Policy Futures in Education, Volume 2, Number 2, 2004

EDITORIAL

University Futures

SIMON MARGINSON
Monash University, Clayton, Australia

What is the University and where is it going? What are its possible futures, and what futures are most likely to happen? The popular image of 'the University' in television and film is one of ivy-covered tradition, though only a minority of actual university sites fit the image. In its search for a foundational argument, scholarly discussion of the University as an institution often works back to the ancient Greeks, or at least to the mid-nineteenth century *The Idea of a University* by Cardinal Newman ([1854] 1996). Here there is a divergence between discussion of the University conducted within the humanities, and discussion in the smaller specialist fields of higher education studies and policy studies in education. Practitioners in the humanities are preoccupied by the discursive and administrative conditions for teaching and scholarship in those disciplines. Examples of this kind of commentary include papers by philosophers Gaita (2002), and Godon in this volume, and Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987), written from English literature. Higher education and policy specialists focus on the tasks of system organisation, government policy and institutional management. Their disciplinary tools are drawn mostly from sociology, economics, and political science and policy studies. They find the antecedents of the contemporary University less in Plato and Newman and more in the building of the modern mass education systems after World War Two (Scott, 1995; King, 2004) and in Kerr's *The Uses of the University* (1963). From there it is a short step to discussing the role of the University in the global 'competition state', which is the most recent rendering of the university-as-nation-builder project, and hence to globalisation and its university manifestations such as global networks (Beerkens, 2004) and cross-border students (Marginson & Rizvi, forthcoming). Examples of this work include the articles in this volume by Vincent-Lancrin, Eckel et al, Rhoades et al, Westerheijden et al, and Turner & Pusser. Some commentary draws on both sets of sensibilities. Though the

article here by Kenway et al works in education policy studies, its central concern is with the character of and conditions for scholarship.

In his account of *The University in Ruins* the starting point for philosopher Readings (1996) is not Plato's Academy but the modern University and its role in constructing national culture, as Waks notes in his article in this volume. Readings argues that this role is irretrievably compromised by globalisation, neo-liberalism and corporatisation. His work might be said to represent a third, postmodern strand of discussion about the University, which focuses on the role of the University in the authorisation of truths. Perhaps the most famous and influential example is Lyotard's critique of utilitarianism and commercialism in *The Post-Modern Condition* (1984):

> The question (overt or implied) now asked by the professional student, the State, or institutions of higher education is no longer 'Is it true?' but 'What use is it?' In the context of the mercantilisation of knowledge, more often than not this question is equivalent to: 'Is it saleable?' And in the context of power growth, 'Is it efficient?' (Lyotard, 1984, p. 51)

Preoccupations with neo-liberalism and its manifestations in the University cross the different literatures. Several of the articles in this volume target commercialism and markets, policy-driven and money-driven science, and credentialism. Compared to a decade ago, there is now less inclination to situate 'managerialism' as a universal explanation of all problems in the University. Executive-leaders, university businesses and modernised institutional bureaucracy are symptomatic of a larger set of cultural and social practices. These practices have produced a fourth way of talking about the University, in the burgeoning business literature, which imagines universities as standalone corporations swinging free of government in their own global marketplace and subjected to the familiar novelties of corporate management and leadership. In this kind of literature the University has no history: it is nothing more or less than the generic corporation – though images of traditional Ivy are exploited in the marketing and branding strategies of the more venerable institutions. The practices of scientific research and its commercialisation might have produced a fifth strand of literature about the research-intensive University (where, rightly or wrongly, most attention is focused), but have yet to translate discussion of innovation strategies, technology transfer and research and development (R & D) investment in journals such as *Research Policy* into a broader institutional frame.

We can find illuminating insights in almost any intellectual tradition. Arguably, no one grasped the institutional being of the modern University better than Clark Kerr. *The Uses of the University* is as informative for executive managers as for their critics (though neo-liberal economists, who are both managers and never-satisfied-with-an-impure-market critics, would probably prefer something that is less explanatory and open-ended than Kerr, and more normative and strident). Kerr's key insight, one that was novel 40 years ago but is now commonplace, was that mass higher education is associated with

multiple purposes and constituencies. Kerr christened the University as 'the Multiversity', which was clever, and anticipated later theoretical developments, though it never quite caught on. He saw the Multiversity as a 'city of infinite variety'. The University was no longer reducible to a single purpose (if it ever had been), such as scientific research, or scholarship, or the formation of culture, or the training of social leaders. As Pusser (2002) remarks in an insightful review essay on the successive versions of Kerr's argument, his Multiversity was also marked by contradictions:

