4] | 9 /3-22 (2) [3] | 5 /3-12 (2)/3 [2] | 6 /6-28 (5) [2] | 6 /13-39 (10) [5] | 7 /13-28 (6)/1 [4] | 1 4/N/D [4] | | 6/15-42 (9) [5] | 1 9/N/D | 1 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 Pittsburg 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 Pittsburg 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 & Infectious Disease | Kinesiology | Microbiology | Nursing | Pharmacology & 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 | 9-32 | | |
| | UC-Berkeley 5-41/outside 6 | Washington U-St Louis 9-36 | Duke 9-45 | Case Western Reserve 8-34 |
| 8 | Emory 8-44/outside 6 | UNC 12-34 | U of Washington 10-50 | U of Illinois-Chicago 11-35 |
| 9 | U of Chicago 7-46/outside 6 | U of Delaware 13-35 | U Penn 11-53 | Emory 9-37 |
| 10 | U Michigan 14-55/outside 6 | U of Florida 10-42 | U Virginia 11-54 | U of Iowa 9-38 |
| 11 | | ASU 13-39 | Tufts 12-55 | U of Kentucky 12-36 |
| 12 | | U of Maryland 13-42 | Yale 14-53 | NYU 15-50 |
| 13 | | U of Wisconsin-Madison 18-48 | UW-Madison 12-56/4 | 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]

| Ran k | Biochemist ry, Biophysics, and Structural Biology | Biology / Integrated Biology / Integrated Biomedic al Sciences | Cell and Developmen tal Biology | Ecology and Evolutiona ry Biology | Genetics and Genomic s | Neuroscien ce and Neurobiolo gy | Physiolo gy | Tot al |
|------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|------------------------|-------------------|
| 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 5/4-27 (4)/1 | Yale 6-25 (3) | UCSF (tied) 3/5-31 (4)/3 or 7 | | Stanfor d 5/3-10 (3)/1 | Stanford 5/2-19 (3)/1 [2] (tied) | Baylor College of Medicine 6/13-65 (8)/[14] |
| | | | Stanford (tied) 6/5-21 (3)/2 or 4 | | | | |
| 4 | UC- Berkeley 4/3-19 (2)/5 | UCSF 9-35 (4) | | | UC- Berkeley 10/2-9 (2)/3 | UCSF 4/4-24 (5)/5 | U. of Washington 7/13-64(7)/[14] (tied) |
| 5 | UCSF 1/9-32 (5)/7 | | | | UCSF 2/20- 93(23)/7 | MIT 14/3-15 (2)/5 | UCSF 5 (1996 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 nk | Institu tion | Applied Mathe matics | Astroph ysics and Astrono my | Chemi stry | Comp uter Scienc es | Earth Scien ces | Mathe matics | Oceanog raphy, Atmosph eric Sciences, and Meteorol ogy | Phys ics | Statisti cs and Proba bility | To tal |
|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Berkeley | [8](US News) | 3/4- 17 (3)/ [3] | 1/4 -11 (3)/1 [1] | 3/2 -4 (1)/1 [2] | 3/ 39 (7) /3 [2] | 2/2- 11 (3)/ [2] | | 4 /3-16 (2)/2 [2] | 2/4 -11 (3)/2 [2] | 22 /8 |
| 2 | MIT | 9-27 (5)/4 [3] | 8/9- 29 (8)/ [5] | 5/1 1-34 (8)/1 | 2/5 -14 (3)/1 | 2/ 13-44 (10)/1 | 3/10- 23 (7)/1 [3] | 2/8-35 (7) | 3 /6-32 (5)/1 | | 24 /7 |

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

[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 2nd 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 State University |

- 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 of | U of Iowa |
| 2 | Washington University in St. Louis | U Of Iowa | U of Alabama-Birmingham | Washington University in St. Louis | 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 (1996 NRC-1 41 specific areas)

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.

