The World-Class Multiversity

Global Commonalities and National Characteristics

Simon Marginson

Professor of International Higher Education
Director, ESRC/HEFCE Centre for Global Higher Education
UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UK

Coverage

- Remarks on method
- The context: bringing the state back in
- Can there be more than one kind of WCU?
- Worldwide higher education tendencies
- Worldwide structural forms and changes
- The rise of the Global Research Multiversity
- Size, shape and motor of institutions
- Conclusions

Method

Context: the state

High citation papers, in top 10% of their research field, in mathematics and physical sciences, 2011-14 (Leiden data)

World rank	University and system	Mathematics and computing
1	Tsinghua U CHINA	280
2	MIT USA	246
3	Nanyang TU SINGAPORE	243
4	Stanford U USA	215
5	Zhejiang U CHINA	205
6	UC Berkeley USA	201
7	Huazhong UST CHINA	198
8	U Texas Austin USA	193
9	National U SINGAPORE	187
10	City U HONG KONG SAR	180
11	Harbin IT CHINA	180
12	U Michigan USA	169
13	Xidian U CHINA	168
14	Shanghai JT CHINA	164
15	ETH Zurich SWITZERLAND	164

World rank	University and system	Physical sciences and engineering
1	UC Berkeley USA	1215
2	MIT USA	1164
3	Stanford U USA	936
4	Tsinghua U CHINA	894
5	Harvard U USA	834
6	Nanyang TU SINGAPORE	797
7	U Cambridge UK	764
8	Zhejiang U CHINA	732
9	National U SINGAPORE	670
10	U Tokyo JAPAN	664
11	U Science & Tech. CHINA	633
12	U Michigan USA	627
13	ETH Zurich SWITZERLAND	626
14	Caltech USA	613
15	Peking U CHINA	579

Worldwide tendencies

1. Organizational modernization

2. Massification

3. World-Class university movement

4. Marketization

5. Globalization

Regional Gross Tertiary Enrolment Ratios (%) 1970-2013

UNESCO Institute of Statistics

	1970	1990	2010	2013
World	**10.0**	**13.6**	**29.3**	**32.9**
North America/ W. Europe	30.6	48.6	76.9	76.6
Central and Eastern Europe	30.2	33.9	67.9	71.4
Latin America and Caribbean	6.9	16.9	40.9	43.9
East Asia and Pacific	2.9	7.3	27.3	33.0
Arab States	6.0	11.4	25.5	28.1
Central Asia	n.a.	25.3	26.7	26.1
South and West Asia	4.2	5.7	17.4	22.8
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.9	3.0	7.7	8.2

Universities with more than 10,000, 5000, 2000 and 1200 journal papers, 2006-09 to 2011-14 (Leiden U data)

Universities publishing over	2006 to 2009	2007 to 2010	2008 to 2011	2009 to 2012	2010 to 2013	2011 to 2014
10,000 papers	25	26	31	34	39	46
5000 papers	122	128	135	143	154	171
2000 papers	381	402	425	452	481	496
1200 papers	594	629	657	682	712	743

Configurations of systems and institutions

1. The rise of the multiversity, the large comprehensive research university, to a more dominant role within national systems, advancing its global capacity, together with growth the size and scope of individual multiversities

2. Overall reduction (with some national exceptions) in the role of semi-horizontal binary sector distinctions and single-purpose institutions

3. Growing internal diversity within the comprehensive multi-purpose institutions

4. Steeper vertical stratification in many national systems

It is likely that there is an overall decline in diversity in the horizontal sense, with the (relatively peripheral) exception of on-line forms and in some countries, the growing role of for-profit private sectors

The global multiversity president

" It is sometimes said that the American multiversity president is a two-faced character. That is not so. If he were, he could not survive. He is a many-faced character, in the sense that he must face in many directions at once while contriving to turn his back on no important group . . .

The university president in the United States is expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer with the foundations and the federal agencies, a politician with the state legislature, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter of the professions (particularly of law and medicine), a spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee of opera and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, an active member of a church. Above all he must enjoy travelling in airplanes, eating his meals in public, and attending public ceremonies. No one can be all of these things. Some succeed at being none. He should be firm, yet gentle; sensitive to others, insensitive to himself; look to the past and future, yet be firmly planted in the present; both visionary and sound; affable, yet reflective; know the value of a dollar and realize ideas cannot be bought; inspiring in his vision yet cautious in what he does; a man of principle yet able to make a deal; a man with a broad perspective who will follow the details conscientiously; a good American but ready to criticize the status quo fearlessly; a seeker of truth where the truth may not hurt too much; a source of public policy pronouncements when they do not reflect on his own institution. He should sound like a mouse at home and look like a lion abroad. . . he is a marginal man but at the very center of the total process."

~ Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University*, Harvard University Press, 1963, pp. 22-23.

Size, shape and motor of WCUs

- Most WCUs strive for greater inclusion, size and reach, rather than de-bundling into separated markets

- Building social and global weight are ends in themselves. Both growth/accumulation and selectivity/concentration are sources of status. The inherent growth vs. selectivity tension continues, but at a higher level of size and scope than before

- A small minority of leading WCUs stay small

- Heterogeneous design: in more complex, multiple, loosely coupled organizational forms, WCUs remain coherent. This is facilitated in some systems by a shift from state administration to site governance in more corporate WCUs

Conclusions

- Global systems and patterning in knowledge and information-related areas drive institutional adaptation and transformation: e.g. comparison and ranking, research and publication, disciplinary structures and research centres, commercial market in international education

- Nationally driven domains are also crucial (though their potency varies). They articulate the global system effects. National domains include inherited political cultures, state-university relations, funding and tuition, governance, scope for WCU initiatives, academic career structures, etc

- Internationalization practices and mobility patterns develop in a dialectic of the global and national, e.g. open global borders vs. national migration and labour market policies