> autonomous and constrained, powerful and vulnerable, innovative at the margins yet conservative at the core, dedicated to education as it depreciates teaching, devoted to liberal arts and vocational, nonprofit and commercial, and an 'aristocracy of intellect' in a populist society. (Pusser, 2002, pp. 460-461)

Clark Kerr sealed the authority of his analysis by predicting – in the early 1960s – the growth of a 'knowledge industry' with nodes along Route 128 around Boston and the Silicon Valley in California, a revolution in the biological sciences, a steeper hierarchy between science and humanities, the politicisation of the student body (later, the student revolt was to cost him his post as President of the University of California when he was dismissed by Governor Ronald Reagan) and the 'mechanisation' of learning to cope with the tasks of mass teaching. Pusser notes that Kerr's account of the origins of the Multiversity and its 'daily routines' has held up well; but 'little in the book explains why the University functions as it does or why it is so often enmeshed in conflict' (2002, p. 463). Kerr's account of the politics of the University is too focused on its internal operations, with not enough recognition of the external forces that drive it. Pusser suggests that in identifying these external drivers, in the case of the American University we might look to the fostering of research by industry and cold-war government, and the role of the research-intensive University in training national and global leaders. Perhaps the former explanation holds up less well outside America – in most nations, despite common global imaginings about the knowledge economy, and much to the continued chagrin of policy makers, the evidence for American-style strategic research synergies between government/university/industry is sparse. 'Academic capitalism' (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) of this kind and on this scale is confined to a small number of leading capitalist economies and cannot become universal to the University unless every nation becomes wealthy. In contrast with the United States, for better or worse, most national economies are not awash with surplus capital from a plethora of public and private sources, available for parking in the universities, to seal the Faustian bargain with economic power. On the other hand, the sociological role of the University in leadership training and in social selection is played out everywhere, whatever the state of the national economy; and it echoes through several of the articles in this volume.

Despite its external limitations, at the time it was published, Kerr's internally focused notion of the Multiversity was useful for people like himself, for the then emerging caste of professional administrators/leaders thereby invited to play balance-of-power politics among the fecund communities that were ranged within and around the University, and so maintain executive control, in the days before performance management and competitive budget distribution were invented to pursue the same purpose in an economically arbitrary, not politically arbitrary, fashion. That political model of the University as a field of often contrary interests (Baldridge, 1971) has now given way to a corporate model of managing the University as a site of production with an economic bottom line, though the latter is hard to define (profits? economic revenues? student numbers? research grants? research outputs? local social status? competitiveness within the national higher education system? global standing?). Yet it is clear that the University as an institution is at least as strongly motivated by social and global status, or prestige, as a goal in itself, as it is by the goal of economic revenues – though the two objectives are also intermeshed, in that achieving one is a principal means to the other. And the component academic units within the University are often little concerned about revenues as an end (while always mindful of money as a means); and their notions of status or prestige tend to be focused on discipline-based goals that are much narrower than those of the University qua University.

Arguably, the model of University as self-serving corporation – while it is certainly capable of inflicting major changes on teaching, learning and research, as the experience of the last decade indicates (Marginson & Considine, 2000) – no more exhausts the University as an institution than the notion of the University as site of political conflict and resolution; the University as privileged site for the workings of the scientific imagination; the University as community of scholars; the University as the fountainhead of culture and civilisation; the University as the arena of cultural diversity and global linkages; the University as producer of common public goods; the University as the wellspring of commercial science and technology; the University as the engine room of global competitiveness; nor, indeed, the University as irretrievably wrecked by neo-liberal globalisation. The range of these images indicates the University is not only complex in its activities and associations, but is a 'discourse sticky' institution. Many claims are made on the University.

The different literatures and the various claims are associated with many insights into the practices of universities. At the same time, though there are growing similarities between research-intensive universities across the world – a convergence that is much remarked on in the higher education studies literature – we lack persuasive theories or just new Kerr-style insights to help us understand the likely future trajectories of the University. It is broadly agreed the research-intensive University will continue to be an important institution. Amid the emergence of flexible learning and virtual institutions, Peter Drucker inspired a careless claim that conventional face-to-face universities would soon be obsolete, but the argument failed to outlast the collapse of the dot-coms at

the end of the 1990s. Since then, there has been surprisingly little attention to 'University Futures'; and the discussion is often narrow. It seems that few of those who talk about the future of the University can refer to its pedagogical and cultural aspects while keeping an eye also on its sociology, political economy and its policy context.

