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Abstract

If ‘creating economic space for social innovation’ is about anything, it is about rethinking our understanding of capital, no longer only in terms of financing the means of production for the material (goods) economy, oft-times also in ways that enslave humanity, but also as the counterpart to the unfolding of capacities, and so as the potential enabler of people everywhere. This is especially the case in regard to financing the education of human beings as to their particular capacities and capabilities.

This is ultimately an adult affair, of what people do with their lives. Prior to that, however, it is a matter of education – from primary to secondary to tertiary – and of ensuring that such education (of capacities) is available to all – but not as an informer, but as an enabler. This depends however on the way generalised education is financed.

Whether it is financed by gift or loans, and whether its funding is a societal affair (an enlightened form of taxation or collective economic action) or an individualised affair.

This study is an enquiry into the nature of funding generalised education to date, with particular regard to the role gift-funded education (education funded by writing off excess capital) can play in creating economic space for social innovation (the reality, not the acronym).

There is a rider: namely, the beneficiaries need to be ‘the marginalised’. In this study the marginalised are understood to be all those (EU) citizens who for want of their capacities being freely educated find themselves in the margins of society. This not only includes those in ‘traditional’ poverty, but ‘graduates without a future’, Los Indignados, and other developments that merely add to today’s rising, even endemic, youth unemployment.
Introduction

In Amartya Sen’s terms, one of the salient features of modern economics is the focus on financial gain, rather than the freedoms and opportunities (in Sen’s terms, ‘capabilities’) human beings need to have in order to benefit from today’s economic system.

In Capability Approach (CA) terminology, capability is the freedom and opportunity to achieve functionings, such as education, inclusion, dignity. These functionings are achieved through one’s ability to pursue one’s goals on a basis of self-determination, self-empowerment and autonomy (agency). This one does through conversion factors that enable or prevent agency, either singly and internally (through the circumstances of one’s own person, such as gender, age), or societally and externally through socio-economic conditions and institutions.¹

In terms of this paper, achieving those capabilities assumes one has the capacities to meet the challenge that developing and fulfilling them presupposes. This, in turn, is as much about funding them as schooling them. Nowadays, this can be readily expressed in terms of whether young people wishing to develop their capacities have access to the right kind of funding for the purpose, a topic that today can be seen and discussed very clearly in terms of the types of funding developed in the last few decades, and that, in this study, culminates in a discussion concerning student loans and ‘curriculum-neutral capitation’ (see 4.1 and 7.2).

The study posits that young people have always had the question “How can I finance the education of my capacities?”, and that that question has, as it were, driven the generalisation of education, together with the form of its financing. The social innovation of this study is therefore the ways found to finance that generalisation. While this is an overt question for society today, it has arguably been latent or implicit over the centuries, and so we impute it backwards in order to look at the history of financing education in a new light, a social innovation that will have policy relevance going forwards (especially, for example, as regards today’s promotion of financial literacy for young people).

This is not to foist the social innovation of financing generalised education onto history, but to argue that it is impliedly present. The aim of this case study is therefore to map, especially since the Renaissance to our time, how the financing of generalised education has been developed so that young people can develop their capacities. Those unable to benefit from such an education are here conceived as marginalised in the sense and to the extent that, for whatever reasons, including choosing not to, they are not able to participate fully in today’s cultural, political and economic life. In other words, those (EU) citizens who for want of their capacities being freely educated find themselves on the margins of society. This not only includes those in ‘traditional’ poverty, but ‘graduates without a future’, Los Indignados, and other developments that merely add to today’s rising, even endemic, youth unemployment.

¹ See ‘Capital, Capacities and Capabilities: Open Access Credit and the Capability Approach.’ Contribution to HDCA Panel, Athens, Houghton Budd (02.09.14).
This may stretch the meaning of marginalisation, but in the CrESSI project that term has been deliberately left imprecise. Naturally, there is a default understanding that marginalisation tends to refer to those in various ways poor – although whether ‘self poor’ or made poor is a matter of debate, as is the question of whether change needs to be done by or to them.

The study of the financing of education has a long history, obviously, proceeding from before Charlemagne to today, from cloistered provision to student-driven. The study reviews the history of how education has been financed, concentrating for our purposes on the period from the Renaissance, through the all-important and representative debates in the Netherlands and England in the 19th century, into the 20th century, when the shift began (initially with higher education) to displace (collective) tax-funding with (individualised) loan-funding.

This study ineluctably culminates in a discussion as to whether students today can ‘drive’ their own education and also be appropriately financed to do so. Its main policy reflection therefore is whether – where this is not possible, i.e. where students cannot get the education they seek in order to develop their capacities – society itself, not just its individual citizens, is the poorer, worse off.

The study also records how along the way the state came into the picture and education became politicised. Further, insofar as state funding, as it has turned out, entails the state also deciding what education is, the question of educational freedom is also tracked – that is to say, whether, in essence, the form of finance supports or otherwise what we call ‘the education nexus’ (see 3.0 and Section 2.3, Table 1.).

Whether the link between state-funding and educational freedom is deemed to be causal or coincidental, the topic is clearly crucial as regards both state-funding and the growing role played by marketised funding. Indeed, following where the evidence led, the study culminates in how in recent decades educational finance has been gradually marketised, beginning with higher education, so that now in many Anglo-Saxon countries in particular student finance is increasingly provided by loans, with the result that as many as half the students graduating in the UK today (i.e. the early 21st century) do so with a debt load of 45,000 GBP. (Morley, 2014). This system is also spreading into continental Europe.

As a result of this students are facing increasingly serious levels of indebtedness. On the other hand, many students are beginning to seek direct access to funding to pay for (and even design) courses of their own choosing. The question is whether an alternative can be developed, for example, by way of this study’s proposition of curriculum-neutral capitation (see 4.1 and 7.2).

Importantly, the study inevitably also points to a second role for capital – namely, as well as its ‘traditional’ role of financing the means of production in the goods economy, capital can also serve as the counterpart to the development of creativity, ideas, knowledge, skills and talents, in short, capacities – an element of modern economic life that is as real as goods production albeit not physically visible in the way that aspect of economics is (see discussion in 7.3 The Challenge to our Concept of Capital).
Although the study looks at the development, diffusion and adoption of the financing of generalised education in the Netherlands and England in particular, its purview is universal as to its topic, and Europe-wide as to its instance and initial evolution. It includes the important example of Germany and the Scandinavian case of Finland – both of them providing valuable contrasts to the otherwise prevailing Anglo-Saxonism of free-market thinking applied to education.

It concludes with an evaluation in terms of Beckert and Mann: in terms of cognitive frames or cultural power (e.g. terminologies and cultures in regard to education finance), institutions or political power (e.g. governance), and social networks or economic power (e.g. availability or otherwise of suitable funding organisations and arrangements) that mainstream adoption entails.

**Seven chapters**

The study has seven chapters, in addition to this overview. Chapters 1-5 set the stage, as it were. Chapter 1 contextualises the case being studied, in order that the reader may understand the precise meaning we give to financing generalised education. Chapter 2 outlines the CrESSI frameworks of Sen, Beckert and Mann. Chapter 3 clarifies our understanding of the education nexus with its various aspects – the need to be educated, the rights pertaining to education, and the funding of it. Chapter 4 outlines the essence of educational economics in order to be clear as to the role of taxation – this being the principal societal mechanism (until now) for financing generalised education. Chapter 5 is a historical consideration, focused in particular on the principle of individuation as the driving force that emancipates us not only from the Church and the State, but also from merely economic imperatives, all three understood as erstwhile impediments to what in this study we call ‘self-directed citizenhood’.

Thereby the stage is set to examine the somewhat uncharted field of educational finance – although the study shows that data concerning this are readily derived from the general history of education as examined in our two main cases in Chapter 6 – the Netherlands and England.

It should, however, be noted that the financing of education, and of generalised education in particular, is seldom a topic for the dispassionate. Education is such an important part of society that it provokes much debate and, indeed, much confusion and conflation of roles as between educators, the state and financial providers. Teasing these apart has been our biggest challenge in order to provide a basis for

2 Sen’s ‘capability approach’ being implicit in its overall premise.

3 Despite its often strong political overtones, implying liberation from oppression and so on, one can also speak of emancipation in the sense of being master of rather than slaves to the circumstances one finds oneself in. It is in this cultural, rather than political, sense that the word is used here, a sense supported by its etymology. The word derives from the Latin *emancipare* “to put (a son) out of paternal authority, declare (someone) free, give up one’s authority over”, in Roman law, the freeing of a son or wife from the legal authority (*patria potestas*) of the *pater familias*, in order to make his or her own way in the world.
identifying and collecting descriptive, analytically neutral ‘data’, historical and social facts presented without bias.

It does not fall to us, however, to decide what these data should comprise or what uses those seeking data have in mind. What we have done is provide historical narratives for the Netherlands (6.1) and England (6.2), then mapped the key ‘events’ (people, dates, Act of Parliament, etc.) onto spreadsheets capable of being mined (6.3). To that end, the spreadsheets have various elements:

- dated chronologie
- generic ‘events’, meaning those that are pan-European or universal, not confined or peculiar to any particular country
- country-specific ‘events’
- further analysis in terms of cognitive frames (cultural power), institutions (political power), and social networks (economic or financial power)
- notes that refer to numbers in square brackets in the narratives.

6.4 then provides data sources and references for the main cases. The rest of Chapter 6 comprises the country perspectives for Germany (6.5) and Finland (6.6), which are mainly focussed on higher education post WW2. Finally, Section 6.7 comprises a detailed template analysis, completed or amended so as to fit the topic being studied.

The seventh chapter on Discussions and Key Lessons has four parts. Firstly (7.1), a review of the four cases studied. Secondly (7.2), a summary of the main points born of the study – multiple curricula and national curricula, free education, curriculum-neutral capitation, and higher education funding. Thirdly (7.3), our deliberations on the challenge to the general understanding of capital, in particular our linking of capital to capacities, and our view that financing generalised education is an instance of this – and best understood as such. Fourthly (7.4), a retrospective view of the case study in terms of Beckert and Mann and implications for other Work Packages.

---

4 The word ‘narrative’ is increasingly used in academia today, probably with methodological connotations and implications. Although we have not been able to trace the roots of its now popular use, it may have its origins in Michel Foucault’s ‘discourse analysis’, which is designed to analyse the social construction of reality based on power and knowledge relationships and the articulation of collective identities. Thus, it may involve a relativist view on reality and truth. In this study, however, the word ‘narrative’ is used in the simple, plain English sense of a written account of connected events.
1.0 Contextualising the Case Study

This is a study of the role (and potential) of financial and monetary innovations in overcoming marginalisation or social exclusion by facilitating social inclusion. It looks specifically at the financing of generalised education, with education understood as the discovery and nurture of human capacities as the necessary foundation or the exercise of what Amartya Sen calls ‘capabilities’ (see 1.1 Individuation and the Nature of Education). By ‘generalised’ we mean the process whereby education went from being for the few to becoming for all. But also that nowadays every individual has a need to be educated as he sees fit, and in that sense a right to education, as also, therefore, the need to be able to finance that education.

The term ‘marginalised’ is here understood to refer to those who, for whatever reasons, including choosing not to, are not able to participate fully in today’s cultural, political and economic life. In other words, those (EU) citizens who for want of their capacities being freely educated find themselves on the margins of society. This not only includes those in ‘traditional’ poverty, but, as defined earlier, but ‘graduates without a future’, Los Indignados, and other developments that merely add to today’s rising, even endemic, youth unemployment.

On the one hand, this is an amorphous group because it cannot be quantified with any precision, neither in the past nor now, and one has also to be careful not to cast backwards onto history concerns that are in fact modern, born of individuation (see 1.1), and that would not make sense in previous times, or simply were not there. On the other hand, it is everywhere said today that education is the key to modern competitive existence\(^5\), preferably at least until the first (bachelor) degree, and even though the levels of unemployed graduates have never been higher, and, according to some, the quality of such degrees never flatter.\(^6\) Indeed, if one extends this idea (of unfulfilled capacities) and expresses it in Sen’s terms as the number of people not able to realise and give expression to their ‘capabilities’, who do not achieve ‘functioning’, this number is considerable and probably growing.

1.1 Individuation and the Nature of Education

Before continuing, a brief but important word about education as such. The Latin *educare* means to lead out, to unfold innate skills or talents; rather than to inform or instil. In that sense, education is about enabling people to find their capacities, to develop or exercise their capabilities, and then building society out of that, rather than forcing people into society’s requirements.

When compiling our histories of generalised education, our attention was repeatedly drawn to this distinction. The more individuals separate themselves out from the

\(^5\) An example is found in the case of Finland (see 6.6), where the very constitution links education to national economic prowess. On the other hand, there are those, such as Derek Gillard, whose work is extensively used in our history of English education (see 6.2), who question the social efficacy of such education.

\(^6\) E.g. Simon Head (2014).
social matrix (see next paragraph), the more they also become the arbiters and/or drivers of their education, and therefore also the ones ultimately responsible for it.

This emphasis on the modern individual needs clarifying. While one can speak of generalised education in overall terms and as an event that has, as it were, been done to us, one also needs to see it as something born of individuation – a term borrowed from Jungian psychology but used here sociologically (as elaborated in 5.0 History, Individuation and Emancipation). It is not that generalised education has pointlessly appeared and developed in history; it has come about because of humanity’s long journey from communitarian to individualised existence. This journey that has not resulted in unalloyed celebration of atomised society, but in the question: How can we re-cohere society? In this case, in regard to education for all.

The notion of individuation has two important meanings for this study. Firstly, it provides a latter-day viewpoint in terms of which all prior history can be seen as antecedent, in the manner not of a process unfolding haphazardly, but in the way that an artist throws away all his earlier attempts until the masterpiece he knows he has ‘within’ him has appeared. Secondly, Beckert’s notion of co-evolution notwithstanding, it provides a common, albeit unseen, driver for the three fields, mentioned earlier, of central relevance to this study – the need to be educated, the rights pertaining to education, and the financing of education.

Although it culminates in a consideration of higher education, the overall focus of this study is not on elementary, secondary or tertiary education in particular, but on themes germane to all three. Nowadays, these are clearly defined types or stages of education, but they have not always been so, having derived from a less externally segmented, more ‘process of life’ modality of apprentice–journeyman–master. In the long evolution of education, as our case narratives detail (see Chapter 6.0 – The Cases), the development of today’s primary, secondary and tertiary segments marks the crystallisation into a staged, programmatic system, often entailing compulsory, state-determined education until mid-adolescence, with the stages or structure reflecting prevailing social mores rather than inherently educational principles.

Lost to view is that what matters most is the end result: that the resulting adult is morally and practically fit for social existence – a social existence that could derive more and more from what is inherent in the capacities of human beings, what they are capable of in both normal and Sen’s meanings of the term, but that is often defined in terms of political or economic objectives, to which education is made subservient. Naturally, the meanings of ‘moral’ and ‘practical’ reflect the mores of different periods, and to that extent today’s increasing marketisation of education says much about where humanity in general is at, namely at risk of being unable to create economic space for social innovation. But what this study shows is that this does not have to be the case. Creating economic space for social innovation, the more so if this is targeted on those marginalised by today’s prevailing economic and educational ethos, will hardly be possible if that ethos is not challenged and, indeed, made subject to transformation or – to use an old-fashioned word – ennobled.
2.0 CrESSI Frameworks

As well as comporting with the methodology of UHEI’s template (see 6.7 Template Analysis), this study addresses the three CRESSI frameworks provided by Sen, Beckert and Mann. Taking these conceptions as comprehensive illustrations rather than definitive blueprints, it may be that not all the concepts they use to ‘capture’ or explain social reality will be relevant. Conversely, some features of the case study, as discovered by research rather than by matching prescriptive templates, may be novel.

2.1 Sen’s ‘Capabilities’ as the Counterpart to Capital

Sen is addressed by the study overall, with its conception of education as the discovery and nurture of human capacities/capabilities and the financing of education understood in terms of capital as the counterpart to and enabler of those capacities/capabilities.

A topic considered in detail in 7.3 The Challenge to our Concept of Capital, today’s concept of capital is narrowly defined in terms of the real economy, essentially the world of goods that meet material needs, requiring savings to finance investment in (physical) means of production. And yet, in our times the amount of capital ‘stocked’ in pension funds and the like far exceeds that required (or capable of being absorbed) by the real or physical economy (Swiss Confederation, Office for Statistics, 2013).

There is a need, therefore, for a wider concept of capital that, in addition to this ‘traditional’ notion, highlights the emancipatory dimension of capital as the counterpart to and enabler of human capacities. ‘Capacities’ is used here in the plain English sense referring to the skills, talents and propensities that people have – whether innately or by education – but which, in our argument, cannot properly or fully come to expression unless they are capitalised. It makes a difference, for example, if, instead of being secured against real assets (in order to protect the lenders from loss), loans are made ‘to the person not the asset’, as used to be the norm in banking. Loans then act like the air beneath the wings of borrowers – providing ‘lift’, they confirm them in their initiative, on the successful fulfilment of which fresh values (and therefore a true return to capital) depend. In this sense, there is a direct link between this wider meaning of capital and Sen’s Capabilities Approach.

2.2 Beckert’s Social Grid Analysis

The study is also conducted and evaluated in terms of Beckert’s social grid, comprising the three co-evolving fields of cognitive frames, institutions and social networks, treated here as synonyms for cultural, political and economic aspects of society, and concretely considered as, respectively, terminologies, concepts and cultures in regard to education finance; rules, policies, instruments, incorporation and other aspects of governance; and appropriate financing organisations and arrangements.

It is worth noting that Beckert’s three fields social grid analysis comports with the generally threefold nature of society as often remarked throughout history and born
out in many examples—inter alia, Plato’s three estates, Montesquieu’s three powers, Comte’s three stages in the evolution of conceptions, and Weber’s cultural, political and economic analysis.

2.3 Per Mann’s Powers

In terms of Michael Mann’s ‘powers’ analysis, as elaborated by Risto Heiskala (May, 2014), the powers relevant to this study are cultural, economic and political. The relationships between ‘financing of generalised education’ and the Mann framework are illustrated with the help of Table 1.

*Table 1: Relationship of Financing Generalised Education to CrESSI’s Common Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael Mann’s Sources of Power²</th>
<th>Kinds of:</th>
<th>DUT²</th>
<th>The ‘Education Nexus’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalisation (1)</td>
<td>Social innovation (2)</td>
<td>Capability (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural / Ideological</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economic</td>
<td>Em</td>
<td>Ei</td>
<td>Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Military</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Sc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Political</td>
<td>Pm</td>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>Pc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Artefactual</td>
<td>Am</td>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>Ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Natural</td>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*
1. See CrESSI Deliverable D1.1.
2. Delft University of Technology team, i.e. the authors of this paper.
3.0 The Education Nexus

If one makes an essential image of education, it is a relationship or nexus between teachers and learners. It is in the first place pedagogical or cultural, with a number of aspects in terms of cognitive frameworks and how they have evolved particularly in the last 1500 years. Here they are organised as a stylised summary showing how ‘then’ (the pre-Renaissance history of education) what was taught, how and why was largely determined from outside the student; until ‘now’ when, the historically recent habit of state provision notwithstanding, the tendency is increasingly for students to exercise their freedom to choose (and even design) their education, although whether that education is instructional or emancipatory one might wish to discuss:

Table 2: Aspects of The Economic Nexus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Given from outside</td>
<td>Discovered within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>The Creed</td>
<td>My creed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Imposed</td>
<td>Unique to me yet universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education by</td>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Learner-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Peripheral (individual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning the last aspect, it is clear that in a country-based sense education can be provided on all levels from local to municipal to regional to national. But one can also add global, insofar as many countries use another country’s exam system (e.g. Argentina using Cambridge), presumably on the grounds that it is superior and/or less parochial than their own. But the global level has an important corollary – its constituency comprises individuals who have emancipated themselves in the sense given earlier (footnote 3). It is this, in turn, that links the core of education to what it lies in the individual to ‘educare’ and thus to what is universal about education rather than national or economic.

Secondly, the relationship between teachers and learners presupposes certain rights or political circumstances or institutions to be operative. Again, these can be outlined as follows, with the essential changes in modality shown alongside. The basic story is of education originating in ecclesiastical, civic and economic settings, met by a rise in democratisation, so that individuals became the focus but the state acted as the provider.

At this point, however, one can wonder if, as has become the norm, this requires the state to become the arbiter also of what education is all about. Or should that not be a matter between learner and teacher? In other words, is it right, even constitutionally correct, for the state to intervene in such a relationship?

From this unfolds a further series of questions:

---

7 To use an ugly term that covers both pupil and student.
How is the right to teach determined?
How is teaching organised institutionally, juridically?
To what extent does its financing make education accessible?

Lastly, in order to teach, teachers have expenses, both in terms of revenue and assets. Given that, seen economically, education is an immediate cost for a future benefit, the basis of its funding is surplus capital, money for which an immediate return is not needed. In terms of type of funding (social networks), to date this has typically been provided in one of three ways:

1) Parents/guardians pay directly, presupposing sufficient ‘disposable income’. Always there in principle.

2) a third party pays – sponsorship. Sponsors are typically the Church, the king or private persons singly or collectively (foundations). And since the 19th century, the state.

3) Collective funding of education by an entire population through the state using taxation. Only a recent possibility, presupposing universal suffrage.

Nowadays, state-funding (taxation) is becoming challenged by marketised finance, beginning especially with student loans in higher education – a topic taken up later.  

Whether wisely or otherwise, the norm for such funding is that he who pays the piper calls the tune, but if one assumes that the learner wants what the teacher has to offer (the ‘substance’ of education), then the question: Do those who provide the finance – whether parents, Church, state or third parties – have any right to do otherwise than follow (i.e. pay for) what the teacher needs? That is, should those who provide the money have any say in the nature, format and content of the education or teaching? Should that not in fact be down to teachers to devise and proffer? Just as who other than architects determine what is architecture, why should the teaching profession be any different?

Such questions can be explored more precisely by asking of education:

What is its purpose and content? And is it to be uniform or diverse? (See 3.1.)

What rights pertain to education? (See 3.2.)

How can it be funded? (See 3.3.)

---

8 Although this study is focused on the European Union, this modality is by no means confined to there. The US works extensively in this way, as do places like Santiago in Chile.
3.1 Education and Citizenhood

As regards the purpose(s) and thus the content (curriculum) of education, one can ask who devises and informs it, and whether its content is to be uniform or diverse? In short, what is to be taught, how, and by whom? Within this are three sub-topics, identified by the study, concerning whether the education is or should be: (a) confessional or faith-based (i.e. intended to instil morality), (b) liberal (intended to educate us to our humanity\(^9\)), or (c) technical, in the sense of developing life- or transferable skills such as literacy and numeracy in order to be economically useful (rather than for their own sake).

Education today has crystallised out from how it was in Medieval Europe and before, when there were no nation states and no state-involvement such as has become the norm today. Then, although there were country and regional differences in the secular world, Europe as a whole was (Roman) Catholic, the relationship with Eastern Orthodox, Mohammedanism and the barbarous north having all been ‘settled’ by the time of the Renaissance. For our purposes, therefore, education was initially embedded in this context, with schooling being a mainly monastic or at least ecclesiastical affair. (Even when the rich few had their children educated it was in monastic contexts for the most part.)\(^{10}\)

The only other modality was being subject to or patronised by a monarch (with all that means in terms of nobility, etc.), until the rise of merchant bankers and those who derived their status and power from capital born of trade and the economic freedoms ushered in with the Renaissance and the subsequent, essentially economic (so-called capitalist), developments associated with the Protestant ethic and the Industrial Revolution. (One could also add the guild-controlled economic life that as unions has lasted into our own times.)

Until then, therefore, society was un-individuated, the individual was embedded in some social matrix. Then, as we outgrew these matrices, the state developed as a twin phenomenon – as res publica replacing res divina, and as the vehicle of nationhood, a conflation discussed later in 5.2 The Role of the State.

In all these regards, the content of education followed suit. Originally a matter of denominational bias (Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, etc.), then came the liberal concept of non-denominational, Renaissance Man, followed in the 17\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\) centuries by the needs of trade and then industry coming to the fore. And so to nowadays, when education is increasingly obeisant to merely financial imperatives, those, that is, of what J. K. Galbraith referred to as ‘the separate personality of money’. (Galbraith, 1987, pp. 140ff.) Whatever course one takes in life, it needs to make sense in a world dancing ever more attendance on financial markets.

---

\(^9\) “A philosophy of education that empowers individuals with broad knowledge and transferable skills, and a stronger sense of values, ethics, and civic engagement ... characterised by challenging encounters with important issues, and more a way of studying than a specific course or field of study.” Source: “What is Liberal Education?” Association of American Colleges & Universities.

\(^{10}\) In England, it was the norm for professors in universities to take Holy Orders. This was true of Darwin, for example; Newton could not be Master of Trinity because he was a Unitarian.
On the other hand, even though education subsequently developed clearly national characteristics, discussed later, these were always strongly influenced by insights that arose in individuals in different countries who were in fact not thinking nationally in the first place (e.g. Erasmus, Comenius, Mill, von Humboldt, Kuyper). Such insights then flowed into a general Europe-wide and ultimately secular understanding of education. Liberal arts education is also universal, as is the notion that practical, economic affairs demand numeracy, literacy and technical capabilities, though whether or not such things should be (or pretend to be) devoid of any wider worldview is a matter worth debating.

Finally, from the point of view of individuation, this long and complex process has led to an important circumstance – that of citizenhood, at which point, all history takes on a different meaning – both as to its past and its future. The past maps the road to citizenhood. The future depends on the use made of that citizenhood – whether the way we conduct our affairs (in this case the financing of generalised education) is on the basis of an emancipated citizenry with no external authority, or, as the prevalence of state-determined education seems to suggest, refusal of the responsibility that possibility entails and thus abdication of it. It is in this sense that one can speak, not just of citizenhood but of self-governing citizens.

In short, the evolution of education reflects that of society:

| Arbiters: Church > Monarch (State) > Traders (Finance) | Self-governing citizens |
| Content: Religious > Clerical > Practical | Self-governing citizens |

### 3.2 The Rights pertaining to Generalised Education

This is an important topic area. It includes the so-called right to education, enshrined, for example, in the UN Covenant (see Appendix 3: Article 13 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights) as well as in the European Convention on Human Rights (1953, Protocol 1, Article 1), which defines the right to education as follows:

‘No person shall be denied the right to education. In the exercise of any functions which it assumes in relation to education and to teaching, the State shall respect the right of parents to ensure such education and teaching in conformity with their own religious and philosophical convictions.’

It is, however, a moot point whether education can be legislated into being instead of arising and existing culturally. The right to education is a recent development. Until the 20th century, in the Netherlands and England at least, society’s ‘elders’ (nobles, churchmen, politicians, etc.) largely determined who could be educated and how.

---

11 In this study the concept and borders of Europe are not those of today’s European Union, which dates only from the second half of the 20th century.

12 A recent (18 January 2014) panel discussion by experts on BBC Radio 4 chaired by Mariella Frostrup concerning financial literacy in schools, stressed the danger of teaching technique without ethics, “mechanics without enlightenment”. It also warned against treating money as a source of value rather than as a means of exchange.
More concretely, this is about freedom of education, thought and speech, and of spiritual life generally. Be that as it may, there are also matters of right that are more concrete in legal and political terms – and in a sense more important. For example, how education is organised juridically – i.e. in terms of the contracts teachers make with society regarding the locus of responsibility for what is taught and how –, the right to teach, and the arrangements regarding finance, and therefore access.

It is not only a question of people having a right to be educated, however. Education has to be provided and so a key question is who has the right to teach and to teach what, and how should their activity be organised, incorporated? Today we have become accustomed to the state playing a large role in this, but in England’s ‘Oxbridge’ universities, for example, a significant model was apparent at their inception in the 14th century: ‘independent corporations of learned people’, meaning those who taught took on the responsibility for what and how they taught and also ensured they were sovereign in their political and economic existence. ‘Political’ meaning how they contracted with the rest of society; ‘economic’ meaning ensuring they were viably financed. Part of our concern in this study is to review what happened to that modality, nowadays somewhat lost in a world of predominantly state-provided education.

Finally, the way education was financed, both in regard to its ‘providers’ and those being educated, plays a key part in access. Quite apart from the money side, finance is a rights matter. Generalised access to education is intimately bound up with funding methods. During the 19th century the state came to be the main vehicle for this, coupled with the right to education. Taxation-funded education made it free at ‘point of consumption’, or pre-financed. The financial performance of the right to education was guaranteed by way of taxation (even if that made of education a political football), an achievement now becoming qualified by modern marketisation, which makes access to education contingent on students’ willingness, readiness and ability to borrow money in the markets.

In terms of rules, policies, instruments and incorporation (institutions), the main ‘rights’ matters considered in this study are the following, framed so as to contrast the possibility of education as a matter between teachers and learners, rather than as the prerogative of the state, nowadays increasingly subject to neoliberal precepts:

Teacher-determined education rather than market- and/or state-determined.

Is teaching self-incorporated or state-prescribed?

Is the financing of education equitable, meaning is it a barrier or classifier of access?

---

13 Understood as a ‘marriage’ of, on the one hand, ideas derived from laissez-faire economics, and a strong antipathy to and rhetoric against collectivist strategies, and on the other, heavy state support for ‘markets’ (for instance, subsidisation of financial institutions and private R&D) and dirigisme in the pursuit of these goals. For an example of neo-liberal thinking in the field of higher education, see Buckingham at 25, Freeing Universities from State Control. Institute of Economic Affairs(2001).
3.3 How Generalised Education has been funded

It is laudable for Kant to have urged ‘sapere aude!’ (Have the courage to use your own understanding! – see 6.1), but for this one needs capital as well as courage. Inevitably, therefore, the question arises of how generalised education has been funded.

At its simplest and in economic terms, the financing of education means ensuring that teachers as a profession have the money (for schools, desks, books, etc., as well as for their own livelihood) necessary for them to teach in safe and effective ways. That translates into the need for revenue and capital, the provision of which raises three further questions:

– Where does the money come from?
– How is it provided?
– Who determines its use: the providers or the recipients?

In the study we plot how the financing of generalised education passed from the narrow base of a privileged few funding their own offspring, to societal meaning everyone getting educated via generalised funding (usually taxation), and on to today’s introduction of marketised funding. This history can be outlined as follows:

1) In monastic or ecclesiastical settings the financing of education was (and continues to be) within the budget of the Church.

2) Where education was secular, funding prior to societal finance was (and continues to be) a direct matter of being wealthy and lucky enough to be born of wealthy parents.

3) Where those to be educated extends to those whose parents cannot afford it, this came to be done via ‘third party’ endowment funding (cash and/or capital) – basically, other people adopting the costs of someone else’s offspring. This remains the basis of endowments and foundations and was the initial modality of the way generalised education was funded. This then became the role of civil society (in the 18th century Edinburgh Enlightenment sense of that term) working through charities.

4) In due course, the state became involved in this funding, such that charities eventually became seconded as agents of the state because, seen from the state’s point of view, they are tax-exempt vehicles (doing societal things that save the state from having to do or fund them).

5) Nowadays, the ‘preferred’ approach is the creation of funds from which young people can borrow in order to finance their education and then repay out of their future earnings.
4.0 The Economics of Education

As a piece of economics, it is easy enough to see how in the case of a single teacher, he needs a salary and enough money to buy desks and materials, to rent a classroom and to pay for a secretary. That cost divided by the number of learners becomes the average fee or capitation – for example, divided by 25. The ability to meet this depends on the size of the salary (typically in the region of 80% of a modern school budget) and the wealth of the parent body – unless, that is, a third party donor joins in.

Written on a societal scale, the economics of education amounts to the income and capital requirements of all teachers divided by the number of all students. Again, the needs of the teachers and the wealth of the parents, taken as a whole, determine the budget and whether or not it can be covered.

From a money flow point of view, the parents can only be the payees if their income is sufficient for the purpose – which it will be unless companies have paid taxes for education and therefore pay their employees correspondingly less. Or if parents pay taxes. In either case it is simply a matter of ensuring that the same amount of money flows and that arrangements ensure that in all cases parents can send their offspring to schools of their own choosing.

4.1 Taxation and Curriculum-neutral Capitation

Using taxation to fund education is clearly a role of the state, but is it a role of the state to involve itself in education per se? From an economic point of view what can happen at a societal or countrywide level – i.e. taxation – is that economies of scale can be effected, ‘swings and roundabouts’ (cross subsidising) can occur, and the financial base can become the entire population (not only actual parents), on the grounds that society as a whole benefits if all its young people are educated. Once one has got to the scale of the entire population one can also then speak in terms of the productive capacity of the economy as the basis of funding. (For example, a country’s total education budget could be expressed as (variable) percentage of its total commercial turnover.)

Apart from the fact that none of this necessitates the state determining the thing it funds, there is another problem. As noted earlier, when disposable income is diminished because parents’ income is taxed, the money they would spend directly on education is then routed via society at municipal, provincial or federal levels.

Part of the argument for tax-funded education is to make education independent of direct parental finances, and thus to even out the effects of wealth differentials. From this point of view, therefore, when taxation is used to fund education, it is important that the general tax take is not used selectively, something that can only be achieved.

---

14 One of the authors of this study, Christopher Houghton Budd, was a primary school governor in Britain for four years during which Mrs. Thatcher introduced local management of schools.

15 Less than that, and one is heading into the economics of tutorials rather than classrooms.
by providing a capitation sum per learner to be paid to whichever school the learner attends (curriculum-neutral capitation)\(^{16}\), because in that way, although the route of the money is indirect via the state, parents can still send their children to the school of their choice.

Curriculum-neutral capitation is a concept born of the study’s historical analysis, in particular from the time when in England Margaret Thatcher introduced local management of schools (LMS) (discussed later, see 6.2), a mixed scheme that sought to create local school autonomy but did so for and as part of a wider neo-liberal strategy intended to by-pass municipal governments, which in those days were mostly socialist.

Explored more fully in 7.2, the idea of curriculum-neutral capitation acts as a conceptual filter when assessing whether taxation, as the societal form of generalised funding of education, is being generally collected but selectively distributed – to only state schools, for example, or conditionally upon a national curriculum, or used to subsidise already well-endowed private schools. Put more positively, curriculum-neutral capitation can also be seen as a form of citizenised financing, whereby the state confines itself to equitable distribution of wealth by generally taxing to fund education but not then selecting which schools or curricula will be funded, something that would then remain a matter between teachers and learners.

\(^{16}\) In effect, a voucher system but shorn of the libertarian context that such schemes usually have.
5.0 History, Individuation and Emancipation

This introductory survey of the nature and context of education has been necessary in order to identify, among the many interweaving threads, that of how generalised education has been financed. Of course, it is not as if anyone set out to achieve a particular form of financing, still less a universal one. The idea is, rather, that history has been driven by a phenomenon that has that result – namely the already-mentioned emergence of the self-directed citizen. It is, after all, from that point of view that we today estimate and evaluate matters educational, including its financing. To that end, some further elaboration of wider history seems necessary in order to pull the thread of educational finance from its entanglement among many other things.

History can be read as a series of events or developments that have no particular cause, in which case today’s individualism and democracy will be seen as simply having emerged – one knows not why or whence or whither. Or, as here, history can be seen as the result of a process of individuation, which perhaps can only be understood and accepted today, now that we have reached something of a zenith in this regard – now that we are all, more or less, individuated.

Individuation has been the driver of the long historical journey whereby the modern self-standing individual has emancipated himself from the matrices of earlier social existences – tribe, family, etc. This is a hugely complex process, of which only essential highlights can be considered here, and only insofar as they have been yielded from our study of educational history in the Netherlands and in England (see Chapter 6.0 – The Cases).

5.1 Individuation and Emancipation

In terms of strictly European history, for that is our remit, the process of individuation has required the individual to achieve several emancipations:

1) Cultural / Theocratic (related to education, values, etc.):

   Emancipation from the Church – meaning until the Reformation, the Roman Catholic Church. In its pre-nations time, when Europe was a place of kingdoms and tribal areas, the whole of ‘civilised’ Europe was within the culture of the Church; not only culturally, but also organisationally and economically. All the kingdoms were Catholic.

2) Political / Monarchic (related to the State):

   If individuals were not part of the Church, then they were the subjects of a king, whose kingdom was the progenitor of the state. Secular existence was monarchical, often predicated on divine right, and economic life was essentially agrarian, with tithes and taxation being the basis of monarchical economics.
3) Economic / Traders (Finance):

A main vehicle of individuation was its reflection in the evolution of finance, notably the monetisation of social relationships and the emergence of free or trade capital through merchants. It was the rich merchant families (Fuggers, Medici, et al), who challenged the power of both Church and king. But finance in the sense of free capital also calls for a kind of emancipation. Just because one is rich one does not necessarily have the right to rule or impose one’s culture on others. One has also to avoid becoming a slave to capital, for example using it to enable oneself or to foster one’s own interests but not those of others. In other words, the relationship between capital and emancipation has yet to become fully conscious. To do this requires linking the economic surplus of modern economies to education, in particular the education of capacities.

Along this path, the emergence of democracy and citizenhood (governance of the people by the people) out of theocracy and monarchy has necessarily entailed finding the right relationship to the state (see 5.2 The Role of the State) and to finance (see 5.3 Separation of Church, State and Economy). By ‘right relationship’ we mean ensuring that both the state and finance serve rather than dictate to the democratic citizenry, the ‘nation’.

Part of our history on the road to citizenhood, therefore, has to do with mapping when and how the state and banking insert themselves inappropriately into history, usurping citizen-based responsibility with abstractions such as ‘the national interest’ or ‘economic imperatives’, such as growth for its own sake or the need for international competitiveness.

All this, in order to become a sovereign individual and a democratic citizen, for the two are not synonymous. One can be an individual alone, without society; but to be a citizen is to be part of society.

If the three fields of culture, politics and economics are to be co-evolutionary rather than warring sectors of society, they need to be seen as emancipatory challenges to the dawning individual, whose task as far as education is concerned, becomes one of establishing (1) his own value system or culture (creed), (2) his own governance, and (3) his own funding.

5.2 The Role of the State

The road to citizenhood entails a problem, however. As the individual emancipates himself in this three-dimensional way, he necessarily becomes solitary, needing then to create society (what we do collectively) anew. This should not be equated with the state. In the first place it is a matter of citizens, who when acting collectively are societal – a competence one needs to be careful not to transfer to the state, except as an enabler. In the process from gods to kings to traders to citizens, the state has not only arisen as a necessary agent of democracy but also as the vehicle of nationhood. In its benign sense, the state is both the way in which free individuals self-govern as a collective, and the way that a nation gives itself existence.
In both roles, the state represents (or should represent) the citizens collectively – as a population subject to the same jurisdiction. But in both cases, and especially in regard to the first, the state is one thing when the instrument of societal values (such as everyone should be educated) and another when it uses the laws that give force to these values as determinants rather than reflectors of human culture and intentions.

