В. В. Зинченко

Институциональные тенденции и комплексные интернациональные трансформации системы образования в контексте глобального устойчивого развития общества

В результате хозяйственно-общественного и научно-технического развития современного мира мы наблюдаем существование нескольких форм стран индустриального типа, для каждой из которых характерна определенная специфическая система (и соответственно, философия и модель менеджмента) образования, общественного воспитания и социального управления. Общей закономерностью индустриального товарно-рыночного общества является интенсивная капитализация тех сфер общественной жизни или форм человеческой деятельности, которые обеспечивают актуальную прибыль. С этой точки зрения рост капиталовложений в образование весьма показателен. Он свидетельствует о реально растущем влиянии образования на общественное производство, то есть о превращении его в экономический фактор. Предыдущие периоды радикальных преобразований всё сильнее дают о себе знать в сфере образования и подготовки специалистов.

Анализ современной образовательной практики в индустриальных странах (прежде всего, транзитивного типа) не только не опровергает тезис об обусловленности всей системы образования нормативными и управленческо-властными задачами социальной системы, классовыми интересами господствующей общественной группы, а, наоборот, подтверждает ее.

Утверждается, что глобализация и технологическая революция должны быть использованы для радикальной перестройки и реконструкции образования для его служения демократии и прогрессивных социальных изменений. Осознание уроков глобального развития является необходимым как для теоретического осмысления сегодняшних перспектив мировой прогрессивной политики в целом и в сфере образования в частности, так и для практических попыток изменить наш мир в интересах общественного большинства..

Ключевые слова: транзитивные модели, высшие ценности, социальная селекция, коммерческий подход, демократическое образование, институционализация, развитие общества

Ссылка для цитирования:

Зинченко В. В. Институциональные тенденции и комплексные интернациональные трансформации системы образования в контексте глобального устойчивого развития общества // Перспективы науки и образования. 2019. № 2 (38). С. 10-24. doi: 10.32744/pse.2019.2.1

V. V. ZINCHENKO

Institutional trends and integrated international transformations of educational system in the context of the global sustainable development of society

As a result, economic and social, scientific and technological development of the modern world we observe the existence of multiple forms of the industrial type, each of which is characterized by a certain specific system (and therefore, the philosophy and model management) education, public education and social management. General pattern of industrial commodity-market society is intensive capitalization of the spheres of social life, or forms of human activity, which provide current income. From this perspective, the growth of investment in education is very significant. It really shows the growing influence of education on social production that is, turning it into an economic factor. Previous periods of radical change are increasingly being felt in education and training.

Analysis of the current educational practice in industrialized countries (primarily transitive type) not only refutes the thesis of conditionality of the entire education system and the management and regulatory challenges overbearing social system, the class interests of the dominant social group, but rather confirms it.

Argues that globalization and the technological revolution to be used for a radical restructuring and reconstruction of education for his service to democracy and progressive social change. Awareness lessons of the global development is necessary for a theoretical understanding of today's global outlook for progressive politics in general and in education in particular, and for the practical attempts to change our world for the public majority.

Keywords: transitive models, higher values, social selection, commercial approach, neoliberalism, democratic education, institutionalization, development of society

For Reference:

Zinchenko, V. V. (2019). Institutional trends and integrated international transformations of educational system in the context of the global sustainable development of society. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania – Perspectives of Science and Education*, 38 (2), 10-24. doi: 10.32744/pse.2019.2.1

Introduction

Education is outstanding in the wide range of ideological, economic, cultural, political and legal phenomena of social development. Any organized human community is impossible without educational relations, since education is a necessary element of the established mechanism of interaction between members of the community. The presence of educational relations is something self-evident, at least for contemporary researchers and therefore there is no need in special discussions around the educational sources and needs. Another matter – the problem of the type and forms of education and the ways of its legitimization – these are the basic issues of modern social and pedagogical discourse. At least such issues are most relevant to communities undergoing radical changes, and not only in the sphere of social construction, but also at the level of human consciousness and thinking.