This special issue of *Policy Futures in Education* on 'University Futures' is one attempt to fill the gap. The authors have varying preoccupations, and use different methods of inquiry and exposition, and come to sometimes contrary and often heterogeneous conclusions. We invite you to read all the articles because they each add something distinctive to our common understandings of University Futures, and they help us to map the field of discussion itself.

In the opening article on 'Competition and Markets in Higher Education', Simon Marginson starts not from the economic roots of the University, nor its contemporary functions in the competition state or the production of knowledge goods, but from its social roots – its role in the allocation of social benefits and relative advantages in a neo-liberal era. Arguably, the University plays a key part in configuring the social as a modernised Hobbesian space, the civilised war of all against all that F.A. Hayek and Margaret Thatcher imagined. Status competition in higher education has two dimensions: the competition between students for the most favoured places, and the competition between institutions for resources and prestige. Within the University, Marginson is interested in the interplay between the University as prestige maximiser and the University as resource driven. He examines status competition in higher education on both national and global planes and explores the national/global intersections. He finds that while status competition is much broader than buyer–seller competition in economic markets, these markets are becoming more pervasive and influential. Correspondingly, status competition has become both 'economised' (it is mediated by private capacity to pay), and intensified (there is diminished attention to public-good objectives, so that status competition is less modified by state interventions designed to increase equality of opportunity between individuals and between social groups). These trends have shaped the capacities of individuals, and universities as institutions, to use globalisation to pursue projects of upward mobility, and have more closely tied the University to the servicing of national and global hierarchies. This suggests the classical national policy project of equality of educational opportunity has been rendered obsolete by marketisation and globalisation, and now needs to be reworked. Marginson is interested in the manner in which in every nation the category of high-quality universities seems to be shrinking and a worldwide market in prestige universities has emerged. These patterns are typical of positional competition (Hirsch, 1976) in 'winner-take-all' markets in a networked environment (Frank & Cook, 1995). Marginson's argument suggests that we need to look beyond the critique of neo-liberal discourse. The discursive practices of neo-liberalism are deployed by specific socioeconomic interests. Far from the free movement of capital being the ultimate arbiter, markets in higher education are subordinated to government policy, to status

competition and to conservative social power. On the global plane markets serve specific national interests, not vice versa. He argues that the leading Anglo-American universities exercise an unhealthy sway, while the rapidly growing commercial markets in cross-border English-language education also rest on relations of domination/subordination. Both of these factors retard the potential of higher education outside the global metropolis and therefore hold back national capacity in the developing world where universities are crucial to social and economic formation.

In 'Building Future Scenarios for Universities and Higher Education', Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin notes that higher education institutions and systems are affected by four common factors: convergence in the forms of higher education and the issues faced by institutions, from often very different starting points; the growth of participation including cross-border student mobility, despite demographic decline in some nations, and the multiplication of missions and functions; greater institutional autonomy and an expanded role for private providers; and new potentials of information and communications technologies (ICTs). The article provides informative internationally comparative data on participation rates, demographic trends and public and private funding across the nations of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). In about half the OECD countries public expenditures per student declined between 1995 and 2000, though in some cases the drop in public funding was compensated by increased private funding. Like Marginson, Vincent-Lancrin notes that as well as providing teaching, research and services, universities exercise a central function – their 'only remaining monopoly' – in granting degrees and screening graduates for employment. This is 'one of the foundations of social stratification in democratic societies'. Vincent-Lancrin identifies six possible scenarios: little change, so that trends to mass education and marketisation are halted and developments in ICTs and lifelong learning largely take place outside the sector; a more entrepreneurial model with enhanced scope for private funding; an unabashed free-market model with institutional specialisation, enhanced hierarchy, extensive internationalisation and widespread use of ICTs in teaching, and movement of much research outside the universities; the re-centring of universities on a lifelong learning and open education model, again with research moving outside the sector, greater flexibility and an enhanced role for corporate institutions; a global network of universities where learners would design their own education, and industry partners would play a key role in the large market for lifelong learning; and the disappearance of formal tertiary education. Common to several of the scenarios is a demand-driven approach, more focus on the development of teaching, and the separation of teaching and research functions, with publicly funded science moving to outside research centres.