If parents, or citizens more generally, deem it right that everyone should be educated, the state could simply then be used to ensure that all learners (or their parents) have the right to attend a school of their own choosing. It is quite different, however, if the state creates a right to education in the sense of an obligation to attend or a prescription as to what will be taught. Or takes money generally but distributes it selectively. Or in other ways assumes roles or powers over, rather than on behalf of, its citizens. The provision of educational finance via taxation, especially as a key means for achieving equitable distribution of wealth, does not require the state also to be the arbiter of education – neither as to its content nor its ‘delivery’.

5.3 Separation of Church, State and Economy

To see the individual as part of a severality – a nation rather than a mere collection of lone individuals – one needs to separate Church and state, the ecclesiastical and the secular. But if a value system given from without (including confessional differentiation) is to be thrown off, then a value system born from within has to arise. Whether individualism leads to universality will then be a key question, but anarchy has to be trusted to if universality is not to remain an imposition from without.

Separation of Church and state is also needed in the sense of education understood as educare – discussed earlier in terms of either furthering the capacities/capabilities of the one being educated for him to use as he sees fit, or of informing him so as to meet some external requirement of society. In effect, as citizens each one of us has to become a sovereign individual as regards his cultural life.

But the state also needs to be separate from the economy. The rights life between free individuals has to have its own ground, which is fairness – not equality in the sense of sameness, but in the sense that no one is above the law. This entails moving from res divina to res publica, treating one another as equal before the law.

Lastly, we need to ensure that the economy itself does not become tyrannical – does not give to money any power other than to allow the economic provision for education to be self-standing, meaning that the needs of educators have to be met out of surplus value. The watchword here should be education as an instance of equitable distribution of wealth.

As a subset of economic life, another area that requires careful consideration is the role of merchants. They came to power in the Renaissance, as a third force over against and then running alongside Church and State. Their particular strength is that they were the bearers of what came to be known as capitalism, the phenomenon of capital coming free of prior constraints and then setting its own agenda, so to speak. It is in trade that capital comes free of all past constraints, hence its further evolution as merchant banking, today’s conversion of all financial dealings into securitised debt
(funds), and the increasing prevalence of the neo-liberal policies that, in effect, represent this process in history.

In this sense, like the state, bank finance is a two-edged sword. It is inevitable that finance as such should become free of all constraints, as this is the reflection of individuation at its zenith. However, whether this process, when captured by banking, should be left to its own devices is another matter. At that stage the question arises: Does finance serve education or use education to serve itself? Does it ‘lose’ itself in the funding of education or turn education into a market, and thus a commodity, in order to justify the status of modern funding techniques, namely, to preserve capital rather than circulate it?
6.0 The Cases

The stage-setting chapters complete, we now turn to the main cases in this study, which are amply documented in the following two reports covering the period from the 6th to the 21st century in the Netherlands and England. It is from these reports that many of the foregoing and subsequent observations have been derived. These observations have in turn yielded the insights into the financing of generalised education that form the backbone of this research. The many details provided in these historical narratives are highlighted using numbers in square brackets as cross-references to section 6.3.

Some general comments

Although the reports focus on the Netherlands and England, it is clear that ideas about education tend to be universal, certainly pan-European, rather than national. Inter alia, the growth of humanism in the 14th to 16th centuries was very important for changing ideas about the content of education. Inspired by old Greek and Roman culture, humanism was a movement of scholars for whom education is much more than just learning a profession or religious worldview, it is a secular way to develop human capacities, to grow into a developed, civilized and sophisticated human being. [1]

Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536) mentioned education in many of his writings; e.g. De pueris instituendis (1529) and De civilitate morum puerilium (1530). [2] Czech philosopher and educator John Amos Comenius (1592-1670) wrote extensively about education in practice (in particular in Didactica Magna). He designed new methods and proposed, for his time, radical ideas such as equal access to all schools for all children independent of race, gender or place of birth. [3]

Although he was not a supporter of widespread education, English philosopher John Locke (1632-1704) wrote an influential work on education entitled Some thoughts concerning education (1693) which was translated into all major European languages and stimulated further thoughts and debate. [4] Also French philosopher Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) wrote an influential work entitled Émile ou De l’éducation (1762). [5] German education reformer and writer Bernhard (1724-1790) was inspired by Locke and Rousseau, and published two influential books Vorstellung an Menschenfreunde für Schulen, nebst dem Plan eines Elementarbuches der menschlichen Erkenntnisse (1768) and Elementarwerk (1774), and founded a new progressive school in Dessau called Philantropinum (1774), in which education was independent of religion and the state. [6] Sometimes decades after their introduction, a lot of ideas of these philosophers were used in debates about educational reform in the Netherlands and in other European countries.

In the 18th century the worldview of the Enlightenment supported the changing perspective on education. The Enlightenment motto was ‘reason above ignorance and superstition’. Education could and should contribute to developing human capacities. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) wrote ‘Enlightenment is man’s emergence from his self-incurred immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one’s own understanding without the guidance of another. This immaturity is self-incurred if its cause is not lack of understanding, but lack of resolution and courage to use it without the
guidance of another. The motto of enlightenment is therefore: *Sapere aude!* Have courage to use your own understanding!” (1784: 1). [7]

Contemporaneously, Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835) promoted *das Bildungsideal* (see Appendix 4). In his view education should be holistic and enable students to become individuals and world citizens. According to Humboldt, the purpose and task of the human being is to develop his intellectual, artistic, moral and practical skills as far and as harmoniously as possible. Other individuals belonging to European history generally also contributed key ideals, e.g. JS Mill, etc. [8]

Within the cultural aspect is nested the confessional dimension, a main driver of which was the question of whether god and things divine was ‘on high’ or ‘in me’. The Protestant Reformation – often simply called the Reformation – begun in 1521 by Martin Luther (1483-1546), and later continued by John Calvin (1509-1564), also influenced education heavily. According to supporters of the Reformation the purpose of education was to educate children in Protestant doctrine. And because education was still mainly determined and organized by the Church, a change in the Church meant a change in education. [9]
6.1 The Netherlands (Historical narrative)

Written by Martijn Jeroen van der Linden

The Dutch School Struggle (1806-1920)

Introduction

In the Middle Ages the idea as such of generalised access to education, let alone how to finance it, did not exist. This is a development that arose with the Renaissance, since when the awareness that education is important for the development of the individual human being and for the development of society as a whole has grown from a matter of privilege to a general human right for everybody. This changing awareness and the changing view of the human being and his role in society is key to the implementation of financing generalised access to education, which in its modern form is a question of how students finance the way they discover and put to use their capabilities.

This part of the comprehensive case study describes the historical development in the Netherlands of generalised access to education, how it was funded and the effect of that funding on freedom of education (what would be taught, how and by whom). From 1806 till 1920 the Dutch struggled with the implementation of the idea of freedom of education and its unconditional funding. The purpose of what became known as the school struggle – schoolstrijd in Dutch – was to achieve overall equivalence – in terms of freedom of underlying worldview and access to funding – between private schools (also called ‘free schools’ and ‘special schools’, in Dutch bijzondere scholen), which fall under the responsibility of school boards and parents, and public schools, which fall under the responsibility of government. [11]

Supporters of freedom of education defended the right to determine the religious or philosophical worldview underlying their children’s education; they argued that freedom of religion, freedom of conscience and freedom of education are inseparably connected. According to them, ‘neutral’ education does not exist, because in the end all knowledge is rooted in and to some extent directed by religious or philosophical convictions, and therefore endorsement of one particular, so-called ‘neutral’, worldview by the state is not only unjust, but even dangerous.

On the other hand, opponents of free education argued that the state has a duty to support children to rise above a particular religious or philosophical conviction – even if this is their parents’ worldview. In their view, in the 18th century, the state (as supra-religious) was the only institution that could ensure that the Netherlands would develop in a modern direction. Freedom of education with a diversity of doctrines was in their opinion a danger and could even destroy the unity of the Netherlands. According to historian Adriaan Goslinga, “the school struggle was really an effort to control the soul of youth; basically it was a conflict between different views of life.”(Goslinga, 1925)

---

After more than a century the ideological school struggle ended with a new article in the Dutch Constitution (Article 23) in 1917 and the enactment of a new Elementary Education Law in 1920. According to researcher Wendy Naylor, who wrote her PhD thesis on the role of Dutch politician Abraham Kuyper in the school struggle, “the Dutch have recognized that most, if not all knowledge (curriculum) and behaviour (pedagogy) is embedded in core beliefs about the nature of God, humanity, and the world” (2012: 245). The new constitution recognised (1) the right to establish, manage and operate a school regardless of religious or philosophical worldview, (2) equal access to public funding for all schools, and (3) that “all schools are accountable to the government regarding education quality and standards of hygiene and safety” (Wolf and Maceto, 2004, in Naylor, 2012, 246).

Here one can see three tasks all given to the state – educational content, ‘flat’ funding, and matters of right, things that are neither cultural nor economic. The threesome is, however, ‘contaminated’ by the inclusion in (3) of education quality, unless by that is meant some form of professional code developed by, and the responsibility of, the teaching profession itself (an issue to which we will return). In The Netherlands, in the nearly one hundred years since equal state funding for both public and private schools became guaranteed “peace” has prevailed.

According to different authors (James, 1984; Naylor, 2012) the amendment to the Dutch constitution “was unique in the history of Europe and remains unique in the world today” (Naylor, 2012, 246). Unique, because Article 23 not only regulates the right to establish a school (political) and the means of funding (economic), but also specifies quality standards (cultural). Thereby the evolution of the Dutch education system is unique in the developed world, because it moved in the opposite direction compared to (most) other countries; the Dutch shifted from a system of ‘neutral’ (relatively secular) public schools under the guidance of the state in the 19th century to a system of ‘free’ schools based on different (mainly religious) worldviews in the 20th century. (James, 1984, p. 606) Finally, also unique, because in contrast to other countries the Dutch focussed mainly on elementary education instead of higher education.

Note

It is worth noting that this report shows an ‘explosion’ of concern about and provision of education in the 18th century (more or less), an intensification of state involvement in the 19th, together with the struggle to achieve state-funding for all schools, only subject to substantial state interference (management). In 1920 the school struggle came to an end with the Pacifatie (pacification) but state funding has become de facto conditional on delivering a national curriculum with, for better or worse, all its biases. This, together with the new struggle between tax- and loan-funded education, is the story with which this study culminates.

---

18 As noted elsewhere in this study variously covers primary, secondary and tertiary education, but its main concern is topics germane to all three, namely, generalised access to education, the way this has been funded, and the question whether the financing of generally accessible education has resulted in that education being also ‘free’ – meaning able to develop according to its own imperatives rather than those of the state or the economy. See discussion in 7.2.
Early History

The first schools were established in what came to be known as the Netherlands in the 8th century (in England in 7th century) (Boekholt and de Booy 2008, pp. 3-4). The aim of these first schools was to educate priests and to spread the art of reading and writing (literacy); calculating (numeracy) was not yet part of the curriculum. The first monastery school was founded in 750 in Utrecht and a couple of years later Charles the Great (747/748 – 814) established schools to spread Christian belief and to improve literacy, which would make it easier to govern the Frankish Kingdom. In the 12th century, increased trade and gradual growth of cities contributed to the need for better-educated citizens for functions in administration, public governance (clerics) and trade (Boekholt and Booy, 2008, p. 9).

Bourgeois vs. Church

In the 14th and 15th century the Dutch population, trade and industry increased further, and a new class in society emerged, the bourgeoisie. When the bourgeoisie became more influential, they also got involved in education, which by then was no longer a monopoly of the Church. In the 15th and 16th centuries different types of schools were established and managed – e.g. city schools (stadscholen) and nursery schools (kleinkinderschooltjes); in the larger cities schools with special programs were also founded (e.g. for calculating) (Boekholt and Booy, 2008, pp. 9–13).

Children of rich families often went to private schools. But gradually new forms of education, school organization and funding were discovered. These antecedents (the different school forms) demonstrated that education could contribute to unfolding capacities/human development, and contributed to the idea of generalised access to education.

Content, purpose and effects of generalised education

Some people argued that education was a means to reduce poverty and to enable children to develop their capacities. According to Dutch historians Boekholt and de Booy (1987, p. 13), many thought and published about education and pedagogy (opvoeding) in the beginning of the 16th century. However, education was still mainly about the basic skills of reading and writing, but also (and maybe even more importantly) about spreading a religious worldview and a related moral standard.

Confessional schooling

In the decades after the reformation, reformists replaced many Roman Catholics on school boards in the Netherlands, and the religious worldview in schools changed from a Roman Catholic to a Calvinist one. In different ways Catholics tried to keep their children away from schools which promoted a different worldview than their own; some moved abroad, some decided to keep their children at home, and some decided to give their children education at home; however, for most of them there was no other choice but to send their children to a school with a Calvinist message. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 20)
In the 17th and 18th century, the Dutch Republic was a divided nation. The provinces of the Republic of Seven United Netherlands (Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Nederlanden) were more or less autonomous, there was a limited number of national laws, and a national education system did not exist.

**Funding**

The Republic had a mixed public-private school system based on fees paid at the level of the municipalities; the influence of the state on elementary education was limited and almost no state funding was available. Churches, municipalities and parents were the most important factors in education. In particular in the cities not all people were able to pay for the education of their children and the schoolmasters had no financial incentive to teach poor youth. Moreover, many children had to work, because their parents could not do without the extra income. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 42) In the cities poverty gradually increased, as did the need to support the poor. The bourgeoisie understood that they had to either invest in education for poor youth, or support the uneducated and illiterate.

**Literacy and numeracy**

Because of economic and social developments, more and more jobs required reading and writing and this is why poverty was increasingly seen as the result of illiteracy (marginalisation by illiteracy!). In the 17th century the importance of educating the poor (and therewith reducing poverty) gradually came to be recognised. This was a huge change in society and in mentality. According to Boekholt and Booy “the idea that education can solve poverty, that education can contribute to a better world, was in line with the upcoming rationalism that would come to dominate the 18th century” (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 43). The result was the first armenscholen (schools for the poor), established with the aim of reducing poverty.

**The French Revolution, classes and centralisation of education**

Despite a surge of ideas concerning education in different countries of Europe (see 6.0, some general comments), in the Netherlands, the state, the church and education remained closely associated until the French Revolution (1789-1799). The purpose, structure and method of education did not change for centuries for lack of practical people wishing to improve it. According to Boekholt and de Booy “at the end of the 18th century each class (stand) had its own education possibilities. These classes were ‘ordained by God’ (‘door God gewild’) and cherished by the elite, and the structure of education was consistent with these classes” (1987, p. 94).

This changed significantly in the 18th century, after the Batavian Revolution (Bataafse omwenteling, also sometimes called the Velvet Revolution, because of the peaceful turnover of political power) in 1795. In this year the French invaded the Republic of Seven United Netherlands and with their support the Batavian Republic was proclaimed. Soon a centralised federal government was established, national laws were enacted and a system of state-subsidised ‘neutral’ primary public schools was
implemented. The Netherlands became a united nation, the Batavian Republic, with a central government in The Hague. The organisation of education was centralised and education became an important concern of the government; a minister for education was appointed (the ‘Agent van Nationale Opvoeding’), who had the task to propose an national education law. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 89)

Under the guidance of this minister the first national education survey was executed with the aim of examining the conditions of the existing schools. [15] In 1796 the government appointed a commission to design a national education system (Commissie tot het beramen van een ontwerp van Nationaal onderwijs). Two years later the Society for the Common Good (Maatschappij tot Nut van ’t Algemeen belang) published an influential document entitled General Ideas about National Education (Algemeene Denkbeelden over het Nationaal Onderwijs). (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 96; Hooker, 2009, p. 1)

This society, which played a key role in the first phase of the Dutch school struggle, was founded in 1784 with the aim to improve “general morality through propagation of knowledge necessary thereunto amongst the lower classes”. [16] It was a product of 18th century rationalism, which considered education as a means to develop humanity. According to Boekholt and de Booy (1987, p. 97) a lot of proposals by the Society for the Common Good later became part of the education laws.

On the 15th of July 1801 the first Education Law was enacted. [17] This national (central) law superseded all existing (local) regulations and defined the purpose of public education as teaching: “reading, writing, and the first principles of arithmetic; this instruction shall be so organised that, through the development of the rational potentialities of the children . . . it shall form them into rational human beings, and further, will imprint in their hearts the knowledge and feeling of everything which they owe to the supreme being, to their parents, to themselves, and to their fellowmen.”

In the beginning in particular, the orthodox-Protestants disagreed with this new purpose of education and objected to what the new law omitted, namely, “Christian virtues, religion, and God.” (Valk, 1995, p. 166) In the worldview of the Enlightenment, and the enlightened intellectuals and leaders of the Netherlands in the beginning of the 18th century, the purpose of education was the formation of virtuous people and useful citizens.

Public and private schools

The Education Law of 1801 stated that each municipality was responsible for the establishment of sufficient schools; i.e. all children should profit form education, but school attendance was not compulsory. Teachers should receive enough wage for a reasonable living, and a system of school supervisors (schoolopzieners) and tests for teachers was implemented. Thereby the Education Law distinguished between openbare (public) funded and operated by the state, and bijzondere (special or private) schools funded and operated by private persons and churches. According to historian and writer of The History of Holland (1999) Mark T. Hooker, “[d]espite the

---

act’s [law’s] requirement that the schools be religiously neutral, the schools had a decidedly Protestant tint. Of the 35 school supervisors of this period, 32 were Protestants and 22 of them were clerics. The list of books that could be used in schools were essentially one prepared by the Society for the Common Good” (Hooker, 2009, p. 3).

Because of political unrest two new laws were enacted in the following years; a second school law in 1803 and a third, the most important for this research, in 1806.

*First Phase of the Dutch School Struggle (1806-1857): Freedom of Education*

The Education Law of 1806 (also called the Van den Ende Law on Education) enacted the principle (introduced in 1795) of classroom teaching; further regulated the supervision of schools and the requirements that teachers had to comply with; and, most importantly for this case study, (1) distinguished between public and private schools, while (2) specifying the purpose of public elementary education as “the development of all civic and Christian virtues”\(^\text{20}\) (*de opvoeding tot maatschappelijke en christelijke deugden*).\(^\text{21}\) According to this law all elementary education was a task of the state (*a de facto state monopoly*); the type of education, let alone freedom of education, was not mentioned at all.\(^\text{[18]}\)

*State-funded, neutral content*

The distinction between public and private schools, and the ‘neutral’ worldview as enunciated in regard to education would dominate Dutch politics for over a century, and become the heart of the Dutch school struggle. The subject of the debate would be the implicit assumption underlying a system of centralised state-funded ‘neutral’ public schools, namely, that knowledge is objective. With the enactment of the Education Law of 1806 (and in particular the new purpose of education) the School Struggle started. The first phase of the struggle lasted as long as the Law of 1806 was maintained, until the enactment of a new Education Law in 1857.

At the time, Dutch society was strongly divided between Catholics and orthodox-Protestants, which led to the decision to educate all children in elementary school with attention to general Christian values. From 1806 onwards it was no longer allowed to teach religious convictions in schools. Teachers were only permitted to talk about religion in as far as this concerned their history and morality (”voor zoover [het] deszelfs geschied- en zedenkundig gedeelte betreft”). According to Van Essen

\(^{20}\) Naylor (2012, 249) argues based on literature research that “The goal of schooling was re-stated as “teaching of appropriate and useful skills, so as to develop rational facilities of the children and nurture them into all Christian and civic virtues (Essen, J. L. van, 1990, pp. 56; Gilhuis, 1974, p. 38; Langedijk, 1928, p. 23; Gilhuis, 1974, p. 38).’

\(^{21}\) Available at: [http://www.denederlandsegrondwet.nl/9353000/1/9svjhf299q0s/zs/vi9k3zv7no4](http://www.denederlandsegrondwet.nl/9353000/1/9svjhf299q0s/zs/vi9k3zv7no4).

In Dutch: "dat onder het aanleren van gepaste en nuttige kundigheden, de verstandelijke vermogens van kinderen ontwikkeld en zij zelven opgeleid worden tot alle maatschappelijke en christelijke deugden”. In English (own translation): “that by learning proper and useful skills, the intellectual abilities of children shall be developed, and the children themselves shall be educated in all social and Christian values.”
“the Act was clearly a result of the principles of the French Revolution – the state could establish schools and determine the character of education: the child belonged to the state” (Essen, J. L. van, 1990, p. 56).

Two types of funding

After the implementation of the Education Law of 1806 a public education system under the control of the government existed. Two types of elementary schools were distinguished: (1) public schools funded by the state which promoted all civic and Christian values (a clear definition was lacking); and 2) private schools funded by private individuals or what would now be called non-government institutions (such as churches). Permission from the local municipalities was needed to establish and run a private (special) school, but “[s]ince the municipalities rarely granted permission, the result was a de facto State monopoly on education” (Hooker, 2009: viii).

The Education Law of 1806 did not create new types of schools; the existing schools were classified and from then on treated differently (private and public). Local municipalities had the task to establish and run proper public schools; they supplied school buildings and provided (extra) funding for the teacher’s wages. School fees paid by parents still existed and were an important source of income. In practice teachers often had additional jobs to make a living. Only in exceptional cases did the national government or the provincial administration supply funds. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 173) As already noted, the establishment of private schools was allowed, but only with the approval and the recognition of local authorities; and even if permission was granted, the authorities did not supply funds. The only option for private individuals and churches who wanted to establish a school was private funds. And even then, they were subjected to state supervision. In practice it was hard to establish and operate a private (vrije, free) school. According to van Essen, in the beginning of the 18th century:

There were two kinds of free schools: schools of the first class and schools of the second class. Those of the first class were: (1) diaconate schools and the schools of orphanages and institutions; (2) schools of the benevolent society Tot Nut van ‘t Algemeen . . .; and finally, (3) schools that were maintained by one or more persons. Schools of the second class were those maintained exclusively from tuition income and for which the schoolmaster was personally responsible. All [both public and private] schools were subject to state supervision by means of school inspectors and local school commissions. (Essen, J. L. van, 1990, pp. 55–56).

In contrast to neighbouring countries, the focus of the Dutch 18th century reform proposals was on elementary education; in other countries the educational reforms started in secondary and higher education and only later moved to elementary education. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 119) In the Netherlands in the 18th century higher education was accessible only to the upper classes of society. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 119)

After the defeat of Napoleon in 1813 at the Battle of Leipzig the Dutch tried to become independent from France. In 1814 King William I enacted a new Constitution, including the Education Law of 1806. In 1815, Belgium joined (or was forced to join) the Kingdom of the Netherlands, which lasted till 1830. [19]
The reforms in education were proposed by a relatively small group of ‘enlightened’ citizens of the upper classes, and subsequently supported by the government. ‘Enlightened’ pastors of the reformed and dissident Protestant churches also participated in these reforms, as is shown by the close involvement of the Society for the Common Good. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 132) However, ‘average’ Dutch citizens did not understand why a change in education was needed. It appears that in the beginning of the 18th century there was a wide gap between the enlightened Protestant bourgeoisie and the belief systems and morals of the majority of Dutch society.

**State ‘managed’ education**

From the beginning, large parts of the population resisted education to general “social and Christian virtues”. In practice, the education reforms were implemented slowly. In particular the Catholics in the south of the Netherlands did not implement the proposed reforms (Boekholt and Booy, 2008, pp. 140–141). Over the years protests against the ‘neutral’ general Christian schools took different forms; illegal schools were established, children were kept at home and there was resistance against the mandatory vaccination of cow-pox in public schools. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 139) Overall the quality of education did not improve. A large part of the schoolchildren did not receive more than basic education in reading, because extra payments were required for education in writing and calculating. The main purpose of education was still the development of proper moral values, and less the development of intellectual capabilities. The education authorities did not really worry because high-level and widespread education was not the aim. The parents’ level of income determined to a significant extent the school fees which could be paid and therewith the level of education.

In this period the government was of the opinion that all children should attend school, but compulsory education was still not implemented. According to the prevailing view of the beginning of the 18th century the government was not allowed to step on the rights of the parents; only indirect measures were taken to stimulate school attendance; e.g. not disbursing the dispensation to the poor and making tuition payment mandatory for all who could pay regardless of whether children attended school or not. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 115) In the 1820s first measurements were implemented to measure school attendance. However, it is unclear how reliable these statistics are, because the degree of school attendance was not measured accurately. There was often one measurement moment, and not all children went to school all year. In the countryside most children worked on the land during summer and attended school only during the winter months. Despite this fact, school attendance rose according to estimates of Dodde\(^22\) from 65.0% in 1825 to 75.1% in 1845.

The first minority to receive funds from the state to establish a school according to their own worldview was the Jewish minority. Despite many attempts of the Dutch government to oblige Jewish children to follow public education, most of the children

\(^{22}\) Cited in Boekholt and Booy (1987, p. 118).
stayed home. According to Boekholt & de Booy (1987, p. 142) there are two main reasons for this lack of participation. First, the Jewish minority of the Netherlands preferred religious education above civic education. Second, the Jewish were confronted with anti-Semitism. Attempts of the ‘enlightened’ government to integrate and assimilate the Jewish minority often led to the opposite result. In other words, in the first half of the 18th century the Jewish minority wanted to have their own space in Dutch society and their environment wanted that as well. Many Jewish schools were established (or kept); the Dutch government accepted this development and even decided to fund the Jewish schools, but did not openly enunciate this development. What was prohibited for Catholics and orthodox-Protestants, was allowed to the Jewish. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, pp. 141–142)

Poet and historian Isaac da Costa (1798-1860) was in 1823 one of the first to criticize the religious foundation of the educational system in his essay Bezwaren tegen de geest der eeuw (Objections to the Spirit of the Century). [20] Although resistance was all over the Netherlands, the discontent did not reach the Dutch Parliament in the first quarter of the 18th century. According to Mark T. Hooker “[t]he first verbal shot in the Schoolstrijd was fired in 1825 by Catholic member of Parliament Leopold van Sasse van Yssel (1778-1844) in a speech, calling for “freedom in education.” By freedom, he meant the freedom to teach not just Christian principles, but Catholic principles to Catholic children in Catholic schools.” (Hooker 2009: viii). Writer, historian and journalist Joachim George le Sage ten Broek was one of the main defenders of the Catholics. He resisted in different ways; he was founder and member of different magazines, among others of De Ultramontaan. Tijdschrift voor Dompers en Ignorantijnen. He also argued that the Society for the Common Good was ‘anti-catholic society’ and established in 1820 a new society, i.e. the Rooms-Catholijke Maatschappij ter bevordering van godsdienstige wetenschap en goede zeden voor het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden. In 1827 le Sage ten Broek spent three months in prison for “disturbing the public” order. (Hooker, 2009, p. 6)

In the southern provinces of the Netherlands (including what we now call Belgium) the resistance against the ‘neutral’ education offered in the public schools grew gradually in the 1820s. The Catholics regarded these teachings as pro-Protestant and in 1828 and in 1829 they submitted petitions to the king pleading for the right to establish and operate their own schools with their own funding. (Naylor, 2012, 250) [30] The first petition request was rejected by the Dutch parliament, and “the king refused to use his authority to overturn that decision” (Langedijk 1928: 24 in Naylor, 2012, 250). In the same years future bishop Richard Bommel (1790-1852) wrote different brochures to express the dissatisfaction of the Catholics and advanced arguments for freedom of education along the same line as arguments for freedom of religion and separation of state and church. (Hooker, 2009, pp. 6–7) The response of orthodox-Protestant to the public schools was varied. Some kept their children at home, others established their own schools in defiance of the law and still others moved to America where the freedom existed to start a school based on one’s own religion. 23 (Naylor, 2012, 250; Essen, J. L. van, 1990, p. 60)

---

23 Naylor (2012, 250); Essen, J. L. van and Morton (1990, p. 60).
Political awareness and debate

In 1830 the southern provinces seceded from the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and Belgium was established. According to Hooker, “[a]fter the Belgian Revolution, political awareness slowly began to emerge in the Netherlands” (Hooker, 2009, p. 9). In 1837 politician and publicist Groen van Prinsterer wrote “Measures used against the Dissenters held against constitutional Law” (De maatregelen tegen de Afgescheidenen aan het staatsregt getoetst). In this pamphlet he argued that “the Dutch public school system, far from being neutral, had fallen under the influence of the French revolution, which understood children to be property of the state and was imposing on children a deistic religion that was foreign to Christianity and to the Netherlands” (Naylor, 2012, 251). Groen van Prinsterer stated that Dutch parents should have the right to determine the religious worldview of their children’s education. He advocated: “Freedom of conscience, freedom of worship, freedom of education, between these there exists an indissoluble connection” (Groen van Prinsterer, Guillaume, 1903, p. 18). [21]

In 1840 a Commission on Elementary Education with six persons (among them Groen van Prinsterer) was appointed by the King to review the complaints presented in the petitions, to study the school system, and to make recommendations. The commission became immediately divided over its task and later over the issue of establishing schools based on the individual’s own worldview. Three members (half) of the commission feared, like most members of the parliament, fanaticism and argued that state schools were needed to secure individual development and national unity. Groen van Prinsterer published a dissenting note accompanying the commission’s report. About this note Hooker writes that Groen van Prinsterer:

…defended the Freedom of Education as a right, not a privilege, closely tied to the Freedom of Religion. When discussing a right, he said, decisions should not be made on the basis of a numerical majority. If there are a hundred people who oppose removing the restrictions on Freedom of Education because they are neither helped nor hurt by them, and one who supports removing them, it is the duty of the Crown to defend the right of the one against the arbitrary decision of many. Asking the approval of the many cases like this can effectively be used to countenance any form of discrimination. (Hooker, 2009, p. 12)

In Groen van Prinsterer’s view the state was not allowed to monopolise education, but the state had the duty to organise equal opportunities. In these years the supporters and proponents of free education started to organise themselves. According to Naylor “the struggle was between those who supported ‘freedom of education’ (classic liberals, the largely disenfranchised Catholics, and orthodox-Protestants) and those who opposed it (the more radical liberals and some conservatives, including the current school and state leadership (Valk, 1995)” (Naylor, 2012, 252).

24 In Dutch: “Vrijheid van geweten, vrijheid van Godsdiensstofening, vrijheid van onderwijs, hiertusschen is een onverbreekbare band.”
In 1840 Professor of Diplomacy and Political History Johan Rudolf Thorbecke, who became later prime minister and is regarded as the intellectual father of the Constitution of 1848, wrote *Proeve van herziening der grondwet volgens de Aanteekening* (*Ideas on an Amendment to the Constitution*). Thorbecke was a supporter of freedom of education for different reasons; he considered the role of the state in education as one of supervision (certification of teachers, standard examinations and inspections); the private sector should organise the rest. (Hooker, 2009, p. 15) He stated that:

One should not lament the special [private] schools, but rather consider them as a contribution of private individuals to the common good, that would otherwise have to be made by the administration. A country with only special [private] schools could do very well. Education is not a task for the government. The government must only provide for public education because special [private] persons in general do not have enough means to do so. . . . I believe that we should encourage attempts by private persons to expand the school system in every way possible.²⁵ (Cited in Savornin Lohman, A. F. de, 1889, p. 102)

In the following years the political climate changed gradually. Within the liberal party a new movement emerged which promoted freedom of education for different, non-religious, reasons. These liberals preferred responsibility to be with local institutions and with individual citizens (as opposed to a strong concentration of power at the national level). The influence of the liberals increased gradually with the foundation of and expansion of liberal newspapers like *Algemeen Handelsblad* (1828) and *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* (1943).

In 1847 Groen van Prinsterer published *Unbelief and Revolution* (*Ongeloof en Revolutie*) in which he argued that “the struggle for Constitutional Revision in 1848 was a battleground between secular rationalist and Christian first principles for the very soul of the nation” (Naylor, 2012, 251). [31] *Unbelief and Revolution* became very influential and a manifesto for the first political party in the Netherlands: the Anti-Revolutionary Party, which was founded in 1879. Groen van Prinsterer is regarded as the founder of this Protestant Christian democratic political movement in the 1840s. In *Unbelief and Revolution* Groen van Prinsterer calls himself an anti-revolutionary in the sense that he rejects the principles of the French Revolution; he wanted to remove the separation of state and church and proposed to make the Dutch Reformed Church (orthodox-Protestants) the state church in the northern provinces, and the catholic church the state church in the southern provinces Brabant and Limburg. At this time Groen van Prinsterer thought that the school struggle could be solved if all public schools would be based on the dominant religion in a region, in

²⁵ In Dutch: “Men moet de bijzondere scholen niet betreuren; maar die integendeel beschouwen als eene bijdrage van particulieren aan de gemeene zaak, waarvoor anders het Bestuur moet zorgen. Een land waar enkel bijzondere scholen zijn, zou zich zeer wel kunnen bevinden. Het onderwijzen is geene taak van Regering. De Regering moet alleen voor een publiek onderwijs zorgen, omdat de bijzondere personen gemeenlijk te kort schieten. Ik ben dus niet van de meening van den geachten spreker (Gevers Deynoot), dat eene bijzondere school eene zeldzame uitzondering moet zijn. Integendeel meen ik, dat de pogingen van particulieren om het onderwijs uit te breiden allezins aanmoediging verdienen.”
which regard he opposed the liberal vision of ‘neutral’ schools. According to Hooker he also opposed “Thorbecke’s new State, based on social legislation that sought to replace Christian charity with State charity” (Hooker, 2009, p. 11)

Constitution of 1848 and Education Law of 1857

When the liberals came to power in 1848, Thorbecke became minister and he took the principle of freedom of education into the constitutional reform and a novel constitution was ratified with the support of the Catholics. Article 194 of the constitution of 1848 reads as follows:

Public education is an object of abiding concern to the government. The institution of public education shall be regulated, with respect for everyone’s religious ideas, by law. Everywhere in the Kingdom the government shall provide adequate public primary education. The provision of education is free (vrij) except from supervision by the government, and, moreover, insofar as secondary and primary education is concerned, except for examination of the competence and morality of the teachers; these matters are to be regulated by law. (Essen, J. L. van, 1990, p. 60)

The constitution of 1848 did not change the purpose of public elementary education (education to social and Christian values), but secured freedom of education with two exceptions: (1) supervision and (2) examination of the competence and morality of the teachers, both of which remained with the government. [32] For this to be realised, a new Education Law had to be designed (based on the novel principle of freedom of the constitution) and ratified by the government; this happened finally in 1857 under the ministry of Van der Brugghen (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 145) a new Education Law was implemented. [22]

In this law many new aspects of education were organised. The development of Dutch society demanded higher educated children and this required a longer time in school and an expanded curriculum, i.e. more subjects. Different measures were adopted to improve the quality of education, such as a definition of the curriculum, the working conditions of teachers (a minimum wage), a minimum of pedagogical skills were required and a maximum number of pupils per class. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, pp. 150–151) Local authorities were given more responsibilities and more duties; central government withdrew further from elementary education.

The Second Phase of the Dutch School Struggle (1857-1920): Equal right to state funding

26 This part is largely based on Hooker (2009, pp. 10-11).
27 The Dutch text is available at: http://www.denederlandsegrondwet.nl/9353000/1/j9vvihlf299q0osr/via0istdc4zt

“Het openbaar onderwijs is een voorwerp van de aanhoudende zorg der Regering. De inrichting van het openbaar onderwijs wordt, met eerbiediging van ieders godsdienstige begrippen, door de wet geregeld. Er wordt overal in het Rijk van overheidswege voldoend openbaar lager onderwijs gegeven. Het geven van onderwijs is vrij, behoudens het toezigt der overheid, en bovendien, voor zoover het middelbaar en lager onderwijs betreft, behoudens het onderzoek naar de bekwaamheid en zedelijkheid des onderwijzers; het een en ander door de wet te regelen. De Koning doet van den staat der hooge-, middelbare en lagere scholen jaarlijks een uitvoerig verslag aan de Staten-Generaal geven.”
With the implementation of the Education Law of 1857 the second phase of the school struggle started; the focus shifted from the right to establish private (special) schools, to getting the equal right of state funding for both public and private schools. This second stage of the school struggle ended in 1920 with equal access to funding (the financiële gelijkstelling) for public and private education, since then both school types have had an equal right to state funding.

Although a clear definition of freedom of education was not formulated and different interpretations existed, the Dutch people were now officially allowed to establish and operate schools based on their religious or philosophical worldview. For a short period the supporters of freedom of education thought that the school struggle was over. However, in practice it was hard for free schools to flourish in an environment with public schools funded by the state. Naylor explains that “[t]he constitution mandated that public schools be established everywhere, all parents (except for the indigent) were levied a substantial tax to establish and maintain public schools” (2012, 253). This meant that in practice free school supporters had to pay taxes for public schools, and additional fees for private schools. Some public schools even reduced their fees to attract more children. Plenty of free school advocates simply lacked the means to fund their own school. The funding of public schools and special schools was unequal (unfair), and the lack of means made it almost impossible for the free school movement to take advantage of the freedom of education. The consequence was a next step in the political school struggle; the aim became equal access to funding for all different types of schools.

In the 1860s liberals were the main political party. They made education more secular (neutral) and this made the public schools more attractive to the Jewish citizens of the Netherlands; and the number of Jewish private schools declined gradually. But although it was expensive to establish and operate a special school, their number increased. This “clearly showed that Protestants and Catholics were willing to put their money where their mouths were on this issue of religiously neutral Public School. The high costs of the bijzondere [private] schools, however, led to increasing political pressure to amend the Lower Education Law of 1857 to permit some state funding to go to them” (Hooker, 2009, p. 20). In 1860 lawyer and professor Joannes Theodorus Buys (1826-1893) expressed his vision on education clearly:

I believe that an unlimited right to found special [private] schools is not enough to establish the freedom of education; that the artificial protection of state [public] schools—be it by extending tuition-free education to other than the needy, or through the provision of other advantages—makes special schools unviable and the granting of this right illusionary… The modern state must be a conservative institution par excellence. All movements and parties that are consistent with the law must be supported equally and simultaneously. Should it on the other hand become a tool of the majority or of a minority, used not to preserve, but to destroy everything of which the ruling movement disapproves, then we will have returned to the abuses of the old, medieval system of state, and right for all will no longer be the principle upon which life is based, the actual raison d’être of the modern state. The state is not a natural resources trading company out to develop the morals of those to whom it
belongs. That is my motto, and my motto is dearer to me even than the mixed schools.\textsuperscript{28} (cited in Savornin Lohman, A. F. de, 1889, pp. 102–103)

In the 1860s and 1870s civil and political pressure increased gradually, but the liberals did not change their view of education: a non-religious state should not fund religious schools. When Groen van Prinsterer died in 1876, Abraham Kuyper became the main advocate of freedom of education and the key person in the second phase of the school struggle.

