THE VISIONS OF WORLD-CLASS UNIVERSITIES

ABSTRACT
The visions of the top 26 world-class universities of the first 30 in the Shanghai ranking list have been evaluated and compared with the missions of the world’s top 20 universities. Applying the content analysis, a group of 48 keywords, which describe the essence of these visions, has been revealed. The average amount of keywords in one vision is 51. According to the relevant characteristics, the missions are three times shorter (respectively 15 and 18 words). All keywords in missions, except one, are present in the list of words for visions. The main keywords for visions are “world”, “research”, “students”, “education” and “knowledge”, each of these words is present in half and more than three quarters of visions. For missions such words are “education”, “research”, “knowledge” and “create”, and have the same degree of use. The main content differences relating to visions and missions occur due to a lower word frequency (less significance). Comparison of visions and missions using 20 characteristic parameters shows that in quantitative terms, except the range of normalized frequencies for a certain number of institutions and the average frequency of keyword use, visions substantially prevail the relevant characteristics of missions (from 1.3 to 5.0 times). Regarding the qualitative structure of visions and missions – they are almost identical (mismatch within 0.9–1.2 times). This can be explained by the fact that mission in general as the generic purposes of the top institutions are more specific, unambiguous and stable in formulations, so to speak, statutory and the degree of their interuniversity variations is less. At the same time, the strategic visions of their implementation are more diverse and creatively formulated like a sort of expected predictions; therefore, they are less accurate and more approximate, and of course they are frequently reviewed in the process of development.
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INTRODUCTION
Research and innovative character of global progress raises a special interest upon certain peculiarities of functioning and development of stable leaders and locomotives of this progress. Such exemplary drivers of social progress are, first of all, the institutions of higher education (hereinafter – institutions, universities) of extra class identified by the international rankings like the Academic Ranking of World Universities (Shanghai-Ranking) (Academic Ranking of World Universities, 2014; Луговий, Калашникова, Слюсаренко, Таланова, 2013; Слюсаренко, 2014). Given this, it is much more important to know the guiding ideas and principles, targets and strategies, slogans, mission and visions of the world’s top universities.

According to the previously performed study the key characteristics of mottos and missions of the world’s top 30 universities in mentioned Shanghai-Ranking are elucidated. The findings of this study in 2014 were sent for publication to the Intercultural Education
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magazine (Poland). Other similar studies on the stated problem are not represented in modern specialist literature.

THE AIM OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the article is to clarify the essential characteristics of visions of the top 26 universities in the Shanghai ranking list (Academic Ranking of World Universities, 2014) of the top 30 universities and compare them with previously identified mission parameters of such institutions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODS

To achieve this goal, the content and Spearman’s correlation analysis and also appropriate vision generalizations of the top 26 universities have been made, first of all, to identify the keywords that reflect the essence of these visions.

The frequency method (approach), under which it is believed that the more a certain word is used in the formulation of different visions the more significant it is, has been applied to determine the keywords in visions.

RESULTS

In this paper a vision is interpreted as a strategic vision of itself by any institution due to its capacity to most effectively and fully realize its own mission (purpose, generic calling) under certain institutional slogan (motto – short formulation of the main guiding idea, action program).