In 'Universities, Regional Policy and the Knowledge Economy', Michael Peters & Tim May extend Vincent-Lancrin's discussion of knowledge economy linkages to a more detailed examination of ICT-driven economic activity and

its implications for regional capacity building. Regardless of the ideological content of some knowledge economy discourses, for example a tendency to abstract education/economy linkages from community building, ICTs have transformed both industrial productivities, and the material forms of community. At the same time, ICT-mediated networks, like the ICT industries themselves, are concentrated in particular nodes bound by geographical space. 'The major theoretical question is why has industry clustering reappeared in advanced economies when it had all but disappeared in the mid-twentieth century.' This re-regionalisation enables location-bound higher education institutions to retain a central role in economy and society, confounding predictions that the Virtual University would shift from adjunct to dominant form. 'Place matters', as Turner & Pusser put it in the heading to their article. Further, there is potential for these concentrations of new economic activity to be globally plural, rather than confined to the USA; and in turn this suggests that in the longer term there is potential for the exacerbated dominance of American institutions to be modified. In any case, Peters & May suggest that it is important not to become confined by critique but to focus also on the materiality, the positivity of the new economies and explore the potential for civic construction and education/industry/community interfaces that are created. They examine a detailed case study, the Manchester Knowledge Capital Initiative, which seeks to counterbalance the 'Golden Triangle' of Oxford, Cambridge and London. Within the Knowledge Capital Initiative some regional higher education institutions are shifting significantly, from being seen as merely 'in' the region to becoming 'of' the region.

In 'In the Shadow of the Ruins: globalization and the rise of corporate universities', Leonard Waks focuses on that sector of higher education where, as Vincent-Lancrin notes, much of the institutional innovation is now concentrated – the for-profit institutions and corporate universities. For-profit corporate universities have yet to gain acceptance from the orthodox academic sector as 'real' universities. However, benefiting from the neo-liberal policy climate and offering specialised forms of adult and vocational education, they 'have achieved broad public and political acceptance and accreditation'. Waks identifies two principal types of for-profit corporate university: standalone adult universities such as the University of Phoenix that are open to all customers, and the university divisions of corporations such as Motorola that want staff training that is 'more closely aligned with the firm's specific missions and markets'. In the last decade enrolments in both categories have grown rapidly though there are only a small number of really large-scale providers. The University of Phoenix is the outstanding success story, with many city-fringe sites in the USA and campuses in Mexico and the Netherlands. Few of the company-specific institutions have gained accreditation their own right: most work through established universities. However, conferral of state or mainstream institutional authority is not always essential to the corporate university sector, which sees the mainstream University is an illegitimate cartel organised to retard new initiatives, and regards Hayekian neo-liberal states as

over-regulatory. Waks notes that in 1988 the Thatcher Government passed legislation requiring all diploma programs in the United Kingdom (UK) to be subject to approval by the universities. For the successful International Management Centres Association (IMCA) these were the very institutions IMCA was set up to contradict. The IMCA provides tutoring services and accredited degree programs to corporate universities. It has no preset curricula and develops flexible reflexive teaching/group learning processes that are 'authentic' to the specific firm. Like the University of Phoenix, IMCA provides no research function, maintains no library and dispenses with conventional academic criteria in staff appointment and promotion. The economic efficiency and demand-attractiveness of this model is beyond the reach of orthodox research-intensive universities. The success of the corporate universities in developing and exploiting specific adult learning markets is clear. It is not so clear that they are capable of developing commercial alternatives to conventional first degrees for pre-vocational undergraduates, or research training at doctoral level.

It is those nations that benefit most from global exchange in education that tend to be its more fervent advocates. Yet in 'Curricular Joint Ventures: a new chapter in US cross-border education?', Peter Eckel, Madeleine Green & Britany Affolter-Caine remark that, nonetheless, American universities can be surprisingly indifferent to the global sphere. While there is a continuing debate about the implications of the World Trade Organization/General Agreement on Trade in Services model for public institutions in the United States, globalisation in higher education generates net benefits to American universities and poses little threat to them. But despite (or is it because of?) America's favoured global position, international students are relatively marginal, and universities are often insular. The authors focus on exemplary universities that use strategic partnerships with each other, and/or with corporations, non-profit organisations and non-governmental organisations, to provide cross-border programs. Global enterprise is not just designed to raise revenues: it also augments institutional prestige and creates a broader set of capacities, potentials and perspectives. Institutions, including bachelor-level and community college providers, consider not just research and knowledge but the curriculum itself as a form of negotiable capital and the basis for entrepreneurial activity. The examples include the for-profit Cardean University; the Singapore–MIT alliance; the integrated international OneMBA program based on five providers in five nations (USA, Netherlands, Hong Kong China, Mexico, Brazil); Universitas 21 Global, an alliance of 17 universities that is attempting to mount a virtual university with a principal focus on delivery to China; and a second multi-institutional network of established universities, the Worldwide Universities Network, offering joint programs, the first accredited by York University in the UK. Curricular joint ventures are pursued most actively by certain large research-intensive universities that see themselves as global in orientation, and institutions that see the global dimension as their market niche, including the for-profit sector. Eckel et al note that nevertheless