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

| | Institution | Breadth / Availability (40%) | Research Funding (11%) | CM UP (6%) | Patent Total (5+ 6= 11%) | Gourman Report (17%) | Funded Graduate Students (5%) | Number of Doctorates Awarded (10%) |
|----|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Wisconsin (Madison) | 1 | 2-6 | 10-12 | 4-8/5 | 8 | 5-15 | 2-8 |
| 2 | Michigan (Ann Arbor) | 3 | 2 | 5-8 | 9-11/11 | 3 | 3-7 | 1-5 |
| 3 | Harvard | 15 | 8-31 | 1-4 | 9-29/9 | 1 | 5-11 | 8-16 |
| 4 | Stanford | 15 | 9-14 | 1-4 | 3-4/2 | 5 | 7-11 | 4-14 |
| 5 | MIT | 12 | 11-23 | 1-4 | 2/7 | 9 | 17-33 | 14-17 |
| 6 | UC-Berkeley | 13 | 16-26 | 9 | 1/1 | 2 | 16-31 | 1-4 |
| 7 | Minnesota | 2 | 13-15 | 16 | 29-50/- | 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 | 14-19/4 | 15 | 2-6 | 18-34 |
| 10 | Columbia | 13 | 10-24 | 1-4 | 9-19/- | 11 | 8-16 | 19-27 |
| 11 | Yale | 18 | 18-33 | 5-8 | 48-85/- | 4 | 6-17 | 37-50 |
| 12 | Cornell | 7 | 12-17 | 18-19 | 12-28/13 | 13 | 19-23 | 18-25 |
| 13 | Chicago | 18 | 40-55 | 18-19 | 23-/- | 6 | 18-37 | 33-43 |
| 14 | Princeton | 15 | 78-92 | 29 | 55-/- | 7 | 51-82 | 44-54 |
| 15 | Johns Hopkins | 23 | 1 | 13-15 | 7-20/6 | 29 | 1-3 | 23-36 |
| 15 | Washington (Seattle) | 6 | 3-5 | 10-12 | 18-27/15 | 34 | 2-4 | 13-17 |
| 17 | Illinois (Urbana) | 5 | 22-34 | 30-32 | 10-24/17 | 17 | 24-55 | 3-13 |
| 18 | Ohio State | 4 | 9-22 | 27-28 | 25-/-19 | 28 | 30-40 | 6-13 |
| 19 | Duke | 18 | 5-10 | 5-8 | 27-46/8 | 21 | 6-19 | 39-54 |
| 20 | Texas (Austin) | 7 | 23-34 | 20-22 | 3-8/3 | 18 | 29-31 | 1-12 |
| 21 | Penn State | 9 | 14-22 | 30-32 | 45-76/- | 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 Ern | 27 | 28-31 | 14-17 | 14-23/- | 16 | 18-29 | 26-46 |
| 25 | UNC (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 | Pittsburg | 18 | 10-22 | 20-22 | 21-35/- | 43 | 7-21 | 27-42 |
| 28 | California- Davis | 39 | 15-27 | 33 | 1/1 | 33 | 24-52 | 18-24 |
| 28 | Iowa (Iowa City) | 30 | 39-61 | 50-51 | -/- | 24 | 23-44 | 40-52 |
| 30 | Michigan 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 (Lafayette) | 37 | 32-37 | 36-37 | 12-34/- | 27 | 51-116 | 8-15 |
| 32 | Georgia Tech | 24 | 25-30 | 30-32 | 9-43/- | 46 | 36 - | 19-29 |
| 34 | Rutgers (New Brunswick) | 27 | 31-45 | 52-53 | 21-68/ | 47 | 39-75 | 35-48 |
| 35 | Indiana (Bloomington) | 33 | 45-106 | 54-59 | 44-/- | 23 | 37-197 | 26-45 |
| 36 | Washington (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 Western Reserve | 40 | 38-55 | 54-59 | 43-63/- | 49 | 23-37 | 78-105 |
| 40 | SUNY (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- 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 (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, 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).

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 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

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)

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 desperateness, 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 st 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*** (pub.) | USNWR** | 1 st 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 st 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 | 0 | 9 |
| 10 | Penn | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| 10 | Yale | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| 10 | Purdue | 7 | 0 | 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 | 91 (5/6) | 95 | 93 | 423.5 |
| 6 | Michigan | 96.5 (8/5/8) | 42 | 90 (4/8) | 96 | 95 | 419.5 |
| 7 | Princeton | 98 (6/7/4) | 45 | 89 (8/6) | 92 | 95 | 419 |
| 8 | MIT | NA/NA/NA | 43 | 95 (1/5) | 96 | 92 | 326 |
| 9 | UCLA | 92 (NA/14/11) | 45 | 97 (2/3) | 90 | NA | 324 |
| 10 | Chicago | 98.5 (1/6/6.5) | 45 | 89 (6/8) | 90 | NA | 322.5 |
| 11 | Minnesota | 95.5 (13/12/14.5) | NA | 90 (6/6) | 90 | NA | 275.5 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| 12 | Columbia | 97.5 (3/3/9) | 42 | NA | 88 | NA | 227.5 |
| 13 | NYU | 90 | (NA/NA/ 22.5) | NA | 83 | NA | 183 |
| 14 | Duke | 90 (NA/NA/22.5) | NA | NA | 87 | NA | 177 |
| 15 | Washington (Seattle) | 91.5 (NA/NA/16.5) | 84 (8/8) | NA | NA | NA | 175.5 |
| 16 | Northwestern | 93.5 (17/17/16.5) | NA | NA | 80 | NA | 173.5 |
| 17 | Cornell | 96 (10/9/11) | | | | | 96 |
| 18 | Illinois | 95 (11/10/12) | | | | | 95 |
| 19 | Johns Hopkins | 94.5 (7/16/10.5) | | | | | 94.5 |
| 20 | Penn | 94 (12/11/13.5) | | | | | 94 |
| 21 | Indiana | 93 (19/15/17.5) | | | | | 93 |
| 22 | Ohio State | 92.5 (15/18/22.5) | | | | | 92.5 |
| 23 | North Carolina | 91 (NA/NA/17.5) | | | | | 91 |
| 24 | Texas | 91 (NA/NA/17.5) | | | | | 91 |
| 25 | Brown | 90.5 (NA/NA/21) | | | | | 90.5 |
| 26 | Cal Tech | | | | 90 | | 90 |
| 27 | Penn State | | | | 89 | | 89 |
| 28 | Washington (St. Louis) | 89.5 (NA/NA/24) | | | | | 89.5 |
| 29 | Pittsburg | | | | 88 | | 88 |
| 30 | UC- San Diego | | | | 87 | | 87 |
| 31 | UC-Davis | | | | 85 | | 85 |
| 32 | Cal San Francisco | | | | 83 | | 83 |
| 33 | Georgia Tech | | | | 82 | | 82 |
| 34 | Rockefeller | | | | 81 | | 81 |

- * 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 (1st or 2nd) 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. .
- NA or blank means no significant data for institutions.
- 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).

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. Juris, 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-5JlKqHgvbKSmRBGIItZuasRX4EdsqSAR4f3oaI>