

고등교육정책연구

Journal of Higher Education Policy

2009. 3. 제2권 제1호, pp. 135-157.

The Appropriate Role of Government in Education

Stephen P. Heyneman(Vanderbilt University)



교육과학기술부 지정

고등교육정책연구소

Higher Education Policy Research Institute

The Appropriate Role of Government in Education

Stephen P. Heyneman(Vanderbilt University)†

<ABSTRACT>

Since the beginning, public education has primarily been for the purpose of augmenting social cohesion. In some parts of the world it is assumed that this needs to be delivered by government institutions; in other parts of the world private and religious institutions may be financed and regulated by public authorities to perform this task. As long as it is understood that the task serves the public good, it doesn't matter whether it is delivered through public or private institutions.

In higher education, the single most important issue is competitiveness. Since competitiveness is associated with diversity in purpose, the availability of non-government institutions is important, but may not be essential. What is essential is that all institutions of higher education are honest, and it is the responsibility of government to ensure the public that university honesty in their country is secure. On the other hand, it is the sole responsibility of each university to model good behavior in how to search for truth, and to model professional behavior which later influences social cohesion (Heyneman, 2007a).

Key words: the role of government, competitiveness in higher education

PREFACE

In the 1960s, the decade of independence for much of Sub-Saharan Africa and South East Asia, educational ambitions were high and governments were thought to be the necessary engine to achieve them. It was inconceivable to imagine acquiring full enrollment in elementary and secondary school, or quality higher education, supporting scientific research, or policies of equity without a leading role from government.

But 40 years have now passed. During this time we have discovered that government

† Correspondence Author: Stephen P. Heyneman(International Education Policy, Peabody Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Vanderbilt University Nashville, Tennessee, 37203-5721, s.heynean@vanderbilt.edu)

education systems have many problems. Following the break-up of the Soviet Union we uncovered the truth about socialist education and found it to be widely divergent from its claims (Heyneman, 1997; 1998). We have discovered that government monopolies deliver educational supplies and equipment at higher prices and lower quality (Heyneman, 1990). We have discovered that some government ministers and other senior officials were predatory and use schools to garner corrupt personal income (Heyneman, 1975; Heyneman and Anderson, 2008; Gollin, 2008). We have discovered extremist governments who use textbooks and curricula to build anger against external religions and peoples (Heyneman, 2000; 2006a). We have found government bureaucracies incapable of responding to repeated failure. And lastly we have found systems of government universities frozen for decades without reform in a spiral of declining efficiency and quality (Heyneman, 2006b) In each instance, suggestions have included diversifying government control using the private sector to manage, supply, deliver or regulate education programs. But how far should these suggestions go? To what extent should governments be bypassed in the design and provision of education? Under what circumstances is there an appropriate role for government?

This paper will review the origins and purposes of first public education and then of higher education. Then it will summarize some of the problems of government managed systems at both levels and the solutions which have been proposed. Lastly it will offer some modest recommendations.

ORIGINS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

In Europe public rationales for sending children to school were first articulated about 400 years ago, during the time of Martin Luther, and centered on the need to improve public morality. Here is what Luther said:

I am of the opinion that the government is obligated to compel its citizenry to send their children to school. If a government can compel its citizens to bear spear and gun, to run about on the city wall and to assume other duties when it desires to carry on

war, how much more can and should the government compel its citizens to keep their children at school. (Martin Luther, 1530 cited in Helmreich, 1959, p. 15).

The prince of Wittenberg, in 1559 is acknowledged to be the first of a series of German political leaders to sponsor state schools open to all children, but it wasn't until 1717 that Frederick William I made urban education compulsory and helped provide finance for the children from homes that could otherwise not afford it. It was his son, Frederick the Great, however, who is credited as being the 'father of public education'. Because Prussia had recently acquired lands in which there were Catholics as well as Protestants, in the law titled *Generallandschulreglement* in 1763 and a second law titled *Allgemeine Landrecht* in 1794 he established: (i) the principle of compulsory education for all children, (ii) the state's supervisory role with respect to private (church) providers, and most importantly, (iii) the principle of tolerance toward confessional activities in exchange for loyalty to Prussia. These three characteristics describe public education today. Its origins were to mold different categories of citizens into a common loyalty, but without requiring them to abrogate their supplementary loyalties to different churches.¹⁾ As Frederick the Great put it:

There are few lands in which all citizens have the same religion, and the question arises: is such unity to be forced or can one permit every one (sic) to think according to his own views? To this the answer must be that it is impossible to establish such unity...general tolerance along guarantees the happiness of the state. (Frederick the Great, 1763, cited in Helmreich, 1959, p. 29)