The institutional visions are taken directly from the universities’ websites (About the Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2014; Caltech, 2014; Cornell University, 2014; ETH Zurich, 2014; Global Vision, 2015; Harvard Business School, 2014; Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, 2014; Harvard School of Public Health, 2014; Imperial College London, 2015; Johns Hopkins University, 2015; Kyoto University, 2015; Teacher College Columbia University, 2015; The University of California, San Diego, 2014; The University of Chicago Medicine and Biological Sciences, 2014; The University of Tokyo Charter, 2015; The will and the way, 2015; University of California, Berkley, 2014; University of California, Los Angeles, 2014; University of California, San Francisco, 2014; University of Chicago, 2014; University College London, 2014; University of Illinois, 2014; University of Michigan, 2015; University of Minnesota Twin Cities, 2015; University of Oxford, 2015; University of Pennsylvania, 2015; University of Toronto, 2014; University of Wisconsin – Madison, 2015; University of Wisconsin, 2014; Yale Information Technology Services, 2014; Yale University. Office of the President, 2014; Yale University, 2014). Basically, the visions of the top 26 (87 %) universities in the Shanghai ranking list (Academic Ranking of World Universities, 2014) of the top 30 institutions were available there. In the 17 (65 %) of the 26 surveyed institutions visions are formulated at the institutional level as “visions” (Caltech, 2014; Cornell University, 2014; ETH Zurich, 2014; Global Vision, 2015; Imperial College London, 2015; Kyoto University, 2015; The University of California, San Diego, 2014; University of California, Berkley, 2014; University of California, San Francisco, 2014; University College London, 2014; University of Illinois, 2014; University of Michigan, 2015; University of Minnesota Twin Cities, 2015; University of Oxford, 2015; University of Pennsylvania, 2015; University of Toronto, 2014; University of Wisconsin – Madison, 2015; University of Wisconsin, 2014). Yet in 4 (15 %) institutions as a strategic vision of what should be the institution in general (University of Toronto, 2014; University of California, Los Angeles, 2014; The University of Tokyo Charter, 2015; The will and the way, 2015). In the case of the 3 (12 %) other universities (Harvard, Yale and Chicago) due to lack of a unified university’s vision because of substantial diversity and autonomy of major university units the aggregated visions of several leading schools and other departments are evaluated (About the Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2014; Harvard Business School, 2014; Harvard School of
Table 1

A method for vision determination of the 26 top universities by Shanghai ranking in 2014 and grouping of the institutions according to their stability ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Definition of vision statement, the number of words</th>
<th>Vision composition of several departments</th>
<th>Vision of a certain main unit of the institution</th>
<th>Rank group, subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I stable, degenerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II stable (1st stable subgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II stable (2nd stable subgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II stable (2nd stable subgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II stable (2nd stable subgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II stable (2nd stable subgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II stable (2nd stable subgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>II stable (2nd stable subgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II stable (2nd stable subgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II stable (3rd stable subgroup, degenerate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>University of California, San Francisco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>University College London</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>University of Tokyo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III quasi stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>Imperial College London</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IV unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin – Madison</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IV unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kyoto University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IV unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IV unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IV unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IV unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>University of Minnesota, Twin Cities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IV unstable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1315

The average number in 26 institutions: 51
Table 1 illustrates that institutions of stable, quasi-stable and unstable groupings within
the first top 30 universities are represented by visions (Луговий, Калашихов, Слюсаренко,
Таланова, 2013; Слюсаренко, 2014). In addition it is easy to see that the shortest vision
statement consists of 5 words (University of California, San Francisco), the longest is of
191 words (Harvard University). The average vision statement of the 26 institutions consists
of 51 words. All visions together contain 1315 words. At the same time, during calculation
of the verbal vision composition the same word (or of the same root word), which is
repeatedly mentioned in one vision formulation, has been accounted only one time. In
addition, the words of a general (not specific) secondary importance, such as “university”,
“institute”, “college”, or when they reflect the name or location of the institution etc., are
not taken into account.

The general list of 1315 words in institutional visions contained 438 (33%) different
words (not of the same root word and not close to synonyms), i.e. the average frequency of
repeated words equals 3. The frequency distribution of essentially different words is shown
in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Word frequency data (normalized to 26)</th>
<th>The number of words (percentage of the total number of different words)</th>
<th>Words (in English)</th>
<th>Number of institutions that do not have appropriate words in their visions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (&lt;0.77)</td>
<td>3 (0.2%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 (0.73)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>world</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18 (0.69)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17 (0.65)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>research</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16 (0.62)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 (0.58)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 (0.54)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13 (0.50)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12 (0.46)</td>
<td>3 (0.7%)</td>
<td>global, lead, community</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 (0.42)</td>
<td>4 (0.9%)</td>
<td>society, learning, our, innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10 (0.38)</td>
<td>4 (0.9%)</td>
<td>nation, serve, create, distinctive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9 (0.35)</td>
<td>5 (1.1%)</td>
<td>future, faculty, most, work, broad</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 (0.31)</td>
<td>13 (3.0%)</td>
<td>challenges, teaching, people, discovery, diverse, making, economic, life, environment, partnerships, academic, strive, development</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7 (0.27)</td>
<td>14 (3.2%)</td>
<td>center, solutions, provide, public, sciences, new, culture, collaboration, enhance, scholarship, integrate, staff, engage, advanced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6 (0.23)</td>
<td>15 (3.4%)</td>
<td>international, level, practice, strength, recognized, ways, problems, impact, experience, connect, important, great, state, supporting, benefit</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5 (0.19)</td>
<td>23 (5.3%)</td>
<td>23 another words</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4 (0.15)</td>
<td>42 (9.6%)</td>
<td>42 another words</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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18 3 (0.12) 51 (11.6 %) 51 another words 0
19 2 (0.08) 82 (18.7 %) 82 another words 0
20 1 (0.04) 177 (40.4 %) 177 another words 0
Total 438 (100 %) 0