\textit{Abraham Kuyper}

A journalist and statesman, Abraham Kuyper (1837-1920) described the problem of unfair competition between state and private schools as follows:

The State competes with the private schools but has the power, first to write the law determining how the private schools need to be managed, and secondly, through means of taxes, to take money from the private schools’ purses, in order to finance their competitive state schools? (Kuyper 1879, pp. 565-566 cited in Naylor, 2012, 256)[23]

Kuyper not only questioned the unequal right of protection of the state for Dutch people who wanted education based on a “non-neutral” worldview, but also questioned the unequal access to funding for free education:

Do the poor, the less well-to-do, have no heart, no convictions, no desires concerning their offspring? And is it acceptable to dare to use the word ‘freedom’ in a program that offers us: freedom for the rich, but coercion for the poor? (Kuyper, 1890, p. 243 cited in Naylor, 2012, 264)

In the words of Abraham Kuyper quoted above one may hear the echo of the British philosopher and political economist John Stuart Mill who, two decades earlier, had expressed similar objections against state education in \textit{On Liberty}:

A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another; and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the dominant power in the government, whether this be a monarch, an aristocracy, or a majority of the existing generation; in proportion as it is

\textsuperscript{28} Translated by Hooker (2009) In Dutch: “Ik geloof, dat een onbeperkt regt om bijzondere scholen op te rigten nog niet genoeg is om de vrijheid van onderwijs te vestigen; dat kunstmatige bescherming van de staatsschool, ‘t zij door het verstrekken van kosteloos onderwijs anders dan aan behoeftigen, ‘t zij door het toekennen van andere voordeelen, de bijzondere school feitelijk onmogelijk en dus het gegeven regt illusoir maakt. ... De moderne staat moet zijn de conservatieve instelling bij uitnemendheid; alle rigtingen en partijen, die bestaanbaar zijn met het regt, moet hij gelijkwaardig en gelijktijdig steunen. Wordt hij daarentegen een werktuig van de meerderheid of van de minderheid, bestemd niet om te bewaren maar om te vernietigen alles wat de heerschende rigting niet is toegedaan, dan keeren wij terug tot de misbruiken van het oude en middennieuwsche staatswezen, en is regt voor allen niet langer het levensbeginsel, het eigenlijke \textit{raison d’être} van den modernen Staat. De Staat geen zedelijke exploitatie-maatchappij van wie of voor wie het dan ook zijn moge! Ziedaar mijn leus, en de waarheid van die leuze is mij liever, zelfs dan de gemengde school.”
efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by a
natural tendency to one over the body. (Mill, 1859, p. 97) [24]

In short, according to Kuyper and Mill, the state should never be allowed to be(come)
an institution of moral exploitation, for or against any worldview or doctrine.
According to Kuyper, schools are based on the most important questions in human
life, answers about which consensus is impossible: “questions of anthropology and
psychology, of religion, and sociology, of pedagogy and morality” (Kuyper, 1875a,

Instead of a state-based school system, a school system based on the responsibility
and governance of local school boards would better respond to the education needs of
children and better harmonise with the moral convictions at home. These free schools
should be accountable to the parents for their worldview of education and to the state
for the academic quality. Kuyper was convinced that the Education Law of 1857 had
led to a system based on unjust competition “by arming the ‘sect school of the
modernist’ with the monies and diplomas of the state, and denying that support of free
schools” (Naylor, 2012, 262). The public schools were a means to promote and to
spread the worldview of Modernism.

Opponents of Kuyper and the free education movement argued that religion should
not have a place in elementary schools; the best way to accommodate a diversity of
worldviews was to offer at school general and rational Christianity-based teachings,
and at home and in the churches parents were allowed to teach a worldview of their
choice. According to the liberal leaders of the time this ‘neutral’ teaching of
‘universally acknowledged facts’ was not only possible, but also the only ethical
option, necessary to protect the freedom of conscience in a country with a diversity of
worldviews.

Kuyper did not agree and “was adamant that state schools had become what he called
‘anti-Church’ (Kuyper, 1879, p. 465, 1875b, 1879: 465) and insisted that forcing all
children to attend so-called neutral schools was as grievous an injustice as forcing all
children to attend Calvinist or Catholic schools” (Naylor, 2012, 262). He argued that
when the state was responsible for the teaching of all children, it would also
determine its moral education and morality, and “the school would become a de-facto
summarises the two opposite views clearly and concisely:

The antithesis between the Anti-Revolutionaries and the Liberals could not
have been more clearly laid out. The Liberal party viewed religious education
as pedagogically irresponsible, conducive to religious hatred, destructive of
national unity, and intentionally designed to make children dependent upon
the church. Kuyper and the Anti-Revolutionary Party viewed the so-called
“neutral” education as repressively dogmatic, pedagogically harmful, morally
corrupt and intentionally designed to make children dependent upon the state.
(Naylor, 2012, p. 266)

Kuyper reminded the supporters of freedom of education that in recent decades the
school struggle had moved from being generally considered a power struggle to an
engagement of fundamental principle. According to him freedom of education was
the basis of freedom of thought and freedom of development, and its funding a necessary condition for a free society.\textsuperscript{29} He understood the need for cooperation around a clear first principle and a specific agenda. Important for the course of the school struggle was the foundation of the Anti-Schoolwetverbond in 1872. The main goal of the Alliance was an amendment of the constitution article about education. Medio 1873 the alliance had already 10,000 members. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 214) In 1874 Kuyper became a Member of Parliament and he combined his membership with activities outside parliament. He was leader of the orthodox-protestant pillar (\textit{zuil} in Dutch), was chief editor of the newspaper ‘De Standaard’, and founder of the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam and the Anti-Revolutionary Party. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 214) With the support of Groen van Prinsterer, but against the resistance of many Christian leaders, Kuyper officially established the Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP) in 1879. In the founding document of the ARP, titled Our Program (\textit{Ons Program}), Kuypers argued that “schools governed by an association of parents and community leaders are far more likely to teach the real needs of the children and far less likely to use schools as a means of social engineering (Kuyper 1879, p. 482-483, Naylor, 2012, p. 256).

In Kuyper’s view society consists of distinct spheres, “each of which could only thrive according to its own God-given life dynamic and norms. He believed that God delegated His authority to each of these spheres in different ways (Kuyper and Bratt, 1998)” (Naylor, 2012, 256). According to Kuyper “the state was not equipped to govern life in the social spheres (education, the arts, science, and the media). This social doctrine of “sphere sovereignty” provided him with a theoretical grounding for limited government very different from classical liberalism” (Naylor, 2012, p. 256). Schools could only flourish within civil society under the direct control of associations of parents, free from politics, the state and the church. Naylor summarises:

\begin{quote}
. . . for 40 years Kuyper consistently argued for an education system whereby the state should equally fund \textit{no} schools rather than equally funding \textit{all} schools. While recognizing that indigent parents should receive state financial aid in order to provide their children’s education, he also insisted that such provisions fall under the welfare laws, not the education laws (Kuyper 1879, p. 475). (Naylor, 2012, p. 257)
\end{quote}

Kuyper also argued that the education could only excel if there was real competition between all schools.

\textit{Political battle and petitions}

In politics Kuyper consistently discussed with the liberals, who he knew to be divided. Slowly liberals changed their mind about the role of the state in education. Therefore, Kuyper tried to unite the Catholics and orthodox Protestants in their struggle for freedom of education against the Liberals. An important step was the

\textsuperscript{29} Whether one of causation or coincidence, here the link between state-funding as the modality of financing generalised education and the freedom of the education so financed is made crystal clear. See 7.2.
initiation of a National People’s Petition in 1878 by Kuyper, De Geer van Jutphaas and de Savornin Lohman with the aim to start a mass movement. Following the orthodox-Protestants, the Catholics decided to start their own petition based on their own first principle. Both petitions could be signed from the middle of the year and became very successful. “Within days the petitions gained 305,869 Protestant signatures, 164,000 Catholic signatures, and the support of 42\textsuperscript{30} church councils. For the first time in the school struggle, Dutch Christian citizens had spoken in unison. To have garnered half a million signatures in a nation that comprised only four million people and only 127,000 voters was a remarkable achievement (Ginsburg 1952, p. 23). . .” (Naylor, 2012, 269). Subsequently “The petition was presented to the King who eventually decided to side with the voice of Parliament (representing 127,000 voters) rather than listening to the voice of such a large portion of his subjects (most of whom had no representation in the Parliament)” (Naylor, 2012, 269). [25]

The petitions did not lead to the desired result immediately, but built a network for communication and mobilization. This grass root organization with committees at different levels was essential for the future success of the free school movement. Another important step was the collaboration between the ARP and the Catholic party. For the first time in Dutch history Catholics and orthodox-Protestants joined forces in politics; their aim was to expel the state out of education; both favoured public funding for private schools based on different worldviews above a national system of public schools. Still, many Dutch Catholics and orthodox-Protestants kept their children out of school as a form of protest and a lack of money to pay for a private school.

In 1878 a new Education Law was enacted (also called the Kappeijne Law on Education); this law set new standards that increased the costs of operating a school significantly. The state funded 30\% of the public elementary schools to the municipalities, wages for teachers were raised, and retirement arrangements, redundancy schemes and stricter rules for school building were implemented. Between 1878 and 1882 the expenses of municipalities remained the same; the government expenses increased form \(f\) 876,000 to 4,665,000. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 174) The law of 1878 was regarded as a victory for the liberals, and improved the quality of elementary education. After the enactment the Protestants and Catholics found common ground and started to work together in a coalition, e.g. “[i]n mixed voting districts, Catholic voters cast their ballots for Anti-Revolutionary candidates, so that Kuyper’s Party began to make slow gains on the Liberals” (Hooker, 2009, p. 23). [26]

School attendance increased steadily in the second half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. On January 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1858 75\% of all children between the age of 6 and 12 went to school. This percentage rose to almost 90 in the 1880s, and after the introduction of obligatory education to almost 100. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 160) The proponents of free education were opponents of mandatory education as long as the school struggle continued.

\textsuperscript{30}Hooker (2009, pp. 22) claims 421 instead of 42 church councils.
**First coalition cabinet**

In 1887 the Dutch Constitution was revisited, resulting in a doubling of the number of adult males allowed to vote to 28%. Shortly thereafter the ARP-Catholic coalition had (with the support of one Conservatives) for the first time in history a small majority over the Liberal party, which was dominated by Dutch Reformed Church. Baron Mackay became prime minister of the first coalition cabinet in the history of the Netherlands. Article 194 was reinterpreted which led to a new status of private schools. A revised Education Law was submitted in 1889, the Mackay Act. This law recognised the legal status of free schools and allowed government (partly) funding of private schools to cover operational expenses. This was an important step in the process towards *financiële gelijkstelling* (equal access to funding). In the same year politician Alexander de Savornin Lohman wrote *De Pacificatie* (The Pacification) in which he explains in detail the issue of and the different arguments in the School Struggle. About the new education law he wrote: [27]

> For the first time in our land an education law has been accepted, that can be called a true compromise, a transaction, not in the sense that each party has given up something in turn or let go of one of this principles, but rather in the sense that its composition was motivated by a desire not to consciously advantage one party or another, and that continual efforts were made to remove everything from the legislation that could lead to iniquity or corruption.  

[Savornin Lohman, A. F. de, 1889, pp. 100–101]

Naylor explains that “[i]n the years to come, laws were passed, which gradually increased the amount of subsidies to free schools until finally, in 1917, the constitution was amended to grant religious schools complete equality with public schools” (2012, 271). In 1891 the coalition fell on the issue of individual military conscription, and this resulted in a ten year control of the Dutch Parliament by the liberals. (Hooker, 2009, p. 24) In 1897 the ARP and the Catholics resolved their differences and resumed cooperation. (Hooker, 2009, p. 142) [28]

In the years between 1888 and 1917 the issue of funding private education was the main topic in Dutch politics. On the one hand there were Christian parties like ARP, CHU and Algemene Bond, on the other hand secular parties (mainly the liberals). The Law of 1887 realised equal rights (*rechtsgelijkheid*) of public and private education, but in practice this did not mean equal treatment. The national government still supported public education and private education still had to attract a large part of its funding itself. However, the situation of unfair competition improved gradually; it was no longer allowed to offer public education for free to compete with private schools, and also for public schools a school fee was required (an exception was made for the poor youth). In exchange for subsidies, private schools accepted quality requirements set by the government, which made education more dependent on the

---

31 Translated by Hooker (2009). In Dutch: “Voor de eerste maal in ons land is eene schoolwet aangenomen, die in waarheid een compromis, eene transactie kan worden genoemd ; niet in dien zin, dat elke partij beurtenis wat heeft toegegeven op, of losgelaten van haar beginselen, doch in dezen zin, dat bij haar samenstelling het streven heeft voorgezet, om geene enkele richting als zoodanig te bevoordeelen, en dat steeds gepoogd werd om alles wat tot onbillijkheid of knoeierij zou kunnen aanleiding geven uit de wet te verwijderen.”
state. At the end of the 19th century the state demanded smaller school classes and better facilities; the small subsidies stimulated and supported private schools, and made it possible to fulfil the new requirements.

During the second part of the 19th century, the municipalities and the national government increasingly became the funders of education. The total government expenses for elementary education increased from 1.2 million guilders in 1858 to 8.3 million guilders in 1880 (national: circa f 250,000 to 2.2 million guilders; municipalities f 973,000 to 5.5 million; province in 1880 600,000 guilders), to 23 million guilders in 1906. (Boekholt and Booy, 1987, p. 174)

In 1900 a new law made elementary education compulsory; children between 6 and 12 years had to attend schooling of six grades. From 1901 to 1905 Kuyper was prime minister and led the second Dutch coalition government. [33] Government funding (subsidies) for private schools expanded gradually, and extended to special (bijzondere) private gymnasia. However, financiële gelijkstelling (equal access to funding) was impossible, because of a lack of resources. [29]

**Constitution reform and a new education law**

In 1913 liberal Prime Minister Cort van der Linden converted two ‘pacification’ commissions; one about voting reform and one to resolve the issue of education. Chairman of the education commission was liberal Dirk Bos, vice-chairman was ARP politician Alexander de Savornin Lohman. The view of the latter reached to both sides of the debate; de Savornin Lohman argued that public and private schools are not competitors, but a component part of the education system, and fiscal equality for both types of schools guaranteed freedom of choice. (Hooker, 2009, pp. 26, 92) The commission’s final report came out in 1916. [34] “It recommended the fiscal equality of both Public and Bijzonder [special or private] Schools and proposed an amendment to the constitution, specifically to the article on education, which removed the word Openbaar (‘public’) from the phrase: “public education is a matter of continuing government responsibility”. This removed all doubt the admissibility of government support to Bijzonder Schools” (Hooker, 2009, p. 26).

In 1917 the Constitution was amended. Article 192 of the Constitution added:

> Special primary education that answers the conditions set by the law will be funded from the public budget by the same measure as public [i.e. state] education. The law determines the conditions on which the public budget will fund special secondary education.  

Finally, freedom of education and equal access to funding had clear definitions. All Dutch citizens had the right to establish schools based on their own religious, philosophical, ideological and educational worldview or conviction, and all public and private schools had equal access to funding if they met certain qualitative standards provided by the Ministry of Education. Since then the Inspection of Education supervises the quality of all public and private schools.

In the years immediately following, a new education law was designed. This law was ratified by the government in 1920, and implemented on January 1st, 1921. Its implementation marked the end of the school struggle. From 1921 onwards groups of parents (and other private individuals and institutions) were allowed to establish new private schools. The national government regulates education (certification, supervision, training, etc.) and covers teachers’ salaries; local governments cover the costs of school buildings and other operational expenses.

1921 to Second World War

In the years between 1920 and the Second World War many public schools turned into private schools, and churches established may new private schools. In 1850 77% of elementary schools were public and 23% private, in 1900 69% versus 31%, in 1958 28% versus 72%. Of those in the private schools in 1958, 27% were in Protestant schools, 43% in Roman Catholic, and 2% in ‘neutral’ or non-denominational school. (Reller, 1963, p. 22) Gradually also more schools were established with a particular worldview, often based on the ideas of education reformers, e.g. the first Montessori school in 1916, the first *Vrije School* (Waldorf School) in 1923, the first Dalton school in 1923 and a *Werkplaats Kindergemeenschap* in 1926, and later, after WW2, the first Jenaplan school in 1962. [35] In contrast to most other developed countries where public general education grew fast in this period, in the Netherlands private pluralistic education expanded.

The rapid spread of private schools and the rapid increase of its costs, led to heated debates. In 1930 the costs of public and private schools were compared, and public schools turned out to be more expensive. In that year there were 772,521 pupils in 4,378 public schools and 427,072 pupils in 3,175 public schools; the cost per pupil was 90.40 guilders at private schools and 118.30 at public schools. (Hooker, 2009, p. 27)

The provisions made for elementary schools were gradually extended after 1920 to nursery schools, secondary schools, and tertiary schools. [36] Government spending on education increased rapidly from 12 million Euros in 1900 to 81 million Euros in 1920 and 107 million Euros in 1940.[33]

In the first decades after the School Struggle the government looked after the implementation of freedom of education and restricted its activities in education to administrative, financial and juridical tasks. Schools were heavily regulated on inputs

---

[33] Database Central Bureau voor Statistiek (accessed March 23, 2015): http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=80509NED&D1=0-1,3-4,6-7,9-11,13-14,16-18&D2=0,5,10,15,20,25,30,35,40,45,50,55,60,65,70,75,80,85,90,95,100,105-110&HD=120118-1003&HDR=T&STB=G1
(such as costs, wages) and less on output (curriculum and degree requirements, i.e. content). This is called the period of ‘distributive policy’; a period in which the national government and municipalities had a limited role and in which citizens decided the direction (i.e. content, method and organization) of education.

Second World War till Now

After WW2 the role of the government in education changed gradually into a period of ‘constructive policy’. In addition to administrative, financial and juridical tasks, the government increasingly developed and took responsibility for policy. In particular since the end of the 1960s it was the government itself, through the ministry of education, that developed education reforms. The idea that education and society are ‘maakbaar’ (‘designable’) became increasingly accepted, and following this reasoning the government increasingly used education ‘to create (a better) society’.

In 1968 the Law on Secondary Education (known as Mammoetwet, literally “Mammoth Law”), was enforced. [37] This law introduced four streams of secondary education: pre-vocational education (LTS/VBO), lower general secondary education (MAVO), general secondary education (HAVO) and pre-university education (VWO), and expanded compulsory education to 9 years of education. This reform was supposed to improve the connections between the different levels of education. In 1998, VBO (pre-vocational education) and MAVO (lower general secondary education) were combined into VMBO (pre-vocational secondary education).

In 1970 Philippus Jacobus Idenburg published Naar een constructieve onderwijspolitie (‘Towards a constructive education policy’) in which he argued that the education policy of the Dutch government was too restricted; there was only attention for the distribution of resources, and not for problems like geographical and social inequality and education reform. (Bronneman-Helmers, 2011, p. 23) Idenburg suggested a ‘constructive policy’; i.e. the government should formulate aims for education and an innovation strategy to reach these aims. In 1973 minister van Veen added a Nota inzake het onderwijsbeleid (Memorandum on education policy) to the education budget, in which he stated that increasingly ‘an active, “co-thinking”, and – when needed – guiding policy’ was asked from the government. (Bronneman-Helmers, 2011, p. 23) According to Bronneman-Helmers (2011, p. 14), a discussion paper by minister van Kemenade in 1975, entitled Contouren van een toekomsting onderwijsbestel (Contours of a future education system), has been the most important manifestation of the development towards a ‘constructive policy’. In this paper it is argued that the education system could be used to distribute knowledge, power and income in the long term. [38]

In 1972 the text of Article 23 of the Dutch constitution was changed; the possibility for state investigation into competence and decency (de mogelijkheid tot bekwaamheids- en zedelijkheidsonderzoek) was expanded from primary and secondary education to other forms of education, e.g. university education. [39] The years 1976 and 1985 saw proposals to revise (to simplify) the constitutional law on

---

34 ‘actief, meedenkend en – waar nodig – sturend beleid’ (Ibid.).
35 Available at (Accessed March 25, 2015): http://www.denederlandsegrondwet.nl/9353000/1/fj9vvihi9f299q0sr/vi9fki3zv7nq4
education, but both attempts failed. In 2006 the possibility for private and public schools to cooperate within a newly established public school (a legal entity) was added to the Constitution (Article 23).

Because of economic stagnation and changing economic policies in the beginning of the 1980s, economic motives became also more important in education, and the Dutch government attempted increasingly to connect the education system with the ‘labour market’. (Bronneman-Helmers, 2011, p. 25) As a consequence, the influence of businesses on education increased gradually, and subsequently a business logic of efficiency, return on investment and economies of scale have entered the education system in recent decades. [41]

After WW2 government spending on education increased further from 252 million Euros in 1950, 3,683 million Euros in 1970, 13,530 euro in 1990, and 39,581 million Euros in 2013. As a percentage of GDP, government spending on education rose from 2.7% in 1950 to 5.7% in 2013.36

After almost a century Article 23 of the Dutch constitution still generates discussions because the article is interpreted in different ways by some of the main political streams. Sometimes the discussion focuses on confessional education versus non-confessional education, other times on public versus private schools. In recent decades in particular some members of the liberal party (VVD) have argued to change Article 23 drastically, and some have even proposed to abolish Article 23 altogether. (Bronneman-Helmers, 2011, p. 37) In their opinion, perhaps surprisingly for a liberal party, Article 23 enables private schools to develop an own value system and this prevents the integration of minorities.

In the 1980s, lawyer Mouringh Boeke criticised the Dutch constitution because in it one finds “within a single article, the responsibility for education, the freedom of education, the funding of education, and the quality requirements, all entrusted to the state. Mutually contradictory mandates in one hand.” (Boeke, 1987, p. 43). This constitution has three consequences; first, the quality of state education itself cannot be tested; second, it excludes the possibility to educate on the basis of other views; third, even schools that are not funded by the state have to meet the state’s quality criteria. [42]

In terms of funding education, Boeke proposes what we in this study call ‘curriculum-neutral capitation’, that is,

the government collects money from those liable to taxation and puts this at the disposal of those having the right to education. What and how education takes place and who undertakes it are affairs in which the state is not allowed to intervene. (Boeke, 1987, p. 45)
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36 Database Central Bureau voor Statistiek (accessed March 23, 2015): http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=80509NED&D1=0-1,3-4,6-7,9-11,13-14,16-18&D2=0.5,10,15,20,25,30,35,40,45,50,55,60,65,70,75,80,85,90,95,100,105-110&HD=120118-1003&HDR=T&STB=G1
According to Boeke, if state education exists, it should exist side by side with state-independent education on the basis of equal rights. This is the essence of the constitutional change in 1917.

In his article, Boeke proposes a concrete constitutional change to make this possible – based on the idea that the domain of the state is law and regulation, not the contents of education.

In 2011, a proposal was made for a new law for “strengthening the position of teachers” in primary, secondary and tertiary education. The proposed law places the responsibility for the design and execution of educational policy, as well as for policy with respect to the quality of education37 with teachers (Huisman, P. W. A., 2011, p. 21). [43] At the same time, however, teachers remain answerable to a board above them. The motivation for and outcome of this proposal is as yet unclear.
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6.2 England (Historical narrative)

The following notes, abridged and in places annotated by CHB, are from *Education in England: a brief history* by Derek Gillard (2000), an exhaustive exploration and account of the development of education in England from the earliest schools in the sixth century, through the establishment of the state education system in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to current concerns about government policies. It aims to explain how we got to where we are now.

Leach (1915, pp. 6–7) notes that grammar schools and song schools ‘have often been confounded as if they were one school’ but he argues that they were ‘distinct foundations, completely differentiated in function as they were in their teaching, and generally in their government’, though ‘[i]n small places they were sometimes united under one master’. [44]

It seems likely that the very first grammar school was established at Canterbury in 598, endowed – along with Augustine’s church – by King Ethelbert, who was baptised in June 597. Canute was concerned about the education of poor boys: whenever he went to any famous monastery or borough he sent there at his own expense boys to be taught for the clerical or monastic order.

By about 1100 all the cathedrals and collegiate churches had schools: the schoolmaster was one of their most important officers and teaching was one of their most important functions. But new schools were springing up, not all of them provided by the churches: ‘On the contrary, in every town of considerable population there was a demand for, and consequently a supply of schools’ (Leach, 1915, p. 115). [45]

Some schools – like those at Bedford, Christchurch and Waltham – were removed from monastic control and handed over to secular canons. Bury St. Edmund’s School, for example, which had probably been founded as part of a collegiate church before Canute’s time, was given an endowment at the end of the twelfth century to convert it into a ‘free or partially free grammar school’ (Leach, 1915, p. 119). [46]

And what of the teaching in medieval England’s schools? Leach (1915, p. 136) says they ‘gave no education fit to be called a liberal education’. While education was still seen as a Christian enterprise, the concept of a liberal education – a preparation for the specialised study of law, medicine, or theology – began to develop. The concept of the Seven Liberal Arts (the trivium of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic, the quadrivium of music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy) goes back to at least the fifth century, but it was only now that it began to be realised with any adequacy, as new material from classical learning, and new attitudes towards it, flowed in. (Williams, 1961, p. 130) [47]

Change was not limited to the schools: by the beginning of the 13th century universities were beginning to develop. There is evidence of some teaching in Oxford as early as 1096, which developed rapidly after 1167, when Henry II banned English students from attending the University of Paris. In 1188 the historian Gerald of Wales
visited Oxford to speak to the dons and two years later Emo of Friesland became the university’s first overseas student. By 1201, the university was led by a ‘magister scolarum Oxonie’ and in 1214 he was given the title of Chancellor. The masters were recognised as a universitas or corporation in 1231. These early colleges were founded by bishops and catered exclusively for wealthy graduates. Cambridge: By 1226 the scholars had formed themselves into an organisation, represented by an official called a Chancellor. [48]

There were no professors: the teaching was conducted by masters who had themselves undertaken the course and who had been approved or ‘licensed’ by their colleagues (the universitas). The only difference between the university college, with its church attached, and the collegiate church, with its schools of grammar and song attached, was that the latter were primarily for religious services and secondarily for education, and the former were primarily for education and secondarily for religious services.

As we have seen, the control of the Church over education was beginning to diminish during this period. (It was, of course, never removed entirely: indeed, religious provision of schools is still a significant – and growing – feature of education in England today.

There were a number of challenges for the Church:

- first, the development of philosophy, medicine and law, together with the needs of a developing secular society, removed parts of the curriculum from church supervision;

- second, the new universities were determined to be independent ‘corporate learned bodies’ deciding their own conditions for granting degrees and hence licences to teach’ (Williams, 1961, p. 131);

- third, by the end of the 15th century the network of grammar and song schools had been joined by a number of ‘independent’ schools, for ‘ruling class boys’ who paid fees. [49]

Founded in 1384, Winchester’s special significance was that, though connected with New College, it was a separate and distinct foundation for boys, ‘a sovereign and independent corporation existing by and for itself, self-centred and self-governed’ (Leach, 1915, p. 208).

In 1458, the great schoolmaster, William Waynflete, founded Magdalen College, ‘and attached to it not one but two schools, one at his native place, Wainfleet, in Lincolnshire, in 1459, the other Magdalen College School, by the gates of the college at Oxford’ (Leach, 1915, p. 270). At the latter he provided for a master to be paid £10 a year and an usher (his deputy) £5, ‘to teach all comers freely and gratis without exaction of anything’ (quoted in Leach, 1915, p. 270). [50]

1500-1600 Renaissance and Reformation

Two forces reshaped Europe during this period. The Renaissance (literally ‘rebirth’)
was a cultural movement which began in Italy in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century and spread across the continent during the following three hundred years. It is mainly thought of in relation to artistic endeavours – the development of linear perspective in painting, for example – but it also encompassed a resurgence of learning from classical sources and more general ‘humanist’ educational reform based on reasoning and empirical evidence. Pico della Mirandola’s famous public discourse of 1486, \textit{De hominis dignitate (Oration on the Dignity of Man)}, has been seen as the ‘Manifesto of the Renaissance’. [51]

The \textit{Reformation}, which established Protestantism as a branch of Christianity, was prompted by discontent at the perceived worldliness of the Papacy and the financial demands it made. As early as the 14\textsuperscript{th} century the Lollards, led by John Wycliffe, and the Hussites, followers of the Czech reformer Jan Hus, began to attack the hierarchical and legalistic structure of the Church. But the Reformation is usually reckoned as beginning in 1517, when Martin Luther famously protested at church corruption and the selling of indulgences. The movement against Rome spread across Europe over the next two centuries. [52]

\textit{The English Reformation}

In England, the Reformation was a much more localised affair, which centred on King Henry VIII’s disputes with Rome over the status of his various marriages.

Under Henry’s leadership, the English Reformation affected education in a number of ways. Some of the old foundation schools were closed and an equal number of new ones were opened. Many older schools were revived, expanded, or converted into free schools. The grammar school remained central to the system, but there was an important change in its sponsorship. Whereas the typical medieval grammar school had belonged to the Church, the new grammar schools were mostly private foundations ‘supervised in variable degree by Church and State’ (Williams, 1961, p. 132). These refounded schools would provide ‘the greater part of the education of England till the eighteenth century’ (Leach, 1915, p. 316). [53]

In Italy, Spain, Portugal, Flanders, the most populous and naturally the richest countries, the Renaissance was strangled almost in its cradle by monasticism in its most formidable development, the Inquisition: while its growth was stunted in France and Germany by the prolonged series of wars and massacres between the upholders of monasticism and the friends of free thought. Its full development was reserved for England and Scotland, where the monasteries, and with them clerical celibacy, were suddenly and wholly swept away. (Leach, 1915, pp. 331–332)

The main educational theories of the Renaissance – especially the ideal of the scholar-courtier - had little effect on English schools. In fact, Williams argues that they had ‘the paradoxical effect of reducing the status of schools’ in favour of an alternative pattern, ‘drawing in part on the chivalric tradition, of education at home through a private tutor’ (Williams, 1961, p. 133), a preference which, for many families, would last well into the nineteenth century.
Apprenticeships and chivalry
As early as the 16th century – and more so in the 17th – there was much criticism of the limited curriculum of the grammar schools, based as it was on the requirements of the universities and the learned professions. In particular, it no longer suited the needs of the upper classes, who wanted their sons trained for posts at Court, for diplomacy and for higher appointments in the army.

As a result, two other types of educational provision became popular with the upper classes: apprenticeships in crafts and trades, which were standardised in the Elizabethan Statute of Artificers in 1562; and the chivalry system, which enabled noble families to send their young sons to be pages at great houses and undergo a course of training for knighthood. Williams (1961, p. 131) points out that:

The existence of these two systems, alongside the academic system, reminds us of the determining effect on education of the actual social structure. The labouring poor were largely left out of account, although there are notable cases of individual boys getting a complete education, through school and university, by outstanding promise and merit. For the rest, education was organised in general relation to a firm structure of inherited and destined status and condition: the craft apprentices, the future knights, the future clerisy. [54]

Elsewhere in Europe – in France and in the German and Scandinavian states – knightly or courtly academies were being founded to give instruction to young nobles, not only in horsemanship and the use of arms, but also in modern languages, history and geography, and in the application of mathematics to military and civil engineering.

Although the traditional grammar school changed little, there were significant developments in the education of younger children. The number of schools increased and there was ‘a bewildering variety of forms, ranging from instruction by priests to private adventure schools, often as a sideline to shopkeeping and trade’ (Williams, 1961, p. 133). Many of the ‘petties’ or ‘ABCs’ were proper schools, with links to grammar schools. Indeed, in a few cases, they virtually took over the running of grammar schools whose old endowments had shrunk.

Another type of school which began to develop was the ‘writing school’. The aim of these schools was to meet the secular needs of a society in which trade was now expanding rapidly and whose administration was becoming more complex. They taught ‘scivener’s English and the casting of accounts’ (Williams, 1961, p. 133) and in some cases this teaching was adopted by the grammar schools. [55]

In contrast, Ascham stressed the importance of play in education. ‘The Scholehouse should be in deede, as it is called by name, the house of playe and pleasure, and not of feare and bondage.’ He set up his own school, funded by Richard Sackville.

1600-1800 The concept of universal education
In the 17th and 18th centuries there were important developments in educational theory and the school curriculum began to take on a form we would recognise today.

The modern concept of a common education emerged in Europe after the Reformation amid quarrels between learned groups of Protestants, and between the Protestants and the established monastic orders. Comenius (1592-1670), a Czech teacher, scientist, educator and writer, was one of the earliest champions of universal education, a concept he developed in his 1632 book *Didactica magna*. He argued that teachers and learners should leave the divisive sects and unite in common institutions of learning.

He went on to develop the idea of human learning as a progression from youth to maturity and from elementary to advanced knowledge. ‘Nothing should be taught to the young’, he wrote, ‘unless it is not only permitted, but actually demanded by their age and mental strength’ (Comenius, 1632, quoted in Nunes, (undated)). ‘These three elements of commonality, community and progression have characterised most education systems developed since’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 1).

Comenius stressed the educational importance of the first six years of a child’s life and developed the idea of teaching children of five or six ‘without any tediousnesse to reade and write, as it were in a continual course of play and pastime’ (*Informatorium der Mutterschul*, Leszno, 1633, quoted in Hadow, 1933, p. 24). In 1640, the House of Commons invited Comenius to England to establish and participate in an agency for the promotion of learning. It was intended that by-products of this would be the publication of ‘universal’ books and the setting up of schools for boys and girls. At the start of the Civil War in 1642 Comenius left England, but the plan was furthered by Samuel Hartlib with the backing of Oliver Cromwell.

After the execution of Charles I in 1649, the period of the Commonwealth (1649-1660) saw many proposals made for modifying the traditional courses in schools and universities. Unfortunately, following the Restoration of Charles II in 1660 there was ‘a virtual abandonment of the interventionist role of the state in education provision’ (Chitty 2007:9). The liberal movement was checked and the endowed grammar schools tended to become even more conservative than before. [56]

The grammar schools of the period can be categorised in three groups:

- the nine leading schools, seven of them boarding institutions, maintained the traditional curriculum of the classics and mostly served ‘the aristocracy and the squirearchy’ (Williams, 1961, p. 134) on a national basis;

- most of the endowed grammar schools served their immediate localities and had a reasonably broad social base, but they, too, stuck mainly to the old curriculum;

- the grammar schools which changed most significantly were those situated in the larger cities, serving the families of merchants and tradesmen. During the 18th century their social base widened and their curriculum developed, particularly in mathematics and the natural sciences.
By the end of the 17th century there was much argument between the ‘ancients’ and ‘moderns’ over the changes that were gradually taking place in the curriculum, and an increasing demand for ‘useful studies’ (Spens, 1938, p. 12).

**Urbanisation**

By the beginning of the 18th century, then, the curriculum was beginning to take on its modern form, with the addition of mathematics, geography, modern languages, and, crucially, the physical sciences.

The first significant attempt to meet the needs of children in the growing towns and cities was that of the Charity School movement, which began to develop around the end of the 17th century. This proved to be something of a mixed blessing, however, because the main aim of the Charity Schools was ‘the moral rescue as opposed to the moral instruction of the poor’ (Williams, 1961, p. 135) and because they established the notion that elementary education was that appropriate to a particular social class.

It was the Industrial Revolution, which gathered pace in the last quarter of the 18th century, which finally spurred the state into providing a national education system, because industry ‘required much more than limited reading skills acquired through moral catechism’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 1). However, progress in establishing a public education system would prove to be painfully slow.

Perhaps the first sign that the state was beginning to acknowledge some responsibility for the conditions in which the poor - and particularly poor children - lived, was Peel’s Factory Act of 1802: ‘An Act for the preservation of the health and morals of apprentices and others employed in cotton and other mills and cotton and other factories’. The Act required an employer to provide instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic during at least the first four years of the seven years of apprenticeship. Such secular instruction was to be part of the twelve hours of daily occupation beginning not earlier than 6am and ending not later than 9pm. Many of the apprentices were young pauper children who were frequently brought from distant workhouses to labour in the cotton mills.

Alongside the upheaval of industrialisation, the process of democratisation got under way with the Representation of the People Act 1832 (commonly known as the Reform Act), which gave a million people the right to vote. As regards education, in 1816, of 12,000 parishes surveyed, 3,500 had no school, 3,000 had endowed schools of varying quality, and 5,500 had unendowed schools of even more variable quality.

Various types of school

To fill the gaps, and to provide for England’s newly-industrialised and (partly) enfranchised society, various types of school began to be established to offer some basic education to the masses.

*Sunday schools* taught the poor – both children and adults – to read the Bible, but not to do writing or arithmetic or any of the ‘more dangerous subjects’ which were ‘less necessary or even harmful’ (Williams, 1961, p. 136).
Schools of industry were set up to provide the poor with manual training and elementary instruction. Such a school opened at Kendal in the Lake District in 1799. According to the Records of the Society for Bettering the Conditions of the Poor (III. 300-312): ‘...the children were taught reading and writing, geography and religion. Thirty of the older girls were employed in knitting, sewing, spinning and housework, and 36 younger girls were employed in knitting only. The older boys were taught shoemaking, and the younger boys prepared machinery for carding wool. The older girls assisted in preparing breakfast, which was provided in the school at a small weekly charge. They were also taught laundry work. The staff consisted of one schoolmaster, two teachers of spinning and knitting, and one teacher for shoemaking.’ (Hadow, 1926, pp. 3–4)

In the rival monitorial schools of Lancaster and Bell, as in the Sunday schools, the teaching was based on the Bible, but using a new method which Bell called ‘the steam engine of the moral world’ (quoted in Williams, 1961, p. 136). [60]

Bell’s method involved the use of monitors and standard repetitive exercises so that one master could teach hundreds of children at the same time in one room. It was the industrialisation of the teaching process. The curriculum in these monitorial schools was at first largely similar to that of the schools of industry - the ‘three Rs’ (reading, writing and ‘rithmetic) plus practical activities such as cobbbling, tailoring, gardening, simple agricultural operations for boys, and spinning, sewing, knitting, lace-making and baking for girls.