The foundation for public education as it is known today however was established in the 19th century in France by Francois Guizot (1787-1874), in New England by Horace Mann (1796-1859), and in the Netherlands by Petras Hofstede de Groot (1802-1886). With each, the effort to enlighten a nation through a system of popular education was

1) The origins of public schooling are not the same as the origins of universal literacy. Early Chinese, Islamic, and Hindu literacy were limited to a small percentage of the population, Chinese because the symbols were extraordinarily complicated, Hindi because the written texts were limited to Brahmins, and Arabic because use was derived and largely limited to theological texts (Foster and Purves, 1990). The first fully literate population appeared in Scandinavia largely because to be recognized as a normal citizen one was required to read the bible (Rouse, and Rouse, 1982).

concerned more with attitudes and values than with skills of literacy and numeracy. As Glenn observes, "popular education was not simply, or even primarily, to teach literacy or other skills, but to develop the common attitudes and values considered essential to a society in which broader and broader circles of the population were entering public life," (1998, p. 45).

Much thought has been given to how schools might teach values, but none summarizes the process better than the comment cited by Hyman and Wright: "Children learn to think about what it is like to be another person. They cultivate their systematic imaginations." (1979, p. 67).

The essence of public schools and their principal rationale for socializing the population does not conform to typical economic rationales for investments in education. The dissemination of literacy, numeracy and many other skills constitute economic benefits which accrue to the individuals who experience schooling. But the principal rationale, and the reasons nations invest in public education, have traditionally been the social purpose of schooling. This social purpose originated from the time when the first multi-ethnic nations were emerging. The principle task of public schooling, properly organized and delivered, has traditionally been to create harmony within a nation of divergent views and peoples.

ORIGINS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In the 12th Century the pope gave masters degree-holders from the guilds in Salerno and Bologna the right to 'teach anywhere' (*jus ubique docendi*). These guilds consisted of 'faculties' which prepared students for the law, medicine and theology. A student could not enter training for a professional certificate without having a 'bachelor's certificate. To acquire a bachelor's certificate a student had to master the trivium of grammar (Latin), rhetoric (persuasive reasoning) and the dialectic (logic). The professional degree consisted of the quadrivium: music, arithmetic, geometry and astronomy. This guild of faculties offering degrees in two stages with identical curricula in different institutions and the

right to teach elsewhere on order of the pope became known as universities (Perkins, 1984).

Universities became dangerous right from the beginning. It was Thomas Aquinas who offered reconciliation between the 'pagan logic' of Aristotle and the Bible by using the recently translated (from Arabic to Latin) of the dialogues of Plato. It was Plato's use of the dialectic which revolutionized the university. As powerful as today's internet, the dialectic allowed a questioning of strongly held assumptions, including edicts of church orthodoxy. Though the pope as the word of God declared that man had a soul and that there was life after death, how can these be proved? These were the kinds of questions to which the dialectic could respond.. When the dialectic became a required part of the trivium in essence it was a declaration of independence by the university from the church and (later) the state. Regardless of financial and legal authorization, it implied that a university has *the right to seek the truth*. This is the claim which led Martin Luther to nail a list of questions to a church door in Switzerland which he felt the pope could not answer. This precipitated the reformation and the split which exists today between Protestant and Catholic Europe, all of which was caused by the university (Perkins, 1984).

One hundred years later there were only 16 universities. One hundred years after that, in the 14th century there were only 38 universities; by the 15th century there were only 72. Universities and the number of students in them increased slowly, except in the United States. In the 70 years between 1860 and 1930 the number of students increased by eight times in Germany and Russia, by 12 times in Britain and by 38 times in the United States (see table one).

Table 1. Number of Students(ooo')

	1860	1900	1930
Germany	12	34	98
Britain	3	18	37
Russia	5	16	44
US	32	256	1,200

With the rise of the nation-state in 19th European higher education shifted from being owned by the church to being owned by the state, hence state motives affected its nature and function. This helped it to enter the world of modern science and technology. With the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862, the Land Grant institution was born in the U.S. This helped to drive universities away from classical vocations, to place them in the service of the farmer and the industrial entrepreneur. Land grant institutions owned their own land and controlled their own income. Mary Jean Bowman points out that the land grant institutions were the first to create a scientist/scholar ('with dirty fingernails'), welcome women as students, and create a strong loyalty of the general population to higher education (Bowman, 1962).

