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Desires for social betterment: The struggle for relative advantage

‘The desire of bettering our condition ... comes with us from the womb and never leaves us till we go into the grave’


But do we rise only at the expense of others, within a fixed hierarchy in which competition is zero-sum... or can we all rise together?
GROWTH OF PARTICIPATION, AND DIVERSITY IN SYSTEMS
Vertical and horizontal diversity in systems

• Vertical diversity (here *stratification*) distinguishes HEIs by ‘quality, reputation and prospective status of graduates’ (Teichler, 1996, p. 118), and also resources

• Horizontal diversity (here *diversity*) refers to ‘the specific profile of knowledge, style of teaching and learning, problem-solving thrust’ (Teichler, 1996, p. 118)

• Horizontal diversity can also include differences in mission, governance or internal organizational culture

Diversity, competition and growth: the debate in the literature

• Does diversity foster growth? Or, does growth lead to greater diversity?
• Does market competition foster diversity (and hence also growth)? Does market competition directly foster growth (and perhaps also diversity)?
The market diversity 'hypothesis'

market competition → systemic diversity → growth of participation

market competition → growth of participation → systemic diversity

Others find that growth of systems is associated with no change or less horizontal diversity, and ... competition fosters homogeneity


“The dynamics of higher education are first and foremost a result of the competition for reputation. Higher education systems are characterized by a reputation race. In this race, higher education institutions are constantly trying to create the best possible images of themselves as highly regarded universities. And this race is expensive. Higher education institutions will spend all the resources they can find to try to capture an attractive position in the race. In this sense, Bowen's (1980, p. 20) famous law of higher education still holds: ‘in quest of excellence, prestige and influence… each institution raises all the money it can … [and] spends all it raises"(van Vught, 2008, p. 169).

A more interesting question

• But is market diversity (for or against) really the point?
• The more interesting question is:

‘What systemic and institutional configurations are naturally typical of higher education in the higher participation systems (HPS) era, and why?'
Systemic and institutional configurations

1. The rise of the multiversity, the large comprehensive research university, to a more dominant role within national systems, 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

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
**Triumph of the multiversity form**

- In national systems, a larger proportion of system activity, resources and status is concentrated in multi-disciplinary multi-purpose research universities, or multiversities
- Research-intensive multiversities are elevated further above other institutions
- The multiversity includes or absorb other institutional forms
- It exhibits greater internal complexity and diversity
- Its average size tends to increase
- In often becomes more autonomous and self-driving in the corporate sense, though mostly remains tethered to state policy and regulation
- Below the research multiversity other large multi-
Size and social power

• The twin objectives of the multiversity are status and resources. The former is the end, the later the means.

• The multiversity is shaped between two contrary and compelling logics: the logic of selectivity, which generates status by increasing unit value; and the logic of aggregation of functions, reach and social power, which generates status through growth.

• In short, in stratified systems, institutional status is generated by both quantity and quality.
Reconfigured systems

- Shrinking roles of non-university sectors
- Absorption of specialist HEIs, and some separate research academy activity, by larger multidisciplinary conglomerates
- Combinatory forms develop the size and reach of multiversities, including mergers, multi-site and cross-border institutions, and hybrid structures
- The exceptions to this picture are the growing role of online and for-profit forms, but they face a barrier. They lack the gravitas of the multiversity. Neither has found a way to generate superior positional value. Arguably, it is the desire for social position is the main driver of the growth of participation in higher education
Internal diversity

- The growing internal diversity of multiversities affects some or all of the range of missions, business activities, institutional forms and internal structures, the discipline mix, research activities, levels of study and range of credentials, the heterogeneity of the student body, links to stakeholders, cross-border relations, and forms of academic and non-academic labour. It also extends to more diverse financing arrangements and research activities.