State regulations

In 1846 the Committee of Council on Education, under Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, its Secretary from 1839 to 1849, began making grants to day schools of industry towards the provision of gardens, trade workshops, kitchens and wash-houses, and for gratuities to the masters who taught boys gardening and crafts and to the mistresses who gave ‘satisfactory instruction in domestic economy’ (Hadow, 1926, p. 9).

Impressed by the practical work he had seen in Swiss schools, Kay-Shuttleworth attempted to introduce more practical instruction into England’s elementary schools. In the Regulations for the education of pupil teachers and stipendiary monitors, which he submitted to the Privy Council in December 1846, it was provided that pupil teachers at the end of their fourth year should be examined by the Inspector ‘in the first steps in mensuration with practical illustrations, and in the elements of land surveying and levelling’.

Technical education

Because the industrial revolution had given Britain a head start in world trade, the government saw no reason why the state should be involved in the training of industrial recruits. So modernisation of the old apprenticeship system was left to voluntary agencies. Several Mechanics’ Institutes opened in the mid-1820s and by 1850 there were 610 such Institutes in England and 12 in Wales, with a total membership of over 600,000.
The state did establish a ‘Normal School of Design’ in London in 1837 and made some annual grants for the maintenance of some provincial schools of design from 1841 onwards, but otherwise it did nothing until the Great Exhibition of 1851 drew public attention to the lack of facilities for technical education in England compared with those provided in various continental countries.

So in 1852 a Department of Practical Art was created under the Board of Trade. In 1856 this was moved into the Education Department as the Department of Science and Art, and in 1859 it began setting examinations - for both teachers and students - in branches of science related to industrial occupations (see Spens, 1938, p. 51).

**Hostility to mass education**

All the schools described above were established by individuals and groups who believed in – and campaigned for – mass education. But they found themselves up against vicious hostility to the very idea of educating the poor. One Justice of the Peace, for example, opined in 1807 that: ‘It is doubtless desirable that the poor should be generally instructed in reading, if it were only for the best of purposes - that they may read the Scriptures. As to writing and arithmetic, it may be apprehended that such a degree of knowledge would produce in them a disrelish for the laborious occupations of life.’ (Quoted in Williams, 1961, p. 135)

And when the Parochial Schools Bill of 1807 was debated in the Commons, Tory MP Davies Giddy warned the House that:

‘However specious in theory the project might be of giving education to the labouring classes of the poor, it would, in effect, be found to be prejudicial to their morals and happiness; it would teach them to despise their lot in life, instead of making them good servants in agriculture and other laborious employments to which their rank in society had destined them; instead of teaching them the virtue of subordination, it would render them factious and refractory, as is evident in the manufacturing counties; it would enable them to read seditious pamphlets, vicious books and publications against Christianity; it would render them insolent to their superiors; and, in a few years, the result would be that the legislature would find it necessary to direct the strong arm of power towards them and to furnish the executive magistrates with more vigorous powers than are now in force. Besides, if this Bill were to pass into law, it would go to burthen the country with a most enormous and incalculable expense, and to load the industrious orders with still heavier imposts.’ (Hansard, 13.06.07, quoted in Chitty, 2007, pp. 15–16)

**Parliamentary grants for school buildings**

Some financial assistance to schools from the local rates had been permitted in a few places in the 18th century. Now, from around 1830, national funds began to be made available for school building. [61]

Five School Sites Acts were passed between 1841 and 1852, designed to facilitate the purchase of land for school buildings and to make ‘Parliamentary Grants for the Education of the Poor’.
These were followed by the 1855 School Grants Act (14 August 1855) which sought ‘to render more secure the Conditions upon which Money is advanced out of the Parliamentary Grant for the Purposes of Education’. It stated that, where Parliament had made grants for land, or for the construction, enlargement or repair of school buildings, they were not to be sold, exchanged or mortgaged without the written consent of the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

The involvement of the churches

The Church of England regarded education for all children as desirable. This was not a unanimously held view, however – influential taxpayers and those who benefited from employing children were less enthusiastic. But despite the doubters, the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church (which, for obvious reasons, became generally known as the National Society) was founded in 1811. Its aim was to provide a school in every parish. Local clergy ‘often took on this initiative wholeheartedly’ (Gates, 2005, p. 16), with or without the benefit of special donations. ‘The inclusion of the fourth “R” of religion, alongside the other three (reading, writing and ‘rithmetic), was simply assumed as right. It took the form of the Bible, catechism and prayer book services’ (Gates, 2005, p. 16). [62]

Other Christians, along with liberal Anglicans and some Roman Catholics and Jews, preferred a less denominational approach and in 1814 founded the British and Foreign School Society for the Education of the Labouring and Manufacturing Classes of Society of Every Religious Persuasion (the British and Foreign School Society). Its schools drew on the pioneering work of the Quaker Joseph Lancaster. They taught Scripture and general Christian principles in a non-denominational form.

A third group, who wanted religion kept out of schools altogether, formed a third organisation, the Central Society of Education, in 1836. Unfortunately, they represented a tiny minority, and ‘it was the tussling between the other two [the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society] that delayed the introduction of a fully comprehensive school system funded by public taxation’ (Gates, 2005, p. 16).

The government was unwilling to intervene or take the lead for fear of appearing to promote one group over the other, so in 1833 it began giving annual grants towards school provision to both the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society. From 1846 similar grants were given to Baptists and Congregationalists (subject to an agreement about the reading of Scripture), from 1847 to Wesleyan Methodist and the Catholic Poor School Committee, and in 1853 to the Manchester Jewish community (subject to an agreement about the reading of at least part of the Bible).

The Church of England resisted the introduction of a ‘conscience clause’ which would have allowed children of Dissenters to attend its schools without fear of religious offence, and a ruling that only the Authorised Version of the Bible was acceptable delayed the granting of aid to RC schools. The 1861 Newcastle Report (of which more in the next chapter) noted the problems these rulings caused in areas...
where there was only one school.

Curricular reform

Concerns about the traditional curriculum were reflected in the publications of the Central Society of Education. In Education Reform, published in 1837, Thomas Wyse (1791-1862) gave a vivid picture of the state of secondary education at the time:

In no country is the strife between the new and the old educations more vehement - the education which deals with mind as spirit and that which deals with it as matter. In no country are there greater anomalies – greater differences not merely in the means, but in the ends of education ... it runs through the entire system. (quoted in Spens, 1938, pp. 18–19)

By the 1840s England had around 700 private grammar schools and more than 2,000 endowed schools, and by the 1850s the curriculum in both was changing, partly because of parental pressure and partly in response to the requirements of various external examinations, such as the London Matriculation Examination, the examinations for the Indian Civil Service (first held in 1855), the Oxford Local Examinations (from 1857), the Cambridge Local Examinations (from 1858), and the Examinations of the College of Preceptors, which was established in 1846 for the promotion of middle class education and for the training and certification of teachers. [63]

The 1870 Elementary Education Act had created local school boards to be responsible for the provision of elementary education. Some of them, however, had ‘significantly altered the legislators’ original concept of elementary schooling in terms of buildings, equipment, curricula and age range’ (Chitty, 2007, p. 19) by establishing higher classes, ‘higher tops’ and even separate higher grade schools for older pupils who showed ability and commitment. A few had gone still further and created a new type of evening school for adults.

This had angered the churches, which were already suffering from a decline in the number of worshippers, and now found their schools being overtaken by board schools funded by ratepayers. It had also angered many of the older endowed grammar schools, whose finances were precarious, leading to charges of inappropriate use of the rates.

Three-class structure

The background to the 1870 Act was three commissions, whose deliberations reveal an entrenched class-based system that to this day in forms the structure of education in England. Regrettably, this class-based system was further exacerbated by three national education commissions, whose reports - and the Acts which followed them - each related to provision for a particular social class:

– the Clarendon Report (1864) focused on the nine ‘great’ public (ie private) schools and led to the 1868 Public Schools Act;

– the Taunton Report (1868) (produced by the Schools Inquiry Commission) and the Endowed Schools Act of 1869 dealt with separate institutions for the middle classes;
the Newcastle Report (1861) and the 1870 Elementary Education Act made provision for schools for the masses.

The Royal Commission on the state of popular education in England, under the chairmanship of the Duke of Newcastle, was appointed in 1858 ‘To inquire into the state of public education in England and to consider and report what measures, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people.’

While 1870 can, with some justification, be described as the year in which the government finally began to take the education of the nation’s children seriously, it must be acknowledged that the 1870 Elementary Education Act was only the start of a process which would take more than twenty years to complete.

As a result of the Act, 2500 new school boards were created. They were directly elected and independent of existing forms of local government. They varied in size from that of London, which had 55 members and controlled almost 400 schools, to the rural boards, many of which controlled just one school (see Chitty, 2007, p. 17). At the same time, the Endowed Schools Commission was merged into the Charity Commission in 1874.

 Provision from Church to state

The ‘Cowper-Temple clause’ in section 14 of the 1870 Act (‘No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school’) was named after its proposer, Liberal MP William Cowper-Temple (pronounced ‘Cooper-Temple’). It banned denominational teaching in the new board schools.

But in other respects, the 1870 Act failed to resolve the problem of the involvement of the churches in state educational provision. It could have begun to separate church and state, as was happening in other countries. ‘That this did not happen was based on a combination of economic realism, institutional convenience and a political predisposition to enjoy religious company in spite of its irks’ (Gates, 2005, p. 18).

The churches had not been able to make universal provision, so the state would now fund schools managed by locally elected and inter denominationally representative school boards. Church schools would continue to receive a maintenance grant of up to 50 per cent, but once the system was in place they would get no money for new buildings.

The cost of sustaining this expanded provision was huge. ‘Knowingly or not the churches had overreached themselves’ (Gates, 2005, p. 19). So in 1884 a newly formed interdenominational Voluntary Schools Association began lobbying against what it regarded as the unfair financial advantages enjoyed by the board schools, which had local rates and central government taxes to draw on. In 1888, the Cross Commission (details below) reviewed the working of the 1870 Act and recommended public funding for the secular curriculum in church schools, a proposal which was eventually included in the 1902 Education Act.
The 1891 Elementary Education Act (5 August 1891) was another significant step in the process which the 1870 Act had begun, as it decreed that elementary education was to be provided free.

The Act provided for ten shillings (50p) a year to be paid as a ‘fee grant’ by Parliament for each child over three and under fifteen attending a public elementary school (Section 1). The schools were forbidden to charge additional fees (3) except in certain circumstances (4).

1902 Education Act (The Balfour Act)

Across Europe and the USA systems of publicly financed elementary schools had been rapidly developed in the second half of 19th century, providing educated personnel for the new industries. Now, at the turn of the century, the USA was beginning to open common secondary high schools as well, and many European schools were giving priority to engineering and science, subjects ‘conspicuously downgraded in England’s classical model of education, the one preferred by gentlemen’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 4).

So the development of a national public system of education in England and Wales was lagging behind much of Europe and the USA ‘by a good half a century’ (Green 1990:6 quoted in Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 4), and it was against this background that the newly-elected Conservative government of Arthur Balfour presented its 1902 education bill to the Commons.

Balfour (pictured) warned the House that ‘England is behind all continental rivals in education’ (quoted in Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 3). Despite this, the bill caused dissent among both Conservative and Liberal politicians, who feared that the cost of popular education would lose them the support of the large landowners and industrialists who were the major taxpayers. Most, however, accepted the argument that, with mass education developing fast elsewhere, Britain needed an educated workforce if it was to maintain its position in world trade. So Balfour got his bill.

But not before religion had once again reared its divisive head. The 1870 Act had taken 28 days to debate. The 1902 Act took 59, and most of that time was spent on the religious clauses. Dissenters and Doubters objected to state funds being used to support denominational schools, including those of the Church of England but more especially those of the Catholic Church. ‘Inside and outside Parliament there was outcry against “Rome on the rates”’ (Gates, 2005, p. 19).

The 1902 Education Act (18 December 1902) abolished the school boards and created local education authorities (LEAs), based on the county councils and county borough councils which the 1888 Local Government Act had established. The new LEAs had authority over the secular curriculum of voluntary (church) schools. They provided

For an interesting ‘close-up’ on Balfour and his bill, see the biography of Balfour by R S Q Adams, The Last Grandee, Thistle, London 2013.
grants for school maintenance, but if a school wanted to provide denominational teaching the buildings had to be paid for by the church.

The Act laid the basis for a national system of secondary education into which the higher grade elementary schools and the fee-paying secondary schools were integrated – a move approved of by a few socialists, like Sydney Webb, but disapproved of by many others, like Keir Hardie.

Thus it had the effect of creating two types of state-aided secondary school: the endowed grammar schools, which now received grant-aid from LEAs; and the municipal or county secondary schools, maintained by LEAs. Many of the latter were established in the years following the Act, and others evolved out of the higher grade science schools or pupil teacher centres. ‘These new Municipal Secondary Schools, influenced by the tradition of the Higher Grade Schools, attached more weight on the whole to scientific and modern studies than the older types of Secondary School, especially for girls’ (Hadow, 1926, p. 26). The new LEAs also began to establish first and second grade secondary schools, sin Every county and county borough was required to provide for ‘the progressive development and comprehensive organisation of education in respect of their area’.

Local education authorities were required to ensure:

(a) that public elementary schools included ‘practical instruction’ in the curriculum and offered advanced instruction ‘for the older or more intelligent children’;

(b) that they attended to ‘the health and physical condition of the children; and

(c) that they co-operated with other LEAs to prepare children for further education ‘in schools other than elementary’, and to provide for the supply and training of teachers.

LEAs were to establish and maintain ‘a sufficient supply of continuation schools’, co-operate with universities in the provision of lectures and classes, and appoint LEA representatives to the managing bodies of such schools ‘if practicable’.

1903-1918

In 1904 the Board of Education published the first of its annual Regulations for Secondary Schools, defining a four year subject-based course leading to a certificate in English language and literature, geography, history, a foreign language, mathematics, science, drawing, manual work, physical training, and, for girls, housewifery. The Regulations reinforced the tendency of the new secondary schools to adopt the academic bias of the established ones.

The object of these rules was ‘to ensure a certain measure of breadth and richness in the curriculum of Secondary Schools, and to provide against Schools recognised under that name offering only an education which is stunted, illiberal, unpractical or over-specialised’ (Hadow, 1923, p. 39). [Even so,] the Board explained that with the growth of educated public opinion it might be possible - and it was certainly highly desirable – ‘to relax these requirements in schools of tested efficiency, and to leave
them a larger freedom in devising and executing schemes of education of their own’
(Board’s Report for 1905-6 (Cd. 3270) page 46, quoted in Hadow, 1923, p. 39). [66]

The 1907 Education (Administrative Provisions) Act (28 August 1907) established the
scholarship and free place system for secondary education (which already existed in
some areas), designed to give promising children from elementary schools the
opportunity to go to secondary schools (sections 11-12).

*Inter alia*, the Act’s main provisions related to:

- the acquisition of land by LEAs (sections 1-2); various financial matters (including
  the repayment of loans by county councils and their power to contribute to
capital expenditure incurred in the provision of non-elementary education (3-
9); councils’ powers under Parts II and III of the 1902 Education Act (10);
councils’ power to ‘aid by scholarships or bursaries the instruction in public
elementary schools of scholars from the age of twelve up to the limit of age
fixed for the provision of instruction in a public elementary school by
subsection two of section twenty-two of that Act’ (11); the extension of
councils’ power to aid ‘education other than elementary’ (12) [67]

A bewildering variety of schools

By the end of the 19th century the nomenclature of England’s schools was already
bewildering: public, grammar, endowed, proprietary, elementary, first, second and
third grade, board, voluntary, preparatory, monitorial, higher tops, etc. In the early
years of the 20th century, yet more categories of school were added.

**Higher elementary schools**

**Central schools**

The expansion of secondary education after 1902 enabled England to keep pace with
its growing technical demands. By 1911, the national census and Board of Education
surveys showed that about 8 per cent of 14 and 15 year olds and 2 per cent of 16 and
17 year olds were being educated in schools either publicly provided or recognised by
the Board of Education, and fifty per cent of children were staying on at school until
they were 14.

However, as more and more elementary school pupils wanted to stay at school
beyond 14, the new secondary schools could not meet the demand. So new ‘central
schools’ were established to take up the work of the higher grade schools (*see
Crowther, 1959, p. 12*).

Central schools provided an improved general education of a practical character,
sometimes with a slight industrial or commercial bias, for pupils between the ages of
11 and 14 or 15. A considerable number of such schools, both selective and non-
selective, were established in London, Manchester and elsewhere from 1911 onwards.
They were ‘another example of the general tendency of the national system of
elementary education since 1870 to throw up experiments in post-primary education’
(Hadow, 1931, p. 17). The development of central schools, alongside the secondary
schools, further accentuated the tendency in the larger urban areas to introduce a break in school life at the age of 11. [68]

Day trade schools

Day trade schools, mainly for boys, were established, especially in the London area, from about 1900 onwards. The first of these was the Trade School for Furniture and Cabinet-making, founded at the Shoreditch Technical Institute in 1901. They were designed to take boys at or near the completion of their elementary school career for a period of one, two or three years, and to give a specialised training that would fit them to enter into workshop or factory life, at about the age of 16, with the prospect of becoming skilled workers or of rising ultimately to positions of responsibility as foremen, draughtsmen, or even managers. Such trade schools received grant as ‘Day Technical Classes’ from 1904-05 onwards under Article 42 of the Regulations for Evening Schools, Technical Institutions, etc. Many of these were organised as Courses within an existing Technical School or College (see Hadow, 1926, p. 32).

Junior technical schools

In 1913 the Board of Education issued Regulations for a new category of ‘Junior Technical Schools’. These were day schools providing two or three year post-elementary courses for boys and girls. They combined a general education with preparation for industrial employment at the age of 15 or 16 (see Hadow, 1926, p. 33).

1918 Education Act (The Fisher Act)

Most of the Lewis Report’s recommendations were enacted in the 1918 Education Act (8 August 1918), which extended educational provision, increased the powers and duties of the Board of Education, raised the school leaving age from 12 to 14 and gave all young workers right of access to day release education. (The raising of the leaving age was not immediately implemented, however, and had to wait until the 1921 Act).

LEAs could combine to form federations. The managing bodies of such federations should include ‘teachers or other persons of experience in education and of representatives of universities or other bodies’ (6). The limit on LEA education expenditure imposed by the 1902 Education Act was abolished (7). Sections 8-16 covered Attendance at School and Employment of Children and Young Persons. School attendance would be compulsory from 5 to 14 (15 in certain cases). Such attendance could only count if the school was inspected and registers were kept. In certain circumstances an LEA could make the lower age limit 6 and the upper age limit 16. Any changes the LEA made to arrangements for secular instruction must not prevent a child from receiving religious instruction (8).

Section 26 provided for the Abolition of Fees in Public Elementary Schools: No fees shall be charged or other charges of any kind made in any public elementary school, except as provided by the Education (Provision of Meals) Act, 1906, and the
Local Education Authorities (Medical Treatment) Act, 1909. [69]

1918-1939

1921 Education Act

The 1921 Education Act (19 August 1921) raised the school leaving age to 14 and consolidated all previous laws relating to education and to the employment of children and young persons. [70]

The Board of Education remained the Central Authority for education and the consultative committee was retained. The Act specified which councils would be local education authorities (LEAs), required them to have education committees and laid down rules for their operation (5-10).

*Inter alia*, LEAs were:

- required to ‘maintain and keep efficient all public elementary schools within their area’ and provide sufficient accommodation, including new schools where the Board of Education deemed them necessary (17-19);
- required to ensure provision in elementary schools of ‘practical instruction suitable to the ages, abilities, and requirements of the children’, and ‘courses of advanced instruction for the older or more intelligent children’ including those who stayed on beyond the age of 14 (20);
- empowered to provide nursery schools (or classes) for 2-5 year olds, and to attend to the ‘health, nourishment, and physical welfare’ of children attending such schools (21);

The Act laid down regulations for the conduct of public elementary schools:

- no pupil was to be required to attend or abstain from attending ‘any Sunday School, or any place of religious worship’ (27(1)(a));
- parents were entitled to withdraw children from religious observance or instruction (27(1)(b));
- schools (and the religious instruction in them) was to be open to HMI ‘at all times’ (27(1)(c));
- LEAs were to report infractions of these rules to the Board of Education (27(2));
- ‘No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school’ (28); [71]
- LEAs were to have control of secular instruction in non-provided public elementary schools (29);
- every public elementary school provided by the LEA was to have a body of managers, and two LEA representatives were to be appointed to the managers of non-provided schools (30);
- other provisions concerned: foundation managers (31-32),
- the grouping of schools under one management (33-34),
- the powers of managers (35),
- the management and grouping of provided schools in London (36),
- the prohibition of fees in public elementary schools (37),
• the power to transfer a school to the LEA (38),
• the re-transfer of schools (39),
• the closure of a school (40), and
• endowments (41). [72]

School Attendance

It shall be the duty of the parent of every child between the ages of five and fourteen, or, if a byelaw under this Act so provides, between the ages of six and fourteen, to cause that child to receive efficient elementary instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic. (42) [73]

Part VI made provisions regarding: [74]

• the duty of LEAs to ‘supply or aid the supply of higher education, and to promote the general co-ordination of all forms of education’ (70);
• the power of LEAs to train teachers for such education, to make provision outside their area, and to provide scholarships (71);
• rules regarding religious instruction: these were to be the same as for elementary schools (72);
• the transfer to LEAs of schools for science and art (73);
• the power of LEAs to aid educational research (74);
• LEAs’ duty to provide sufficient continuation schools ‘in which suitable courses of study, instruction, and physical training are provided without payment of fees’ (75);
• LEAs’ power to require attendance at continuation schools (76);
• exemptions from attendance at continuation schools (77); and
• the enforcement of attendance (78).

1936 Education Act

The 1936 Education Act (31 July 1936) raised the school leaving age to 15, but empowered LEAs to issue employment certificates to allow 14 year olds to work rather than attend school in certain circumstances - for example, where a family would suffer ‘exceptional hardship’ if the child did not work (Sections 1-7).

The raising of the school leaving age necessitated extra accommodation which had enormous cost implications, especially for the churches. The 1936 Act therefore empowered LEAs to make agreements regarding the enlargement or establishment of non-provided elementary schools for senior children, and to make grants of between half and three quarters of the cost of such a scheme; provided that religious instruction was given in accordance with the LEA’s syllabus and that the teachers were employed, appointed and dismissed by the LEA (8-11). These became known as ‘special agreement’ schools. As a result, the Church of England submitted proposals for 230 new schools, the Catholic Church for 289.

1938 Spens Report

By the late 1930s, about ten per cent of elementary school pupils were being selected
to go on to secondary schools. The rest either remained in ‘all-age’ schools or went on
to senior schools. It was becoming clear that England’s class-divided secondary
schools were failing the nation’s children. Twice as many students were going on to
higher education in Germany, more than twice as many in France, over three times as
many in Switzerland, and almost ten times as many in the US. Scotland’s education
system, ‘based on a widespread respect for learning and a more traditionally
egalitarian social outlook’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 4), was also doing much better
than England’s.

Thus the 1938 Spens Report *Secondary Education with Special Reference to
Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools* recommended that there should be
three types of secondary school:

- grammar schools for the academically able;
- technical schools for those with a practical bent; and
- new ‘modern’ secondary schools for the rest. [75]

For these two reasons, ‘the basic class teaching approach, with the main emphasis on
literacy and numeracy, continued in the new junior schools after the Second World
War’ (Galton et al., 1980, p. 36). In education, therefore, the period may be viewed as
one of consolidation and preparation. The wide-ranging education act of 1921
consolidated all previous education legislation and raised the school leaving age to 14.
The 1936 education act raised the leaving age to 15. Meanwhile, the government’s
Consultative Committee produced six reports - the five Hadow reports published
between 1923 and 1933, and the Spens report of 1938. All these made
recommendations which would shape the national education system in the wake of
the 1944 Education Act.

There was also much debate about the nature of primary education, with growing
interest in the works of Dewey, Montessori and Edmond Holmes, and Susan Isaacs’
books on the intellectual and social development of children.

The inter-war years, then, can be characterised as a period when there was a lot of
debate about lots of ideas - but little significant action. Once more, educational
developments would have to rely on a major war to be the catalyst which precipitated
a real advance. [76]

1940-1979

In October 1940 President of the Board of Education Herwald Ramsbotham (later
Lord Soulbury) met with senior officers of the Board at its temporary office in the
Branksome Dene Hotel at Bournemouth. Interrupted by the occasional air raid, they
discussed the educational measures which would be needed to achieve the prime
minister’s ideal of ‘establishing a state of society where the advantages and privileges
which hitherto have been enjoyed only by the few, shall be far more widely shared by
the men and youth of the nation as a whole’ (quoted in Taylor, 1977, p. 158).

The Board’s proposals were set out in *Education after the war*, the ‘Green Book’
which was circulated, on a strictly confidential basis, to selected recipients in June 1941. These proposals formed the basis of much (but not all) of what would become the 1944 Education Act.

It was proposed that the existing differentiation between elementary and secondary education should be abolished and that instead there should be three stages of education: primary, secondary and further. The provision of secondary education would be a duty - not just a power - of local education authorities; all schools at the secondary stage would be subject to a single Code of Regulations ‘providing for equality of treatment in such matters as accommodation, size of classes, etc’, and all secondary schools (with the exception of the direct grant grammar schools) would be free.

Rather than ending the ‘dual system’ (of LEA-provided and voluntary schools), further financial assistance would be offered to the voluntary schools, ‘accompanied, as it must be, by such extended public control as is necessary, not simply to secure a quid pro quo, but to ensure the effective and economical organisation and development of both primary and secondary education’ (quoted in Taylor, 1977, p. 159).

Rab Butler (Conservative) was appointed President of the Board of Education in the summer of 1941 and the coalition government began to make plans for an ambitious programme of ‘social reconstruction’ in the post-war period. He and other reformers were delighted that it promised a free, common and universal system of education for students up to 18 underpinned by the principle that ‘the nature of a child’s education should be based on his capacity and promise and not by the circumstances of his parent’ (Board of Education, 1943, p. 7).

1940 Education Act

Indeed, the importance of the 1944 Act - sometimes referred to as the Butler Act since it was Butler (pictured) who piloted the bill through parliament - cannot be overemphasised. It replaced almost all previous education legislation and set the framework for the post-war education system in England and Wales. There were similar Education Acts for Scotland (1945) and Northern Ireland (1947). [77]

Its major provisions concerned:

- the Ministry of Education: - the Minister - Central Advisory Councils for Education;

- the statutory system of education: - local education authorities - primary, secondary and further education - school management - secular instruction - appointment and dismissal of teachers - transitional arrangements - special educational treatment - compulsory school age - provision of further education - ancillary services (medicals, milk, meals etc) - employment of children - miscellaneous (prohibition of fees etc);

- independent schools;
miscellaneous provisions: - parents’ wishes - inspections - administrative provisions - financial provisions. [78]

**Part I Central Administration**

The Act provided for the appointment of a Minister of Education and the establishment of the Ministry of Education.

**Local education authorities**

Every county and county borough would be the local education authority (LEA) for its area (6(1). Property and staff previously owned and employed for educational purposes would be transferred to the LEAs (6(3 and 4).

The statutory system of education shall be organised in three progressive stages to be known as primary education, secondary education, and further education; and it shall be the duty of the local education authority for every area, so far as their powers extend, to contribute towards the spiritual, moral, mental, and physical development of the community by securing that efficient education throughout those stages shall be available to meet the needs of the population of their area (7). [79]

Provision was made for the grouping of schools under one management body (20). In county schools (and most voluntary schools) the ‘secular instruction’ and matters such as the length of the school day and the dates of school terms were to be under the control of the local education authority. In aided secondary schools, this control would be exercised by the governors (23). The appointment of teachers would be under the control of the local education authority (24).

**Further education**

LEAs were charged with providing ‘adequate facilities’ for full-time and part-time education ‘for persons over compulsory school age’ and ‘leisure-time occupation, in such organized cultural training and recreative activities as are suited to their requirements, for any persons over compulsory school age who are able and willing to profit by the facilities provided for that purpose’ (41). They were to submit their schemes for further education to the Minister (42) and set up county colleges for this purpose (43). LEAs could serve ‘college attendance notices’ on under-eighteens, requiring them to attend a county college for (roughly) a day a month or for eight weeks in a year (44-47).

**Independent schools.**

Part III of the Act:

- provided for the appointment of a Registrar of Independent Schools and laid down the conditions of registration (70);
- provided for a school proprietor to be served with a ‘notice of complaint’ if the Minister considered that the school’s premises, accommodation, teaching or
staff were inappropriate (71);

- allowed a proprietor to appeal against the notice, such appeals being heard by an Independent Schools Tribunal, which could annul the complaint, order that the school be struck off the register, or lay down conditions for the school remaining on the register (72);
- set the penalty for continuing to operate a deregistered school as a fine of up to £50 and/or a prison sentence of up to three months (73);
- allowed the Minister to remove the disqualification if he felt it was no longer necessary (74); and
- empowered the Lord Chancellor, with the concurrence of the Lord President of the Council, to make rules relating to the practice and procedure to be followed by Independent Schools Tribunals (75).

The General Principle to be observed by Minister and Local Education Authorities

Section 76 stated that:

In the exercise and performance of all powers and duties conferred and imposed on them by this Act the Minister and local education authorities shall have regard to the general principle that, so far as is compatible with the provision of efficient instruction and training and the avoidance of unreasonable public expenditure, pupils are to be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents. [80]

Miscellaneous Provisions

Sections 77-87 dealt with the following:

- the inspection of schools and colleges (77): - regular and special inspections as required by the Minister (77(2)) - LEA inspections by their own officers (77(3)) - illegality of obstructing an inspection (77(4)) - special rules relating to religious instruction (77(5 and 6));
- the provision of LEA ancillary services to non-maintained schools (78);
- the provision of LEA information to the Minister of Health (79);
- the duty to keep registers of pupils and to make returns to the Minister and the LEA as required (80);
- the power of LEAs to offer financial assistance and scholarships where appropriate (81);
- the power of LEAs to conduct or sponsor educational research (82);
- the power of LEAs to organise educational conferences (83);
- the power of LEAs to provide financial assistance to a university to improve further education facilities (84);
- the right of LEAs to accept gifts for educational purposes (85);
- the right of the Minister to amend certain endowment schemes (86); and
- amendments to some 19th century Acts relating to assurances of property (87).

Administrative Provisions

Sections 88-99 provided for:

- the appointment by LEAs of Chief Education Officers (88);
- the remuneration of teachers (89);
the compulsory purchase of land by LEAs (90);
• the auditing of local authority accounts (91);
• LEA reports and returns to the Minister (92);
• the Minister’s right to order a local inquiry (93);
• the power of the Minister to intervene if an LEA or school management body failed
to comply with the Act (99); and
• various other technical matters.

Financial Provisions

Sections 100-107 provided for:
• grants by the Minister to LEAs and others, and grants by the Minister of Health in
  respect of medical inspections and treatment (100);
• special provisions relating to Wales and Monmouthshire (101);
• grants by the Minister to aided and special agreement schools of up to 50 per cent
  of the cost of buildings maintenance (102);
• grants by the Minister to aided and special agreement schools of up to 50 per cent
  of the cost of new premises (103);
• grants by the Minister to aided and special agreement schools for displaced pupils
  (104);
• power of the Minister to make loans to aided and special agreement schools in
  respect of initial expenditure (105);
• contributions between LEAs (106); and
• ‘Any expenses incurred by the Minister or by the Minister of Health in the exercise
  of their functions under this Act shall be defrayed out of monies provided by
  Parliament’. (107)

The government of education

The Act divided responsibility for education between central government, which was
to set national policies and allocate resources; the local education authorities (LEAs),
which were to set local policies and allocate resources to schools; and the schools
themselves, whose head teachers and governing bodies would set school policies and
manage the resources.

Jones notes that some historians have seen in the 1944 Act a strengthening of central
government over local control and he acknowledges that, in some respects, this was
true. But he argues that: “to stress centralisation too strongly is to miss something
about the dynamic that 1944 in effect encouraged. Local authorities had some power
to organise and reorganise schooling. In addition, because the Act made no
stipulations about curriculum and pedagogy, teachers had considerable capacities to
initiate school-level change ... these capacities were often under-used, but none the
less the elements of decentralisation built into the Act were later the basis for
significant initiatives of local curricular reform.” (Jones, 2003, p. 20) [81]

Central government

The Act replaced the Board of Education with the Ministry of Education and gave the
Minister ‘a creative rather than a merely controlling function, charging him with
promoting education in England and Wales’ (Mackinnon and Statham, 1999, p. 54).

The Minister had ‘the duty to secure the effective execution by the local authorities, under his control and direction, of the national policy for providing a varied and comprehensive education service in every area’ (1944 Act, Section 1(1)). He was responsible to parliament and exercised this responsibility through the Ministry. ‘The Secretary of State does not provide schools or colleges, nor employ teachers or prescribe textbooks or curricula’ (Shipman, 1984, p. 39). But he (and later, she) ‘can identify areas for development and place duties on local authorities’ (Shipman, 1984, p. 39).

The schools

The Act established a nationwide system of free, compulsory schooling from age 5 to 15. (The school leaving age was raised to fifteen in 1947 and the Act said it should be raised to 16 as soon as practicable). Pupils could be taught in LEA schools (‘county maintained schools’), schools maintained by other organisations or, in certain circumstances, (under Section 56 of the Act) ‘otherwise’. (The phrase ‘or otherwise’ came to be used by parents who did not wish their children to attend school but preferred to educate them at home. An organisation supporting such parents is known as ‘Education Otherwise’).

Disappointments

The main reason why the 1944 Act was considered less radical than many had hoped it would be was its failure to resolve two problems: the church schools and private education. [82]

The church schools

The Act thus categorised church schools as voluntary ‘aided’ (where the church had greater control) or ‘controlled’ (where the LEA had greater control). Aided schools were offered 50 per cent of their building and maintenance costs from state funds; controlled schools 100 per cent. Both Rab Butler and Archbishop of Canterbury William Temple assumed that only about 500 of the 9,000 Church of England schools would opt for voluntary aided status. In fact, around 3,000 of them did - along with all the Roman Catholic and Jewish schools. The proportion of church school building costs funded by the taxpayer rose to 75 per cent in 1959; to 80 per cent in 1967; to 85 per cent in 1974; and to 90 per cent in 2001.

Private education

This was another area where hopes for the Act ran high. The 1944 Fleming Committee had examined how the independent schools might be integrated into the state system, but it was not to be. The Act did nothing about the private schools, other than to require them to be registered.

The first post-war Minister of Education was Ellen Wilkinson (pictured), whose main task was to implement the provisions of the 1944 Education Act. She accepted the challenge enthusiastically, seeing opportunities for a new kind of schooling with
laughter in the classroom, self-confidence growing every day, eager interest instead of bored uniformity’ (Wilkinson, 1947, p. 5, quoted in Jones, 2003, p. 23). [83]

**Selection: comprehensive failure**

The concept of comprehensive education (in which all children attend a common school rather than being divided by selection between secondary modern, grammar, specialist schools etc) came late to Britain. Many in the Labour Party hoped that the new government would get rid of elitism and pursue a common education for all children, something the 1944 Act would have allowed.

**The tripartite system** [84]

In circular No. 73 (12 December 1945) the government told local authorities to ‘think in terms of three types’ of state school for the new secondary education. An accompanying booklet, *The Nation’s Schools*, explained that the new ‘modern’ schools would be for working-class children ‘whose future employment will not demand any measure of technical skill or knowledge’ (MoE 1945, quoted in Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 5). This was interpreted as meaning the tripartite system of secondary education, with grammar schools for the most able, secondary modern schools for the majority, and secondary technical schools for those with a technical or scientific aptitude.

The tripartite system, then, was not required by the Act. Indeed, the Act itself never mentioned the words ‘tripartite’, ‘selection’, ‘eleven plus’, ‘grammar schools’ or ‘secondary modern schools’. It simply required that education should be provided at three levels: primary, secondary and further. The tripartite system was no more than the continuation of the 19th century class-based system of English education which had been promoted, shamefully, by the reports of Spens (1938) and Norwood (1943).

The result was that there was no ‘parity of esteem’ between grammar and secondary modern schools. Competition for grammar school places increased as these schools offered pupils the opportunity of a place at university and thereafter a professional career. The tripartite system thus reinforced the notion that working class children were of lower intelligence.

This appalling system was based on the notion of the IQ (intelligence quotient) promoted by the now-discredited educational psychologist Cyril Burt. Burt had stated his definition of ‘human intelligence’ in *How the mind works*, a book based on his series of talks broadcast in 1933:

By the term ‘intelligence’, the psychologist understands inborn, all-round intellectual ability. It is inherited, or at least innate, not due to teaching or training; it is intellectual, not emotional or moral, and remains uninfluenced by industry or zeal; it is general, not specific, ie it is not limited to any particular kind of work, but enters into all we do or say or think. Of all our mental qualities, it is the most far-reaching. Fortunately, it can be measured with accuracy and ease. (Burt, 1933, pp. 28–29, quoted in Chitty, 2004, p. 26) [85]
General Certificate of Education

Whatever its origins, the effect of the tripartite system was to disqualify a majority of the nation’s children from access to qualifications. The General Certificate of Education (GCE) was introduced in 1951, replacing the old School Certificate (‘matriculation’). It was designed for the top 25 per cent of the ability range. GCE exams were normally taken at 16 (Ordinary Level) and 18 (Advanced Level), mostly in the grammar schools and the independent (public or private fee-paying) schools.

Primary education

The tripartite system also had a damaging effect on the new primary schools, the success of whose pupils in the eleven plus quickly became the measure by which the schools were judged. ‘Once again, the fate of the junior school and its educational role depended on developments at the upper levels’ (Galton et al., 1980, p. 38).

1963 Newsom Report

The concerns about selection were given added weight by the 1963 Newsom Report Half Our Future, which looked at the education of 13-16 year olds of average and less than average ability and urged that they should receive a greater share of the nation’s educational resources.

1967 Plowden Report

Children and their Primary Schools, the report produced by the Central Advisory Council for Education (CACE) chaired by Bridget Plowden was thus published at a time of great excitement and creativity in education. The eleven plus was being abolished, freeing primary schools from the constraints imposed by the need to ‘get good results’. Streaming was being abandoned. Sybil Marshall was writing about the creativity of primary pupils in An Experiment in Education. Comprehensive schools and middle schools were being established. Teacher-led curriculum innovation was being actively encouraged.