The Soviet Union is a good illustration of the problem with an extremist control of government. First of all, the society had been governed by an exclusive and secretive political party. The entire economy had been administered by a bureaucracy without consideration either to demand or prices. Labor markets were controlled within each sector separately. Educational institutions, faculties and curricula were governed within each sector. Students were assigned to jobs according to the sector of their particular school. For institutions in a market economy, curriculum relevance is a continual problem. In the former Soviet Union, curriculum relevance was simple because the education institution was often owned by the employer. Students in some technical schools could even be trained on specific machinery because the factory where they would later be employed was only steps away. Of the 516 higher education institutions in the Russian Federation at that time, the rectors of only two knew what was spent on their own institutions. 2) Only 16 institutions (4%) were under the auspices of the Ministry of

2) Moscow and Leningrad State had their own 'line item' in the federal budget. These were the only higher

Education. Others were controlled by 21 federal ministries—transport, health, industry, agriculture; four were controlled by the Ministry of small engine repairs. None of the intuitions could allocate resources or improve efficiency because budgets and statistics were controlled by ministries separate from their own sector. There were no public statistics available on the number of higher education programs, the students in them or the curricula offered. Normal information necessary to plan and manage education was considered to be a state secret to which rectors and even ministers had no access. (World Bank, 1995; Heyneman, 1995; 1997a;1997b; 1998). ³⁾

GOVERNMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

There are three issues to address in connection with this question: (i) what is meant by education; (ii) what is meant by government and (ii) what options for government roles are available.

What is meant by education?

It is not well recognized that education is a large industry, falling into *three separate categories*. The first consists of *educational programs*. This is understood by many to be the only definition of education. These include organized curricula which, on completion, offer a degree or certificate of some kind to a student. These can be at different levels – primary, secondary, vocational, higher, professional. They can be offered through public or private institutions, profit-making or not-for-profit, sectarian or religiously-affiliated, local or international, delivered in person, by mail or through electronic correspondence. The second category of education consists of *educational products*. These include reading materials such as textbooks, pedagogical software, pencils, caulk, blackboards, laboratories, sports equipment, and school construction. In the U.S., educational products constitute

education institutions in the Russian Federation which had access to a budget.

3) Papers can be downloaded from this website: www.vanderbilt.edu/peabody/heyneinan

35% of the total expenditures on education; electronic products constitute 9%; publishing products 35%, and hardware products 29% of the total (Heyneman, 2001). In socialist societies these were supplied by government industries under the auspices of the ministry of education.⁴⁾ Throughout OECD countries these are generally supplied by the private sector which responds to requests for bids from educational authorities. While textbooks, for instance, are produced by private industry they respond to the content requirements of the public.⁵⁾ Within ex-socialist countries, in higher education the privatization has not occurred as quickly as it has in primary and secondary education for reasons of educational rigidity. It is still common for professors to publish a textbook through their university press and require students to read *only their textbook* as a way of learning the subject. The incomes from textbook sales accrue to the professor/author. Students, in some instances, are not allowed to take the final exam for the course unless they prove that they have purchased the book instead of reading it in the library (Heyneman, Anderson and Nuraliyeva, 2008).

The third category of education consists of *education services*. These include training for adult employment on- or off-the-job (70% of the total). It also includes testing and consultant services, after school and weekend tutoring services, services for at-risk children, and management assistance to educational operations. These latter may include transportation to- and- from schools, housing, food and accounting. Even in OECD countries these are very often supplied by a mixture of suppliers, some within the government, and others in the private sector. Using the United States as an illustration, the financial expenditures of education categories one, two and three are about equal in size and together account for approximately \$US 100 billion/year (Heyneman, 2001; 2003).

When discussing the appropriate role of government or whether education should be subject to free trade (World Trade Organization) regulations, the usual problem is that education categories two and three are sometimes not included in common definitions of education (Heyneman, 2003b; 2007b). Testing services, vocational and technical training

4) This may remain true in isolated situations such as North Korea and Cuba.

5) There are exceptions, such as textbooks in Lapp a language of northern Sweden. There are so few Lapp schoolchildren, the books are produced within the ministry of education as an exception to normal policy of utilizing the private sector.

and educational software are closer to being products and services in other sectors—health care, tourism, telecommunications, banking, financial services and the like, and these constitute about two thirds of all educational expenditures. The case for having educational products and services delivered by non-public institutions on a competitive basis in accordance with public regulations is quite strong. Here the proper role of government is not to manufacture but to regulate and perhaps to finance (see discussion below on governmental functions).

What is meant by government role?

In general governments may have three different roles with respect to educational programs, services and products: (i) *provision*, (ii) *finance* and (iii) *regulation*. In *providing* educational programs governments take their most active, some would say intrusive (Tooley, 1996) role.

Today there are two separate definitions of public educational provision. One holds that public education should be supplied, financed, and regulated by the state. This is the definition which pertains to primary and secondary education in my own country, the United States. The second definition is that public education should be financed and regulated by the state but not necessarily supplied by the state. This is the definition which holds in countries where publicly-financed religious schools are considered part of public education and where school choice is not a new experiment but rather traditional policy (Heyneman, 2008) This pertains to France, Britain, Canada and many other OECD countries.