Note: *The visions without words of such and higher frequencies.

Table 2 illustrates that the frequency range for reproduction of certain words in different visions is between 1 and 20. Half and more of the 26 visions contain five main words (“world”, “research”, “students”, “education” and “knowledge”), in a descending order, having frequencies between 20 and 13. Normally three of them have been found in each of the surveyed visions. In total, the 48 words are found with frequencies from 7 (27 % of the 26 institutions) to 20 (77 %). They are to be recognized as the most important for vision characterization. The number of keywords is comparable with the average number of words (51) in one vision. Imaginary vision, which contains 48 keywords, can be recognized as a typical one for the top institutions located in the first 30 places in the Shanghai ranking list.

A comparison of average “lengths” in the formulation of actually ordinary visions (having 51 words) and imaginary typical visions (having 48 words) with related missions (having 18 and 15 words) shows that the visions are approximately three times longer than missions.

In Table 3 a set of vision characteristics of the top institutions are compared with a set of mission characteristics.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>The characteristic parameter</th>
<th>Visions</th>
<th>Missions</th>
<th>Parameters’ correlation between visions and missions (times)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of institutions</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of words</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The number of different words</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The average frequency of word use</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Word frequency range</td>
<td>1–20</td>
<td>1–15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The average number of words</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The smallest number of words</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The largest number of words</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Keyword frequency range</td>
<td>7–20</td>
<td>5–15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The range of normalized frequencies for keywords (26 and 20)</td>
<td>0.27–0.77</td>
<td>0.25–0.75</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The number of different keywords (in typical vision, mission)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The number of keywords</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The average frequency of keyword use</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The share of keywords among all words</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 The share of typical vision and mission words among the average vision and mission words 94 % 83 % 1.1
16 The share of keywords among different words 11 % 9 % 1.2
17 The average number of keywords in one vision, mission 17 6 2.8
18 The share of one vision and mission keywords among the total number of different keywords 36 % 38 % 0.9
19 The share of keywords in one vision, mission 34 % 32 % 1.1
20 Number (percentage) of mission keywords that coincide with vision keywords 14 (93 %)
21 Number of main keywords (found in half and more than half visions, missions) 5 4 1.3

Table 3 shows that quantitatively the characteristic parameters of visions (numbers 1–9, 11, 12, 17 and 21) except the range of normalized frequencies for keywords and the average frequency of keyword use (numbers 10, 13) substantially prevail the relevant characteristics of missions (from 1.3 to 5.0 times). Regarding the qualitative structure of visions and missions (numbers 14–16 and 18, 19 respectively) – they are almost identical (mismatch within 0.9–1.2 times).

For this case, there is an explanation. After all, if missions of the world’s top institutions are more specific, unambiguous and stable in formulations, so to speak, statutory, the strategic visions of their implementation are more diverse and formulated as the expected predictions, therefore, they are less accurate and more approximate, frequently reviewed in the process of development that is quite understandable. Sometimes, especially at Harvard University and the University of Tokyo, the visions are applied as an explanation of their missions (usually verbose). Although due to composition, the main (high-frequency) keywords in visions are close to such keywords in the missions. For example, three of the most high-frequency words in missions and visions are “education”, “research”, and “knowledge”, and they are identical in both cases.