In European countries, the reform of higher education is carried out systematically and for a long time. It was promoted by the democratic systems of these countries and the democracy in education. But in different countries the results of the institutional implementation of the new paradigm of education are different.

In the actual practice of the educational process the manifestation of mechanisms that transform the system of education into an instrument of social management is partly disclosed in the content of the public functions of education [3; 6; 25]. Thus, seemingly, by appearance neutral educational and educational phenomena (the teaching process, the standards of education, the evaluation of knowledge, the relationship between teacher/professor and pupil/student, school/university and parents etc.) is the embodiment of the ruling will and economic interest of the dominant system of society – its norms, values and goals, which is realized through the system of education and upbringing [24, p. 61].

This does not mean, however, that the social system, its sphere of management and power rely only on the spontaneous self-realization of its interests by the direct functioning of the system of education and upbringing. It seeks direct control, supervision and domination over the educational process [8, p. 251].

Research methods

In this aspect, the manifestation of the governing power and the ruling will is manifested in the relevant guidance and policy standards, norms, prescriptions, official documents and other state-legal acts. Most of them express the practical relation of the state to the system of education – exactly the state, which appears, as it is well known, the political organization of the system of society and represents the interests of the ruling social group (groups) [10; 13; 35]. These norms, standards and documents, in accordance with their explicit or implicit orientation, reflect the process of transformation and evolution of the education system in industrial (and post-industrial) countries in the means of certain social interest and purpose. The estimates and value orientations that are represented in these documents and related other materials have a particular importance.

Official standards and documents (instructions, official correspondence, orders, guidelines, curricula and comments, statements of political figures and government officials etc.) are considered as an embodiment of the practical interest of society and its groups

(first of all, dominant) in management of the process of education and upbringing. Worthy of note is primarily the study of the motivation for these goals that concern the school and other educational institutions. Their significance is understood from the fact that most of them are formulated, unfortunately, not by theoreticians, experts in pedagogical science, but by managers of the education system and government officials. Since a comprehensive analysis of such sources needs their localization in time and space, then the actual basis of this study is taken from the state of the European continental education system, reflected in the documentation for the period from the end of the XIX century up to this day.

This period is largely demonstrative, since it begins with the transformation of pre-monopolistic market capitalism into a cartel-monopolistic, state-monopoly and state-regulated, and has been culminating in the deployment of a scientific and technological revolution and industrialism of various forms at the global level, which has a great influence on the overall evolution of the modern industrialized countries [37, p. 259]. This period is characterized by an increase of the number of state schools and other educational institutions of different levels, by increased centralization of the management of the education system, by the adoption of compulsory schooling and the active involvement of schools (primary, secondary and higher) in the process of formation of specialists and workforce.

Results and Discussion

As a result of the economic, social, scientific and technological development of the modern world, we observe the several forms of industrial countries [3, pp. 62-65], for each of them it is typical the specific system (and accordingly, philosophy and management model) of education, social education and social management.

First, it's so-called **developed industrial countries**, which earlier than others entered the path of industrial, scientific and technological revolutions – the current leaders of the prevailing economic and political (and educational) model of globalization (their system is also called «*neo-capitalism*» or «*post-capitalism*» [38, p. 3]).

Secondly, among them is a group of countries that are increasingly oriented in their development and economic activity on the production of technologies, innovations, various types of science-intensive information, instead of the manufacture and sale of finished industrial products or financial resources (which is typical for countries the first group) – **postindustrial countries**.

Thirdly, since the late 1970's, we can observe the active development of countries that have implemented a large-scale industrial and technological leap in agrarian or industrial-type economic development. They gradually turn into serious rivals for systems of the first and second groups (the most telling examples from among them are China, South Korea and Taiwan, some countries in Latin America) – so-called «**new industrialized countries**». The systems of education and social management of education in them are not yet stable, being in a constantly changing development, representing a queer (albeit very qualitatively working!) symbiosis of traditional educational systems of the national type, pieces of Western philosophy and management education, as well as the latest, purely exclusive products in this field [39].