The essence of Plowden is summed up at the start of Chapter 2: ‘At the heart of the educational process lies the child’ (Plowden, 1967, p. 7). And not just the child, but the individual child. ‘Individual differences between children of the same age are so great that any class, however homogeneous it seems, must always be treated as a body of children needing individual and different attention’ (Plowden, 1967, p. 25).

1970s and the end of the post-war consensus

The economic background to the period was not auspicious. The oil crisis and subsequent recession of 1971-3 ‘fundamentally altered the map of British politics’ by exposing ‘all the underlying weaknesses of Keynesian social democracy’. The governments of Heath, Wilson and Callaghan were all ‘unable to breathe new life into the old system’. The post-war ‘welfare capitalist consensus’ had relied on increasing prosperity to foster social unity. ‘When that prosperity disintegrated, so, too, did the consensus’ (Chitty, 2004, p. 31).
The post-war consensus finally collapsed under the Wilson-Callaghan government of 1974-79, amid mounting inflation, swelling balance of payments deficits, unprecedented currency depreciation, rising unemployment, bitter industrial conflicts and what seemed to many to be ebbing governability. The Conservative leadership turned towards a new version of the classical market liberalism of the nineteenth century. Though the Labour leadership stuck to the tacit ‘revisionism’ of the 1950s and 1960s, large sections of the rank and file turned towards a more inchoate mixture of neo-Marxism and the ‘fundamentalist’ Socialism of the 1920s and 1930s. (Marquand, 1988:3, quoted in Chitty, 2004, p. 32) The recession ‘provided a rationale for economic cutbacks in education not only in England but in most advanced western industrial countries’ (Galton et al., 1980, p. 41). [86]

Disenchantment

As a result, politicians were beginning to call for teachers to become more accountable. In 1974 the DES established the Assessment of Performance Unit (APU) to ‘promote the development of methods of assessing and monitoring the achievement of children at school, and to seek to identify the incidence of under-achievement’. Teacher accountability would become a priority for both major parties following Callaghan’s Ruskin College speech in 1976.

Lurch to the right [87]

Conservative politicians were beginning to demand ‘consumer-oriented education’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 11). They wanted the Schools Council abolished, more national testing, the school leaving age put back to 15 (it had been raised to 16 in 1973), and they called for national inquiries into ‘everything progressive’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 11).

Not to be outdone, the Labour government took its own dramatic turn to the right and ‘announced a sudden halt to the forward march of comprehensive change’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, pp. 11–12). Its 1976 ‘Yellow Book’ - commissioned by prime minister Jim Callaghan and produced by the DES - was supposed to be secret but was widely leaked to the press. It promoted ‘the imposition of a new “agreed” core curriculum and claimed that the reorganisation of secondary education was now complete’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 12). This was nonsense - eleven plus selection still existed wholly or partially in more than half of LEAs.

The Yellow Book was about much more than pedagogic method:

The DES aimed not just at reshaping practice through judicious advice, but at bringing to a halt what seemed to be the spontaneous and deep-seated tendencies of the school system, towards localised, piecemeal, unsupervised, professionally led and progressive-influenced reform in primary schools and throughout the state system. (Jones, 2003, p. 95) With Callaghan’s Ruskin College speech in 1976 and the ‘Great Debate’ which followed, comprehensivisation slipped off the political agenda. It disappeared from view altogether in 1979 when Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative government came to power and set out to transform the country’s schools into an
education marketplace.

The Black Papers

The worrying economic climate provided the context for the views presented in a series of five ‘Black Papers’ written by right-wing educationalists and politicians.

The first, published in 1969, specifically focused on the progressive style of education being developed in the primary schools as ‘a main cause not only of student unrest in the universities but of other unwelcome tendencies or phenomena’ (Galton et al., 1980, p. 41).

All five Black Papers - supported by the right-wing press - attacked the concepts of comprehensive education, egalitarianism and progressive teaching methods. They deplored the lack of discipline in schools and blamed comprehensivisation for preventing ‘academic’ students from obtaining good examination results.

In the last two Black Papers (1975 and 1977) contributors went beyond ‘the cautious conservatism of the first three documents’ (Chitty, 2004, p. 46) and advocated voucher schemes under which parents would be issued with a free basic coupon valued at the average cost of schools in a local authority area. The editors of the 1975 Paper wanted education vouchers trialled in at least two areas, and in the last Black Paper a ‘Letter to Members of Parliament’ said:

The possibilities for parental choice of secondary (and also primary) schools should be improved via the introduction of the education voucher or some other method. Schools that few wish to attend should then be closed and their staff dispersed. (Cox and Boyson 1977:9, quoted in Chitty, 2004, p. 46)

These arguments for choice, competition and parental control of schools - and the questioning of the very concept of a ‘national system, locally administered’ - would be taken up with enthusiasm by Margaret Thatcher’s administrations from 1979.

The five Black Papers were:

1979-1996 [88]

Public services

Thatcher’s neo-liberal policies affected not only industry and commerce but also public services. Conservative legislation sought to drive neo-liberal principles into the heart of public policy. An emphasis on cost reduction, privatisation and deregulation was accompanied by vigorous measures against the institutional bases of Conservatism’s opponents, and the promotion of new forms of public management. The outcome of these processes was a form of governance in which market principles were advanced at the same time as central authority was strengthened. (Jones, 2003, p. 107) Thus the twin aims of Margaret Thatcher’s education policies in the 1980s were to convert the nation’s schools system from a public service into a market, and to transfer power from local authorities to central government.

Sexton’s theme was taken up by an ‘ever-growing number of right-wing think-tanks with small but interlocking memberships’ which ‘bombarded’ ministers with policy ideas ‘ideologically driven by commitment to the market and to privatisation’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 12).

Minister Carlisle was replaced in September 1981 by the very different Keith Joseph, a long-time advocate of free market ideas (especially parental choice and education vouchers). In 1974 he had been a co-founder of the right-wing Centre for Policy Studies, a think-tank which wanted schools to be autonomous with a minimum of state interference.

With Joseph leading the education department, Thatcher set about preparing to take control. This meant confronting the ‘education establishment’ - the teachers and their unions, the training institutions and national and local inspectors and advisors. There would be action on three fronts:

- the curriculum - traditionally seen as the ‘secret garden’ which government ministers were not supposed to enter;
- the teachers - controlling their training and development and restricting their role in curriculum development; and
- the local education authorities (LEAs) - many of which (especially the Labour-controlled ones) Thatcher saw as her enemy. [89]

In 1984 the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) was established to set standards for initial teacher training courses.

In a move designed to reduce the influence of teachers in curriculum development, the Schools Council, in which teachers had played a significant role, was abolished in 1984. Its work was shared between the School Examinations Council (SEC), whose members were nominated by the secretary of state, and the School Curriculum Development Council (SCDC), which was specifically instructed not to ‘concern itself with policy’.

And in 1985 Keith Joseph proposed linking teacher appraisal and performance-related
pay. The result was a year of industrial action by teachers.

In July 1987 the government published The National Curriculum 5-16. This consultation document set out plans for the introduction of a national curriculum and associated assessment procedures. Its 40 A4-size pages appear to have been produced in haste: the cover was printed but the contents were typed - presumably on an electric typewriter or perhaps on an early Amstrad word processor (which had been launched the previous year).

**Vocational education**

The government took another swipe at the local authorities in 1982, when it launched the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI), aimed at 14-18 year olds. LEAs were not allowed to participate. Instead, it was administered by the Department of Employment’s Manpower Services Commission (MSC). It was not exactly a success. ‘From 1977 to 1989 change was breathtaking in this area and so was expenditure: £89 billion spent on introducing 25 training schemes, of which 22 were subsequently cancelled, some after only a year or two in existence’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 16).

The National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ) was set up in 1986 to promote National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs). In 1989 the government announced that schools would in future be allowed to offer vocational courses like those from the Business and Technology Education Council (BTEC). It also made an effort to rationalise ‘Britain’s renowned jungle of vocational qualifications’ (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 17) in an attempt to create a single new system of vocational qualifications: GNVQ for educational qualifications and NVQ for qualifications gained through work.

For a brief moment it looked as if at last a British government was going to catapult the country into a position where it could compete with other industrialised countries which had already made all these changes through comprehensive education reform and an integration of vocational and academic education. (Benn and Chitty, 1996, p. 17) But it was not to be. The Major administration chose not to pursue the integration of academic and vocational education.

**1980 Education Act**

This Act (3 April 1980) began the process of giving more power to parents. Its main provisions were: [90]

- school governing bodies were to include at least two parents (Section 2(5));
- parents were to have the right to choose schools (6) and the right to appeal if they didn’t get the schools they had chosen (7);
- there were new rules regarding school attendance orders (10 and 11), the creation of new schools and the closing of existing ones (12), and the number of school places (15);
• the Assisted Places Scheme would provide public money to pay for 30,000 children to go to private schools (17);  
• the obligation on local authorities to provide free milk and meals was removed, except in the case of children from families receiving Supplementary Benefit or Family Income Supplement (22); and  
• local authorities could establish nursery schools (24).  

1983 Education (Fees and Awards) Act [91]  
This Act (13 May 1983) allowed the secretary of state to require higher education institutions to charge higher fees to students ‘not having the requisite connection with the United Kingdom, the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man’ and to exclude such students from being eligible for certain discretionary awards.  

1984 Education (Grants and Awards) Act  
This Act (12 April 1984) introduced Education Support Grants (ESGs), which were to be given to LEAs for government-specified purposes. It was thus another step in taking control of education policy away from the LEAs and giving it to central government - a move which was taken still further in 1987 when Specific Grants for INSET (In-Service Training) were introduced.  

1986 Education (Amendment) Act  
This short Act (17 February 1986) increased the limit set in section 2(1) of the Education (Grants and Awards) Act 1984 on expenditure approved for education support grant purposes, and excluded remuneration for lunchtime supervision from the Remuneration of Teachers Act 1965.  

1986 Education Act  
In May 1986 Kenneth Baker replaced Keith Joseph as education secretary. He was kept busy: there were two education acts in his first year in the job. The first (and much the shorter - 5 pages) was the 1986 Education Act (18 July 1986), which concerned certain further education grants and the pooling of expenditure by local authorities.  

1986 Education (No. 2) Act [92]  
The second Education Act of 1986 (7 November 1986) was not only much longer than the first, it was also profoundly more important. It implemented the proposals set out in the 1985 White Paper Better Schools which were summarised in the DES booklet Better Schools: A Summary.  

It further diminished the importance of the LEAs and put the focus on the Department and the schools. Governors were to be given much greater responsibility for the curriculum, discipline and staffing. The head was to have a pivotal role - s/he was singled out for specific responsibilities including the ‘determination and organisation
of the secular curriculum’ (though the Act said nothing about what would happen if governors disagreed). The head (and only the head) had the power to exclude pupils.

The Education Reform Act (29 July 1988) was the most important education act since 1944. It is sometimes referred to as ‘The Baker Act’ after secretary of state Kenneth Baker. The Act was presented as giving power to the schools. In fact, it took power away from the LEAs and the schools and gave them all to the secretary of state - it gave him hundreds of new powers. Even more importantly, it took a public service and turned it into a market - something the Tories had been working towards for a decade.

Chitty and Dunford (1999, p. 25) argue that the ‘meretricious agenda’ of the 1988 Act was in many ways ‘a tribute to the remarkable resilience of the comprehensive ideal’. Having failed to get selection reinstated in 1979, the Tories now used ‘devices like opting out, open admission, city technology colleges and the introduction of “local markets”... as attempts to introduce selection by the back door.’

The Act’s major provisions concerned:

- the curriculum: - the National Curriculum - new rules on religious education and collective worship - the establishment of curriculum and assessment councils;
- admission of pupils to county and voluntary schools;
- local management of schools (LMS);
- grant maintained (GM) schools;
- city technology colleges (CTCs);
- changes in further and higher education; and
- the abolition of ILEA.

Part I Chapter III: Finance and Staff

Before 1988, schools had only had control over ‘capitation’ - that part of their budget relating to books and materials. The staff were employed and the buildings maintained by the local authority. Under what became known as ‘local management of schools’ (LMS), the schools were to be given far greater control, managing almost the whole budget. ‘It shall be the duty of the authority to put at the disposal of the governing body of the school in respect of that year a sum equal to the school’s budget share for that year to be spent for the purposes of the school’ (36(2)). [93]

School budgets would be determined on the basis of an ‘allocation formula’ based on the number and ages of the pupils in the school and the number of pupils with special needs (38(3)). Each local authority was required to submit a scheme for this financial delegation (39). Responsibility for the appointment and dismissal of staff would be transferred from the local authority to schools’ governing bodies (44-46).

National Curriculum

The National Curriculum which resulted from the Act was written by a government quango: teachers had virtually no say in its design or construction. It was almost entirely content-based. Dennis Lawton, of the University of London Institute of
Education, described it as the reincarnation of the 1904 Secondary Regulations.

Assessment

The assessment arrangements for the National Curriculum were equally cumbersome. They were based on the 1988 report of the National Curriculum Task Group on Assessment and Testing (TGAT) led by Professor PJ Black (and therefore sometimes known as the Black Report).

Local Management of Schools

Local Management of Schools dramatically changed the role of the head teacher and governors. The head was no longer an educationalist but an institutional manager. S/he now had to learn about recruitment and selection procedures, employment law, health and safety legislation, buildings maintenance etc. The governors now had legal responsibilities in relation to the control of a school’s budget and to the appointment and dismissal of staff. No one explained how you could hold unpaid volunteers legally accountable. Inevitably, fewer people were prepared to take on the role.

Because school budgets were to be based largely on pupil numbers, schools had to attract as many pupils as possible in order to survive. This led to some bizarre cases of schools offering gifts to parents who enrolled their children. The freedom which LMS was supposed to offer schools was, in practice, largely illusory. Schools soon found that, as their staff costs amounted to around 85 per cent of the total budget, any scope for changing

1990 Education (Student Loans) Act

Thatcher’s last education act was the Education (Student Loans) Act (26 April 1990) which introduced ‘top-up’ loans for HE students and so began the diminution of student grants. [94]

1996-2011

Coming hard on the heels of the 1993 Education Act (27 July 1993), the largest piece of legislation in the history of education, the 1996 Education Act (24 July 1996) was another huge piece of legislation (557 pages) which mainly consolidated all previous education acts since 1944. [95]

It included the

Nursery Education and Grant-Maintained Schools Act
The 1996 Nursery Education and Grant-Maintained Schools Act (24 July 1996) introduced a voucher scheme for nursery education (which was unsuccessful and was later withdrawn by Labour) and allowed governors of grant-maintained schools to borrow money.

The School Inspections Act
The 1996 School Inspections Act (24 July 1996) consolidated previous legislation on
school inspections.

It was followed by the **1997 Education Act**, although its passage through Parliament was affected by the forthcoming general election, which the Tories were expected to lose. However, it was still a wide-ranging Act.

But it was all to prove a delusion. The first ‘New Labour’ government, which swept to power in May 1997 with a Commons majority of 179, was to prove very different from any previous Labour government. Indeed, in many ways - its belief in market forces and its commitment to globalisation, for example - it would be virtually indistinguishable from its Tory predecessor. [96]

**1997-2001 Destroying the comprehensive ideal**

The Tories’ Assisted Places scheme had provided public money to pay for 30,000 children to go to private schools. Within two months of coming to power the new administration scrapped the scheme in the 1997 Education (Schools) Act (31 July 1997). It also made a commitment to reduce some class sizes. But it quickly became clear that in other respects New Labour’s education policies would be little different from those of Thatcher and Major. ‘This meant an endorsement of much of the 1988 Education Reform Act and its successors, in relation both to “parental choice” and to competition between schools in a diverse and unequal secondary school system’ (Jones, 2003, p. 145).

Few were surprised, therefore, when David Blunkett, now secretary of state for education, announced that Chris Woodhead would be keeping his job as chief inspector of schools and head of Ofsted. In relation to selection, despite Blunkett’s pre-election promise, the warning signs had been clear. The 1995 Labour policy document *Diversity and excellence: a new partnership for schools*, for example, had set out the party's new thinking on grammar schools:

> Our opposition to academic selection at 11 has always been clear. But while we have never supported grammar schools in their exclusion of children by examination, change can come only through local agreement. Such change in the character of a school could only follow a clear demonstration of support from the parents affected by such decisions. (Labour Party 1995)

**1998 School Standards and Framework Act**

The white paper’s proposals were implemented in the School Standards and Framework Act (24 July 1998) which:

- allowed maintained secondary schools to ‘make provision for the selection of pupils for admission to the school by reference to their aptitude for one of more prescribed subjects’ (Section 102);
- defined the responsibilities of LEAs and gave the secretary of state powers to ensure that they fulfilled them;
- empowered LEAs and the secretary of state to intervene in schools judged to be ‘failing’ by Ofsted - such schools would be given two years to improve or they
would be closed or have radical management changes imposed on them;

- set out a new framework for schools (to be implemented from 2000) with
  community schools replacing county schools and foundation schools replacing
  GM schools. Voluntary schools (mostly the church schools) would stay the
  same.

**Privatisation**

*Education Action Zones*

One of the earliest indications of the enthusiasm of New Labour for privatisation of
the education service was the setting up of Education Action Zones (EAZs). These
consisted of clusters of schools in deprived areas working together, with government
grants and sponsorship from local businesses, and assuming some of the functions of
the LEA. Schools in EAZs were allowed to dispense with the National Curriculum
and were encouraged to innovate.

Blunkett announced the first 25 EAZs in June 1998 and the first twelve of these
started work in September 1998 with sponsorship from Blackburn Rovers, Cadbury
Schweppes, Nissan, Rolls Royce, Kelloggs, British Aerospace, Tate and Lyle,
American Express and Brittany Ferries.

But the government’s enthusiasm for EAZs was short-lived. In March 1999 it began
the much larger *Excellence in Cities* (EiC) initiative, a three year programme to
improve the education of inner city children. The aim was to drive up standards to
match those found in the best schools - now to be designated ‘beacon schools’. Unlike
the EAZs, EiC operated through the traditional channels of Whitehall, LEA and
school.

*Contracting out*

The government began introducing private contractors into other bits of the education
service. Various ‘failing’ local authority services were put out to tender (as in
Hackney and Islington) and even schools were handed over to private companies.
King’s Manor School in Guildford was the first.

In May 2000 school standards minister Estelle Morris (*pictured*) announced that
consultants would be sent into the LEAs in Bradford, Rochdale and Waltham Forest
to advise on how improvements could be made after Ofsted uncovered ‘serious
weaknesses’ in their work.

And the following month she announced the privatisation of Leeds LEA which lost
control of its school services following a damning inspection report.

*City academies*

The creeping privatisation of education took a major step forward in March 2000
when David Blunkett announced that the government intended to create a network of
‘city academies’ - effectively private schools paid for by the state - closely modelled on the ‘charter schools’ in the US and the Conservatives’ city technology colleges.

City academies were to be public/private partnerships. Businesses, churches and voluntary groups would build and manage them, and they would be outside the control of local authorities. In return for a £2m donation towards the capital costs, sponsors would be allowed to rename the school, control the board of governors and influence the curriculum.

I believe in the comprehensive ideal. We have to encourage every single one of our secondary schools to develop their own sense of mission and play to their strengths. That’s why we will invest in specialist schools and training schools, beacon schools and city academies, each school choosing its own identity within the comprehensive family. (Morris 2002) In September 2002 the first three city academies were opened. Head teachers criticised them as divisive.

The academies programme

Five more academies opened in September 2004, bringing the total to 17. The five year plan indicated that the government intended to have 200 academies open by 2010, despite the fact that no evaluation had been made of their cost-effectiveness. Charles Clarke himself admitted that academies were expensive and that there was no evidence that they were improving performance.

14-19 curriculum

In 2002 Estelle Morris published the green paper 14-19: extending opportunities, raising standards (pdf text 1.8mb), which set out her proposals for the 14-19 curriculum.

A year later her successor Charles Clarke published another consultation document. 14-19: opportunity and excellence set out his proposals, taking into account responses to the 2002 green paper.

In May 2004 Clarke announced an overhaul of the modern apprenticeships programme. There would be apprenticeships for 14 to 16 year olds, with pupils spending up to two days a week in the workplace learning a trade. He rejected criticisms that this amounted to a reintroduction of selection and insisted that the new scheme would attract motivated and able pupils (The Guardian 11 May 2004).

In October 2004 the working group chaired by former chief inspector Mike Tomlinson published its report 14-19 Curriculum and Qualifications Reform.

Tomlinson identified the following problems:

- the UK’s poor record on keeping teenagers at school;
- low skill levels in numeracy, literacy and ICT;
- the poor status of vocational courses and qualifications;
• the lack of challenges for bright students;
• the difficulty of differentiating between thousands of pupils with A grade A Levels;
• exam overload; and
• the complexity and lack of transparency in the web of academic and vocational qualifications.

The report recommended:

• replacing GCSEs, A Levels and vocational qualifications with a new single modular diploma at four levels: entry (equivalent to pre-GCSEs), foundation (GCSEs at grade D-G), intermediate (GCSE A*-C) and advanced (A Level);
• introducing a compulsory ‘core’ consisting of ‘functional’ subjects (maths, ICT and communication skills) and ‘wider activities’ (work experience, paid jobs, voluntary work and family responsibilities);
• cutting the number of exams;
• replacing coursework with a single extended project;
• enabling students to progress at their own rate, paving the way for mixed-aged classes;
• stretching the most able students with tougher additional A Level papers; and
• providing ‘graduates’ of the diploma with a transcript of their achievements which would be available to employers and universities online.

The committee said its proposals would take at least a decade to implement fully, though some elements could be introduced much sooner. Tomlinson’s recommendations were backed by heads, by the chief inspector of schools and by the head of the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA). Barry Sheerman, chair of the House of Commons Education and Skills Select Committee, wrote (in The Guardian 21 February 2005) that the government’s decision would be ‘the most significant for education’ during Tony Blair’s premiership.

2004 Higher Education Act

In January 2003 the government published its White Paper The future of higher education which proposed allowing universities to charge variable top-up fees. This was highly controversial but the government just managed to get the 2004 Higher Education Act (1 July 2004) through the Commons.

Blair’s overall aim in his last term as prime minister was that the state should no longer be primarily a direct provider of services, but instead become a regulator and commissioner of services purchased from public, private and voluntary sectors. In one shape or other, markets are being introduced into the public sector – “contestability”, in the jargon - in which providers compete not necessarily over price, but quality. (Wintour 2005)

2006 Education and Inspections Act [97]

The 2006 Act was based on the 2005 white paper Higher Standards, Better Schools for All which clearly demonstrated that the longer a party remains in power, the more extreme its policies become.
It proposed that:

- all primary and secondary schools would be encouraged to become independent state schools (‘trust schools’) backed by private sponsors - businesses, charities, faith groups, universities or parent and community organisations. Like the academies, they would determine their own curriculum and ethos, would appoint the governing body, own their own assets, employ their own staff and set their own admissions policy. They would be required to have parents’ councils which would have a say in the day to day running of the school and on issues such as school meals, uniform and discipline;
- schools would be required to ‘take note of’ guidelines on admissions and there would be a pupil banding scheme to ensure a mix of abilities;
- a school deemed to be failing would be given a year to improve before a ‘competition for new providers’ was held. It would then be reopened as an academy or a trust school with a private sponsor;
- parents would be given the right to set up new schools, to close ‘failing’ ones and to sack head teachers;
- good schools would be encouraged to expand or link up with neighbouring schools in federations, and successful schools would be able to apply for new responsibilities such as teacher training;
- local education authorities would lose most of their powers and would become ‘parents’ champions’ rather than education providers;
- teachers would be given the legal right to discipline pupils;
- parenting contracts and orders would be extended and parents who failed to fulfil their contractual duties would face fines;
- schools would be encouraged to tailor lessons to individual pupils and there would be more support for struggling pupils; and
- pupils from low income families would get subsidised transport to any of the nearest three schools within a six-mile radius.

The white paper was mired in controversy right from the start. Adonis’s fingerprints were all over it. ‘The first half - promoting private intervention, looking to all but abolish local authority involvement in state schools - reads as almost unadulterated Adonis’, commented Will Woodward in *The Guardian* (Woodward 2005).

This caused problems for education secretary Ruth Kelly, who warned that the proposal to create trust schools was ill-thought through. She was overruled by Adonis and Blair and was warned by colleagues that if she didn’t go along with them her ministerial career would be a short one (*Daily Mail* 17 October 2005; *The Observer* 23 October 2005).

But it wasn’t only Kelly who was unhappy with Blair’s proposals. Teachers and Labour MPs were furious and even cabinet members (including Gordon Brown and John Prescott) were worried. Former education secretary Estelle Morris described the white paper as ‘one of the most contradictory documents ever produced by government’ (*The Guardian* 22 November 2005).

More than a hundred Labour MPs threatened to rebel. Their main concern centred, once again, around the issue of selection. Blair pointed out that selection on grounds of ability had been illegal in new schools since 1998, but his critics argued that this
still left a large - and probably increasing - role for covert selection. The white paper’s proposal to take many more schools out of local authority control and give them greater autonomy in determining their selection procedures would make the situation worse, and the proposed code of admissions did not have statutory force.

In mid-December, a group of 58 Labour backbenchers - including nine former ministers - published an alternative white paper. They said the plans for trust schools were likely to ‘strengthen rather than break’ the link between being poor and underachieving in education (The Guardian 15 December 2005). [98]

Kelly responded that trust schools were not ‘a new category of school’ and would be no more independent from local authorities than existing foundation schools (The Guardian 20 December 2005). This was disingenuous, to say the least, and she was given an extremely hostile reception by local government officials at the North of England education conference in Newcastle (The Guardian 7 January 2006).

By mid-January, more than half of Labour backbenchers had signed up to the alternative white paper (The Guardian 18 January 2006). Kelly made matters worse by telling them they ‘didn’t understand’ the government’s plans (The Guardian 21 January 2006).

Relations deteriorated even further when it was revealed that Kelly had suppressed a crucial report warning that her plans would widen the educational gulf between rich and poor children (The Observer 22 January 2006). And the Sutton Trust published new research showing that top-performing comprehensives which controlled their own admissions were already excluding poorer pupils (The Guardian 24 January 2006).

As the first reading of the education bill drew nearer, attempts were made to find compromises, especially on the issues of admissions and the role of local authorities. Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott caved in. ‘My ideas have developed about how we can take forward the traditional values of comprehensive education in a modern setting’, he said (The Guardian 4 February 2006).

Having made a number of concessions, Blair refused any further changes to his bill (The Guardian 7, 9 February 2006) and Kelly insisted she would retain her right to prevent local authorities opening new comprehensive schools (The Guardian 27 February 2006).

Many backbenchers deeply disapproved of the mass handover of publicly owned, democratically accountable schools to unelected private bodies. The bill, they argued, represented ‘the first irreversible step towards the privatisation of the state schools system’ (Matthew Taylor The Guardian 20 February 2006).

The first reading of the Education and Inspections Bill took place on 15 March 2006. As expected, Blair was forced to rely on Conservative MPs to get it through. 52 Labour MPs voted against and a handful abstained (The Guardian 16 March 2006).

During the third reading, in May 2006, 67 backbenchers voted for a rebel amendment which would have required schools to hold a parents’ ballot before they became independent trusts (The Guardian 24 May 2006). But with Tory support, Blair got his bill, by 422 to 98 votes. It was the largest rebellion ever suffered by a Labour
government at third reading (The Guardian 25 May 2006).

The main provisions of the Education and Inspections Act (8 November 2006) were:
• all schools could become trust schools by forming links with external partners who would be able to appoint the majority of the governors, own their own assets, employ their own staff, set their admission arrangements and be able to apply for additional flexibilities;
• local authorities would be required to promote choice, diversity, high standards and the fulfilment of potential for every child, respond to parental concerns about the quality of local schools, act as decision-maker on school organisation matters, ensure that young people have a range of exciting things to do in their spare time, appoint School Improvement Partners for maintained schools, and provide positive activities for young people; and
• the admissions framework would reaffirm the ban on new selection by ability, place a ban on interviewing, strengthen the status of the Code on School Admissions, bringing in new powers for admissions forums, and extend the duty on local authorities to provide free transport for the most disadvantaged families.

In addition, the Act:
• required governing bodies to promote well-being and community cohesion, and to take the Children and Young People’s Plan into consideration;
• created a power for staff to discipline pupils;
• extended the scope of parenting orders and contracts;
• improved provision for excluded pupils;
• put in place a new entitlement to specialised diplomas for young people;
• set new nutritional standards for food and drink served in maintained schools;
• merged several existing inspectorates to form an enlarged Ofsted, covering the full range of services for children and young people, as well as life-long learning; and
• replaced references to ‘local education authorities’ with ‘local authorities’ in all legislation (Section 162).

The academies programme

Meanwhile, the government was pushing ahead with its academies programme, despite continuing problems and persistent criticisms.

Meanwhile, Conservative party leader David Cameron announced that the Tories would ‘revolutionise’ education by supporting the formation of parent-run co-operative schools paid for by local authorities. He said he was setting up a ‘Conservative Co-operative Movement’ based on the ideals of the Rochdale Society of Equitable Pioneers, the world’s first successful co-operative.

The National Union of Teachers (NUT) warned that the proposals would increase social segregation, and Co-operative Party general secretary Peter Hunt said: ‘Co-operative Party policies are ... rooted in Labour philosophy. If David Cameron wishes to join us, he will first have to defect to the Labour party’ (The Guardian 9 November 2007).
At a conference at Brighton College in May 2008, the new shadow education secretary was Michael Gove. Gove told teachers that a Conservative government would reinstate traditional styles of fact-based lessons. Generations of children had been let down by so-called progressive education policies which had taught skills and ‘empathy’ instead of bodies of knowledge, he said. He condemned the ‘pupil-centred learning’ theories which had gained support in the 1960s for ‘dethroning’ the teacher.

Nuffield Review of 14-19 education and training [99]

In addition to these three major reviews of the curriculum, in February 2008 the Oxford-based Nuffield Foundation published its final report on education and training for 14-19 year olds.

_Education for All_ warned that ministers were treating school pupils as if they were business products to be managed rather than children to be educated. The government’s aim of boosting the British economy was overshadowing the true role of schools in young people’s lives. Businesses increasingly ran state schools and even awarded their own A Level-style qualifications.

The lead director of the Review, Professor Richard Pring, said:

The changes at 14-19 are too often driven by economic goals at the expense of broader educational aims. This is reflected in the rather impoverished language drawn from business and management, rather than from a more generous understanding of the whole person. We need to give young learners far more than skills for employment alone, even if such skills are key to the country’s economy.

Free schools

Gove’s other big idea was to establish up to 2,000 Swedish-style ‘free schools’ - independent schools run by or for parents but paid for by the state. He had first proposed these in September 2008. ‘We have seen the future in Sweden and it works’, he declared. ‘Standards have been driven up. If it can work there, it can work here.’

2010

The new Conservative/Liberal-democratic government came to power in May 2010. As regards, education policies, what has the new government done so far, and what is it planning to do? The list is already a depressing one:

- expansion of the academies programme;
- creation of ‘free schools’;
- drastic budget cuts;
- scrapping of the new primary curriculum, school sports partnerships, diplomas, QCDA and the schools rebuilding programme;
- fewer places in higher education and vastly increased tuition fees.
Free schools

Gove was determined to press ahead with the creation of thousands of ‘free schools’, a policy he had made much of during the election campaign. However, his propensity for exaggeration was as pronounced in relation to free schools as it had been in the case of academies. In June he claimed that 700 of the schools would be open in 2011. Three months later he was forced to admit that the actual number was 16. Almost half would be faith schools: three Christian, two Jewish, one Hindu and one Sikh. (The Guardian 6 September 2010)

Writing in The Guardian, Simon Jenkins pointed out that the free schools policy - creating schools which were not ‘under local authority control’ - was just another version of the ‘dreary abuse of local democracy’ which had been pursued by Thatcher and Blair: “Transient private corporations or parents’ groups cannot realistically stand proxy for a community, let alone for a town or city...”

Will a recognisable state system of education even exist five years from now?
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6.3 Spreadsheet Analysis of Main Cases

In this chapter the many details provided in the historical narratives are highlighted using the numbers in square brackets as cross-references. There are three spreadsheets: generic events, the case of the Netherlands, and the case of England. The second two contain a wealth of detail initially analysed using Beckert’s and Mann’s terms of reference.

All three are split out from a larger, single spreadsheet which provides a chronological comparison between the two main cases. We have, however, confined our data presentation to this format on the grounds that it is for those seeking data to mine this quarry as fits their various purposes. At the same time, the spreadsheet format allows one to elaborate or supplement data. Further possible sources are listed in 6.4.

Table 3: Generic Educational Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Gutenberg’s printing press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Humanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erasmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Mirandola’s Manifesto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Luther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Comenius Didactica Magna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,5,6,7</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Locke, Rousseau, Kant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>French Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td></td>
<td>Napoleon defeated Belgium, Holland to 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>John Stuart Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Kuyper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: The Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Cognitive Frames (Cultural)</th>
<th>Institutions (Political)</th>
<th>Social Networks (Economic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>First school in Utrecht</td>
<td>Religious education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral training, beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bourgeoise (Townies)</td>
<td>Loss of church monopoly / numeracy</td>
<td>Capital, economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>Secular City schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protestantism</td>
<td></td>
<td>economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tracts on education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Post Reformation</td>
<td>Protestants trump Catholics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rationalism, numeracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endow / Fees / teacher funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>moral teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>parent funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Society for Common Good</td>
<td>For lower classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td></td>
<td>Batavian Republic</td>
<td>neutral curriculum</td>
<td>state centred</td>
<td>state funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Commission for Nat. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Education Law</td>
<td>3 r's</td>
<td>state centred</td>
<td>state funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Education Law</td>
<td>Civic and Christian virtues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Education Law</td>
<td>No neutral</td>
<td>non-denominational</td>
<td>Need for unconditional funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equalised: private public boards/parents govnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>da Costa</td>
<td>school attendance measured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td></td>
<td>Petitions separate schools</td>
<td>ex Catholics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Groen van Prinsterer</td>
<td>Freedom conscience, worship, education</td>
<td>Equal opps via state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Commission on Elementary Education</td>
<td>secular state not fund religious schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Unbelief and Revolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>New constitution</td>
<td></td>
<td>private monetary provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Education Law</td>
<td>state supervised</td>
<td>Local funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Education Law</td>
<td></td>
<td>equal state funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Despotism of state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Anti-Schoolwetverbond</td>
<td>Local not state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>National People’s petition Education Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Multiple curriculum / not NC Church or state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% state funded / 70% municipalities aim for equal funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td></td>
<td>anti-neutral curriculum competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent run free of state and church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>state funding unfair over privates / 0 state funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Constitution revisited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>New Education Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kuyper prime minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Commission report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>First Montessori school Pluralism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Revised constitution Art 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anyone can start a school, ‘distributive policy’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State fundedFed salaries; local assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Elementary Education Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountable to state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All primary schools state funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>First Dalton and first Waldorf school Pluralism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All primary education state funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>First Werkplaats Kindergemeenschap Pluralism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All primary education state funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provisions for secondary and tertiary schools All education state funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>First Jenaplan school Pluralism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mammoetwet Improve connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>‘Towards a constructive education policy’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government leading in education ‘constructive policy’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Change in constitution Art. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary and tertiary accountable to state State-led education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Attempt to change education law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Marketisation of education Economic motives in education Business influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction student loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Attempt to change education law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Criticism Art. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Proposal for new education law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attempt to strengthen the position of (school, university etc.) boards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Cognitive Frame (Cultural)</td>
<td>Institutions (Political)</td>
<td>Social Networks (Economic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>First grammar school</td>
<td>Endowed by king</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>45/46</td>
<td>All cathedrals had schools</td>
<td>Not fit education</td>
<td>Not all church / some secular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Oxford functioning</td>
<td>Liberal 3 + 4 Self-governing Rich few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Cambridge functioning</td>
<td>self-mastered Incorporated/self governing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford University</td>
<td>Church and secular Incorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ind. Corp. learned bodies Fee funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Waynefleet Magdalen</td>
<td>Endowed by Waynefleet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Renaissance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>52/53</td>
<td>Henry VIII Chivalric tutors over scholar courtiers</td>
<td>Foundations (church and state supported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Apprenticeships (Artificrs Act) Clerisy Knights / Diplomacy Apprentices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing schools e.g. Sackville funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comenius in London Universal curriculum State intervenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Post Cromwell Restoration</td>
<td>State recedes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Charity schools Need for ‘useful’ studies Charity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Revolution National education state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Factory Act Morality, health Protection of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>National Society Parish (church) schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td></td>
<td>British and Foreign Society Non-denominational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Rep. of People Act Widened franchise state funds buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Central Society Religion free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanics Institutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700 private / 200 endowed</td>
<td>State funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Committee</td>
<td>State funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
<td>Privy Council Right to issue degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Bell monitoring Industrialised education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Grants Act</td>
<td>State funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Dept of Education State Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Education Act Local school boards Rates funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Endowed Schools Commiss. Into Charities</td>
<td>Central NC / Feder. MC State via local boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Balfour Education Act</td>
<td>National ed system Science Separate church and state Local education authorities Rome on the rates State funding for all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Government report</td>
<td>Secondary school regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>State involvement deepens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>11 yrs as key threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Government report</td>
<td>School age to 14 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Non-denominational state schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Government report</td>
<td>Local management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Compulsory 6-14 in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Government report</td>
<td>General coordination by state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Spens Report</td>
<td>Tripartite concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Government report</td>
<td>What is education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Repealed previous acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Deepens state involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Primary, secondary and tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Education per wishes of parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Strong centralisation, yet advocating 'teacher-led change'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Church and private schools excepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Self confident students, not bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Tripartite conception Three types of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Cyril Burt</td>
<td>IQ testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Oil price hike, etc.</td>
<td>Global economy influenced education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Cross party lurch to right</td>
<td>State involvement intensified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Neo-liberal marketisation begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>National curriculum To control teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>90 Education Act</td>
<td>Power to parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>91 Education Act</td>
<td>Higher education fees begin (instead of tax-funded grants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>92 Education Act (No 2)</td>
<td>Marketisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Local Management displaces local authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>94 Student Loans Act</td>
<td>Top up fees begin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>95 Education Act</td>
<td>Consolidates all since 1944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>96 Labour comes to power</td>
<td>Blair = Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>97 Education Act</td>
<td>Concept of market + state intensifies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>99 Nuffield Report</td>
<td>Increase educational marginalisation of poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Too much business influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Other Data Sources and References for Main Cases

The Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek has a lot of information and databases. [http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/menu/themas/onderwijs/cijfers/default.htm](http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/menu/themas/onderwijs/cijfers/default.htm)

and:


In particular total expenses education (1900-present): [http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=80509NED&D1=0-1,3-4,6-7,9-11,13-14,16-18&D2=0,5,10,15,20,25,30,35,40,45,50,55,60,65,70,75,80,85,90,95,100,105-110&HD=120118-1003&HDR=T&STB=G1](http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=80509NED&D1=0-1,3-4,6-7,9-11,13-14,16-18&D2=0,5,10,15,20,25,30,35,40,45,50,55,60,65,70,75,80,85,90,95,100,105-110&HD=120118-1003&HDR=T&STB=G1)


6.5 Country Perspective I: Germany

Financing higher education in Germany
Gunnar Glänzel and Thomas Scheuerle, Centre for Social Investment, University of Heidelberg, Germany

Introduction

In comparison to other countries, higher education in Germany bears relatively low costs to students, since the state covers much of it. However, neither has this always been the case nor does this mean that students do not have to have a certain amount of income to pay for their cost of living, books, IT, transportation, etc. So generally, there are two kinds of costs of education: The cost of providing it, and the cost of receiving it, the latter expressible as either opportunity cost or cost of living and studying. To generate income to cover the latter costs, there are three principle sources: The state, students’ stakeholders in the wider sense (families, friends, employers, etc.), and third parties, such as foundations, businesses, networks, etc. The paper will deal with the first source and how the state contributes to cover students’ living costs by providing subsidies (half in the form of a grant, half as a low-interest loan) within the framework of the Bundesausbildungsförderungsgesetz (BAföG, federal education promotion act). Its enactment in 1971 can be seen as a social innovation in the wider context of the “Bildungsexpansion” (education expansion) in Germany, a process in which the state and other societal actors sought to include more people in higher education, as it became increasingly clear that education is an important ingredient to a nation’s economic and social progress (Hradil, 2005, p. 157). Depending on student families’ income, the BAföG entitles students to receive subsidies to cover part of their living costs.