it is not 'clear if US institutions will become more outward-looking both in their academic and entrepreneurial ventures', and they advocate a more open internationalism. The American higher education sector is less aggressively entrepreneurial than UK and Australian universities. Given the tremendous magnetic attraction exercised by American universities on the global scale, what would happen to the global market in cross-border education if the American doctoral sector adopted a more capitalist approach, so that the supply of places to foreign students rose to meet potential demand?

It is therefore ironic that American universities are seen around the world as the paradigmatic case of the successful fusion of higher education and capitalist economy. In 'Imagining *Alternativas* to Global, Corporate, New Economy Academic Capitalism', Gary Rhoades, Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, Imanol Ordorika & Martín Velazquez note that on the global scale an Americanised neo-liberal model of higher education as academic capitalism has become almost all-pervasive. The model blurs the boundaries between public/private, and non-profit/for-profit. It emphasises university entrepreneurship and university–industry partnerships; the generation of profitable commodities by universities themselves; and marketised forms of production, student fee charging, administration and system organisation. Notions of higher education as a producer of public goods and a cultural project are marginalised. This model of the University is now as dominant as the German Humboldtian model of the research university a century ago. But it is an idealised Americanised model not an actual American model, and is applied to other national sites without the infrastructures and social supports enjoyed by American research-intensive universities, e.g. their research resources and tuition subsidies. The move to the market in other countries, aggressively promoted by global agencies – particularly active in many Latin American nations – often 'proceeds much further and to a greater, unrestricted, extreme than it has in the USA'. Public institutions are weakened, their public functions are undermined and because system access is expanded by privatisation, financial barriers increase. The authors argue that nevertheless 'there are realistic and realizable alternatives' to the prevailing model. The seeds of one set of alternatives lie in the inherited tradition of public universities in Latin America, such as the autonomous university as it developed in Argentina; and in the distinctive entrepreneurial forms of a non-profit Mexican private university, the Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey ('Monterrey Tech'). Though Monterrey Tech enjoys less public aid than do non-profit universities in the USA – it has only a limited role in applied research – a third of its students receive tuition aid from within the institution and it has large-scale commitments to both international student exchange, and social service work by students designed to develop sustainable local communities. Rhoades et al conclude that Latin American universities should play to their inherited strengths and develop distinctive national projects in three areas: the democratisation of the University's social and political functions; the sustainable development of independent communities;

and the building of 'new and sovereign cultural identities' in the nations of Latin America.

As Rhoades et al argue, in the policy discourses of the neo-liberal competition state, public becomes private: 'public' purposes become controlled by privatised objectives and agents that are beyond the capacity of either universities or populations to affect. There is no reciprocity here. The University is accountable to capital, but capital is not accountable to the University or subordinated to its logics of teaching/learning and knowledge exchange. Universities are positioned as supplicants and dependants in relation to corporations that are mostly indifferent to higher education, and notoriously reluctant to pay for it. The next two articles provide critiques of government policies concerning innovation and the knowledge economy and the positioning of universities within those policies. In 'The Knowledge Economy, the Techno-preneur and the Problematic Future of the University', Jane Kenway, Elizabeth Bullen & Simon Robb note that the intellectual antecedents of the policies on innovation and the knowledge economy lie in Schumpeter's theorisation of innovation as 'creative destruction'; notions of long-wave cycles of innovation driven by dominant technologies, and endogenous growth, drawn from economics; and the conceptualisation of national innovation systems as networks of private and public sector agents. It is curious that innovation is typed as 'national': knowledge economy policies only partly factor in the global dimension. These policies now exercise a major influence on programs for funding university research in many nations. Kenway et al take in policy discourses from the World Bank, the OECD and European Commission and specific developments in the English-speaking countries, principally Australia. These policies 'accord technology undue power as an agent of change' so that social and cultural factors are seen as subordinate to technology, which like the capitalist economy is beyond control, and share a common preoccupation with techno-science, networking and commercial imperatives. Correspondingly, they value three kinds of university subject: the techno-scientists, the knowledge networker and the entrepreneur. For the University, it is a seductive policy, placing it at the centre of national interest by defining knowledge as the central factor in economic growth. The caveats are that the main purpose of knowledge work becomes its contribution to economic growth, and research funding systems ensure that universities no longer determine the pattern of inquiry. 'Knowledge' is presented as a universal across all fields of inquiry, but valued knowledge is commercialisable knowledge. Kenway et al argue that 'current knowledge economy policies and innovation systems tend to ignore the distinctive features of universities and scholarly communities and that, in so doing, they put in peril aspects of what they seek to achieve and much else besides'. The techno-scientist-entrepreneur is encouraged to cut corners, steal ideas, evade free exchange and treat the ethical and social implications of science as marginal to the main game. This excludes not just basic research in the public interest but the reciprocal bonds typical of the best academic life, where the social-economic logic is not the