The fourth group in the modern global world is a so-called countries of the «**transitive type**» [2, pp. 37-39], type that implement (or imitate the implementation) complex reforms of the system and multilevel types for the purpose of integration into the community of

one of the above groups or ambitiously seek to create their own, competitive social, state and economic model (and, as a result – ideological, educational, educational, and cultural models). Some of them seek to return to the functional system from which they have been torn apart by objective or subjective circumstances – the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Others seek to preserve or create at least the basis of industrial and scientific-intellectual resources for initial industrial and financial self-sufficiency – these are post-Soviet countries (including Ukraine). Therefore, it is expedient to talk about the «**transitive modernization-transformational models**» (countries or their groups) and «**transit countries of the basic level**» (the former Soviet states, Asian or agrarian countries of the «socialist camp», such as Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam and Cuba).

Separately there is the fifth, non-industrial group of countries with only formal features of the state, political symbols, representing virtually the **territory of resources** (raw materials, land-agrarian, natural, animal, recreational, human) – the most of African countries and states of Oceania (Polynesia, Micronesia, Melanesia) and the Caribbean, partly under certain circumstances – and some post-Soviet countries.

Of particular interest is therefore the process of transforming the social functions of education and the goals of education and education in new socio-historical conditions – these goals are proposed by foreign (in particular, Western) science – in pedagogical, philosophical, managerial conceptions [1]. Of course, the goals contained in pedagogical theories, and the goals advocated by instructive official materials, do not fully coincide [10; 13]. Their analysis becomes more necessary. In studying such documents a particular attention should be paid to the goals and objectives of education and the means for achieving them; definition of the principles of attitude to the students and their parents; state and social environment; students' abilities and methods of their assessment; social equality of people and their equality in the education system etc. Of course, there were no absolute consistency of goals, means, assessments etc – they were different and could not be the same for such a long period, but changes in them also had sufficient informative, because they reflect the processes that take place in society. Identification of the same or similar subjects, clarification of the degree of its repetition, similarity or differences of opinion on the issues raised involved the usage of quantitative methods of sociological analysis. In particular, such as: the definition of the volume (in percentage terms) of the pronounced speeches in favor of certain official regulations and installations, the establishment of the coefficient of convergence and differences of opinion, the construction of curves of the growth or the fall of statistical indicators.

As a result of our study, it was proved that with the development of industrial capitalism, the structure of education, the nature of its management, the content of curricula comprehensively adapted to social production and active complicity of the school in the ideological treatment of younger generations [13, p. 60].

Western pedagogical literature in the late XIX – early XX century and even in little earlier period had a certain confidence in the natural superiority of a particular ruling class. In instructional and political documents it was stated: «Social elite is a normal lyceum audience»; in 40% of all speeches the speakers exalted the wealthy parents of the students: «You who make up the elite of the city», «Be worthy of your parents who have such a prominent social position» [22, p. 45]. The elitist trend was in line with the widespread belief that the lyceum, college was preparing a person not for labor or service activity: «Whatever could be your future, you will be human beings first... Here's a career that above all fits your social position» [10, p. 81]. In the list of professions for graduates of lyceums, those that were not

related to the industrial sphere were strongly recommended: a doctor, a lawyer and others. Obedience was constantly preached – obedience that testifies the repressive nature of the western school: «You are, fortunately, are the sober, law-abiding children...», «Your family entrusted you to our care, delegating the powers of the supreme authority...» [23, p. 86]. Teacher appeared here as a sample of morality represents official and informal power.