The main goal of the act is to increase the level of equal opportunities in the educational system as well as to mobilise and utilise the human resources of economically weaker parts of society. And in fact, its enactment has enabled more people to enter the system of higher education in Germany in a less selective and conditional way (other sources of subsidies discriminate more according to certain criteria, such as confession or high talent), thus reducing the amount of marginalised people in economic terms in general and in terms of education in particular. However, the case also illustrates two other aspects of social innovation: First, it demonstrates practical difficulties of handling the concept of marginalization, as this kind of social innovation has neither been designed for not reached the most marginalised in German society. And second, it also underscores that the provision of finance is probably not the most effective way of alleviating the problem of lacking access to education, as the example also makes clear that many are still excluded despite the fact that they are entitled to receive BAföG payments. Instead, other barriers persist, mainly cultural ones, and as a result, part of the social problem remains in place.

Studying in Germany – Access constraints for students with weak socio-economic and educational family background

Education, teaching and learning bear substantial direct and indirect costs: First, teachers have to be paid and teaching facilities have to be operated and maintained.
But also, learning is an unproductive process and thus bears substantial indirect and opportunity costs. In this respect, it is common to distinguish between primary and secondary costs of education (Hetmeier et al., 2007; Avenarius et al., 2003). Secondary costs vary of course, depending on students’ standard of living which in turn depends on which standard they are able to afford. On average, they are approximately €794 per month:

Table 6: Secondary costs of studying: Major costs of living for students in Germany in 2012 (Middendorff et al., 2012, p. 257).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ausgewählte Ausgabenpositionen</th>
<th>Einnahmenquartile in €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bis 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miete einschl. Nebenkosten</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernährung</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleidung</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lernmittel</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto und/oder öffentliche Verkehrsmittel</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eigene Krankenversicherung, Arzt kosten, Medikamente</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommunikation (Telefon, Internet u. a. m.)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freizeit, Kultur und Sport</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures show a slight increase from the last panel of 2009 when total costs averaged at €757. As students usually do not have the time to have a full-time job and thus not the income to cover their costs of living, there is a financing gap which becomes a social problem, once students’ parents (or other “stakeholders”, such as spouses) neither have the financial resources to cover these costs (or are reluctant to do so). Of course, the worse a student family’s financial situation, the more severe this social problem becomes.

There are two sides to this social problem officially acknowledged: First, there is individual deprivation due to the lack of equal opportunities. A large amount of data indicates that particularly students from families with weak socio economic backgrounds (single parents, lower working class etc.) and lower education levels are particularly affected. Moreover, these characteristics often overlap with a migration background. Second, also the macroeconomic or societal effect of the economic potential that remains untapped when talented people are not educated well enough

39 For pragmatic reasons, some tables and figures are presented in German and the terms therein translated in footnotes.
40 Translations: Ausgewählte Ausgabenpositionen “Selected expenses”; Einnahmenquartile “personal income, sample quartiles”; Miete einschl. Nebenkosten “rent including additional expenses”; Ernährung “food”; Kleidung “clothes”; Lernmittel “learning material”; Auto und/oder öffentliche Verkehrsmittel “car or public transport”; eigene Krankenversicherung, Arzt kosten, Medikamente “own health insurance, medical costs, pharmaceuticals”; Kommunikation (Telefon, Internet, u.a.m.) “Communication (phone, internet, etc.)”; Freizeit, Kultur und Sport “leisure, culture, and sports”; insgesamt “total”.
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(Barz et al., 2013). The German state has been attempting to tackle this problem for a couple of decades now and finances education in several ways. The German system for financing higher education is vastly differentiated and complex. Much of the cost is borne by the state in two forms: Direct financing of teaching institutions (universities, universities of applied sciences, and art colleges) to cover the primary costs of education; and direct financial support to students and/or their families (young adults in education up to the age of 27 are treated as children dependent on their families’ income and thus entitled to receive support from the state) to cover secondary costs. Such support can take monetary forms (by increasing the income of receivers either through direct payments or through tax cuts) or non-monetary ones (e.g. free health insurance for students or support to institutions providing students with non-monetary support) (Gwosd and Schwarzenberger, 2009). The best-known and most popular form of direct monetary support is the BAföG support scheme which is tied to certain socio-economic criteria to be met by students’ families. Besides that, students can also apply for other but less easily accessible support from the state and also from other actors such as foundations which, however, tie their support to stricter criteria, such as a certain track record in political or civil engagement, high talent or being member of a certain target group. The BAföG is less selective and more open to large parts of the population, as the targeted beneficiary groups of the BAföG are groups that have been traditionally excluded from higher education due to economic reasons: Women, people with family backgrounds of low education, migrants, etc. (Middendorff et al., 2012). As a result of this broad approach, in 2012, when the last official student census was conducted, 24% of all German students enrolled received BAföG promotion – a slight increase from the previous poll carried out in 2009, however a significant decline from values in the early 1990s41 (also see appendices 1 and 2):

BaföG support comprises two parts: Half of the support is provided in the form of a grant, and the other half in form of an interest-free loan. The total amount of debt a student may accrue in the course of a BaföG support scheme is capped at €10,000, i.e. s/he will not accrue debt exceeding that amount due to BaföG support received. However, BaföG support is provided only for a certain period of time: In the case of

41 However, this decline may partly be attributable to methodological changes made in the early 2000s.
studies the standard study period applies in general, but certain exceptions and extensions may be granted based on terms defined in the act (§15, BAföG). After that time, the student may take a low-interest loan to support her/his living from the semi-state bank KfW (Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau; credit institution for reconstruction). The amount of support depends on five main factors:

- The type of education
- Costs of accommodation
- Health insurance
- Maintenance obligation of parents/spouses
- The place of education

The main factor is whether or not s/he still lives with her/his parents and (if s/he is still dependent on and entitled to family support) and the economic situation of her/his family. The maximum amount for students is €670 per month and is calculated depending on the demand, i.e. costs of living and sources of income/support from family and/or spouses (§13, BAföG). There are options to get higher support, e.g. if children are being raised or if housing costs are extraordinarily high.

The BAföG act has opened up higher education to large parts of the German population which previously could not afford to study, because of the opportunity costs incurred by not being able to earn a living while studying. Usually however it does not cover all costs a student faces. To get a picture of that potential gap, we should take a look at the distribution of support amounts received:

![Figure 2: Amounts of BAföG support (€) received by percentages of students (Middendorff et al., 2012, p. 302).](image)

We do not have data comparing costs of living (see table 1 above) and amounts received through the BAföG scheme, but it appears reasonable to assume that most BAföG receivers still depend on additional sources of income (also see below in the section on impact of the SI). This assumption is backed when comparing the average amounts of BAföG support received (ranging from €388 to €480 per month for

---

42 There is the option to receive BAföG support which is not related to the student’s family (‘elternunabhängiges BAföG’). 12% of BAföG receivers fall into this category (Middendorff et al., 2014, p. 307). In that case, spouse’s income may enter the calculation.

43 Translations: bis 50 “up to 50”; über 600 “more than 600”.
different income groups, see table 2 below) or even the maximum amount possible of €670 with students’ average costs of living approximately €794 per month.

**Antecedents of the SI**

Before the BAFöG act was passed in 1971, there was a legal antecedent in place since the late 1950s: The ‘Honnefer Modell’ (‘Honnef Model’, named after a conference held in Bad Honnef, North Rhine-Westphalia, in 1955), introduced starting with the winter semester 1957/58. And this model, in turn, followed some remarkable developments in the German landscape of higher education. After the WW2 generation had largely graduated, a new generation of younger students populated German universities and student committees which substantial voting power in what is called universities’ self-administration (‘Selbstverwaltung’). With them came an emphasis on different topics, namely first and foremost the social situation of students and support options. A survey among 110,000 students was carried out in the summer semester of 1951. The results were rather disillusioning: Only 5% of respondents had the necessary amount of monthly income to sustain their living; every second one had less that two thirds of that amount and 20% even had less than a third.

These results were discussed quite broadly, but particularly within the higher education field and there also at the official level: In 1952, the Western-German rector council (Westdeutsche Rektorenkonferenz) and the association of universities (Hochschulverband) – two bodies representing the professors – discussed the situation and announced it would call for and support any improvement of it. Almost at the same time, delegates of the German association of student bodies (Verband deutscher Studentenschaften) gathered as well as the student services organisations (Studentenwerke) which were responsible for delivering certain services to students, such as housing or affordable daily goods. So the three main groups (professors, students, and service providers) all took up the issue and were relatively clear that the situation calls urgently for improvement. However, they lacked the right format to cooperate on the issue. So in 1952, the ‘permanent council for student issues’ (Ständiger Ausschuss für Studentenfragen) was established which would consist of representatives of these three bodies as well as the head of the council of states’ education ministries and representatives of the federal ministries of state, work, and foreign affairs. This body gathered on a six-weekly term and prepared the conference of Bad Honnef which would later declare the Honnefer Modell. Suggestions for a support schemes for students to be discussed at that conference came mainly from different student associations: Left-wing organisations called for grant schemes, while liberal ones suggested forms based on loan schemes. However, there was quite some consensus that students should be viewed as autonomous economic actors (independent from their parents) who should have to be capable of financing their own living. Just the means to achieve that were contested (Rohwedder, 2012). All in all, the participants of the Bad Honnef conference were not so much in conflict and students overall not yet so much in opposition to what would later be called “the establishment” (or worse).

---

44 It may be noteworthy that like many other fields of post-war Germany, there were lots of conflicts between the WW2 generation and its successors and society in general but in political and administrative bodies, such as universities bodies of self-administration, in particular Rohwedder (2012).
Thus at the conference, the Honnef model was decided, which would include both grants in the form of scholarships and a repayable portion in the form of a loan. However, there was no legal claim to get such support, unlike the BAföG would contain later on. Until 1971 between 15% and 19% of all students received such support. It had been introduced, because the first social panel had found that students hardly benefitted from the economic boom of the early 1950, and neither were they covered by the social security systems very well. Diverse actors in the educational field (representatives of universities, students, and policymakers both from federal as well as state level) gathered for a conference in Bad Honnef to discuss different models to support students. The result did not consist in codified law, but in a joint agreement between the federal government (‘Bund’) and the states (‘Länder’) die share the costs of promoting economically weak students. In 1964, a formal administrative agreement was made. And because the Honnef model was only for university students, in 1958 the ‘Rhöndorfer Modell’ (Rhöndorf model) was introduced for students of universities of applied sciences and other institutions for higher education not included in the original Honnef model; in contrast its predecessor, the Rhöndorf model was financed by the states only (Deutsches Studentenwerk, 2015).

**Status quo and impact of the SI**

In terms of the CrESSI definition, only one out of the two rationales or goals of the BAföG can be seen as a social innovation: The goal of reducing the untapped economic potential of society is more of an economic or policy innovation, while the goal to increase equal opportunities targets the capabilities of deprived individuals. Therefore, we will only look at this one objective of the BAföG legislation.

In all of the polls since 1994, the percentage of women receiving BAföG promotion was markedly higher than the one for men: 21 vs. 24% in 2003; 22 vs. 25% in 2006; 21 vs. 26% in 2009 and 22 vs. 26% in 2012 (Middendorff et al., 2012). Yet still, in absolute terms, the number of women promoted is lower than the one of men, as their overall enrolment figures are lower.

The extent to which the act can be seen as a social innovation depends significantly on whether or not it has been successful in attracting children of families with an underprivileged educational background to higher education. Indeed, this is one of the central aims of the BAföG. Therefore, the data on the proportion of those whose parents do not have a high educational level is also collected regularly. Here we see the distribution of BAföG receiver as to their families’ educational backgrounds:
We see that the BAföG apparently meets its objective. It reaches more of those whose families have not had the privilege of an upper or high formal education. But also the amount of BAföG support received also correlates with the educational family background:

Table 7: Average amount of monthly BAföG support (Middendorff et al., 2012, p. 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational background</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In figure 3 we see that there is a substantial group of students who have formerly received BAföG support but do not do so anymore. The most common primary reason for that is that the maximum duration (in most cases the standard study period) has been exceeded, but it is also noteworthy that a significant portion also states that the fear of over-indebtedness made them stop receiving the support: 18% of lower education family background, 11% medium, 9% of the upper and 5% in the high educational background group, i.e. this reason is stated almost three times as often by low-education family members than for the counterpart with high family educational level (ibid, p. 291).

---

45 Translations: niedrig “low”; mittel “medium”; gehoben “upper”; hoch “high”; Bildungsherkunft “educational family background”; BAföG-Quote “Percentage of current BAföG receivers”; früher Geförderte “Percentage of former BAföG receivers”.
46 Educational backgrounds of families have been operationalised as follows: Low = one or no parent has a complete but non-academic job education; medium = both parents have a complete but non-academic job education; upper = one parent has completed an academic education; high = both parents have completed an academic education.
47 Obviously it is assumed here that the target group correlates with the educational background of the families involved. It should be noted again that BAföG support is provided depending on the economic situation of the student and her/his family, and not the educational situation.
Concerning another perspective of those receiving BAföG, the following table gives an indication of how the financial support is important in enhancing people’s capabilities in terms of higher education:

Table 8: Percentages of students stating that BAföG enables them to study (Middendorff et al., 2012, p. 280)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational background</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Fully agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So apparently, those from families with weak educational backgrounds depend significantly more on BAföG support. In turn, this shows that BAföG is quite effective as a social innovation, as it helps people who otherwise would not be able to study.

Coming back to our question above (whether or not BAföG support is sufficient to cover all living cost expenses) we may take a look at a similar self-assessment. When asked about how BAföG affects them securing their costs of living, BAföG receivers replied as follows:

Table 9: Percentages of students stating that their costs of living are covered securely (Middendorff et al., 2012, p. 280)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational background</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Fully agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

We have seen that the BAföG support scheme helps many to get access to higher education who would otherwise be excluded for economic reasons. However, the figures presented so far represent those who already are in tertiary education and not those who are still excluded. Yet studies show that there are strong influences keeping young adults out of higher education although they would be qualified (Autorenguppe Bildungsberichterstattung, 2014). They range from early childhood through primary and secondary education. In all of these development phases, the German education system tends to reproduce the educational status of families: Children, youth, and young adults are persistently evaluated and ranked according to their social status and the educational background of their families. The actual performance of children and youth is of course shaped by these assessments, but it good performance also tends to be undervalued. That in turn has a strong influence on young peoples’ educational career: After primary school it is decided whether or not
children go to the “Gymnasium” which is by far the most important milestone towards a later higher education. And it has been shown repeatedly that these decisions are not adequately taken on the basis of pupils’ school performance, but are strongly influenced by cultural factors, such as the teachers’ perception of the educational background of the pupils (Müller-Benedict, 2007; Bourdieu, 1984, 2010). Moreover, recent research indicates that not only financial opportunities might affect educational chances. Also social skills transmitted from one generation to the next through behavioural characteristics learnt and copied within the family environment are relevant for education decisions. Bowles et al (2005) show that such social skills, traits and personality are expressed in a collaborative attitude, ambition, orientation toward the future, sense of personal efficacy, work ethic, risk-taking etc. Such factors might also let young people step back from tertiary education in an academic environment. Although they seem to be far more difficult to be addressed by public policies, they should also be considered as future intervention targets48.

At the moment, the direction against higher education is set quite early, and it is very hard for an individual who has not taken the ‘normal’ path towards studying to make the tough decisions required to do so later on, particularly in families in which nobody has studied before. These cultural influences also act as strong and enduring inertia against more educational mobility (Lörz, 2012).

Nevertheless, over the long-term the BAföG scheme is an expression of a changing cognitive frame on a societal level. A hundred years ago, it would have been unthinkable that principally everybody can and even should have access to higher education. Today, this is more or less common sense and a shared taken-for-grantedness. The BAföG scheme is a manifestation of how the cognitive framing has changed over that period of time.

References


48 For a more detailed elaboration of this argument see von Jacobi and Chiappero-Martinetti (2015).


Appendix 1: Historical data on university students receiving BAföG support

Figure 4: Historical data on university students receiving BAföG support
Appendix 2: University students and pupils in school receiving BAföG support

![Bar chart showing the number of students and pupils receiving BAföG support from 1998 to 2013.](chart)

*Figure 5: University students and pupils in school receiving BAföG support*
6.6 Country Perspective II: Finland

Jari Aro, University of Tampere, Finland

The Ministry of Education and Culture in Finland defines the outlines of Finnish education policy in the following way:

“One of the basic principles of Finnish education is that all people must have equal access to high-quality education and training. The same opportunities to education should be available to all citizens irrespective of their ethnic origin, age, wealth or where they live. Education policy is built on the lifelong learning principle.

The basic right to education and culture is recorded in the Constitution. Public authorities must secure equal opportunities for every resident in Finland to get education also after compulsory schooling and develop themselves, irrespective of their financial standing. In Finland education is free at all levels from pre-primary to higher education. Adult education is the only form of education that may require payment.

The key words in Finnish education policy are quality, efficiency, equity and internationalisation. Geared to promote the competitiveness of Finnish welfare society, education is also seen as an end in itself.”

( http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Koulutus/koulutuspolitiikka/?lang=en )

Finnish basic school reform

The Finnish basic school reform in the 1970s is considered as the most important change in the education system which has increased the equality in access to education and training. The discussions and planning of the reform was done in politically oriented education committees during the 1950s and 1960s.

In the 1950s the Finnish education system followed a parallel model. After 4 years of primary school children were divided at the age of 11 or 12 into two educational tracks. Some went to the so-called civic school, others to grammar school. The grammar school consisted of 5-year middle school and 3-years high school which opened the possibility to higher education. An alternative educational path after the 4 years of basic education was 2 or 3 years of study in one of the civic schools, offered by most Finnish municipalities. The basic education could be followed by vocational training and technical education. (Sahlberg and Hargreaves, 2011, p. 15) (A diagram of the education system before 1970s is presented in Sahlberg 2011 page 20 and in Aho et al., May, 2006, p. 29)

This parallel system had two major problems. The first was the rigidity of the system. The selection between grammar school and civic school determined the pupil’s later path in education and it was difficult to change from one track to another after the choice was made. The basic school reform ended this parallel system and in the current system all children have 9-years long basic education in comprehensive schools (see the diagram Education System in Finland below in this document or

The other major problem was socio-economic and regional inequality. Educational opportunities in Finland were unequal in the sense that only those living in towns or larger municipalities had access to grammar or middle schools. The same applied to vocational training and education too, only larger population centres housed these institutions. Most young people left school after 6 or 7 years of formal basic education.

In 1950 there were 338 grammar schools in Finland. The state operated 103 of these schools and municipalities ran 18. The remaining 217 grammar schools were governed by private citizens or associations. Most grammar schools charged tuition fees. A significant social innovation was a law on the state subsidies to private schools which led to opening new private schools. It also extended the government’s control over these schools. (Sahlberg and Hargreaves, 2011, pp. 15–16)

The demand for education increased during the 1950s and 1960s and both private and public grammar schools extended strongly. In 1955-1956, the nation’s grammar schools enrolled approximately 34 000 pupils. Five years later, enrolment had swelled to 215 000. In 1965 the number was 270 000 and 324 000 in 1970. (Sahlberg and Hargreaves, 2011, p. 21)

In political discussions during the 1950s and 1960s there was a wide consensus of the need to develop the education system and provide equal opportunities for education. The purpose of basic education was defined as the schooling of good citizens and providing opportunity for upward social mobility to “talented individuals” in the lower social classes. There were, however, also disagreement about the main policy principles and core values of education when the basic education reform was discussed in committees and later in the parliament. Some conservative groups and members of academic professions doubted the idea that all children can be educated and attain similar learning goals. More liberal groups on the other hand believed that all students could learn equally well. (Sahlberg and Hargreaves, 2011, p. 19; Kettunen et al., 2012, pp. 28–33)

At the beginning of the 1960s new models of social planning was introduced to the debate. Especially the theories of human capital were widely used. During these years the Finnish society was in a process of economic and social change and young people were moving from rural areas to cities without proper education or vocational training. This was considered not only a social problem but also a question of human capital. The concept was adopted from the OECD and other Scandinavian countries. It was soon established as a standard argument on education policy. According to the model, the increase in the general level of education, the growing economy and the success of the Finnish national economy in international competition are connected. These three factors produce together both social and individual progress. (Kettunen et al., 2012, pp. 26–28)

The law on comprehensive school was passed in 1966 and a national curriculum was accepted in 1970. The reform was implemented between 1972 and 1978. The central
The idea of comprehensive school was to merge existing grammar schools, civic schools and primary schools into a comprehensive 9-year municipal school. All students enrol in the same basic schooling system governed by local education authorities. The structure of the comprehensive school was similar to all students. Career guidance and counselling became a compulsory part of the comprehensive curricula in all schools. (Sahlberg and Hargreaves, 2011, pp. 21–23)

The new comprehensive school reduced inequality in basic education. The parallel system was removed and the network of schools now covers the whole country. The system provides special-needs education. Education in comprehensive schools is free of charge for pupils. Schools provide health care and other welfare services. (For more details see section Basic Education in Finland below).

Graduation rate in comprehensive schools is very high. Only 0.2% of the age cohort will not complete compulsory education successfully (Sahlberg and Hargreaves, 2011, p. 29). The learning results in the Finnish basic education are good. Finnish students’ good performance in PISA surveys is often explained by the comprehensive school model (see Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung, 2014: The Finnish Education System and PISA http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Julkaisut/2009/liitteet/opm46.pdf?language=en)

Other reforms - change in the ideology of the education policy

The whole Finnish education system went through series of reforms during the latter part of the 20th century. The university system was reformed between 1966 and 1981 and the secondary education system in the 1970s and 1980s. The system of polytechnics was established in the 1990s. Reasons and arguments were similar to those of the basic education reform: the rising demand for education, the principle of equality, and the idea of education as an investment in human capital. New schools, institutions and universities were located mainly in the northern and eastern parts of the country in order to create a regionally comprehensive education system.

During the 1990s the ideology in the planning of education changed. The new thinking was based on the idea of innovations and now education was considered an essential part of the Finnish national innovation system. The severe economic depression in Finland at the same time also supported the new ideology. After the economic crises, theories of knowledge society and knowledge economy have been popular in the Finnish education policy and discussion. The importance of the education to the economic growth and success in the global competition is expressed in phrases like “Investment in education is the basis for the knowledge economy.” (Kettunen et al., 2012, pp. 45–62; A recent review of the Finnish innovation system is Halme et al.)

The innovation policy ideology is evident in the new Act on Finnish universities in 2010. Key objectives in the reform were to make the universities to diversify their funding base, compete for international research funding, increase their international co-operation, allocate resources to top-level research and strengthen their role within the system of innovation. The reform made the universities independent legal
personalities and they were separated from the State. The autonomy of the universities as employers was significantly increased because university staff is now in contractual employment relationships with the university and the universities are able to pursue independent human resources policies. (On the University reform see http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Koulutus/koulutuspolitiikka/Hankkeet/Yliopistolaitoksen_uudistaminen/?lang=en)

**Student financial aid in Finland**

Free education at all levels from pre-primary to higher education is one way to guarantee the access to education. The other guarantee is public financial aid for studies.

The system of financial aid for studies was established at the beginning of the 1970s. Aid is provided in the form of study grant, housing supplement and government guarantee for student loans. Student financial aid is available for full-time post-comprehensive school studies, lasting at least two months at an upper secondary school, folk high school, vocational school or institution of higher education. It is also available for studies abroad.

The amount of aid depends on the student’s age, the form of housing, the level of education and means-testing. In higher education, the means-testing usually concerns the student’s own income, at other levels the parents’ income also influences the amount of aid. The aid is granted by the Social Insurance Institution (KELA) in cooperation with the education institution concerned. Student financial aid is tied to the cost-of-living index.

Study grant is available as soon as the student is no longer eligible for child benefit. Its amount depends on age, housing circumstances, marital status, school and income. Housing supplement can be paid to students living in rented or right-of-occupancy accommodation. No age limits apply. Students who do not qualify for the housing supplement can apply for a general housing allowance. With the government guarantee for study loan student can apply for a bank loan. No other security is needed for these loans. The interest and other terms are agreed by the bank and the student. The payback time is usually twice the duration of studies.

Other benefits for students are interest assistance, which is available to those who have a low income. Assistance for school travel is available for full-time student of an upper secondary school or basic vocational education. Meal subsidy is paid to student cafés and higher education students can buy meals for a subsidised price. In upper secondary schools, in initial vocational education and in some folk high schools students get free meals. (On Student financial aid see Ministry of Education and Culture http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Koulutus/opintotuki/?lang=en; KELA http://www.kela.fi/web/en/students)

There are also special services for students in health care and housing:
The Finnish Student Health Service (FSSH) provides general, mental and oral health care services for the students of universities and other institutions of higher education. (see http://www.yths.fi/en/fshs)

Approximately one third of all Finnish students live in student apartments. Student housing organisations operate in all major towns. Finnish student housing foundations and companies are non-profit making organisations governed by student unions and/or the municipality. (see http://www.soa.fi/en/appartments/)
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Education system in Finland

The following description of the Finnish education system is compiled from the web pages of the Ministry of Education and Culture (http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Koulutus/?lang=en)
Basic Education

Compulsory schooling starts in the year when a child turns seven and ends after the basic education syllabus has been completed or after ten years. The local or school curriculum is based on a national core curriculum. Completing the basic education syllabus does not lead to any qualification, but the school-leaving certificate gives access to all upper secondary education and training. Nearly all children complete their compulsory schooling.

Basic education is free of charge for pupils. Textbooks and other materials, tools etc. are free of charge in basic education and pupils are offered a free daily meal. In addition, school health care and other welfare services are free to the pupils. All pupils of compulsory school age have the right to guidance and support in learning and other schoolwork as soon as need arises.

The network of comprehensive schools covers the whole country. Education is provided in neighbourhood schools or other suitable places which make school travel
as short and safe as possible. Local authorities have a statutory duty to provide education for children of compulsory school age living in their areas.

Most institutions providing basic education are maintained by local authorities, which are obligated to organise basic education free of charge for school-aged children living within their respective areas.

Private education providers are licensed by the Government. Private provision is often run by associations and societies with a religious basis or based on a certain language (English, Russian, and German) or Steiner pedagogy. The private schools follow the same legislation and national core curricula as public schools.

Responsibility for educational funding is divided between the State and the local authorities. Funding for basic education forms part of statutory government transfers to local authority basic services, which are managed by the Ministry of Finance. (http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Koulutus/perusopetus/?lang=en)

The basic education system provides special-needs education. (see: http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Verkkouutiset/2012/09/special_education.html?lang=en)

**General upper secondary education**

The post-compulsory upper secondary level comprises general and vocational education. Both forms take three years and give eligibility for higher education. About 50 per cent of basic school-leavers opt for the general upper secondary school, 41 per cent for vocational secondary education and 9 per cent do not immediately continue to secondary level. Some 2 per cent continue basic education for a tenth year on voluntary basis.

For students studying the entire syllabus in general upper secondary education, the instruction is free of charge, but materials, such as books and notebooks, are not. Virtually all students who complete the upper secondary school syllabus will also take the national matriculation examination. Passing the matriculation examination entitles students to continue studies in universities, polytechnics or vocational institutions. Students in general upper secondary education are entitled to student financial aid. (http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Koulutus/lukiokoulutus/?lang=en; https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Finland:Upper_Secondary_and_Post-Secondary_Non-Tertiary_Education)

The vocational education and training (VET) comprises initial vocational training and further and continuing training. VET is intended both for young people and for adults already active in working life. They can study for vocational qualifications and further and specialist qualifications, or study in further and continuing education without aiming at a qualification. The vocational qualification has been designed to respond to labour market needs. A vocational qualification gives general eligibility for polytechnic and university studies. There are no tuition fees in initial VET. Students pay part of the costs, e.g. textbooks and personal tools, equipment and materials. Meals are free. Modest fees may be charged for further vocational training. ( http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Koulutus/ammatillinen_koulutus/?lang=en)
Polytechnic education and university education

The Finnish higher education system consists of two complementary sectors: polytechnics and universities. The mission of universities is to conduct scientific research and provide instruction and postgraduate education based on it. Polytechnics train professionals in response to labour market needs and conduct R&D which supports instruction and promotes regional development in particular.

Polytechnics are municipal or private institutions, which are authorised by the government. Polytechnics have autonomy in their internal affairs. The government and local authorities share the cost of polytechnics. Government allocates resources in the form of core funding, which is based on unit costs per student, project funding and performance-based funding. Polytechnics also have external sources of funding.

There are altogether 24 polytechnics under the branch of government of the Ministry of Education and Culture. 3 polytechnics are managed by joint municipal authorities, 21 polytechnics are managed by limited companies. Degree studies give a higher education qualification and practical professional skills. There are no tuition fees in degree education, and the students can apply for financial aid.

The Finnish universities are independent in their decision-making because they enjoy large autonomy and freedom of research. All universities are either independent corporations under public law or foundations under the Foundations Act. The overall university funding comprises appropriations allocated to universities in the state budget and supplementary funding (paid services, donations, sponsoring). The direct government funding covers about 64% of university budgets. The core funding is divided among the universities based on a formula, which comprises strategic funding as well as the financing of education and research. Competed research funding is an important source of additional financing and plays an especially important part in enhancing quality and impact.

There are 14 universities in the Ministry of Education and Culture sector; two of them are foundation universities and the rest are public corporations. There are no tuition fees in degree education, and the students can apply for financial aid.
6.7 Template Analysis

In this chapter the data collected through the historical narratives is mapped on to the ‘Heidelberg’ template.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART 1</th>
<th>Social problem addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Field of problem</strong></td>
<td>The financing of generalised access to education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance and education, employment, development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Targeted beneficiary group</strong></td>
<td>Those disadvantaged by lack of education, reading, writing, numeracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historically, young people of poorer families and (religious) minorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post 1800, young people and therefore society generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Problem background</strong></td>
<td>The financing of generalised education – meaning making primary, secondary and tertiary education accessible to all – has entailed a great deal of change in terms of policy, financial provision and legislation. For example, until the French Revolution the state, the church and education were closely associated. Afterwards, a growing awareness that education for all children is an important issue became increasingly wedded to the idea that the state should organise education. Nowadays, financing generalised education is being increasingly marketised, alongside which the role of the state as arbiter of education is becoming moot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART 2</th>
<th>Social innovation solution, development and impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Antecedents and invention of the financing of generalised education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing generalised education has a long history. Originally embedded in the financing of schools or monasteries out of Church resources or the funds given to it by adherents. Kings, likewise endowed education through their own resources, including taxation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has also long been some degree of third party (endowment) funding for those who cannot directly finance their education, provided by the Church or the King or private benefactors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 1800 the state has come to play the major part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty was in part financial, meaning the evolution of third party funding until undertaken by the state. In part legal, in terms of the organisational forms schools adopted, whether, in the end, private schools (both direct-funded and endowed; independent businesses or foundations; taxation-funded state schools, or, as increasingly today, market-funded ‘free’ schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2 Phases of development of the financing of generalised education

Financing generalised education began to gather momentum post Renaissance with the rise of individualism – culturally, politically and economically.

It generally evolved by way of emancipation from religious, monarchical, and wealth domination, as these played out in religious, class and suffrage struggles.

This process had generally culminated by the end of the first third of the 20th century.

Adaptation in face of crises was often protracted but generally and incrementally achieved by parliamentary means.

For illustrative examples of organisations, movements, regions see 6.3 Spreadsheet analysis of main cases.

The main future focus of this study concerns the prospects for curriculum neutral capitation – see 4.1.

### 2.3 Streams of development of the financing of generalised education

The main strands of development were:

- emancipation from religious domination – confessional, faith-based education aimed at instilling the prevailing moral and societal values (rather than empowering the individual)
- the gradual emergence of universal ideas about education
- meeting the needs of an ever more economic (financial and industrial) society
- the development of charities as monarch-sponsored vehicles for funding education
- the rise of the state from the early 19th century as the vehicle for funding generalised education.

National differences have been in part parallel; ‘patterns’ have converged; issues tend to be ‘universal’.

### 2.4 Status quo of the financing of generalised education

Insofar as its ‘product’ or benefit lies in the future, education has always to be funded out of economic surplus. If education is to be generalised (available to all), that surplus has to derive from all, that is from the economy as a whole. That surplus can be directly used (private-funding), transferred from some to others (charitable endowments), or drawn from the whole population (tax-funded).

In general today, education is funded by a combination of direct-taxation, diverted taxation, and private fees, with their respective associated entities: the state (federal, provincial and municipal), charities, private businesses and banks.

Insofar as the state has become increasingly seen as society’s agent in this regard, tax-funded state schools have become the norm (and with them a national curriculum). Thus, simultaneously with the change in funding, there is a change in who determines the contents of education (individuals, church, state).
Today generalised education is mainly funded via taxation. However, in recent times there has been a rise in marketised funding.

For details of above see **6.1 and 6.2 Historical narratives for the Netherlands and England.**

### 2.5 Impact of the financing of generalised education

Taxation enabled everyone to become educated at primary, secondary and tertiary levels.

The evaluative space for assessing whether the impact of the SI process is positive or negative is created by the values (regarding education and its purpose) of the individual who is asked to do the evaluation. Education to serve. In as far as education suits us for adult life as self-directed individuals who are literate, numerate and able to make choices, etc., the impact of FGE is positive; but the judgement whether education has been and is successful in these respects is ‘in the eye of the beholder’.

In that education suits us for adult life as self-directed individuals who are literate, numerate and able to make choices, etc., the impact of financing generalised education is positive.

However, generally financed education is now accompanied by many issues:

- in terms of quality, fairness of access and usefulness in conditions of high levels of unemployment,
- the introduction of marketised financing has resulted in students carrying high debt levels with banks, whereas previously their education would have been grant-funded out of taxation.

This last is operational at the tertiary level, but the ethos promises to be applied to primary and secondary levels also.

### PART 3 Influences and relevant context factors

#### 3.1 Social problem

Nowadays most people are educated until 16 (usually a legal requirement), and most people are able to continue in secondary then on into tertiary education, although the range of provision is varied (from simple colleges to universities, from diplomas to degrees).

The evaluative space for assessing whether the impact of the SI process is positive or negative is created by the values (regarding education and its purpose) of the individual who is asked to do the evaluation. education to serve. In as far as education suits us for adult life as self-directed individuals who are literate, numerate and able to make choices, etc., the impact of FGE is positive; but the judgement whether education has been and is successful in these respects is ‘in the eye of the beholder’.

Emancipation from religious, statist and merely economic conditioning of financing is not complete because some parents/students seek conditional education. Today, finance has become the main driver.

There remains a need therefore for full emancipation – **educare** of individuals’ capacities.
### 3.2 Solution approach

The social innovation has been incremental and institutional, also disruptive. But also becoming solid.

There have been all three Beckertian effects: cognitive frames, institutions and social networks.

The way generalised education has been funded has changed: from direct and/or endowment funding to state funding to market funding.

The financing of generalised education has been effected by thinkers (philosophers, educationalists), pressure groups, political movements and parties, and lobbying – and therefore through legislation and state sponsorship – because the state is perceived as the vehicle for not only the generalised funding of education but also for its content and format (even in ‘free market’ societies).

All these developments were enacted via specific personages, groups, constitutional changes and acts of parliament, and so on.

The main actions were taken by proponents of different religions, or social groups formed as pressure groups or political parties (because the state and therefore control of the state was deemed the instrument of generalised education).

Ideals or values were translated into policies, which when made law were also given the resources needed to make them effective.

Concrete activities evolved from direct funding of education (from private wealth, by the Church, by Kings) to thinking about education (the curriculum as well as the funding of education) to organising education (mainly by the state). Today, the organisation is in the hands of the state, while the funding moves away from taxation-based (through the state) to being privately funded (a tendency in primary and secondary education) and commercial borrowing (tertiary education).

For details see 6.1 and 6.2 Historical narratives for the Netherlands and England.

### 3.3 Actors and networks

Pamphlets

Diversity challenged

Diverse kinds of actors in different phases.

Invention phase of idea generation > intellectuals. Thereafter (innovation phase) a combination of civil society, public figures and politicians.