These two definitions of public education pertaining to primary and secondary is the opposite with respect to higher education. Although Western Europe traditionally has large non-government sector in primary and secondary education, it is the only area of the world where the state has a virtual monopoly on the provision of higher education. In North and South America, South and East Asia, Europe and Central Asia, and Sub-Saharan Africa, higher education, often financed from public sources is available through private providers, and subject to public regulation. In the U.S. the anomaly is the most

obvious. No public money may be spent on religiously-affiliated primary or secondary schools but public money (through student grants and loans) are perfectly welcome at religiously-affiliated colleges and universities.

All nations regulate education. This is consistent with the original purpose (section one above) as being an opportunity for a nation to create social cohesion within the population. The public regulatory role is justified on the grounds that a common experience to which all citizens have fair access is necessary for a modern democracy. However, some regulatory authority can be oppressive and can diminish educational creativity. The key question then is to what extent can the public good be effectively regulated without those regulations diminishing the educational excellence? This seems to be a common dilemma.

Culture often determines the approach to what is the appropriate role of the state. In the United States much is made of the need for 'parent participation' in primary schooling. Large scale interventions are financed to generate more participation, and school principals are judged in part on the grounds of how often and how thoroughly their parents are involved with the school program. The term 'involvement' may include helping their children with homework, supplementing school budgets with voluntary contributions, and even assisting teachers in the classroom. What is encouraged in the United States, however, may well be illegal in parts of Europe where the school is the purview of professional teachers and parents are expected to stay away. In the U.S., much is made of the 'school as a community' in which long-serving school teachers and administrators are well known and appreciated. In Japan the effort is made to avoid a school community. Teachers and school directors are regularly relocated to new schools on the grounds that a school should not take on the socio-economic characteristics of the parents; that the school should be neutral. In Japan it is thought that schools in which parents have a strong influence may become unfair to those who come from low income homes assumed to have less influence. Americans bemoan the performance gap between schools located in high and low income communities, but seem culturally incapable of understanding that the solution might be to keep parents away from the schools and rotate school teachers and administrators at random through the system.

Culture is important in determining values in higher education as well. In the U. S. elite universities, such as my own, offer an advantage in admissions to rural students from impoverished areas. In some countries it is the opposite. Universities give advantages to students who attend high cost branch feeder schools. This is an instance in which universities hinder social cohesion rather than help it.

In terms of finance, the role of the state is ambiguous for two reasons. Although the UN charter on human rights and many national constitutions state that 'education shall be free' there is no common definition of what education consists of or what 'free' means. Does free education mean that the taxpayers are responsible for school uniforms? Meals? Textbooks? Supplementary readers? Voluntary trips to local museums? School-affiliated interests such as singing and acting clubs and sports?

Secondly, what about contributions by parents or the local community to school functions: does 'free' mean that those contributions should be forbidden? Or should private contributions be allowed even in free education systems depending on the purpose of the contribution. Should they be allocated for the maintenance and repair of classrooms in which all children would benefit? What about contributions to augment teacher salaries? What about a contribution to a teacher salary on the understanding that only the child of the contributor would benefit? What if there is an understanding that to pass a child is required to pay for after school tutoring by the same teacher as he has in the classroom? In some instances, the public system would collapse if it were not for the private contributions from parents (Heyneman, 1983). But definitional problems as to what 'free' should mean are today particularly problematic in the 27 countries of the Europe and Central Asia region (Heyneman, 2000).

What is meant by government?

Nations are organized differently. No nation is unitary in the sense of having no local authority. Japan, Finland, France, all centrally-controlled, yet local authorities have important and rapidly changing educational responsibilities. In the United Kingdom educational authorities for Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales are virtually autonomous

from England. Federal countries often have the most complex organizations. The federal government in India is financially responsible for most public higher and vocational education, educational research and 'planning' but not elementary or secondary education. The central government in Indonesia is responsible for regulating, financing and providing most elementary and secondary education, but through the local district authorities. The federal government in Germany is responsible only for vocational education. In the U. S. there are 15,000 school autonomous school districts, each with its own source of finance, governance authority, salary structures and curricula. However over 40 states have now been ordered by the state courts to re-distribute educational tax resources across school districts so that impoverished pockets of poverty within the same state will not be at such a disadvantage. The U.S. federal government is attempting to increase its role through its regulatory authority of the conditions embedded within federal education programs. For instance, the debate over the No Child Left Behind legislation is essentially a discussion over how much role the federal government may play in a decentralized system.

In terms of making an effective transfer of educational policy innovations, it may be more productive to watch countries with similar government structures. Rather than trying to force compliance to national standards directly, federal systems in Canada, Australia, Germany and the U.S. may find it useful to compare the challenges of laying down an 'enabling environment' to help the local authorities live up to their various responsibilities (Lykins and Heyneman, 2008).