Students' integration into the ruling elite alienated from the mass of the population was the programmed result of the spatial isolation of the educational institution and the socially homogeneous composition of the students. It created an atmosphere of high enough personal-psychological cohesion and class solidarity. Especially closed educational institution became the most important link in the formation of the top of the ruling class. It united the contenders for power, not only with common socio-economic interests, but also with cultural and psychological ties, the commonality of the formed stereotypes of behavior, experience and categorization of reality.

The role of the isolation of the closed (boarding school) or «elitist» (with a limited level of payment or the need for certain significant acquaintances) educational institution from the outside world was extremely large. The ruling class placed its children in boarding schools, pursuing its main goal – to attract heirs to the social elite, to form in them a sense of class solidarity, a psychological stereotype.

The removing of the education from sphere of work also manifested itself in the fact that the social value of labor is identified with a «business», which was understood to be devoted to the production-market. It was only a result of individual effort for a focused career, self-projecting from the outside, a means of success and success achieving. «Individual efforts and perseverance are a means to achieve something significant. This is the most worthy and most reliable» [13, p. 88]. Indeed, the work of the bourgeois was inseparable from its purpose, which was to create a situation that allowed you to reach the shortest path to safe and assured social position. Otherwise, it's «lost time».

Most pronounced speeches and official documents often included the term «*higher values*» [4]. To the declaration of «higher values» industrial-market capitalized school could be especially appealing, since it did not follow from any practical conclusions and commitments. It represented a kind of peculiar foggy symbolism that means nothing concrete. They were usually concealed and often followed by a more practical purpose – integration into a particular social group by self-isolation and creating the distance from other social groups. This topic is found in 70% of instructional and policy documents, and the rate of coincidence of opinions in official speeches is +20 [7]. It emphasizes the social distance between the «chosen» and the «crowd»: «Humanity does not appeal to the crowd; it prefers the elected minority», consisting of «...all the children of the university who formed a truly great family» [4, pp. 7-9]. The last on the scale of such values were «the formation of labor (technical) skills» and «changes in the outside world».

At the end of the XIX – early XX centuries in the school education of the industrial-market West the tendency of the nationalization of the school at all levels began to intensify, it was opened a significant number of public schools. In this regard, the content of instructional materials, the nature of pedagogical rhetoric was changed. The structure and functions of the education system were rethinking with the intention «...to offer ...democracy education that is consistent with the general goals of economic, political and social necessity...» [23, p. 147]. Although the external differences between some types of schools were already not so evident, at the same time, the selection activities within the school were intensifying, in particular, the final exams were complicated. The encyclopedic orientation of the most

aristocratic educational institution – the classical gymnasium, whose social base was continuously narrowing, was limited enough. Natural sciences were introduced, the number of hours was reduced to the ancient languages and texts, the gymnastics and general means of physical development took more hours. School, and pedagogy in particular, gradually implemented positivist orientations. They obliged educational institutions to form «not only the amount of knowledge, but the ability of their useful application» [17, p. 87] (This was still demanded by Rousseau for his Emile).

The next expansion of the social base of education, the intensification of the recruitment of students, was still combined with recognition of the initial inequality of abilities. The capitalized market-based pedagogical practice began to intensify the ideological and cultural installation in accordance with the bourgeois's main interest and with the particular tasks of the present moment [21; 37]. For the same reason, much less attention is paid to reforms in the structure of the school itself.

Traditional primary education was not of great interest in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. nor the official pedagogy of the Western industrialized countries, nor the state administration (the bourgeois children had traditionally received primary education at home or in privileged boarding schools, elite and educational boarding houses of closed type), since primary education, as believed by the prevailing state-pedagogical model, did not affect decisively neither training scientific-technical and administrative personnel, nor on the formation of the individual's individual as a future specialist. It gave the future employee only «functional» education («writing»): the ability to read, count and write. Foreign sociologists of education noted that there were as if three isolated worlds – *elementary, secondary and higher education* [5; 10; 13].