Diffusion phase: once enacted by law the SI diffuses quickly through a multitude of actors (civil servants, school boards etc.).

‘Catalysers’: intellectuals, philosophers, educationalists. Also political leaders, in a different (political, law-changing, rather than intellectual) way.

‘Multipliers’: civil servants. ‘Adaptors’: schools, parents, all those whose education and its funding changed.

Civil society networks were very important to build up pressure to change laws and implement financing generalised access to education.

The children of the relevant actors could have profited from the financing of generalised education in case of minorities. Not in case of poverty.

Those being educated have not been the movers. The financing of generalised education has been done to/for them.
Politicians are key. It took in general a long time before they became powerful and were able to change laws. Long term process. It takes a long time, but once enacted by law the financing of generalised education diffuses quickly.

The learning economy

3.4 Narratives and discourses (Cognitive frames)

We describe how ideas (‘cognitive frames’) re. financing generalised education evolved over time.

The narrative has changed over time from “education for moral betterment of the elite” to “educating all is good for society” to “education as empowering an individual through discovery and use of his capacities”.

What is the purpose and content of education? And is it to be uniform or diverse?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Then (600)</th>
<th>Now (2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Given from outside</td>
<td>Discovered within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>The Creed</td>
<td>My creed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Imposed</td>
<td>Unique yet universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education by</td>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Learner-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Local (individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbiters: Church</td>
<td>&gt; Monarch (State)</td>
<td>&gt; Traders (Finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then Citizenhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content: Religio-moral</td>
<td>&gt; Clerical</td>
<td>&gt; Practical (numeracy, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then Citizenhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The struggle for emancipation has changed the perception of legislation, notions of freedom in education and the role of the state and markets.

Europe-wide discourse.

3.5 Rules, norms and policies (Institutions)

We show how legal frameworks and policies were changed to allow for financing generalised education.

Laws and religious views contributed to the social problem in different ways. The interesting part of this case study is that laws had to change to make it possible. Parliaments had to discuss and to decide about this financing generalised education.

How is education organised? Many aspects to governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Then (600)</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to education:</td>
<td>Bestowed upon</td>
<td>Self-determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-organised teaching:</td>
<td>Self-mastered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostensibly the state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directed, teacher-determined education:</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal, Self-incorporation:</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision:</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.6 Resources (Social networks)

We describe how the financing of generalised education has changed over time.

Options or combinations of:

1) Parents/guardians **pay directly**, presupposing sufficient ‘disposable income’

2) a **third party** pays – sponsorship. Sponsors are typically the Church, the king or private persons singly or collectively (foundations)

3) An entire population funds education collectively through the state using taxation.

Relevant issues:

- Whence the funds?
- How provided?
- Who determines their use: the provider or the recipient?

Nowadays, is it to be taxation, marketised, or curriculum neutral capitation?

### 3.7 Social and technological innovation

The printing press made books widely available. This made it easier to organise (mass) education.

Nowadays internet and ICT make information freely available for people all over the planet. Many universities organise moocs to spread information. See f.e. https://www.class-central.com

Technological innovations lowers the costs of information, and this makes education easier to organise and accessible for more children.

Financing generalised education has implications for how we think about technology, and for who has access to the processes of designing technology and thinking about the direction of technological change. This has implications for the relationship between technology (including innovation) and education, and for the interrelationships between technology, innovation and the economy.

### 3.8 Social impact measurement

There is no dearth of research on the effects and effectiveness of education. Such research is neither value free nor free of measurement problems. The struggle for generalised education itself points out that our evaluation of education depends on how we think about education and about measurement.

Financing generalised education has implications concerning measurement:

- paradigmatic consistency.
- sources of funds.
- measuring school attendance
- etc…

### 3.9 Further obstacles and drivers of the diffusion of the financing generalised education

We describe how power structures, cognitive fames, religious constellations, value sets of leaders etc. have…
Our case study describes how power structures, cognitive frames, religious constellations, value sets of leaders etc. have affected generalising education.

Challenge to our understanding of capital (capacities)

Among many questions one can ask of this approach, a main one is whether the banking concept of creating funds is more appropriate or as appropriate as the ousted modality, essentially cash-to-cash financing.

Is fund-financing the way to embed today’s footloose capital (J M Keynes) so that it no longer sweeps the world, but finds in the financing of education a means to calm its own volatility? In short, if capital is not to make everything hostage to its own footlooseness, it ought to be used to enable capacities.

Some issues:

1) capital : capacities

2) who calls the tune – the provider or user of funds?

3) form of provision – loan or gift? Preservation or circulation of capital? (Cash-to-cash or funds?)

Other challenge areas:

Changing and recasting of financial terminology
Market and policy failures
Lack of suitable finance concepts, instruments and organisations
Prospects for curriculum neutral capitation

PART 4

Key lessons for:

policy makers – values and world views matter.
Investors – does the piper call the tune?
Investors – an idea may change significantly as it goes down from the sphere of ideas / cognitive frames / culture, to politics / organisation / institutional implementation. to the question how it has to be financed (funding, supporting networks).
Investees – In the process, who listens to the investees? How is their freedom, their choices, their will, taken into account?

+ Multi curricula
Increased state funding
Better buildings
Wider education

- Loss of diversity
More state management
State directs all three - culture, politics, economy
More student loans, debt, unemployment (silent crisis)

A study of generalised access to education points to a dual role of capital as (a) the financier of the means of production and (2) an enabler of capacities.
| Productivity growth (itself a consequence of the growth of human knowledge and consciousness) as the source of funds for education. |
7.0 Discussions and Key Lessons
This study has been something of a tour de force. Not only because of its scope and historical time-frame, but also because of the complexities inherent in understanding both education and finance in their own rights, as it were; and not, as is usual, as seen – and used – in terms of political or ideological perspectives. Unsurprisingly, given the historical threshold represented by the Renaissance, the study’s long time-frame was quickened by, or tightened up when it came to looking at the post-Renaissance period. It was further intensified by the growth of state involvement in education in the course of the 19th century. Then again tightened in the post-WW2 period, when, in addition to the basic study of the Netherlands and England, perspectives were contributed from Germany and Finland.
7.1 Review of Cases

Netherlands
From 1806 till 1920 the Dutch struggled with the implementation of the idea of freedom of education and its unconditional funding. The purpose of what became known as the school struggle – *schoolstrijd* in Dutch – was to achieve overall equivalence (in terms of freedom of underlying world view and access to funding) between private schools (also called ‘free schools’ and ‘special schools’, in Dutch *bijzondere scholen*), which fall under the responsibility of school boards and parents, and public schools, which fall under the responsibility of government.

The first phase of the Dutch school struggle started with the enactment of the Education Law in 1806. This law distinguished between public and private schools, while specifying the purpose of public elementary education as “the development of all civic and Christian virtues” (*de opvoeding tot maatschappelijke en christelijke deugden*). This distinction between public and private schools, and the ‘neutral’ worldview would dominate Dutch politics for over a century, and become the heart of the Dutch school struggle. The subject of the first phase would be the implicit assumption underlying a system of centralised state-funded ‘neutral’ public schools, namely, that knowledge is objective.

Supporters of freedom of education defended the right to determine the religious or philosophical worldview underlying their children’s education; they argued that freedom of religion, freedom of conscience and freedom of education are inseparably connected. According to them, ‘neutral’ education does not exist, because in the end all knowledge is rooted in and to some extent directed by religious or philosophical convictions, and therefore endorsement of one particular, so-called ‘neutral’, worldview by the state is not only unjust, but even dangerous.

On the other hand, opponents of free education argued that the state has a duty to support children to rise above a particular religious or philosophical conviction – even if this is their parents’ worldview. In their view, in the 18th century, the state (as supra-religious) was the only institution that could ensure that the Netherlands would develop in a modern direction. Freedom of education with a diversity of doctrines was in their opinion a danger and could even destroy the unity of the Netherlands.

In 1857 a new Education Law was enacted. This law secured freedom of education with two exceptions: (1) supervision and (2) examination of the competence and morality of the teachers, both of which remained with the government. Although a clear definition of freedom of education was not formulated and different interpretations existed, the Dutch people were now officially allowed to establish and operate schools based on their religious or philosophical worldview. For a short period the supporters of freedom of education thought that the school struggle was over. However, in practice it was hard for free schools (without state funding) to flourish in an environment with public schools funded by the state. In the second phase of the school struggle, from 1857 till 1920, therefore the focus shifted from the right to establish private (special) schools, to getting the equal right of state funding for both public and private schools.
This second stage of the school struggle ended in 1920 with the enactment of a new Elementary Education Law in 1920. In this law the Dutch “recognized that most, if not all knowledge (curriculum) and behaviour (pedagogy) is embedded in core beliefs about the nature of God, humanity, and the world” (Naylor, 2012, p. 245). The new constitution recognised (1) the right to establish, manage and operate a school regardless of religious or philosophical worldview, (2) equal access to public funding for all schools, and (3) that “all schools are accountable to the government regarding education quality and standards of hygiene and safety” (Wolf and Maceto, 2004 in Naylor, 2012, 246).

In the first decades after the school struggle the government looked after the implementation of freedom of education and restricted its activities in education to administrative, financial and juridical tasks. Schools were heavily regulated on input (such as costs, wages) and less on output (curriculum and degree requirements, i.e. content). This is called the period of ‘distributive policy’; a period in which the national government and municipalities had a limited role and in which citizens decided the direction (i.e. content, method and organization) of education.

After the Second World War the role of the government in education changed gradually into a period of ‘constructive policy’. In addition to administrative, financial and juridical tasks, the government increasingly developed and took the responsibility over policy tasks. In particular since the end of the 1960s it was the government, in particular the ministry of education, itself that developed education reforms. Since the beginning of the 1980s the influence of businesses on education increased gradually, and subsequently a business logic of return on investment and economies of scale entered the education system.

At first sight the Dutch history of generalised access to education looks like a success story. Looking further, we notice that two new problems have arisen. First, today, higher education is only partly state-funded, and increasingly funded by loans; young people increasingly have to borrow to study and, in conditions of high and rising unemployment, many become heavily indebted.

Second, diversity has declined and standardisation has become the norm. Today, the Dutch government sets standards not only for class size and facilities, but also for curriculum subjects, teacher certification, and tests. One of the main questions raised in this study is to what degree the state should be allowed to judge the quality or soundness (‘deugdelijkheid’) of education, and to what the degree the state should influence the organisation of schools and the content of education. In the Netherlands the state currently organises, funds and controls generalised access to education; all three aspects are in the hands of the state. Have the Dutch missed the essence of the constitutional change in 1917?

Both developments are not unique to The Netherlands. This is why several authors, including Sen (2001), Houghton Budd (2004) and Nussbaum (2010), argue that today’s society faces a ‘silent crisis’ (Nussbaum, 2010); our education system(s) is (are) increasingly not aimed at the free development of capacities of young people, but subordinated to economic efficiency and/or political demands – preparing young people for employment in the economy or in government is the key purpose of schooling. The demands of economic and political life are dominating cultural life. In
particular since the rise to dominance of free-market ideology in politics and the subsequent marketisation of education in the 1980s values like efficiency, effectiveness, return on investment, assessments according to standardised criteria, measuring, hierarchical and management take precedence over values such as freedom, diversity, pluralistic, spirituality, citizenship, solidarity and independency.

**England**

The generalisation of education in England, as also its financing, has a similar profile to that of the Netherlands – the tension between Church, King and merchants, the universality of ideals from the Renaissance and from people like Comenius. Also, not unsurprisingly, the reflection in education of the structure and biases of society with its three main cases – landed (conservative) towns and merchants (liberal) labouring (labour) and three main walks of life – clergy, administration and trades (both capital and labour).49

In England, of course, the reformation was very different in origin and character, but the upshot in both cases was the potential, if not yet recognised, let alone realised, emergence of education in its own right, not as required by one aspect of society or another.

As in the Netherlands, so in England, the more education was perceived as good for society and good for individuals, the more the state became more involved in, indeed charged with, the definition and provision of education. As noted earlier this gives to the state a mixed role. On the one hand, it can be the vehicle, through legislation, of bringing into social fact generally held values. On the other, although it is not self-evident as to why, the state has come to do more than provide an equitable context for education, and gone on to determine its nature and provision, something, arguably, that should be the proper prerogative of the teaching profession. Were this distinction made and realised, the financing of generalised education would then remain a matter of charging an equitable levy on the ‘productive’ economy.

‘Contextualising’ does not mean the state has to do anything other than, for example, ensure equitable money flows, not-for-profit modality when relevant, recognise ‘independent corporations of learned people’, and so on. Chartering charities, for example, historically often the initial vehicles for generalised education. In other words, its ‘business’ is to legislate for fair access and provision (of education in this case), not to design or manage the things being financed. That it has come to do so can be seen as a sign (even measure) of the societal or constitutional immaturity of those countries where the state does what conscious, responsible adults ‘ought’ to do.50

The overall story of financing generalised education in England is that by the end of the 19th century this had become essentially a matter of state education, meaning

---

49 Whether this is true of Germany and Finland the country perspectives do not reveal, but then the recent histories of those countries is one of republics, rather than constitutional monarchies.

50 Although admittedly it has qualified powers under the system of constitutional monarchy, in England it is the Privy Council, not the state directly, that confers the power to award degrees.
schools were tax-funded on terms, including pedagogical terms, dictated by the state. There were, and still are, of course, private schools (called ‘public’ by a quirk of Englishness), and there were church schools. As the 20th century unfolded, however, the situation changed to being one in which private schools still abound, albeit as charities receiving state subsidies, while church schools have become subsumed in state education with their denominational or confessional specificities reduced to special assemblies or lessons, or else ‘neutralised’. Even so, a salient point to note is that, confessional add-ons apart, nowadays they all pursue a curriculum with a positivist and materialist bias.

More precisely viewed, the development of English education in the 20th century was characterised by five things:

1) Increasing state involvement through the [understandable but non-causal] link between state funding and state control of what it is funding. Since in England, the state does not exist in law, as an entity, in practice this means a combination of central and local government authorities (variously named over the period), while funding means a combination of national taxation and local taxation, the latter called rates, charged mainly on property owners, until Margaret Thatcher extended it to include renters, tenants.

2) The continuation in various forms of its tripartite approach, reflecting not only the upper, middle and lower classes as a general social conception, but the deep-rooted notion in England that society should be so composed – of those who rule, the professions, and then everyone else. Worse, that it is part of nature that some people are born ‘bright’ and so are ‘at the top’ and others cannot be bright and so belong ‘at the bottom’.

3) The maintenance of a mixed economy from 1945 to the end of the 1970s, which undergirded a largely state-funded educational system with access generally available to all (even if the access was skewed by the tripartite conception), funded by government grants of various amounts and kinds. As a rule, therefore, overall education was state-funded. As just mentioned, even private schools, as bona fide charities, were eligible for substantial state subsidies.

4) The switch under Margaret Thatcher towards marketisation, which is a development that is not as straightforward as it may seem. On the face of it, the idea is to free education from the state and let it be a matter of market forces, meaning parental choice, and, eventually, private funding by those being educated (or their parents), with schools owned and managed as private businesses. Linked to this is the rise of the banking notion of loan-funded education, rather than grants.

The strategy is clear, beginning with the marginalising of all socialist forces in England, especially those linked to the Labour Party. That meant denuding the unions of much of their power, removing education from (or directly closing) local authorities which were often typically Labour-led, and by creating national alternatives to state-funding instead of local authority funding, such as the Funding Agency for Schools and local management of schools (LMS), which respectively allowed schools to get their funds from central government rather than locally and made their governors responsible for their budgets and day-to-day management.
(albeit within constraints laid down by the government).

One says, ‘on the face of it’ because the effect has not only been to make education an increasingly-kicked political football, with 14 education acts since 1976 (out of 21 since 1900), but also to ensure that with each successive government regardless of its traditional ideological stripe the new status quo of a marketised education system continues. Whether the ideology so–supported is of one colour or another is secondary to the fact that all education in England is now becoming marketised (beginning, as noted elsewhere with higher education).

An important aspect of this marketisation is based on commercial models. For example, when energy provision was privatised, free market supply was regulated by a government agency (notwithstanding that such agencies seldom have real teeth and that in modern finance regulation is a code word for innovation, albeit of the not-so-social kind). Part of this concept, therefore, is that the ‘supply’ of education is overseen by government agencies responsible for its quality, but as if education were synonymous with goods coming off a production line. Moreover, it also needs to be noted that while such increased centralisation and deepening of state involvement may, perversely perhaps, be seen as the prelude to getting the state out of education (or education out of the state), as things stand this is far from the case. In England the state has never been so involved in education as it is now.

**Germany**

The country perspective for Germany concentrates on higher education in post WW2 Germany. In terms of our overall frame of reference – financing generalised education – it both narrows the subject down to higher education and focuses it on the last 70 years. Quite apart from the wealth of statistical detail provided in support of its thesis, for our purposes the paper is interesting and informative in a number of respects.

Firstly, as concerns “the practical difficulties of handling the concept of marginalisation, as this kind of social innovation has neither been designed for nor reached the most marginalised in German society.” As noted at the outset of this study, for want of an agreed, specific definition of the term, our is ‘those unable to benefit from education of their capacities in the sense and to the extent that, for whatever reasons, including choosing not to, they are not able to participate fully in today’s cultural, political and economic life.

Secondly, the idea that an Act of Parliament, in this case the 1971 Bundesausbildungsförderungsgesetz (Federal Education Promotion Act) can be a social innovation, albeit the “extent to which the act can be seen as a social innovation depends significantly on whether or not it has been successful in attracting children of families with an underprivileged educational background to higher education.” Here a qualifier of marginalisation is also introduced, but the more interesting point is that, in all the countries studied, acts of parliament are a primary form of social innovation from an institutional (Beckert) or political power (Mann) point of view.

Thirdly, and most importantly from our point of view, its understanding of finance, concerning which three things warrant closer attention. The first is the description as
‘non-monetary’ of funding that is in fact provided by a third party or in-kind. It is in fact not, therefore, non-monetary, but monetarily unaccounted for on the part of the recipient of the benefit. ‘Financed by others’, ‘indirectly financed’, ‘pre-financed’, would therefore be better descriptors of what is being referred to. Indeed, in the UK at least, an in-kind benefit would be quantified, that is, monetised for tax purposes.

More precisely, in accounting terms there is an expense on the part of the provider, and an undeclared income to the same amount on the part of the recipient. Since there is no expense against it, however, the income is all profit, which, when applied, as it is, to the equity or own capital (Eigen Kapital) account on the balance sheet means the recipient has been capitalised. He then elects to spend out his capital on paying for his education.

In this way, finance is compared to finance – the difference being not a sociological one of monetised versus non-monetised, but straight finance, monetised declared versus monetised undeclared.

In this way too, one does not need to constrain finance with sociology, one simply goes deeper into finance to discover its deeper and, we would argue, social nature – since no exchange occurs except that there are willing parties to it, both (or all) of which profit from it.

By using the term ‘non-monetary’ one is tricked (by the language) into then positing some form of sociology of economics that in reality is not needed. Indeed, much speculation about the nature of finance and the intentions of those involved with finance indeed derives from the very fact that not everything they do is given clear accounting expression. This may well be because they have something to hide, but that has nothing to do with accounting per se. In fact, if only as an exercise, were we to render visible in accounting terms the full nature of all our transactions much that is untoward in both the actions and interpretations of modern finance would disappear, (just as cockroaches do when a light is switched on!).

The second thing is its statement that “learning is an unproductive process.” If the thing being financed were a factory or a car, the economics would be straightforward – the asset would be purchased, then consumed/written off/depreciated to match its real economic wearing out, with the income to cover the depreciation derived from the sales of what had been produced when using up the asset. In cost-benefit terms, both are located with the producer, although of course, both his customers and his suppliers also benefit from his business.

But education does not lend itself to such economics. First of all – there is nothing to show on the asset side, nor, therefore, anything to write off. A diploma or ‘earning potential’ are not normally allowed for tax purposes unless accounted for under ‘R&D’, the costs of which can be booked as an asset purchase until the R&D results in a related saleable goods or services.

There is a further important financial point. Goods are usually paid for when consumed or close to consumption, and the consumption is more or less immediate. In contrast, education is paid for in advance and its benefit occurs over the long term, and often elsewhere – for example, on society’s balance sheet. In that sense, it is pre-
financed. Moreover, when pre-financed by grants or donations (from whatever source) there is no repayment due. The capital flows onwards. The true opposite of a grant, therefore, is to do the same when opportunity presents itself – not to return the capital in a spirit of ‘pay back’, but to circulate it forwards, in the spirit of a flow of giving, but now with giving elevated as a key economic concept, something different to ‘merely’ social acts of generosity.

Leave aside that financing generalised education has, in the last 150 years or so, become effected through tax-funded state education, the form has been ‘free at the point of delivery’, prefunded by grants (or the assumption of costs by a third party, which strictly speaking also includes the state). The type of funding, therefore, has been donation, albeit with strings attached. Arguably, the next step would be, therefore, to detach those strings – whether they take the form of curriculum specification, means testing, ‘incentivisation’, or anything else.

An alternative would be to lower taxation so that parents and adults retain their disposable income for direct use. Either way, the financing would remain predicated on giving, in the economic sense of forwardly circulating capital.

Instead the alternative has become increasingly – certainly as regards high education – to lend where before money was given. Yet, the charging of interest and repayment of principal (even if at a reduced level compared to commercial rates) assumes that education is less productive of value than, for example, manufacture, and that the cost of the education so funded should be recouped and repaid in later life.

In reality, loan-funded education is a device to create a financial market and so to lend money. In short, to involve and thereby maintain the banking system when it is not necessary to do so.\(^{51}\) In fact, by and large education has been, is, and, we would argue, ought to remain funded by previously generated surpluses.

The third part of its economic analysis of educational finance is its reference to two cost parts:

1) Provision (also described as ‘primary’) meaning presumably the cost of buildings, teacher training, teacher salaries and administration.

2) Reception (also ‘secondary’), meaning the cost to those who go to university (in this case), comprising fees, travel and living costs. (Fees, of course, are income on the provision side.)

Although its authors do not say so, the costs of provision are covered by income from the state (i.e. taxation), fees charged, and, in the case of endowments, earnings on investments; while those of reception come from three principle sources – the state, students’ family and friends (stakeholders), and own earnings, and third parties, meaning foundations and corporate sponsors.

---

\(^{51}\) It is to state the obvious that the nature, role and remit of banking requires reviewing.
All these are sources of funds, however, not types. The types are essentially two: loans (both interest free and interest bearing) and gifts. This is important because in strict accounting terms, in the case of students’ balance sheets the two types appear as debt and equity (own capital) respectively. That is to say, the students themselves are the locus of decision-making when it comes to paying for their education. In short, the decision is taken by the user not the provider of funds.

**Finland**

The study for Finland is also post WW2, but in this case mainly from 1970 onwards. Finland is a small country in terms of population. Before 1970 its education system was bipartite, reflecting a somewhat conservative view that not everyone can achieve and so there were two streams that allowed the ‘bright’ to go further than the others.

In the 1970s the system was changed to be universally comprehensive with a national curriculum, but higher education remains two streams – polytechnics for the training of professional and universities for research. As structural as meritorious, this distinction reflects different tasks of education rather than the idea that some can achieve others cannot.

The features of the Finnish educational system that most stand out as regards the focus of this case study are the following:

1) **The widespread nature of state-funding.**

In 1950, for example, of the 338 grammar schools, 217 were private, meaning not state-funded, but fee charging. State-funding was then generalised, although with that came a generalisation of state involvement – hence a national curriculum that all schools, regardless of their background, follow. (The state’s role in education is written into the Finnish constitution.)

As regards state-funding, usually provided via municipalities, the normal expression is to say that it is ‘free’, but this simply means it is paid for by taxation, pre-funded. In that sense, Finland, until recently, reflects the ‘pattern’ in the other countries studied, of state-funding as the main means for financing generalised access to education. In Finland this is especially strongly the case because of the extensive welfare state concept that the country follows. It is not only education fees that get paid, but school meals, travel, housing and many other benefits, albeit often means-tested.

To date the bulk of state-funding came in the form of grants (donations), alongside which students can also borrow from banks with the state acting as guarantor.

2) **The strong tie-in to the economic needs of Finland.**

The Constitution makes it clear that education in Finland is strongly related to economic imperatives in particular the need for Finland to compete in the international economy. This has also meant tying education to ‘investment in human capital’ and in recent times, since 1990, seeing education as part of national
innovation, requiring a strong knowledge economy. The link to economy imperatives is also in the form of polytechnics training students in response to ‘the needs of the labour market’.

That said, education is also seen as an end in itself from the students’ perspective, and many higher education institutions enjoy considerable organisational and funding autonomy, even if the larger part of funding comes from the state.

The 2010 Education Act made universities independent legal entities, separate from the state, meaning the beginning of marketisation, with employees being given contracts other than from the state. Their funding base was also diversified, meaning opened up to sources of funding other than state-funding. However, such funding can hardly mean other than bidding for research grants to extra-Finnish institutions, meaning presumably the EC in Brussels and/or corporations and other bodies in other jurisdictions.

The overall picture therefore, is of a small country by population within a strong welfare society, meaning heavily tax-funded. The state has correspondingly substantial involvement in the content and modality of education, even if administratively schools and institutions have (increasing) autonomy. But this can also simply mean modernisation towards privatisation, if only, at this stage, by way of the state adopting market-like arrangements and cultures in the delivery of its services.
7.2 Essential Policy Considerations

The second task is to identify the essential policy considerations that the studies made evident. These include topics that, while seemingly not inherent to the question of financing, have nevertheless arisen in the long process of generalised education. Three in particular are of note.

Multiple curricula / National curriculum

Firstly, the emergence of a national curriculum, concerning which Comenius would probably feel vindicated and proud. Emerging after all the struggles of a confessional and political nature, and notwithstanding differing ideological and pedagogical approaches, the norm seems to be one of a national curriculum in one form or another that is both cross-party and cross-finance. Even though one could argue that the different confessional and even pedagogical approaches imply multiple curricula, national curricula tend to be standardised and with a positivist and materialist bias. In essence, therefore, this is a cultural or universal element. A problem of cognitive framing, rather than institutions or social networking.

Free education

A second topic is the question of whether education is or should be free of political and economic imperatives – grounded in itself, as are other professions. This is an especially complex topic because, as stated before, although not necessarily a causal one or inevitable, a link between state-funding and state control of education is everywhere apparent and assumed. This is understandable if the convention is maintained that he who pays the piper calls the tune, that the providers of capital dictate its use; but if this assumption is relaxed or, rather, replaced by the assumption that the use of capital is decided by its user, then there is no reason for the state, or any other provider of funds (neither corporations, markets nor parents) to also dictate the nature, content and organisational modality of education. These things then become the prerogative of educators (affirmed by those wishing to be educated) and there is no more reason for financiers of education to meddle in them, than they would seek to tell their architect-clients how to construct buildings.

That a link is made between state provision of funding and state control of education is not denied. But it is a convention only; just as the tripartite nature of English education persists, despite no explicit reference to it in legislation. The problem, in other words, is, again, primarily one of ‘cognitive framing’.

In institutional terms, there is also an interesting story to tell, or lesson to be learned. In England, at any rate, the notion that education should determine itself has been in the background ever since Oxford and Cambridge universities were founded in the 14th century as ‘independent corporations of learned people’. The idea is still there, albeit slumbering like Sleeping Beauty, in the averring of Derek Gillard, when citing Jones (2003:95), that, despite everything, the ideal (for Jones and presumably Gillard at least) is “the spontaneous and deep-seated tendencies of the school system, towards localised, piecemeal, unsupervised, professionally led [italics added] and progressive-
influenced reform.” This, rather than the involvement of the state in the field of education, not only its content and ‘quality’, but even its micro-management to political ends (in England at least).

From a purely financing point of view, this would be a sine qua non of any form of funding that sought not to control the thing being financed. One is aware that this is not where things are at currently – neither in those countries where education is state-managed, nor where it is being marketised (where the intention by definition is to make a commodity, and thereby a source of profit, out of education). If those are the only options history has left us with, then the future can only be either/or and is likely to remain one of education as the plaything of politics.

**Curriculum-neutral capitation**

But is that the only possibility history (as accounted for in this study) has to offer? Surely, one can see that the tax-funding of education does not have to be skewed, as it now is, to be an instrument of ideologies. The state could as easily simply confine itself to ensuring that the education system was equitably accessible. It does this, for example, when, in expression of wider values in society, it forbids the employment of children and requires them to go to school – not, in inception, as a means of power over the citizenry, but as an agency for society’s changing sense of what dignified human existence entails.

It is in this sense that the idea of ‘curriculum-neutral capitation’ has been introduced – as earlier remarked, not as a programme for educational reform, but as a concept that may be of help in understanding the history of financing generalised access to education. In particular, the proposition of curriculum-neutral capitation allows for a rethinking of tax-funded education in a way that preserves the pre-financed and grant-funded feature of ‘conventional’ state funding yet frees education to be led by those whose profession it is.

**Higher education**

Finally, we have given thought to the nature and development of higher education and in particular its method of funding and, the theoretical corollary, the idea of students being able to choose and in that sense drive their own education. In terms of the educational nexus discussed in 3.0, this comes down to their seeking out and affirming the education offered. The idea of marketised student loan funding is that students then exercise their freedom of choice, but this does not necessarily ensure the quality of what is ‘on offer’. Among the many questions one can ask of student-loan funding, therefore, are these two: (1) Is this method – the banking concept of creating funds – more appropriate than (or as appropriate as) the ousted modality of essentially cash-to-cash financing? (2) Is it a form of capitalising capacities in ways that match Sen’s ‘capabilities’ expectations?

As regards student-driven education, notwithstanding the question of how students fund their studies, it is worth remarking that in the UK since the mid 1960s there has been a phenomenal increase in ‘mature students’. That means people who enter university without the normal prior education. This has been accompanied by TV-based study linked to local libraries for face-to-face meetings with supervisors and
other members of one’s cohort. Mature students in effect design their learning pathway and are usually high-achievers.
7.3 The Challenge to our Concept of Capital

As the natural concomitants of the financing of generalised education, the following topics have been touched on in this study:

i) the relationship between capital and capacities

ii) the question who calls the tune – the provider or user of funds?

iii) the form of provision – loan or gift? Preservation or circulation of capital? (Cash-to-cash or funds?)

In this section, albeit briefly, we elaborate the consequences for our understanding of capital that the financing of generalised education entails. In particular, is there is the possibility of a related development in the evolution and use of capital? For instance, is funding education the way to embed today’s “loose capital”\textsuperscript{52}, so that it no longer “sweeps the world”, but finds in the financing of education a means to calm its own volatility?

Conventional economic theory does not distinguish between different forms of capital. The aim of capital as envisaged in conventional (neoclassical) economic theory is to create the means of production required to expand the production of goods which will raise living standards.

The emphasis on the means of production is understandable within the context within which neoclassical theory emerged (the turn of 18th/19th century Britain) where the emphasis of economists and statespeople was on increasing living standards by way of industrialisation. Capital made available for the purpose of financing the means of production generally comes at a rate of interest, while the physical assets financed by it are used to produce goods, the production of which generates an income out of which interest can be paid. The lender demands interest which the borrower, who uses the capital productively in the economy, is able to pay, provided his profit reflects the creation of real, as distinct from speculative or fictitious, values. Borrower and lender are on the same plane. Access to capital made available for this purpose is open to anyone able to pay the interest, that is, any profitable entrepreneur.

But the financing of (non-entrepreneurial) capacities, tertiary education in particular, needs a different type of capital – one where the benefits it gives rise to accrue to society, not to the provider of capital. This capital needs to be given, not lent. Its cover is not found in the realm of goods, but in the capacities it allows to come to expression and in the exercise of the capabilities this facilitates. An uneducated or ill-educated person is a net beneficiary of society; an educated person is a net benefactor.

This type of capital ‘behaves’ differently. Notwithstanding today’s inequitable wealth distribution, in principle and over time, as living standards increase and people develop aspirations beyond meeting the needs of material existence, capital can take on this second role. In the argument of G. E. Moore, J. M. Keynes and others, e.g.

\textsuperscript{52} Keynes (2013).
Robert Skidelsky, with their livelihood taken care of, human beings aspire to learn and become creative. This requires not only that they have food in their stomachs, shoes on their feet and a roof over their heads, but also that they have access to education and training. Arguably, much of the capital now footloose in global markets is of this kind, looking to lose itself in this type of use (rather than merely evaporating in ‘market corrections’).

In both cases, the conditions attached to capital are tuned to the purpose that capital serves. As the purpose evolves, so do the conditions on which capital is made available. In particular, as capital takes on the role of enabling the unfolding of capacities through education, access to it needs to become ‘open’, that is based on the users’ possibilities and intentions, rather than those of the providers.

A further challenge is to generalise access to such capital away from privileged groups, but also from state-determination and mere marketisation. In short, by using capital to enable capacities we will prevent capital from making everything hostage to its own footlooseness – a topic that will be investigated further in WP4 and WP5.
7.4 Beckert and Mann Retrospective and Implications for this and subsequent Work Packages

Looking back at our topic – financing the generalisation of education – in terms of the three CrESSI perspectives, it is clear that we see the ‘new’ role of capital as the counterpart to unfolding and developing capacities as the sine qua non of ‘capabilities’. Seen as a social innovation financing generalised education is at once incremental, institutional and disruptive, meaning the whole of society is as affected by it as shaping of it. Different countries have distinct colourings in line with their histories, but a clear circumstance is emerging that they all have in common, namely the challenge to the generalisation of education represented by state-funding being conditional upon a state curriculum, on the one hand, and by marketisation, on the other. This development is, in that sense, pan-European or universal. As such it reflects the fact that, national differences notwithstanding, education is a universal thing and so the financing of generalised education is not only of importance throughout the EU but also in the world generally.

In terms of the perspectives of Beckert and Mann (see Table 1) our study suggests a need to revisit cognitive frameworks / cultural ideas, which cannot be done either in theory or in practice without also looking at the institutional / political and social network / economic aspects.

Thus, our study of the history of financing generalised education helps to identify in more concrete terms:

a) aspects of marginalisation (a concept not defined in the CrESSI project until now) in terms of ‘culture’, ‘politics’ and ‘economics’;

b) how capacities as the foundation of ‘capabilities’ entail establishing one’s own value system, one’s own governance, and one’s own funding.

As well as these general considerations, various points in this study are of consequence for this and subsequent Work Packages. Specific questions include the following:

WP3 (Measurement Approaches to capturing Social Impact) and WP7 (Integrated Case Studies, quantitative): How are non-material yet real phenomena such as values, self-direction, and world conceptions to be measured? If this is not possible with today’s methods, are novel concepts of science and method required? Do we need to revisit the purpose of measuring and, for example, think in terms of ‘reversed measuring’?

WP5 (Social Innovation Life Cycles): What is the theoretical underpinning of the view of capital that emerges from these studies of the financing of generalised education – that is, capital as an enabler of capacities / capabilities? (See 7.3.)

WP4 (Social Versus Technological Innovation): What is the source of the capital on which the funding of education depends? What is the relationship between capital, technology and capacities? Can the growth in technological advancement, for example – itself a consequence of the growth of capacities / capabilities – be matched
by a growth in the amount of capital linked, not to yet more material production, but to the education, i.e. growth, of capacities / capabilities?

Could this be effected, for example, by a portion of the gains to Microsoft or Apple or Sony, etc., not accruing to their shareholders, but being ‘siphoned off’ into funding education such that humanity becomes less dependent on a life-style predicated on material consumption? As things stand, this surplus is simply put back into the financial markets and causes yet more excess capital, itself a main cause of continuing technological expansion and technological unemployment. All this is consequent on when the money markets separated from the goods markets during the 19th century, that is, on ‘money doing business on its own account’, financialism, whereby investment ceases to take place in the classical sense of investing in the means of production so that material needs can be met, but production becomes undertaken merely to provide a return to capital. What some, with reason, describe as a carginogenic process.
Appendix 3: Article 13 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

1. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognise the right of everyone to education. They agree that education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity, and shall strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. They further agree that education shall enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society, promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial, ethnic or religious groups, and further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

2. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognise that, with a view to achieving the full realization of this right:

   (a) Primary education shall be compulsory and available free to all;

   (b) Secondary education in its different forms, including technical and vocational secondary education, shall be made generally available and accessible to all by every appropriate means, and in particular by the progressive introduction of free education;

   (c) Higher education shall be made equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity, by every appropriate means, and in particular by the progressive introduction of free education;

   (d) Fundamental education shall be encouraged or intensified as far as possible for those persons who have not received or completed the whole period of their primary education;

   (e) The development of a system of schools at all levels shall be actively pursued, an adequate fellowship system shall be established, and the material conditions of teaching staff shall be continuously improved.

3. The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians to choose for their children schools, other than those established by the public authorities, which conform to such minimum educational standards as may be laid down or approved by the State and to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

4. No part of this article shall be construed so as to interfere with the liberty of individuals and bodies to establish and direct educational institutions, subject always to the observance of the principles set forth in paragraph I of this article and to the requirement that the education given in such institutions shall conform to such minimum standards as may be laid down by the State.
Appendix 4: Von Humboldt’s Bildungsideal

At the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th century German philosopher, philologist, educational reformer, statesman and founder of the University of Berlin Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835) promoted das Bildungsideal. Von Humboldt considered the development of a human being into an independent individual with a broad worldview as the aim of education, and to reach this aim, he argued, education should be economically independent of the state. Both the individual as well as the society as a whole would benefit of freedom of education and its unconditional funding. Von Humboldt’s ideas are interesting because they influenced the development of education all over Europe, not only in his time, but also today – e.g. in our times in the ideas of contemporary philosophers such as Jürgen Habermas and Rob Riemen, in the literary genre of ‘Bildungsromans’, and in the structure of some schools and universities.