Among the conclusions emanating from the collapse of the former Soviet Union has been the consensus that some educational functions are required at a central level (pensions, health insurance, research, monitoring and evaluation, educational statistical reporting) and some are required at the level of the classroom (pedagogical style, class sequencing, time dedicated to particular subjects). After the collapse of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, today it would seem ludicrous to try to control classroom pedagogy from a single location across multiple time zones, local authorities, and cultural differences (Heyneman, 1997).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Primary and Secondary Education.

The theory of maximum choice holds out gains for everyone (Hoxby, 2003; Levin, 2001). But the evidence from New Zealand, Chile as well as in many OECD countries, suggests the choice may not be more efficient in terms of generating higher test scores (Carnoy and McEwan, 2000) and it may raise problematic issues of social 'bunching' in divergent institutions (Fiske and Ladd, 2000). On the other hand, maximum choice appears to be very popular with parents and the local communities. The major differences between political parties in Britain and the U.S on the issue of choice—whether to utilize the non-state and religious sector—should end. Parents have a right to choose the style of education, including religious education, which they prefer.

The dilemma, however, remains: freedom and efficiency are associated with local management, divergent styles of pedagogy and student motivation. Religion clearly has a role in motivation and intelligent social management (West and Wossmann, 2008). On the other hand there are natural limits to educational extremism (Coulson, 2004). Is it not in the public interest to assure a curriculum of inclusion rather than exclusion? Schools systems which engage in the conduct of social exclusion to the detriment of neighbors and minorities are a danger to everyone's security. The international community has a role in offering professional advice and opinion on the degree to which pedagogical extremism is a danger to international social cohesion. The strength of international organizations needs to be augmented to perform this function well. This could be accomplished through a re-structured UNESCO or through an international NGO (Heyneman, 2003c).

The time of large-scale secondary schools is over. The movement beginning in the 1930s to consolidate students into comprehensive high schools which could offer multiple curricular choices and extra-curricular activities has broken down on the grounds of social anomie. Students in large schools, whether in Europe, North America or Asia, are prone to loneliness, isolation, and are at risk to being victims of peer group exclusion, hazing

and punishment. The mistreatment of vulnerable youth in large scale schools is unacceptable in a modern democracy. Smaller, more personal scale institutions are the logical future.

Routine is important for rigor, but routine can kill creativity. While it is imperative for all students to master the basics, it is counter-productive to only emphasize mastery. The educational challenge in East Asia-Japan and Korea in particular-is to reward several kinds of rigorous accomplishment. More variety in the fine arts, technology, sports, music and literature may be as important as basic skills in the sciences and mathematics. More importantly, social experience-work/study, internships, entrepreneurial employment opportunities, opportunities to perform social service and to encounter families and cultures vastly different from one's home, these are some of the strengths of a high quality school system. Variety of challenges improves the changes of adaptation. Adaptation improves the changes of economic flexibility. The responsibility of the state is to ensure the opportunity to experience a variety of personal challenges and to help the young build an 'internal commitment' to innovate.

Higher Education

Until recently economists defined education by enrollment and most associations with economic growth were attributed to the growth in the rates of enrollment. Today, however, in most middle income countries enrollment in secondary education is virtually universal and enrollment in higher education is no longer limited to the elite. No OECD country has an enrollment rate in higher education less than 35%, while enrollment rates in Sweden, Korea, Canada and Finland have approached 80%. Differences in enrollment are no longer the distinguishing linkage to economic growth.

Today earnings differences are explained largely by differences in skills. Each additional year of educational attainment is associated with an increase in national income growth by 0.58%, but an increase in skills by one standard deviation is associated with an increase in national income growth of 2%. Skills are acquired through length and quality of education. When growth is subjected economic models including the quality of

education, the findings are clear. The quantity of education accounts for 25% of the explained variation in national income growth, but educational quality accounts for 75% of the explained variance. Moreover, when education quality occurs in an open economy, its effect is significantly greater than in a closed economy. The effect of educational quality on growth is 0.9 of a standard deviation in a closed economy and 2.5 in an open economy (Hanushek and Wobmann, 2007) . In essence what these findings imply is that what is learned matters more than the proportion of the age cohort in attendance.

New economic research demonstrates a causal link between education quality and economic growth, new findings in education also show that greater diversification in higher education produces better quality and better access for the poor. Higher education systems have several dimensions associated with diversification. One dimension is the portion of *financing from non-state sources*.⁶⁾ Public universities in Korea garner 43% of their income from non-governmental sources; private universities garner 90% of their income from non-governmental sources. The portion of a university budget coming from non-public sources is growing over time. In 1960, 90% of the annual expenditures at the University of Santiago in Chile and the (public) University of Tennessee derived from governmental sources. Today that portion is only 20-25%.⁷⁾ In terms of research productivity and international prestige, the quality of these universities has increased dramatically. Universities with high levels of non-state income increase in quality because these incomes are fungible. They are allocated in the direction which university managers have determined make the most difference and are consistent with the university's strategic plans.