The main differences between the missions and visions start for the words that have a normalized frequency, which are present in less than half of the maximum possible cases (20 and 26). This is evident from Table 4.

Table 4

Key words in the visions and missions of the world’s top 30 universities in the Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Missions (of 20 institutions)</th>
<th>Visions (of 26 institutions)</th>
<th>Missions (of 20 institutions)</th>
<th>Visions (of 26 institutions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 (0.75)</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 (0.70)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (0.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13 (0.65)</td>
<td>research</td>
<td>18 (0.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 (0.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (0.65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 (0.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (0.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (0.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(0,50)</td>
<td>knowledge, create</td>
<td>13 (0,50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(0,45)</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>lead, community</td>
<td>12 (0,46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0,40)</td>
<td></td>
<td>our, innovation</td>
<td>11 (0,42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nation, distinctive</td>
<td>10 (0,38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(0,35)</td>
<td>advanced, serve</td>
<td>future, faculty, most, work, broad</td>
<td>9 (0,35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0,30)</td>
<td>society, global, world, international**</td>
<td>challenges, people, diverse, making, economic, life, environment, partnerships, academic, strive, development</td>
<td>8 (0,31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0,25)</td>
<td>public, teaching, discovery, learning</td>
<td>center, solutions, provide, sciences, new, culture, collaboration, enhance, scholarship, integrate, staff, engage</td>
<td>7 (0,27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of key words** 14 (93 % of 15)  34 (71 % of 48)

**Boundary words for the typical vision** international** + 14 other words  6 (0,23)

Note: *it means that there were no words with appropriate frequency.
**the keyword in missions, which is absent among keywords in visions, but together with 14 other words is a boundary word for the visions (is the next one after the keywords regarding the frequency of use).

As in the case of the missions, the relationship between the presence of keywords in a certain vision and ranking position of the institution is elucidated. Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient ($K_r$) was used to clarify the link between two ranked positions. Calculation of $K_r$ for the case dealing with the number of keywords in visions demonstrates the lack of correlation. This is primarily due to the wide range of vocabulary in visions (from 5 to 191 words) and large number of vision keywords (equals 48). Thus, the number of keywords in brief visions is sharply limited while in the lengthy visions there is no such limitation. However, consideration of qualitative composition of visions reveals a positive correlation ($K_n = 0.48$ for $K_n = 0.33$) between the ranking position and percentage of keywords. In determining the percentage of keywords – the first method (bulky visions and their “key” contribution to the typical vision) fits with the second method (small visions having keywords). For the University of Wisconsin – Madison, whose vision has the same vision with the typical vocabulary size (of 48 words), both methods are identical. Therefore for ranking – important is a qualitative composition of vision associated with the percentage of keywords.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the visions’ evaluation of the top 26 universities in the Shanghai ranking list of the top 30 institutions provides the following conclusions.

First, due to presence of various words in the institutions’ visions, they have a wide range: 5 to 191 words, on the average – 51 words.

Secondly, regarding the total number of 1315 vision words and 438 different words with an average frequency of use – 3, content analysis reveals a group of 448 key (high-
frequency) words – 48 of which are different words (having average frequency of use – 9) that essentially describe the vision. They constitute the typical vision.

Third, in comparison with the visions, under the relevant characteristics, the missions are threefold concise. All keywords in the missions, except one, are present in the list of words for the visions. The main (most high frequency) keywords in the visions are “world”, “research”, “students”, “education” and “knowledge”. Each of these words is present in half and more than three quarters of visions. For the missions such words are “education”, “research”, “knowledge” and “create” and they also have the same degree of use.

Fourth, the basic differences in visions’ and missions’ content occur through the words which have less frequency of use (less significance).

Fifth, as in the case of the missions, the visions’ qualitative composition (the percentage of keywords) is positively correlated with the place of the top-rating institution in the ranking list.

The further analysis of the specificity of missions and visions of the world-class universities should include the analysis of values, which are the guiding principles of world’s leading higher education institutions. This is necessary for effective modernization of higher education system in Ukraine in line with the trends of civilization.

The author expresses her gratitude to the Doctors of Pedagogical Sciences V. I. Luhovyi and Zh. V. Talanova for their discussion of the findings represented in this article.
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