In the aftermath of the French Revolution absolute monarchies collapsed and the ideas of the Enlightenment spread all over Europe. In this period von Humboldt became an influential thinker and reformer in the field of education. During his life he had close connections with other contemporary German intellectuals as Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, Friedrich Schiller and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. In line with the ideals of the French Revolution von Humboldt argued that education should be many-sided and enable students to become independent individuals and world citizens. His concept of Bildung is hard to define a single way, because the concept is multidimensional and has changed over time. In 1791-1792 von Humboldt described the aim of Bildung as “the highest and most harmonious development of [man’s] powers to a complete and consistent whole” (Humboldt, 1993, p. 10). More than half a century later John Stuart Mill quoted von Humboldt in his essay On Liberty (1859) and introduced his ideas to the English-speaking world:

Few persons, out of Germany, even comprehend the meaning of the doctrine which Wilhelm von Humboldt, so eminent both as a savant and as a politician, made the text of a treatise – that “the end of man, or that which is prescribed by the eternal or immutable dictates of reason, and not suggested by vague and transient desires, is the highest and most harmonious development of his powers to a complete and consistent whole”; that, therefore, the object “towards which every human being must ceaselessly direct his efforts, and on which especially those who design to influence their fellow-men must ever keep their eyes, is the individuality of power and development”; that for this there are two requisites, “freedom, and variety of situations”; and that from the union of these arise “individual vigour and manifold diversity,” which combine themselves in “originality.” (Mill, 1859, pp. 53–54)

The state and freedom of education

According to von Humboldt states are usually mostly interested in educating people into good citizens, but in the wake of the French Revolution another direction was needed: “das Menschengeschlecht [steht] jetzt auf einer Stufe der Kultur, von welcher es sich nur durch Ausbildung der Individuen höher emporschwingen kann; und daher sind alle Einrichtungen, welche diese Ausbildung hindern und die Menschen mehr in
Massen zusammendrängen, jetzt schädlicher als ehemals”. Von Humboldt argued that education should therefore be as free as possible: “Man muß soviel Freiheit lassen, als möglich. In Schulsachen muß das Regieren mit der Zeit soviel als möglich ganz eingehen.”

In Von Humboldt’s view, freedom and a diversity of experiences in manifold situations are key to the many-sided development of capacities and virtues. The purpose and task of the human being is to develop his intellectual, artistic, moralistic and practical skills as far and harmoniously as possible, particularly since humanity is currently at a stage of development in which “es sich nur durch Ausbildung der Individuen höher emporschwingen kann”. Therefore, institutions which hinder this development and force individuals to become part of masses are today even more harmful than they were in the past. Rather than educating individuals to become citizens, the individual should be educated in the freest possible manner and the individual thus educated should then test the law against himself. According to von Humboldt only then the state and society can progress: “Unter freien Menschen gewinnen alle Gewerbe bessern Fortgang; blühen alle Künste Schöner auf; erweitern sich alle Wissenschaften.”

Ideas for an endeavour to define the limits of state action

In 1791-1792 von Humboldt, who was only 24 at that time, wrote his main work Ideeen zu einem Versuch die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit des Staats zu bestimmen (“Ideas for an endeavour to define the limits of state action”). Because von Humboldt foresaw problems with the Prusian censorship this book was first published as a whole only in 1852, although sections of it had appeared in Schiller’s journal Neue Thalia and in the Berlinische Monatsschrift (Burrow, 1969, p. vii). Former German professor and education specialist Gerd Hohendorf wrote about von Humboldt’s book:

In this publication, tight limits are placed on the State; its action should be confined to protection of the citizen within its frontiers and against attacks from outside. Humboldt advocated the greatest possible freedom for the individual in an environment in which ‘each individual, depending on his own needs and inclinations and bounded only by the limits of his own energy’ must be allowed to develop according to his own innate personality (GS, I, p. 111). He was afraid that State influence on education would ‘always favour one particular form’; this was particularly deleterious if it ‘relates to man as a moral being […] and ceases altogether to have any beneficial action if the individual is sacrificed to the citizen’ (GS, I, p. 143). ‘Without regard to certain civic forms which must be imparted to men, the sole purpose of education must be to shape man himself’ (GS I, p. 145). Humboldt reversed the role of the State: ‘Education of the individual must everywhere be as free as possible, taking the least possible account of civic circumstances. Man educated in that way must then join the State and, as it were, test the Constitution of the State against his individuality’ (GS, I, p. 144). In

53 See Gesammelte Schriften, Band 1.
54 See Gesammelte Schriften, Band 16: 110.
Humboldt’s view, man is not the object of the State but must be a subject who himself helps to shape conditions within society. (Hohendorf, 1993)

Two years after its publication, in 1854, Joseph Coulthard translated von Humboldt’s book into English as The Sphere and Duties of Government (The Limits of State Action). In the following years Von Humboldt’s ideas influenced the English-speaking world, in particular through Mill’s On Liberty (1859). According to Hohendorf (1993: 4), Von Humboldt “subscribed to the educational policy notions of Count Mirabeau in calling for public education to ‘take place entirely outside the limits [...] within which the State must confine its own activities’ (GS, I, p. 146).” Von Humboldt “made repeated reference to Mirabeau’s ‘Discourse on National Education’ and quoted him in a footnote: ‘Education will be good to the extent that it suffers no outside intervention; it will be all the more effective, the greater the latitude left to the diligence of the teachers and the emulation of their pupils’ (GS, I, p. 146)” (Hohendorf, 1993).

Von Humboldt and John Stuart Mill
Von Humboldt’s ideas, which originated in an idealist interpretation of the world, appear to have been often little understood. By the time Von Humboldt’s book appeared (posthumously, in 1852 Burrow, 1969), German Idealism had been pushed aside by new philosophical streams of thought. For instance, according to Spitta (1962), the freedom of moral-spiritual life defended by John Stuart Mill in On Liberty was a freedom (from the state) only in an outer sense. Moreover, Mill granted the educational system a number of rights which Von Humboldt from his idealist point of view could not justify. Finally, Von Humboldt’s ideas about an associative form of economic life were not at all considered, although Mill repeatedly refers to Von Humboldt’s book.

Economic independence
Of particular relevance for the purpose of this case study are Von Humboldt’s ideas on the funding of education – in particular his attempt to achieve that the newly established University of Berlin, the Academy of Sciences and Arts, and the associated research institutes and collections would be given sufficient land to enable them to become economically independent of the state.55 His idea was to gradually move to a situation where the education system would no longer depend on the state budget, but support itself through rent and through contributions by society.56 This economic independence would be the foundation of the intellectual freedom and self-determination of the educational system. For the state is not an institution for education, according to Von Humboldt, but an institution of law. Education is a matter for society, not the state. “Das geistige Leben ist nun das soziale Gebiet, in welchem das Ideal der Freiheit verwirklicht werden kann und muß” (Spitta, 1962).

55 Spitta 1962; see also the documents on the establishment of the University of Berlin, Gesammelte Schriften.
56 See Gesammelte Schriften, Band 10; and Königsberger Schulplan, Gesammelte Schriften, Band 13.
Conclusion

In short, according to von Humboldt the state is not responsible for the psychological and moral condition of its citizens; it is responsible only for the security of citizens in economic and cultural life. He proposed to make pedagogy and education free and independent of the state (and other national, political, economic, ideological and religious interests). For him economic independence is a condition for freedom of education. Only in a free and independent environment it is possible for a human being to develop into a harmonious entity.

In our opinion von Humboldt’s ideas on education and his Bildungideal are still relevant today. They offer even a foundation for a different view on society, education and the human being. In particular his strict separation of different spheres of life (economic, cultural and state) seems to be an interesting concept to rethink and develop further.
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METHODOLOGICAL REMARKS AND INSTRUCTIONS

Purpose of case studies: Empirical data provision for analysis and theory building

WP2 serves as a case collection and database for the other WPs in the project, especially work packages 3 (measurement), 4 (social vs. technological analysis), 5 (life cycles) and 6 (policy analysis). It also allows for the testing of the theoretical framework developed in WP 1. Accordingly, the purpose of the case studies is to collect empirical data that can be analysed through the different theory lenses of the project in the different work packages. Therefore the basic versions of the case studies (particularly comprehensive cases) will be rather descriptive and “analytically neutral” and provide the ground for pluralistic theoretical analysis within the different work packages.

Units of analysis

The idea of the comprehensive case study is to take a long term perspective on “basic” social innovations such as social housing or fresh water supply that have become mainstream in most parts of Europe over time. It follows the logic of an embedded single case study, which means that it focuses on a single phenomenon, yet attention is also given to different subunits (Yin, 2003:39ff). This means it does not examine, for example, social housing in a certain town, nor the activities of one specific organisation or social movement. It rather aims to understand the neuralgic points and crucial components in the diffusion process of the social innovation, at least since the 19th century, including the variety in adaptations across different contexts and backgrounds such as different welfare regimes or economic and political crises. Nevertheless, the most important and illustrative implementations of the social innovation will be analysed in more detail as subunits of analysis according to the categories of the template. This logic is illustrated in a simplified way in Fig.1.

Figure 1: Scope of analysis in comprehensive case studies

Accordingly, the comprehensive cases will describe the historical development of the social innovation and focus specifically not only on the invention, but also largely on the diffusion process (Fagerberg, 2003; Westley et al., 2007). For illustration, we added a case study on the social context of bicycles as a technological innovation from the long-established research field of sociological technology studies (Bijker, 1995). Although it follows a slightly different template and contains some theoretical perspectives, its scope is comparable to a
comprehensive case study as aspired for in our context. Moreover, it shows that technological and social innovation have been jointly analysed before. The other example we included is a conference paper on the life cycle of the intelligence test (McGowan/Westley, 2013). It illustrates what a life cycle analysis in WP 5 could look like.

The individual case studies on the other hand will focus on one specific organisation, movement or initiative, such as, a micro credit initiative for Roma population in Hungary (“Way out” programme). It takes the approach of a holistic single case study that largely builds on a single unit of analysis (Yin 2003: 40). Moreover, they mostly focus on the present and examine innovations that are beyond invention, yet still in a diffusion process. Different aspects of this one specific case are examined, while the macro perspective plays a subordinate role here.

There are little differences in the template designs to account for these different approaches in the units of analysis. Both templates depart from the social problem that is addressed by the social innovation. Since the template for the comprehensive cases puts a strong emphasis on the development process, different streams, and changes over time (CCS – Part 2), this part comes next here. This perspective is less prominent in the individual case studies (ICS – Part 3), since the scope and observation period is substantially narrower. Influences and context factors are important in both case types and contain more or less the same questions. Both templates close with discussions and key lessons.

Table 1: Structures of comprehensive and individual case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Case Study</th>
<th>Individual Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Social problem</td>
<td>I. Social problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Solution, development, and impact</td>
<td>II. Solution, influences, and context factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Influences and context factors</td>
<td>III. Development and impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Discussion and key lessons</td>
<td>VI. Discussion and key lessons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection

WP 2 tells the story of different social innovations. Its task is to collect sources, data and other material as a basis for the future WPs. Both case studies should build on different types of sources for data triangulation.

The comprehensive case studies provide a historical perspective of a certain social innovation from a macro level. The results will especially be of interest for the life cycle analysis in WP 5. The partners should do desktop research, if necessary also archival research, looking for historical, political, economic, legal, etc. secondary sources or data and figures (also quantitative) which help to clear the history of the social innovation. If actors involved in the development or distribution of the social innovation can be accessed (housing companies, cooperatives, etc.) an interview could be considered with a representative to get his/her interpretation of the development.

→ Country perspectives in comprehensive cases: The partners who are not directly responsible for the cases will be asked to add their national perspective later in the process. More specific instructions will follow here.
The **individual case studies** concentrate more on the organisational level. They offer more possibilities for primary data collection, particularly **interviews**, but also for other data sources for triangulation. The historical perspective is not as important here as for the comprehensive case studies. But if partners run into evidence, which seems to be relevant for the life cycle analysis in WP 5, it would be a nice bonus.

**Suggestion for length**

- Comprehensive case studies: about 80 – 100 pages (including country perspectives)
- Individual case studies: about 30 – 40 pages

Given the comprehensiveness of the template and the fact that data might not be available to the same amount for all different parts, it is obvious that some sections of the template can be filled in in less detail than others. However, regardless of whether the case is comprehensive or individual, the collected data may be of interest for the partners in other WPs during the research process, so information for all questions in the template should be provided if possible.

**References**


I. TEMPLATE Comprehensive case studies

CCS - PART 1) Social problem addressed

1.1 Field(s) of problem
In which field(s) of activity did the targeted social problem originally arise (e.g., health, care, economic development, work integration)? Are there also any interrelated effects in other fields?

1.2 Targeted beneficiary group(s)
Who were/are the targeted beneficiaries? What specific characteristics did/do they have that might be relevant for or a symptom of their marginalisation (e.g., economic vulnerability, physical handicaps, migration status, lack of access to the education system, etc.)?

1.3 Problem background
Please describe the context conditions that were/are relevant for the emergence of the social problem or the marginalisation of the target group. This could be the general economic situation, political situation, welfare policy, a poor education system, religious constellations, demographical or technological development, etc. and/or more specific problems such as market power abuse, discrimination, corruption, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>Which individual (or collective) capabilities of marginalised people were deprived? Which functioning could not be achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How were conversion rates affected by the context conditions and how did they contribute to marginalisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can specific networks (actor constellations), cognitive frames or institutions be identified that were relevant for the problem situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can power structures, according to Mann’s adapted framework, be identified that were relevant for the problem situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a specific field (Fligstein) where the social innovation occurs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Is there a clear beneficiary that is being targeted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was the social problem addressed individual-specific or group-specific or context-specific?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How did contextual conditions that were/are relevant relate to each other? (e.g. complementarities, co-evolution, etc..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Did technological innovation cause marginalisation or make existing marginalisation worse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did technological innovation pave the way for social innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>Did social problems addressed by social innovation emerge in certain context conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>Which policies/political constellations did contribute to the social problem?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All questions in the boxes do not have to be explicitly addressed within the case study, but the collected data should allow the analysis of these questions within the work packages.
2.1 Antecedents and invention of the SI solution approach

When can the first activities of the social innovation be detected? How did they address the social problem, and how did these activities relate to previous solution approaches (if any) for the problems constellation?

How did they provide novelty in terms of goods, services or processes (including new forms of organisations, resources, or communication)?

2.2 Phases of development of the SI

How did the social innovation develop over time and across different contexts? Can different phases or crucial incidents be identified in the development of the social innovation towards a broadly adapted standard? What were the relevant societal levels of action?

2.3 Streams of development of the SI

Were there also different “streams” of the social innovation, i.e., different forms and adaptations in the implementation of the basic idea? Did these streams converge or diverge over time?

2.4 Status quo of the SI

How is/was the social innovation established today? Please describe who (e.g., public authorities, private companies, associations and cooperatives, public-private-partnership, etc.) provides which services, products, activities, etc. to whom and under which conditions?

2.5 Impact of the SI

In a long-term perspective, how did the social innovation unfold its impact in its initial field of activity and beyond (e.g., did the improved sanitation and health situation also improve the situation of the target group on the labour market)?

How can the positive impact of the social innovation be described (e.g., improved access to resources, learning options, self-confidence, etc.)? At which structural levels of society did the social innovation achieve impact?

Have there also been any negative impacts in the targeted field of activity and beyond?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>To what extent has the social innovation been incremental (adaptive change in practice, e.g. with a focus on products or services that addressed identified market failures effectively), institutional (changes in the Social Grid practice, e.g. reconfiguring existing market structures to create social value), or disruptive (radical change in practice, e.g. with a focus on politics and social movements, changing the cognitive frames around markets and social systems/structures) across its diffusion process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Evaluative Space: which was/is the initial goal of the SI process? Did it change over time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who has been/is being empowered by the SI process?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WP 4 Which kind of technological artefacts and infrastructures were required for the development of the SI? Which kind of novel technological artefacts (TA)\(^2\) and / or new infrastructures were involved in the development of the SI?

WP 5 Which kind of key techniques (TC)\(^3\) are required for the SI? Was it necessary to acquire new techniques (TC) in order to implement the SI?

WP 5 Can specific reoccurring developmental stages be identified for SI?

WP 5 Can their development be described as linear, cyclical, etc.? Are there path dependencies in SI?

WP 5 What drivers or obstacles fostered and hindered the social innovation?

WP 5 Which cognitive frames, networks and institutions did change along the lifecycle of the SI? How did the dynamics between these elements change?

WP 5 Did the reduction of one form of marginalisation cause another?

WP 6 ...

**CCS - PART 3) Influences and relevant context factors**

**3.1 Social problem**

Have there been any changes, extensions, etc. in the addressed social problems or marginalised target groups, from a long-term perspective? Can different reasons be identified over time that were responsible for the rise and persistence of the social problem? Are there reoccurring patterns that repeatedly caused a need/fostered the adaptation and distribution of the social innovation?

WP Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)

**WP 1** Did reasons for marginalisation change over time?

**WP 3** How did empowerment in one dimension cross-fertilize empowerment in other dimensions?

**WP 4** Did the lack of access to new technological artefacts (TA) and infrastructures (TI) have an impact on the marginalisation?

**WP 4** Did the lack of access to training to acquire relevant techniques (TC) have an impact on the marginalisation?

**WP 5** Did the social innovation solve or mitigate social problems?

**WP 6** Did the social innovation (usually) meet the needs of different target groups?

**WP 6** …

---

\(^2\) Technological artefacts (TA) including “hardware” (TA\(_h\)), i.e. any kind of material artefacts, and “software/Apps” (TA\(_a\)), i.e. any kind of software apps, protocols, services, blueprints….

\(^3\) This can include: TC\(_s\) – Somatic techniques (e.g. swimming, singing …), TC\(_e\) – Exosomatic techniques (e.g. making fire, writing, haircutting, riding a bike or car, …), TC\(_p\) – Primary production techniques (meaning human appropriation of net primary production in agriculture and exploitation of the lithosphere), TC\(_i\) – Industrial techniques, TC\(_c\) – Communication techniques, etc.
3.2 Solution approach

Did the concrete activities of how the social innovation approached the social problem change and renew over time (including new forms of organisations, resources, or communication)? Describe the most relevant activities to prevent, mitigate or solve the marginalisation (e.g., service provision, lobbying, advocacy, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>Which cognitive frames, networks and institutions did change during the course of the lifecycle of the SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the social innovation been incremental (with a focus on products or services that addressed identified market failures effectively), institutional (reconfiguring existing market structures to create social value), or disruptive (with a focus on politics and social movements, changing the cognitive frames around markets and social systems/structures) across its diffusion process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>How stable were the social innovation solution approaches? How dependent were the solution approaches to contingencies (individual characteristics of promoter/inventor, contextual circumstances)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>How did education/training contribute to the diffusion of the social innovation? Did the solution involve support in acquiring the relevant technological artefacts (TA)? Did the solution involve support in access to the relevant infrastructure (TI)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>Can the development of cognitive frames, networks and institutions be described as linear, cyclical, etc.? Are there path dependencies in SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Actors and networks

Can specific networks or individual actors be identified as key players in the idea generation, invention phase, the innovation phase and the diffusion phase of the social innovation?

Are there also typical “adapters” that did not necessarily develop the social innovation (incremental innovation), but adapted it to their context and accordingly contributed to the diffusion of the social innovation? Can they be located in a specific societal sector (civil society, market, public)? Did networks play a role in the adaptation process?

Were relevant actors or members of networks personally affected by the social problem addressed? Was or is the target group involved in the value creation process? Did the target group members take any collective action?

Which networks or other actors were important as catalysers, multipliers, or adapters? (e.g., sponsors, public authorities, politicians pushing for beneficial changes in legal frameworks, celebrities that increased public attention, etc.)? Where those actors particularly powerful? Why?

Did those actors and networks influence legislation, education curricula, or other institutions?

Which influence did these actors and networks exert on narratives and public discourses regarding the social problem/social innovation?
Please indicate if typical networks or other actors were present when a social innovation was invented or adapted. If so, did these different network and actor constellations change across different phases of the social innovation? Were these constellations influenced by the general framework conditions (e.g., the political welfare regime)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>How did networks contribute to the social innovation over time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How did networks relate to institutions and cognitive frames? Which dynamics of change did occur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Distributive aspect: which actors had access to the SI process? Which barriers can be identified at different levels (e.g., geographical distance, knowledge gaps, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Which scientific networks (e.g. disciplines) contributed to the success of the SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which industrial actors contributed to the success of the SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>What actor constellations were present during important developmental stages of the SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did different societal spheres (e.g., civil society incl. philanthropy, private markets, and public authorities) contribute at different points of dissemination to the SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>How were policies driven by actors and network constellations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Narratives and discourses

Please, indicate which narratives or discourses accompanied / were relevant for the addressed social problem and the social innovation. How did these change over time? Did they inhibit or foster social innovations?

In which social domains can these discourses and narratives be located (media, parliament/city council, civil society/community)? What were the instruments of the discourse (reports, petitions, opinion leaders, media campaigns, letters to the editor etc.)?

Who was involved in these discourses (e.g., the beneficiaries)? Can any parties be identified that dominated these discourses or narratives? Why could they do so (e.g., power, knowledge)?

Did those narratives influence the perception and acceptance of legislation, education curricula, or other institutions?

Did they affect the perception and acceptance of any social networks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>What was the role of cognitive frames in social innovations? How did they relate to institutions and social networks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>How can cognitive frames possibly be measured? What is the evaluative space here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Which technological visions and scientific advances were used in the discourse?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.5 Rules, norms, and policies

Were there any policies (in the thematic field or generally) that contributed to the social problem? Were there any legal / constitutional triggers or framework conditions that contributed to the social problem? Were there any other rules or norms that contributed to the social problem?

Were there any policies (within the relevant thematic field or elsewhere) that fostered or inhibited the social innovation, e.g. by altering its capacity and function to tackle marginalisation? Were there any legal / constitutional triggers or framework conditions that fostered or inhibited the social innovation? Were there any other rules or norms that fostered or inhibited the social innovation?

To what extent have rules, norms and policies contributed towards systemic change through social innovation in this field of study?

Is ‘tackling marginalisation’ (either via poverty reduction, social inclusion, etc.) a central, explicit objective or outcome of policies or other rules and norms? Why/Why not?

Did the social innovation build on or recombine existing policies, norms and rules?

Were relevant policies located on a regional, national or international (EU) level? Can different influences of different policies be detected across different regions?

At what stage of the development process did supporting policies become most relevant?

What are the diffuse and unintended effects of policies and/or other rules and norms in this field of study?

Did existing policies change as a consequence of the social innovation? Did other rules and norms change as a consequence of the social innovation? How was this achieved, and by whom? Were those particularly powerful?

How did policies or other rules and norms relate to social networks relevant for the social innovation?

How did policies or other rules and norms represent or relate to public discourses and narratives? How was policy making influenced by them? Vice versa, how did policies and other rules and norms influence public discourse?

### WP Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>What was the role of institutions in social innovations? How did they relate to cognitive frames and networks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Which networks/links were shared by social innovators and policy makers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were there complementary policies that made a difference? On which basis did their complementarity rest (e.g., same beneficiaries, same social problem addressed, complementary social problem addressed, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>What was the role of research, technology and innovation policy during social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
innovation process?
What was the role of education (and life-long learning) policy during social innovation process?
Did technological norms and standards play a role?

WP 5 What was the role of policy makers during the social innovation process?
WP 6 Which (social) innovation policies have been successful in the past? In which contexts?
Which role did policies play in ecosystems fostering social innovation in the past?
How do policies relate to cognitive frames and social networks?

3.6 Resources

Please describe and compare different forms of funding that were used to finance the social innovation (e.g., own assets of target group, donations, membership fees, grants, social investments, regular loans, public funds, etc.)? For what purposes were these resources deployed (e.g., machinery, commodities, advisory, etc.)?

Were other forms of resources (voluntary work, social networks, natural resources, etc.) relevant for the social innovation? Please describe their role.

Did those resources change during different phases of the diffusion process or different background conditions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>How did power structures affect the resource endowments of the marginalised over time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>How relevant was the combination of different resources (complementarities vs. substitutes)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How did eventual complementarities come about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who had/has access to the crucial resources and on what did/does accessibility depend upon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Did the nationalization / privatization of relevant infrastructures impact on the access to social innovations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>Are there recurring dynamic patterns during the course of the diffusion of a SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can different forms of financing contribute to the same diffusion results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>Can the role of capital forms (social, cultural, ecological, etc.) for social innovations be specified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Social and technological innovation

Was the social innovation fostered by or related to technological innovations like
- a new general purpose technology (e.g., information and communication technologies) and/or by scientific advances?
- a new artefact (e.g. mobile phone)?

Was the social innovation fostered by or related to a new infrastructure (e.g. Internet)? Was the social innovation fostered by the emergence of new techniques?
How did technological innovation contribute to the social innovation, or vice versa? Did technological innovation help to distribute the social innovation or even improve it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Can patterns of sequencing be observed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Can recurring patterns on the interplay of social and technological innovation be specified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To which step in the social innovation and diffusion process do technological innovations contribute? (idea generation, invention, innovation, diffusion process incl. adaptation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8 Social impact measurement

Have there been any attempts to measure the impact of the social innovation (on the level of a specific intervention, a national level by public authorities, etc.)? Did these measurements influence the development of the social innovation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>What dimensions and approaches for impact measurement have previously been used? How did they contribute to the development of the SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were there any discussions about the impact of the SI, its measurement or the meaning of measured results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which actors/groups/beneficiaries were considered in previous impact measurement attempts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>Where there any evidence-based policies during the SI lifecycle?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.9 Further obstacles and drivers of the diffusion of the SI

What further contextual factors can be identified that fostered or inhibited the diffusion of the SI over time (e.g., legal framework conditions, economic/political situation or crisis, dominant welfare regime, ecological situation, power structures, cognitive frames, religious constellations, demographic developments, etc.)

What further factors can be identified on the level of the innovative agents that fostered or inhibited the diffusion (e.g., organisational capacity of the inventor, resources, resistance of employees, value set or skills of the leaders)?

Can different patterns of drivers and obstacles be identified, like for bottom-up vs. top-down adaptations of the innovations or related to different context conditions?

If the innovations were adapted across different regions or national borders, were there specific obstacles?
**WP** | Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)
---|---
WP 1 | ...
WP 3 | Which contexts did matter? In particular, which definition/level of context did matter? (e.g., geographical surrounding, political/economic situation at the macro or global level, belonging to professional groups, etc.)
WP 4 | ...
WP 5 | How do different influential factors in the diffusion process of SI interrelate? What are the different obstacles for different kinds of SI (e.g., bottom-up vs. top-down)?
WP 6 | ...

**CCS - PART 4) Discussion and key lessons**

Based on the findings throughout the template, what are the key lessons for …

- Policy makers?
- Investors (resource structure)?
- Inventors / investees?

**CCS – ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES [subunits of analysis]**

*The descriptions in the comprehensive case studies, particularly in parts 2 and 3, should be illustrated with a small range of examples, i.e., subunits of analysis. In addition to the information relevant for illustrating a specific argument, please also provide the following data specifically for these examples (cf. also ICS part 2):*

- **Solution approach:** main activities and novelty in context
- **Actor constellations:** inventors, adaptors, other relevant actors, involvement of target group
- **Resources:** financial and others
- **Social vs. technological innovation:** interrelations
- **Social (innovation) policy:** support through a certain policy, impact of SI on legislation
- **Social impact measurement:** application and relevance
- **Further drivers and barriers for the diffusion of the SI:** economic/political situation or crisis, dominant welfare regime, ecological situation, religious constellations, demographic developments, etc.)
- **Impact:** positive and potentially negative
II. TEMPLATE Individual case studies

ICS - PART 1) Social problem addressed

1.1 Problem area
In which field(s) of activity does the targeted social problem arise (e.g., health, care, economic development, work integration)? Are there also any interrelated effects in other fields?

1.2 Targeted beneficiary group(s)
Who are the targeted beneficiaries? What specific characteristics do they have that might be relevant for or a symptom of their marginalisation (e.g., economic vulnerability, physical handicaps, migration status, lack of access to the education system, etc.)?

1.3 Problem background
Please describe the context conditions that are relevant for the emergence of the social problem or the marginalisation of the target group. This could be the general economic situation, political situation, welfare policy, a poor education system, religious constellations, demographical development, technological development, etc. and/or more specific problems such as market power abuse, discrimination, corruption, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>Which individual (or collective) capabilities of marginalised people are deprived? Which functioning could not be achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are conversion rates affected by the context conditions and how do they contribute to marginalisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can power structures be identified according to Mann’s adapted framework that are relevant for the problem situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Is there a clear beneficiary that is being targeted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the social problem addressed individual-specific or group-specific or context-specific?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do contextual conditions that were/are relevant relate to each other? (e.g., complementarities, co-evolution, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Did technological innovation cause marginalisation or make existing marginalisation worse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did technological innovation pave the way for social innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>Can specific networks (actor constellations), cognitive frames or institutions be identified that are relevant for the problem situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do social problems addressed by SI emerge in certain context conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>Which policies/political constellations did/do contribute to the social problem?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICS - PART 2) Solution, influences and relevant context factors

2.1 Solution approach

How does the social innovation approach address the social problem? Describe the most relevant activities to prevent, mitigate or solve marginalisation (e.g., services provision, lobbying, advocacy, etc.)?

What is the novelty in terms of goods, services or processes (including new forms of organisations, resources, or communication)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>Which cognitive frames, networks and institutions are addressed by the SI? To what extent has the social innovation been incremental (adaptive change in practice, e.g. with a focus on products or services that address(ed) identified market failures effectively), institutional (changes in the Social Grid practice, e.g. reconfiguring existing market structures to create social value), or disruptive (radical change in practice, e.g. with a focus on politics and social movements, changing the cognitive frames around markets and social systems/structures) across its diffusion process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>How stable are social innovation solution approaches? How dependent are solution approaches to contingencies (individual characteristics of promoter/inventor, contextual circumstances)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Which kind of technological artefacts and infrastructures are required for the development of the SI? Which kind of novel technological artefacts (TA) and/or new infrastructures are involved in the development of the SI? Which kind of key techniques (TC) are required for the SI? Is it necessary to acquire new techniques (TC) in order to implement the SI? How does education/training contribute to diffusion of the social innovation? Does the solution involve support in acquiring the relevant technological artefacts (TA)? Does the solution involve support in access to the relevant infrastructure (TI)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WP 5 ...  
WP 6 ...  

2.2 Actors and networks

Can specific networks or individual actors be identified as key players in the idea generation, invention phase, the innovation phase and the diffusion phase of the social innovation? Are relevant actors or members of networks personally affected by the social problem addressed? Is the target group involved in the value creation process? Do members of the target group take any collective action?

4 Technological artefacts (TA) including “hardware” (TA_h), i.e. any kind of material artefacts, and “software/Apps” (TA_a), i.e. any kind of software apps, protocols, services, blueprints …

5 This can include: TC_s – Somatic techniques (e.g. swimming, singing …), TC_e – Exosomatic techniques (e.g. making fire, writing, haircutting, riding a bike or car …), TC_p – Primary production techniques (meaning human appropriation of net primary production in agriculture and exploitation of the lithosphere), TC_i – Industrial techniques, TC_c – Communication techniques, etc.
Which networks or other actors were/are important as catalysers, multipliers, or adapters (e.g., sponsors, public authorities, politicians pushing for beneficial changes in legal frameworks, celebrities that increased public attention, etc.)? Where those actors particularly powerful? Why?

Did/do those actors and networks influence legislation, education curricula, or other institutions?

Which influence did/do these actors and networks exert on narratives and public discourses regarding the social problem/social innovation?

Are there also typical “adapters” that did not necessarily develop the social innovation (incremental innovation), but adapted it to their context and accordingly contribute(d) to the diffusion of the social innovation? Can they be located in a specific societal sector (civil society, market, public)? Did/do networks play a role in the adaptation process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>How did/do networks relate to institutions and cognitive frames? Which dynamics of change did/do occur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Which complementary actors needed to be involved contemporarily?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distributive aspect: which actors have access to the SI process? Which barriers can be identified at different levels (e.g., geographical distance, knowledge gaps, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Which scientific networks (e.g. disciplines) contribute(d) to the success of the SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which industrial actors contribute(d) to the success of the SI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>How do different societal spheres (e.g., civil society incl. philanthropy, private markets, public authorities, etc.) contribute at different points of dissemination of the SI? How do they interact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do marginalised groups contribute to different forms of social innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Narratives and discourses

Please, indicate which narratives or discourses accompany / are relevant for the addressed social problem and the social innovation. Do they inhibit or foster social innovations? Can already any changes be detected?

In which social domains can these discourses and narratives be located (media, parliament/city council, civil society/community)? What are the instruments of the discourse (reports, petitions, opinion leaders, media campaigns, letters to the editor etc.)?

Who is involved in these discourses (e.g. the beneficiaries)? Can any parties be identified that dominate these discourses or narratives? Why can they do so (e.g., power, knowledge)?

Do those narratives influence the perception and acceptance of legislation, education curricula, or other institutions?

Do they affect the perception and acceptance of any networks?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>What is the role of cognitive frames in social innovations? How do they relate to institutions and social networks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>How can cognitive frames possibly be measured? What is the evaluative space here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Which technological visions and scientific advances were used in the discourse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>Do changes in cognitive frames represent specific phases in social innovation lifecycles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>How are policies driven by cognitive frames?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 Rules, norms, and policies

Were/are there any policies (in the thematic field or generally) that contribute(d) to the social problem addressed? Were/are there any legal / constitutional triggers or framework conditions that contributed to the social problem? Were/are there any other rules or norms that contribute(d) to the social problem?

Are there any policies (within the relevant thematic field or elsewhere) that foster or inhibit the social innovation, e.g. by altering its capacity and function to tackle marginalisation? Are there any legal / constitutional triggers or framework conditions that fostered or inhibited the social innovation? Are there any other rules or norms that fostered or inhibited the social innovation?

To what extent do rules, norms and policies contribute towards systemic change through social innovation in this field of study?

Is ‘tackling marginalisation’ (either via poverty reduction, social inclusion, etc.) a central, explicit objective or outcome of policies or other rules and norms? Why/Why not?

Does the social innovation build on or recombine existing policies, norms and rules?

Do relevant policies exist on a regional, national or international (EU) level? Can different influences of different policies be detected across different regions?

At what stage of the development process did/do supporting policies become most relevant?

Have existing policies been changed as a consequence of the social innovation? Did other rules and norms change as a consequence of the social innovation? How was/is this achieved, and by whom? Are those actors particularly powerful?

How do policies or other rules and norms relate to social networks relevant for the social innovation?

How do policies or other rules and norms represent or relate to public discourses and narratives? How is policy making influenced by them? Vice versa, how do policies and other rules and norms influence public discourses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>What is the role of institutions in social innovations? How do they relate to cognitive frames and networks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Which networks/links were shared by social innovators and policy makers?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which policies are able to change distribution and accessibility to resources/inputs for the SI process?

Were there complementary policies that made a difference? On which basis did their complementarity rest (e.g., same beneficiaries, same social problem addressed, complementary social problem addressed, etc.)?

WP 4 What is the role of research, technology and innovation policy during social innovation process?

WP 5 What is the role of education (and life-long learning) policy during social innovation process?

Do technological norms and standards play a role?

WP 6 Which (social) innovation policies are currently successful / have been successful in the past? In which contexts?

Which role do policies play in ecosystems fostering social innovation?

2.5 Resources

What type of financial resources are used to finance relevant activities of the social innovation (e.g., own assets of target group, donations, membership fees, grants, social investments, regular loans, public funds, etc.), and for what purposes are these resources deployed (e.g., machinery, commodities, advisory, etc.)?

What other types of resources (voluntary work, social networks, natural resources, etc.) were/are relevant for the social innovation? Please describe the role of the different resources.

WP Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)

WP 1 …

WP 3 How is the distribution and accessibility to these resources?

WP 4 Does the nationalization / privatization of relevant infrastructures impact on the access to social innovations?

WP 5 What role do financial resources play for SI (invention, diffusion, etc.)?

Can the role of the type of capital (social, cultural, ecological, etc.) for social innovations be specified?

WP 6 …

2.6 Social and technological innovation

Is the social innovation fostered by or related to technological innovations like
- a new general purpose technology (e.g., information and communication technologies) and/or by scientific advances?
- a new artefact (e.g. mobile phone)?

Is the social innovation fostered by or related to a new infrastructure (e.g. Internet)? Is the social innovation fostered by the emergence of new techniques?

How did/do technological innovation contribute to the social innovation, or vice versa?

Did/does technological innovation help in the diffusion of the social innovation or even improve it?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>How is the distribution and accessibility to technology and its use? Whose perception on the use of the technology matters / is being promoted/diffused?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>To which step in the social innovation and diffusion process do technological innovations contribute? (idea generation, invention, innovation, diffusion process incl. adaptation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>Which patterns do emerge in the interplay of social and technological innovations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 Social impact measurement

Have there been any attempts to measure the impact of the social innovation (on the level of a specific intervention or organisation or a national level, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>What dimensions and approaches for impact measurement are currently used? (How) do they contribute to the development of the SI? What is the chosen evaluative space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 Further drivers and obstacles for the diffusion of the SI

What further contextual factors can be identified that fostered/d or inhibited the diffusion of the social innovation (e. g., legal framework conditions, economic/political situation or crisis, dominant welfare regime, ecological situation, power structures, cognitive frames, religious constellations, demographic developments, etc.)?

What further factors can be identified on the level of the innovative agents that fostered or inhibited the diffusion (e.g., organisational capacity of the inventor, resources, resistance of employees, value set or skills of the leaders)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>How can actors be ‘nested’ into contexts? Do different networks overlap? If yes, how do they overlap? Which actors are taking part in more than one network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>How do different influential factors in the diffusion process of SI interrelate? What are different barriers for different kinds of SI (e.g. bottom-up vs. top-down)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICS - PART 3) Social innovation development and impact

3.1 Development of the SI

Can different phases and crucial events in the development of the SI be identified today? Are there perhaps different “streams” within the social innovation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>How does the development of SI relate to changes in relevant cognitive frames, institutions and social networks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can the innovation be located in Mann’s framework of power sources/fields of innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>To what extent has the social innovation been incremental (with a focus on products or services that address(ed) identified market failures effectively), institutional (reconfiguring existing market structures to create social value), or disruptive (with a focus on politics and social movements, changing the cognitive frames around markets and social systems/structures) across its diffusion process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>Do any new actors/relevant groups get involved? (especially marginalised groups with previously little voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Impact of the SI

What kind of impact can be attached to the social innovation today (e.g., improved access to resources, learning options, self-confidence, etc.)? Does the social innovation also unfold its impact beyond the initial field of activity (e.g., effects on the labour market)?

How can the positive impact of the social innovation be described? Are there also potentially negative impacts in the targeted field of activity and beyond?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Possible questions of analysis (addressed within work packages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>What was/is the evaluative space for assessing that the impact of the SI process is positive or negative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICS - PART 4) Discussion and key lessons

Based on the findings throughout the template, what are the key lessons for …
- Social innovators?
- Policy makers?
- Investors and funders (resource structure)?