Since the beginning of the 20th century the situation was changing. «Functional» writing was already becoming insufficient for a skilled worker of industrial production. Primary education extends to the bulk of the population and serves as a means of pre-selection, searching for «capable» ones, which were also required from an economic point of view.

Purposeful education in an industrial society began to socialize the entire population. The school became a powerful factor in the spiritual control of personality and management of it. The school not only did not yield, but also began to surpass other ideological mechanisms of the industrial society in terms of volume and effectiveness of actions on the person. Further, the merging of state and monopoly capital transformed a private «business» into a general «firm», individual entrepreneurship – In a joint venture, traditional individualism – in the surrogate of collectivism, classical capitalism – in state monopoly, which reflected on the system of education and upbringing.

Some unification of education at the end of the XX – the beginning of the XXI century did not remove in the industrialized countries the socio-class differences that existed within its framework. Only an open selection on the basis of social origin was transformed into a hidden one. The school (both secondary and higher) becomes an arena of social-class struggle. There were some changes in the internal structure of the school and university system of education, there were differentiated the forms of training in order to create better conditions for the class-limited selection of students: sections, subsections, branches, directions (with Latin, without Latin, with Greek, without Greek language instruction), there were new teaching classes, lyceums or colleges, various types of graduation exams etc. The same was true with the academic disciplines, the network of training hours and educational programs.

The purpose of these innovations was to «develop the intellectual capabilities of the enlightened elite, the aristocracy of the spirit, the highest personnel of the army and

production» [26, p. 12]. It was self-evident that the distinction in diplomas and other educational certificates determined the social future of the individuals.

The stabilized structure of education in most developed industrial countries had already shown the relevance of its objectives to the market system. Variety of educational institutions allowed for free maneuver and selection on the basis of social origin to submit selection «for the abilities». **Higher education** had particular significance. It focused on the interest of the ruling class.

However, the **secondary school** did not fall out of sight of the dominant social layers that seeking to give it, if it was possible, an aristocratic character. The pre-existing contempt for «modern education» fades somewhat, although classical education continues to be immutable: «We do not in any way question the value of classical education; its conclusions are indisputable» [11, p 150].

Subsequent monopolization of capital caused significant ossification of social structures. Vertical mobility of the population was decreasing. Market individualism as a basis for entrepreneurial activity and personal self-affirmation significantly changed. The middle and petty bourgeoisie were actively seeking other means of social promotion, directing their hopes on education. «Today, – said one of the school documents, – the caste spirit has no grounds, nor justification. We know that the last of our compatriots can rise because of our intelligence and diligence» [10, p. 231]. Although, «if this democratic ideal is not always fully realized, since some posts are completely inaccessible to the children of workers and peasants, this does not cancel (only considerably reduces) the action of the general principle» [23, p. 99].

Education began to be interpreted as a neutral, inadequate basis for social status (this was already a response to the expansion of its social base and some democratization). One of the speeches of the Western education functionalist was as follows: «I admit that one soldier of one of the two Parisian regiments, which the authorities send every Wednesday to visit monuments and museums, will find one or two, which has an idea of Veronese and Rembrandt... But this does not mean that they will ever become truly educated people». And so, «...should all those who learn ancient languages and whether we want to have all the carpenters read Sophocles?» [13, pp. 158-159].

Significant changes in the structure of the western school occurred after the Second World War. In all large industrial capitalist countries there was an increase in school education. So, if in 1920-1928 the coverage of youth in France by all types of education increased from 5 to 10%, already from 1930, and especially in the postwar period, the level of «schooling» of young people increased in 1960 to 33% [20, pp. 376, 378]. The main reason for such a jump was the scientific and technological revolution with all its social consequences for an industrial society: the ruin of the middle and petty bourgeoisie, for which the diploma became the only means of preserving or enhancing social status; bureaucratization of society and the establishment of a system of certified careerism; making «bourgeois» of some social groups by orienting them into commodity-market values; the depersonalization of social relations and the desire to overcome it by means of «improving understanding» and, finally, transforming education into an economic factor and the main means of forming labor [8, p. 242].