- Note especially diversity of organizational and academic (departments or schools) units, including cross-disciplinary and problem solving research institutes; and the increasing heterogeneity of student populations.
STRATIFICATION OF VALUE BETWEEN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
**Stratification**

- Horizontal differences in the missions, profiles or nomenclature of HEIs can be practised also as vertical differences
- The weightiest distinction between HEIs derives from comparisons of research intensity
- *The secular tendency:* As participation expands there is a secular tendency to greater stratification. Places in elite HEIs shrink as a proportion of total places, competition for entry into the elite segment intensifies and fine differences between institutions, in student selectivity, research intensity and/or price etc., are magnified
Stratification and competition

• All else being equal, competition between institutions is associated with a growing stratification of resources, and also status—e.g. in North America see

• Regulation and funding policy can counter this tendency. In some systems governments foster a large ‘middle ground’ of institutions which are partly selective and have some research

Conditions that enhance the stratification of value, ‘stretching’ systems vertically

- The secular tendency: growth of participation is naturally associated with increased selectivity of leading institutions
- Competition policies foster greater inequalities between institutions in resources and status
- At top of systems: Rankings and World-Class University movement push top institutions further above others—unless the concentration on WCUs is balanced with compensating support for lower tier institutions
- In mass education: Under-funding of public systems, the use of low-cost expedients such as MOOCs in place of face-to-face learning, expanding role of low quality for-profit sectors
STRATIFIED VALUE AND THE REPRODUCTION OF SOCIAL INEQUALITY

The USA as an example
### Income shares top 1% and lower 50%


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOP 1% share of labor income</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOP 1% share of capital income</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOP 1% share of total income</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOWER 50% share labor income</strong></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOWER 50% share capital income</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOWER 50% share total income</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The new ‘meritocratic hierarchies’: The case of the United States

“What primarily characterizes the United States at the moment is a record level of the inequality of income from labor (probably higher than in any other society at any time in the past, anywhere in the world, including societies in which skill disparities were extremely large) together with a level of inequality of wealth less extreme than the levels observed in traditional societies or in Europe in the period 1900-1910.”

Social reproduction of (in)equality via education

- Taxation and public policies that sustain or reduce social advantages
- Socially differentiated families
- Tiered labor markets, stratified in entry and progression
- Tiered opportunities, resources and aspirations in education
- Differentiated rewards at work (income, occupational status)
Factors that facilitate the social differentiation of opportunity in stratified education systems

• Elite schools and school sectors that articulate selection into higher education institutions, enabling families to invest in education as a private good to secure advantage
• Classification hierarchies and public/private sector differences
• Field of study (discipline) differences
• Tuition barriers and differentiated tuition prices
• Differentiated aspirations, ‘under-matching’ in applications by poor high achieving school students
• ‘Under-learning’, poor quality cognitive formation, which penalizes hard working students from poor families
• Intensified competition between higher education
Social inequality in achieved college degrees, USA 1970/2013
Bachelor degree by age 24, family income quartile
Source: The PELL Institute and Penn Ahead, 2015

![Bar chart showing the percentage of bachelor degrees attained by age 24 within different family income quartiles in 1970 and 2013. The top quartile had the highest percentage in both years, with 40% in 1970 and 77% in 2013. The bottom quartile had the lowest percentage in both years, with 6% in 1970 and 9% in 2013.]

- Top quartile: 77% (2013) vs 40% (1970)
- Third quartile: 34% (2013) vs 15% (1970)
- Second quartile: 17% (2013) vs 11% (1970)
- Bottom quartile: 9% (2013) vs 6% (1970)
## Access to U.S. higher education hierarchy is income-stratified

Data from Soares 2007, p. 167

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of institution</th>
<th>Proportion of all students drawn from the top 10% of American families in terms of family income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Income inequality (2012), and two indicators of social mobility (2000s and 2012), OECD countries with available data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6.4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nordic model: Positional ambitions in a solidaristic social order

Level of education and interpersonal trust (%) OECD countries

- Below upper secondary education
- Upper secondary education
- Tertiary education
Equality: Social solidarity and equal respect? Or ‘the career open to the talents’ within a steeply hierarchical society and higher education system?