capitalist economy but the gift economy. A gift transactor wants an intellectual community, 'the intellectual relationships that the exchange of gifts creates'. Such a position is anathema to the 'techno-preneur', argue Kenway et al. '[C]ommodity exchange exerts a disintegrating influence on the academic community ... No one, for instance, will freely share with someone who is known to have an eye on a potential patent.' No doubt the future of the University turns on the potential for accommodation between the gift economy and the techno-economy.

In 'Neo-liberalism, Knowledge and Inclusiveness', Peter Roberts critically examines two New Zealand examples of policy discourses on the knowledge economy: the Foresight Project developed by the then National Government in the late 1990s, and the Labour-led Tertiary Education Strategy, setting out priorities for post-compulsory education and training in 2002-2007. Both statements are enamoured of a sense of 'newness', and foreground futures in education. The discourses blend what Lyotard (1984) called 'narrative knowledge', and techno-science, with neo-liberal 'market knowledge', using terms such as consumers, providers, stakeholders, choice, outputs, value-added, market share, positioning, competition, performance indicators, etc. But in this fusion market knowledge is decisive: it has harnessed techno-science (whose role becomes to legitimate economism) to competitive capitalist ends. The Foresight Project is a potage of all modern things to all modern people. In its language about the 'knowledge revolution' there is the familiar unproblematic, almost seamless movement from broader thinking about the future, to openness to innovation, to globalisation and breaking down boundaries, to fostering science and technology, to maximising opportunities for individuals and enterprises, to mushrooming knowledge industries, to global economic competitiveness. The Labour education strategy adds 'foundation skills', multiculturalism and sustainable communities to the mix; and repeats the Foresight commitment to consultative processes. But on whose terms? Roberts argues that notions of inclusiveness and social–racial harmony fostered by both policy statements are illusory. The policy makers skate over both historical inequalities and the social disharmonies fostered by market competition; and leave fairness to be determined by market competition.

In 'The University and Social Transformation', Rafał Godoń shares preoccupations common to several articles: that education is become a privatised commodity and the incentives governing life in the University 'have nothing to do with the common good'. Conceptions of University as self-education, as a process of reflective personal development, have been displaced. Students 'no longer study for the sake of their inner betterment'. They are focused on the transactional utilities of knowledge and degrees. Correspondingly, 'the institutions increasingly focus on their economic success than on educating'. They care less about the person they educate and more about efficiency and about expanding the number of graduates. The myth that is identified by Godoń, 'that education is like a ticket to a better world' – the myth that the University is a medium for understanding, calculating, creating