From the fact that the school began to look outwardly as a single, publicly available, it concluded: «There should not be any teenager from which environment he would not be, who would not be able to get into Lyceum if his intellectual abilities are allowed» [14, p. 392]. The «rationalization» of the structure of educational institutions and educational

programs according to the criteria of industrial-market (capitalized) profitability was actively implemented: up to 40% of time was devoted to philosophy (ideological indoctrination) and natural sciences (formation of labor force) against 24% to literature [10, p. 103].

At the same time, however, there was another tendency – the expansion of the sphere of services and the emergence in this connection of a whole group of «communicative» or «intermediate» professions, which did not require any special training, except for general erudition, intelligence, ability to communicate, which focuses on the formation of a «common culture» school.

In expressing this tendency, official materials were filled with calls for the creation of conditions for the «general culture»: «Those who believe in classical education attach primary importance to its educational values, the general culture that it has formed, which is implanted in the spirit of awareness» [13, p. 112]. It was worth pointing out in this regard that the idea that one of the most important disadvantages of a Western school was the excessive specialization of education was appropriate in the case when the school was included in the system of training of labor and technical specialists, that is, when the education system was used for the majority members of society. When education was used for internal consumption – the formation of a person of the ruling class and the perfection of one's lifestyle, which required an increasing number of hired professionals in the humanitarian profile, – it (the system of education) acquired a pseudo-elitist, pseudo-aristocratic character [9]. This was done either through studying in private (closed) educational institutions, or by creating lyceums or sections of the «general» type, which focused mainly on the cultural and psychological profile of a person.

Unlike the utilitarian approach to education from the side of the «early» bourgeoisie, in the new conditions there was an aristocratic contempt for its professional orientation, which at least formally balanced the representatives of different states. The case of education, thus, was the preparation for everything. It should provide everything supposedly necessary for future successes. Socio-cultural function was expelled from vocational training and monopolized by the elite of the ruling class.

Such a transformation of the functions of the school met resistance from the hired workers, the peasantry, a significant part of the middle and petty bourgeoisie, for which the school had become the only means of gaining a corresponding personal social appearance, close to the appearance of the ruling class. Therefore, supporters of the ideology of social reformism required a «unified» school, that is, equal to the right of the big bourgeoisie to intellectual and cultural succession of society.

This idea was carried out under the slogans of transforming education into a means of social solidarity and class peace: «Let our lyceums and universities form young people with unified views, covered in one spirit, prepared by some teachers and the same methods and means ... It is not only pedagogical but also social reform» [20, p. 189]. These call still sound rather shy in the mighty voice of choirs, which rejected the equality of abilities and opportunities that call for the «individualization» of education, that is, the strengthening of its selective-blocking function. Among the opinions expressed on this issue, the «coefficient of similarity» reached in the years 1931-1940 +2, in 1960-1990 – +3, in 1999-2017 – +3 [7; 17; 18].

The installation of individualization of instruction was a modified form of the expression of the previous orientation towards the formation of signs of «aristocracy». It was for this reason that in the official instructions, the prevailing calls were: «to feel beauty», «to form and to instill taste», to cultivate «the ability to thinner perception of the world», to improve

the «gymnastics of the spirit», to cultivate «ability to judge», «spirit of initiative», «access to general ideas», and the like. Even in their form, they were frightened by democratic, and even more soiling, layers who were accustomed to another expression of thoughts.

If before the large bourgeoisie with the help of education only confirmed its domination, used mainly its social-blocking function, now it was with the help of the school, it was forced to maintain, consolidate and protect its position and position in the fight against other social groups. Accordingly, further reconstruction of the practical pedagogical process took place in the following directions: the differentiation of the structure continued, opportunities for more flexible maneuvering were created in the intricate «corridors of education». The selection function of preschool education and elementary education was intensifying.