A second dimension is the *difference in purpose* from one institution to another. In some countries (such as Italy and the Czech Republic) higher education is unitary; all higher educational institutions have the same structure and purpose. In other countries (such

6) Non-state sources may include: rent on university property, income from university services, returns from copyrighted products, research grants, gifts, donations, returns on university investments, fees for university services, and tuitions.

7) These figures represent *direct public allocations*. Additional public resources are acquired indirectly through open competition. These may include research grants and student scholarships and loans which will come to the institution only when they win a research competition or when a recipient student chooses to attend.

as in France, Germany and Russia) higher education institutions are assigned either vocational or academic purposes. And in a third group of countries (such as Japan, Korean, Sweden, Israel, and the US) higher education institutions are diversified. They vary in purpose, quality, level of prestige, and degree of both faculty and student selectivity.

Systems where there are a variety of purposes and qualities—diversified systems — are associated with higher degrees of access. They generally enroll a larger proportion of the age cohort. These are higher education systems with tuitions.⁸⁾ Is it true that high tuitions prevent students from low income families from attending university? Surprisingly, students from low income backgrounds have more opportunity in those systems where a high proportion of the finance is from non-state sources. *This challenges the traditional assumption that tuition discriminates against the poor. In fact, the greater the proportion of non-state income, the greater will be the diversity of purpose and the greater will be the opportunity for the poor.* But is not true that students from low income families congregate in institutions of the lowest quality? Evidently not. In diversified higher education systems, the most selective universities have a higher percentage of students from low income backgrounds than in unitary or binary systems (Shavit, Arum and Gameron, 2007). Though counterintuitive this new evidence has significant ramifications for countries in transition from state-dominated systems and from systems where governments constrain managerial creativity.

Higher education systems which simultaneously achieve goals of equity and quality can be said to be highly competitive and have the most significant impact on growth. How did these systems become equitable and high in quality at the same time? Competitive systems of higher education have some characteristics in common. Among them:

- a high degree of income from non-state sources
- a high degree of institutional differentiation
- a high degree of institutional autonomy in terms of governance, financial

8) There are exceptions to this tendency. With income from petroleum and a rapidly declining population Norway is an illustration of high enrollment and low non-state income in universities.

management and curriculum content

- a legal environment which includes ownership by universities of their own property and tax exemption on income which universities earn
- open competition for state funded research
- significant state incentives to improve quality
- The support of autonomous agencies in terms of accreditation and professional licensing.

Governments have important roles in regulating taxes on higher education fairly and equitably, by providing clear legal title to educational property, by providing incentives for increasing quality and to open the competition for state-sponsored research to higher education institutions on an open and competitive basis. Nations which aspire to have competitive systems of higher education should consider inaugurating these characteristics. It includes a mixture of public and private roles and an intense competition among all institutions equally. While it is important that higher education institutions be autonomous, it is not essential that they be private.

While Western European systems of state monopolized higher education struggle (so far without overall success) for competitiveness against the perceived excellence in other parts of the world, it is the systems in the former Soviet Union and parts of Eastern and Central Europe which are more worrisome. Each nation has ambitions of joining in the 'Bologna Process' which holds out possibilities for universities in Uzbekistan or Kazakhstan to offer degrees equivalent to those from Germany; and course credits which could transfer to similar courses in Western Europe. The danger is that this process may come to a halt on the grounds of educational corruption (Heyneman, Anderson and Nuraliyeva, 2008). If a university system is perceived to be corrupt, the nation's educational credibility is reduced and its future economic prospects diminished. It is an essential role for government to set the example of intolerance of educational corruption and to provide clarity about the penalties for those who engage in it.

The social cohesion purpose is an important in higher education as it is in primary and secondary education. The mechanism differs (Moiseyenko, 2005; Heuser, 2007; Kraince,

2007; Lesko, 2007; Bastedo, 2007; Heyneman, 2007a). But regardless of whether they are public or private, universities are not legitimate unless they are autonomous from government in terms of the content of what they teach. 9) Modern universities have the same professional obligation to seek truth as did universities in the 12th Century. Universities which have become 'vocalized' and hence intellectually controlled by governments are common. The ones which aspire to be 'world class' all have one characteristic in common—the ability to speak truth to power.

9) To be autonomous is not to be independent. Universities which receive tax resources are honor-bound to prove to the public that these resources have been effectively allocated and utilized.