and controlling futures – in different ways runs through the knowledge economy discourse; through status competition between institutions and the competition between students; through the rates of return equations of economists, through the policy assumption that the University is the producer of individual benefit, and universities' own strategies of increased tuition; and through University's marketing to students, its invitation to make enrolment in this or that program of study into self-investment. Godoń notes that this myth rests on ideologies of self and social transformation in which 'self-education' is replaced by 'self-satisfaction and success'. These ideologies foster illusions, and disappointment is inevitable; it is unsurprising that there is endemic frustration with the University. Like Kenway et al, Godoń emphasises the consequences for human relationships. The University 'is not, any longer, a place for establishing new friendships' based on the love of something held in common. Students become preoccupied with the size of the diploma, the service they receive and the status of their institution rather than knowledge and friendship. By confronting the philosophical underpinnings of conduct within the University, Godoń takes the critique of neo-liberalism, and the solution, a stage further. There is no universal internal antidote for these difficulties. The problems lie in the larger culture. After all, as Waks remarks, 'institutions are adaptive tools for meeting basic human purposes', and 'as one sphere changes, others must adapt to maintain stability'. We need to look to those basic human purposes – in Kerr's suggestive term, to the *uses* of the University – if we are to understand the predicament. But the University also constitutes a space and set of tools for personal and social reflection. If social life is reified, this makes it all the more important to preserve (or regain) independent spaces within the University, where research is controlled by scholars and not by outer bodies or vocational demands. 'Only one who is able to forget himself, to lose himself in otherness, can reveal new perspectives on the world.' Godoń argues that to address its own health and gain (or regain) its 'equilibrium', the University needs to confront the nature of the knowledge it transmits, recover the distinctions between the sciences and the humanities, and above all foreground self-understanding and empathy with the other.

The final two articles re-anchor the discussion in national systems and locally focused universities, albeit operating within global contexts. In '*Ground Force* Does the Dutch Higher Education Gardens', Don Westerheijden, Jeroen Huisman & Harry de Boer use styles of garden as a metaphor for the national higher education system (*Ground Force* is the BBC's garden changing program). In 2001 Westerheijden et al conducted a Delphi study to establish forecasts for the Dutch higher education for 2010. In an exercise similar to that of Vincent-Lancrin they identified three possible types of system-garden. The Palatial Garden is government ordered in straight lines with well-clipped hedges, consisting of the present two well-defined types of institution (universities and colleges) with homogeneity within each group. With all universities focused on a research-intensive mission, most students are in the college sector, which caters for local/regional labour markets. The system is planned and public,

though tuition costs have risen. Polder Gardens fit on the margins of the Dutch polders, which are designed in straight lines but have to fit the natural shape of flowing water, so that there is room on the margins for a few wild flowers. The Polder Garden higher education system in 2010 remains a nationally ordered public responsibility and continues to be largely supply driven. It is rationally designed but less strictly than in the Palatial Garden. The binary line is abolished, government influence in curriculum is limited to the bachelor level and the Master's level is deregulated, with some instances of high fees. Some Dutch students are exiting, preferring to access Master's programs through European structures. The Natural Garden is a wilder and messier place. Networking, partnerships and collaborations with industry are endemic. A range of missions has developed, though certain research-intensive universities have survived. Some institutions have broken out of the national system onto the European plane, or have become global players with focuses on China and Latin America. For-profit education takes a large share of the student market, while academic areas without strong demand support have tended to wither. The basic units are shorter modules. Accreditation is managed at European level, using a bachelor/Master's structure. Comparing the garden scenarios with the changes in 2001-2004, Westerheijden et al note that already a bachelor/Master's structure has been achieved, and institutions can now merge across the binary divide. The Polder Garden is closest to reality, but developments have been more international than the Polder scenario suggested. Government is positioning Dutch institutions at the quality end of the global market by making their research strengths more visible; while cross-border developments within Europe are taking an inter-national rather than a supra-national European Union (EU)-controlled form. The core of Dutch education remains a nationally controlled public education system producing public goods. Clearly, the nation-state is proving to be more resilient in higher education than many in the Netherlands and elsewhere expected, and much of the literature on globalisation has suggested (for example, Appadurai, 1996). Higher education is determined not by a dialectic of global (or EU-regional) elements with local elements, but in the *three* interacting dimensions of the global/regional, the national, and the local (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002; Valimaa, 2004).

Notwithstanding the growing salience of economic markets within and between national higher education systems, and the fervour about private universities and commercialisation that touches many in the global agencies and in the higher education sectors of nations where neo-liberalism holds sway, on a worldwide basis public education remains the dominant mode. Public, state or national universities enrol the majority of students at all levels of education except vocational education, and cover more than two-thirds of students in the United States. Even in some nations where the private sector is the majority sector, the national universities exercise leadership in academic research and social status, for example Japan. If public education and public policy – and more problematically perhaps, public goods – are at the centre of