With the advent of tests and other forms of measuring the «level of intelligence» as tools for a more sophisticated social selection in official instructions and school practice, attention was drawn to the «pre-install» effects of tests, assessments and professional orientation. Accordingly, in a new way, the whole discipline was also considered. Due to the fact that the tests used in school were mainly verbal, the language began to be interpreted as a means intended to conduct an inventory of natural inclinations. Other subjects were also beginning to be obliged to show «continuity of effort», «susceptibility», «the speed of mental reflection», «ease and correctness of prudent reaction», «spontaneity of entrepreneurship and spirit of initiative». Particularly it was emphasized that «exercises of this kind... if the class consists of students whose spirit has already been awakened (family upbringing), intended to become a means of their difference, distance». Even the performance of laboratory works in the natural sciences should show «the elegance of perception and sensitivity», «abstraction and self-expression ability» [23, pp. 176-178] – the quality formed by a solid cultural environment and family upbringing.

All the efforts of the school, therefore, were aimed at revealing, not the awakening of giftedness, which so need children from the families of hired workers and the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry. In the instructions and other policy documents it is emphasized that «general» culture and the formation of intelligence – was essentially the only basis and purpose of education. It created the bourgeois culture and psychological climate that was familiar to children, which allowed them to view the school as «their own home». At the same time, the cultural and psychological alienation of children of working people was carried out, the attitude towards the school was characterized by elimination, indifference, a feeling of neglect in another, hostile world of values and assessments.

Although the postwar period was characterized by a sharp blast of «schooling» of youth (between 1960 and 1964, the schooling index in Western Europe grew, for example, annually by 8.6%, and between 1989 and 2018 it grew annually by 9.9%) [7; 17; 18], however, for example, in France only 20% of young people had attended lyceums, and only 35% of them were in classical sections [18]. The latter «settled down» in specialized sections of lyceums, technical colleges. The bulk of the children were ostracized in the field of «short» (dead-end) education and vocational training. Therefore, we can agree with the conclusion of sociologists that «... study in the Lyceum remains a privilege...» [26, p. 16].

The general regularity of an industrial commodity-market society was the intensive capitalization of those spheres of social life or forms of human activity that provide actual income. From this point of view, the growth of investment in education was very demonstrative. It showed the real impact of education on social production, that is, on transforming it into an economic factor. At the same time, embedding into the labor force or living labor for any bourgeoisie was always compulsory and conditioned by the total cost

of its (labor) social reproduction at this stage of socio-historical development. Therefore, the bourgeoisie sought to shift the financial burden of investments into education on the shoulders of the working people themselves. This was a characteristic feature of a new kind of capitalist exploitation: the use of a person's growing desire for education, the growth of culture and one's individual development [36, p. 9]. The industrially-market firms were only involved in vocational training, while preparing the labor force in a highly specialized manner, using the field of education to reproduce a part-time worker.

The class orientation and the commercial approach to education now also show differentiated attention, which is given to its various levels and stages. The educational pyramid is built from top to bottom, that is, the modern industrial-market state (and, in particular, the Ukrainian one) attaches exceptional importance to the «upper floors» of education, while care (and costs) for high-quality primary (now – secondary and higher) education is the main task for the family [15; 16; 19]. Therefore, the richer family has the opportunity to better prepare their children in primary schools and thus guarantee quality education at secondary and higher schools (which, unfortunately, are also massively commercialized in Ukraine).

The transfer of family expenses is not only a means of attaching it to the chariot of industrial-market production, but also a means of social control, social selection at school, since families of the majority of the population – hired workers (and other less socially protected layers) are not can compete in this respect with the families of the rich (and in general, the social minority – much more prosperous) fellow citizens. Children of the absolute majority of the population in transitional countries not socially oriented (including in Ukraine) are deliberately doomed to acquire education of «lower grade», as family expenses for education increase in proportion to its level and quality [5; 7].