REFERENCES

- Bastedo, Michael N. 2007 "Rethinking governance from the Bottom Up: the Case of Muslim Students in Dutch Universities," *UNESCO Prospects* Vol. 37 No. 3 (September), pp. 319-332.
- Bowman, M. J. (1962). The Land Grant Colleges and Universities in Human Resource Development. *Journal of Economic History*, 22(4), 523-546.
- Bushnell, H. 1847 *Discourses on Christian Nature* Boston (Mass.): Massachusetts Sabbath School Society.
- Carnoy, M. and McEwan, P. 2000 "The effectiveness and efficiency of private schools in Chile's Voucher System," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* Vol. 22 # 3, pp. 213-39
- Coulson, A. 2004 Education and Indoctrination in a Muslim World. Is there a problem? What can be done about it? *Policy Analysis* No. 511 (March 11th). pp. 1-35
- Fiske, E.B. and Ladd, H.F. 2000 *When Schools Compete: A Cautionary Tale*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Foster, Philip and Purves, Alan 1990 "Literacy and Society with Particular Reference to the Non-Western World," 1990 pp. 26-45 in *Handbook of Reading Research* Vol. 11 New York: Longmans
- Glenn, C. 1988 *the Myth of the Common School*. Amhurst (Mass.) : University of Massachusetts Press.
- Gollin, George D. 2008 "When criminals control the ministry of education," *International Higher Education* No. 53 (fall), pp. 5-7.
- Hanushek Eric A. and Wobmann, Luger 2007 *The Quality of Education and Economic Growth*. Washington D.C. The World Bank, 2007.
- Helmreich, E. 1959 *Christian Religious Education in German Schools: An Historical Approach* Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press
- Heuser, Brian L. 2007 Academic Social Cohesion within Higher Education *UNESCO Prospects* Vol. 37 No. 3 (September), pp. 293- 303
- Heyneman, S.P. 1975 "Changes in efficiency and equity accruing from government involvement in primary education," *African Studies Review* (April), pp. 51-60
- .1983 Education during a period of austerity: Uganda 1971-1981," *Comparative Education Review* Vol. 27 No. 3 (October), pp. 403-13.

-
- 1990 "Protection of the Textbook Industry in Developing Countries: In the Public Interest?" *Book Research Quarterly* (winter), pp. 3-11.
-
- 1995 "Education in the Europe and Central Asia Region: Policies of Adjustment and Excellence." Washington, DC, World Bank (ed.) *Reflections Bank: Office of the Vice President, Europe and Central Asia Region, #IPD-145*, August 1994. Reprinted in F.J.H. *Reflections on Education in Russia*. Amersfort: Acco pp. 23-53.
-
- 1997a "Education and Social Stabilization in Russia," *Compare* 27 (No. 1) pp. 5-18
-
- 1997b "Russian Vocational and Technical Education in the Transition: Tradition, Adaptation, Unresolved Problems," presented to the Russian Academy of Vocational Education, Moscow, December 1996. *Institute for the Study of Russian Education Newsletter*, (May), pp. 22-34
-
- 1998 "Transition from Party/State to Open Democracy: The Role of Education," *International Journal of Education Development* Vol. 18 No. 1 pp. 21-40
-
- 2000 "From the Party/State to Multi-Ethnic Democracy: Education and Social Cohesion in the Europe and Central Asia Region," *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis* Vol. 21 No. 4 (summer), pp. 173-191.
-
- 2001 "The growing international market for education goods and services," *International Journal of Education Development* Vol. 21 No. 4 (July), pp. 345-61.
-
- 2003a "The knowledge economy and the economy of knowledge," pp. 355-71 in Brent Davies and John West-Burnham (Eds.) *Handbook of Educational Leadership and Management* London: Person/Longman Press.
-
- 2003b "Educational Qualifications: the economic and trade issues," in Angela Little (ed.) *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice* special issue of *Globalization, Qualifications and Livelihoods* Vol. 7 No. 3 (November), pp. 417-39.
-
- 2003c "Education, Social Cohesion and the Role of International Organizations," *Peabody Journal of Education* Vol. 78 No. 3 pp. 25-38.
-
- 2004 "Education and Corruption," *International Journal of Education Development* Vol. 24 No. 6 pp. 638-48.
-
- 2006a "the role of textbooks in a modern system of education," pp.