the higher education equation, then the provision of an equitable structure of participation is at the core of that public role. As Vincent-Lancrin suggests, the classical democratic mission of national and provincial/state higher education systems is to provide social equality of opportunity. In 'Place Matters: the distribution of access to a state flagship university', J. Kirsten Turner & Brian Pusser provide a major empirical study of the role of public universities in developing social leaders/allocating positional or status goods. The empirical site is the University of Virginia in the American state of Virginia. Turner & Pusser review debates about equality and diversity in admissions. They note that despite the benefits to individuals, institutions and communities of diversity in the student body – and despite efforts to improve diversity – students from certain racial–ethnic, socioeconomic and regional origins are persistently under-represented in selective universities such as the University of Virginia. The founder of the University, Thomas Jefferson, stated that 'we hope to avail the State of those talents which nature has sown as liberally among the poor as the rich, but which perish without use, if not sought for and cultivated'. Turner & Pusser provide both tabular and diagrammatic tests of proportionality in representation, for 1992 and 2002. They find for example that in 2002, though more than three-quarters of Virginia's high schools were represented in the admission cohort, more than half the students came from 13.6% of the state's high schools, and one school district, Fairfax County, had a remarkable access to the University. Income tests indicate substantial socioeconomic inequality on a sub-state regional basis. Afro-American students apply at less than 40% of the rate that proportionality of representation would suggest, and the acceptance rate lags further. Hispanic-Americans are also under-represented. Asian-American students are considerably over-represented in applications (more so) and acceptances, though over-representation diminished between 1992 and 2002. Place, income and racial–ethnic effects tend to combine. The data from Turner & Pusser enable specific pockets of under-representation to be identified and addressed. But whether Jefferson's goal is still relevant is unclear, given that the University of Virginia has declared that it wants to raise enough in donations to dispense with the need for state government funding and the public accountability that goes with it.

The question posed by Turner & Pusser in their careful locality study is 'Whose social interests are served by universities?', a question posed more broadly in the first article by Marginson. The questions posed by self-privatisation and self-marketisation strategies are 'Whose interests are served by university self-interest?', and what does this mean for the community building dimension of higher education that was identified in different ways in the article by Peters & May, and in the article by Rhoades et al? As editors, we have found gathering these articles to be a rewarding process, and we have learned much from them. We hope they will stimulate further discussion, and invite vigorous rejoinders and alternatives.

Correspondence

Professor Simon Marginson, Faculty of Education, Monash University, Clayton Campus, Wellington Road, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia (simon.marginson@education.monash.edu.au).

References

Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Baldridge, R. (1971) *Power and Conflict in the University: research in the sociology of complex organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Beerkens, E. (2004) Global Opportunities and Institutional Embeddedness: higher education consortia in Europe and Southeast Asia. Doctoral thesis, Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies, University of Twente.

Bloom, A. (1987) *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Frank, R. & Cook, P. (1995) *The Winner-take-all society*. New York: The Free Press.

Gaita, R. (2002) The University – is it finished? in S. Cooper, J. Hinkson & G. Sharp *Scholars and Entrepreneurs*. Melbourne: Arena Publications.

Hirsch, F. (1976) *Social Limits to Growth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, C. (1963) *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

King, R. (2004) *The University in the Global Age*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lyotard, J. (1984) *The Post-modern Condition: a report on knowledge*, tr. G. Bennington & B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Marginson, S. & Considine, M. (2000) *The Enterprise University: power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marginson, S. & Rhoades, G. (2002) Beyond National States, Markets, and Systems of Higher Education: a glonacal agency heuristic, *Higher Education*, 43, pp. 281-309.

Marginson, S. & Rizvi, F. (forthcoming) Going Global: the internationalisation of Australian universities. Manuscript in preparation.

Newman, J. ([1854] 1996) *The Idea of a University*. Newhaven: Yale University Press.

Pusser, B. (2002) The Political Uses of the University, *Review of Higher Education*, 25(4), pp. 459-467.

Readings, B. (1996) *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Scott, P. (1995) *The Meanings of Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. (1997) *Academic Capitalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Valimaa, J. (2004) Nationalisation, Localisation and Globalisation in Finnish Higher Education, *Higher Education*, 48, pp. 27-54.

SIMON MARGINSON is Professor of Education at Monash University in Australia, and Director of the Monash Centre for Research in International Education. He is currently supported as an Australian Professorial Fellow

(2003-07) to investigate higher education and international education in the global context. His books include *The Enterprise University* (Cambridge University Press, 2000, with Mark Considine).
Correspondence: Professor Simon Marginson, Faculty of Education, Monash University, Clayton Campus, Wellington Road, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia (simon.marginson@education.monash.edu.au).