- 439 -68 in *Textbooks and Quality Learning for All: Some Lessons Learned from International Experience* Cecelia Braslavsky (ed.) Geneva: UNESCO/International Bureau of Education.
- 2006b "Global Issues in Higher Education," *eJournal USA* Washington DC: U.S. Department of State
- 2007a "Three universities in Georgia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan: the Struggle against Corruption and for social cohesion," *UNESCO Prospects* No. 3 (September), pp. 305-18.
- 2007b "International trade in higher education: what should India do?" *India Economic Review* Vol. 4 no. 4 (December) pp. 86-93.
- 2008 "International Perspectives on school choice," in Mark Berends, Matthew G. Springer, Dale Ballou and Herbert Walberg (eds.) *Handbook of Research on School Choice* Mahwah (New Jersey): Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Heyneman, S.P., Anderson, K.A. and Nazym Nuraliyeva 2008 The Cost of Corruption in Higher Education *Comparative Education Review* Vol. 51 no. 2 pp. 1-15.
- Hoxby, C. 2003 "School Choice and School Productivity: should school choice be a tide which lifts all boats?" in C.Hoxby (ed.) *The Economics of School Choice* Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Hyman, H.H. and Wright, C.R. 1979 *Education's Lasting Impact on Values*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kraince, Richard G. 2007 "Islamic higher education and social cohesion in Indonesia," *UNESCO Prospects* Vol. 37 No. 3 (September), pp. 345 - 56
- Lesko, Nancy 2007 University teaching and social cohesion in the age of AIDS: a South African Case Study," *UNESCO Prospects* Vol. 37 No. 3 (September), pp. 333 - 344.
- Levin, H. 2001 *Privitizing Education: Can the Marketplace Deliver School Choice, Efficiency, Equity and Social Cohesion?* Boulder and Oxford: West view Press.
- Lykins, Chad R. and Heyneman, S.P. (2008) "Federal Role in Education: Where to from Here?" Washington D.C.: Center for Education Policy
- Moiseyenko, Olena 2005 "Social Cohesion in Higher Education," *Peabody Journal of Education* Vol. 80 No. 4 pp. 89-104.
- Perkins, H. 1984 "The Historical Perspective," Pp. 17-55 in Burton Clark (ed.) *Perspectives*

on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views. Berkeley (California): University of California Press.

Pritchett, L. 2003 When will they ever learn? Why all governments produce schooling. Cambridge (Mass.): Bureau of Research in Economic Analysis and Development Working Paper # 31.

Rouse, R and Rouse, M.A. 1982 "Statim invenire: schools, preachers and New attitudes to the page," pp. 201-25 in *Renaissance and Renewal in the 12th Century*. R. L. Benson, Constable Giles and Carol D. Lanham (eds.). (ed.): Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Youssi Shavit, Richard Arum and Adam Gamoran 2007 *Stratification in Higher Education*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Tooley, James 1996 *Education without the State*. London: Institute of Economic Studies.

West, E.G., Tooley, James, and Stanfield, James (eds.) 2003 *Government Failure: E.G. West on Education* London: Institute of Economic Analysis

West, Martin R. and Wossmann, Ludger 2008 " ' Every Catholic Child in a Catholic School': Historical Resistance to State Schooling, Contemporary Private Competition, and Student Achievement across Countries" Munich: Center for Economic Studies and the Institute for Economic Research, University of Munich, Working Paper Series No. 2332 (June)

World Bank 1995 *Russia: Education in the Transition*. Washington DC: Europe and Central Asia Country Department III, The World Bank.

- 논문접수 2008년 1월 2일 / 수정본 접수 2월 20일 / 게재 승인 3월 5일
- Stephen P. Heyneman: University of Chicago에서 Ph.D.를 취득하였고, 현재 Vanderbilt University 교수로 재직 중임. 주요 관심분야는 고등교육 재정과 경영 등임. e-mail: sheyneman@earthlink.net

요약

교육과 정부의 역할

Stephen P. Heyneman(Vanderbilt University)

공교육은 그 시작부터 사회적 유대를 공고히 하는 것을 목적으로 하였다. 어떤 지역에서는 이 역할을 정부 기관이 담당해야 했고, 또 다른 지역에서는 정부로부터 재정 지원 및 지시를 받는 사설기관 및 종교기관이 이 역할을 담당해야 했다. 사회적 유대가 공공의 유익을 위한 것이라는 전제하에서는, 그 역할을 누가 맡는지는 큰 문제가 되지 않았다.

고등교육과 관련하여 가장 중요한 한 가지 주제는 경쟁력이다. 경쟁력이 목적의 다양성과 관계가 있기 때문에, 다양성을 증진시킬 수 있는 비정부 기관의 역할은 중요하긴 하지만, 필수적인 것은 아니다. 핵심은 모든 고등교육기관들의 정직성이고, 대중들이 자국 고등교육의 정직성에 대한 신뢰를 갖게 하는 것은 정부의 역할이다. 다른 한편으로 어떻게 진리를 추구할 것인가에 대한 좋은 모범을 보여주는 것과 미래 사회 유대를 돈독히 하는데 영향을 미칠 전문적 활동의 모범을 보여주는 것은 각 대학의 유일한 책임이다.

주제어 : 정부의 역할, 고등교육의 경쟁력