The ***modernization by the neo-liberal model*** represents the expansion of the market as a forced and inevitable measure in the conditions of the modern world economy. Within this «boundary of possible» the governments try to achieve a competitive advantage solely by the rapid restructuring of existing and new sectors of the economy. At the heart of these transformations there are the researches and projects aimed at preserving high-added-value aspects of production, and one of them is the sale of higher education products in order to gain profit in international industrial change. Neoliberal governments also seek to use «competitive advantage» to justify this restructuring, calling it a modernizing force that generates benefits for employees, since it allows the workforce to react promptly to fluctuations in the market.

The role of the state in this case is manifested in several aspects. First, governments began to commercialize the higher education independently without waiting for international legal agreements. The role of international agreements, such as the General Agreement on Trade in Services, for countries that are at the forefront of liberalization and commercialization of educational, public services, is to «consolidate» commercialization in those areas where it has already begun [6].

Compulsory, thus, is aimed at those states that are trying to resist the dictates of global market capitalism. And even then, it is precisely those countries that intend to develop and apply radical reforms that require the expansion of capitalist discipline. This leads to the fact that protesters against the neo-liberal model of education are mainly focused on discussing international treaties, such as the *General Agreement on Trade in Services*, that gives just partial results when it comes to effective resistance. As the current experience of the development of the higher education system in the EU shows, the resistance to educational

neo-liberalism should produce a more clear theoretical and practical approach to such a variety of agreements in order to understand the relationship between political structures and the historical development of global capitalism [31, pp. 129-131]. Failure to do so may result that it could be too late to resist the spread of total commercialization of education and scientific knowledge, the system of the General Agreement on trade in services to other public services and it could not save the higher education from commercialization and all its consequences.

The *problem of commercializing the education and growing-up system* and spreading of the commercial sector at all levels of education is an acute and controversial issue that is often grounded by its apologists in that the creation of a mercenary education system will only become an «new addition» to existing state systems and this «supplement» will help to improve knowledge providing, «pluralize» the offer of educational services. Albert Hirschman is a well known American economist from Germany whose main themes of research are political economy, political ideology, management. A quarter century ago, he showed why total implementation of the commercial (in particular, private) sector or commercialization in state-public sphere destroys quite often the public sector and entirely harms the society and the state [33, p. 62]. The rich strata will concentrate the private sector under their control in order to be able to demand more quality services. And since they have already great influence on the state policy, their reorientation to the private (more precisely, commercial) sector will lead to the state «getting rid» to burden of hard social problems: once the others have less money, there is no need to worry about their opinion. The quality of public services will be reduced, while commercialized and private ones will increase. Those who can afford it will take the private services, whereas the state-owned services will soon become the only way out for the poorest people. This, in turn, will increase and consolidate social inequality. The rich, therefore, will be more educated, highly skilled and able to influence social processes with a benefit to themselves. The rest will be forced to become less educated, less healthy, ready to give adequate response. Therefore the opportunity to express their educational, economic, and socio-political interests for them will be narrowed until it disappears altogether – that is why the apolitical attitude to the social struggle is increasingly spread in our time.

Although according to the general scheme, the long-term consequences of the large-scale implementation of the mercantile education sector and the decline in the availability of a socially important educational and growing-up sector could be delayed, the neoliberal governments sometimes act as if they wish to achieve all this immediately. Commercial institutions are already attracted public finances, and commercial schools and universities will do the same. The governments of many transit post-Soviet countries are encouraging the commercialization of certain types of educational services, including those that can not exist without a system of state support, since the public sector must now earn and save money. Commercial education services, therefore, literally parasitize the public sector: according to the government's hypothesis the privatized services, in order to earn more, will work more hard. In reality, for the public sector this means more labor and lower wages. The realities of post-Soviet commercialization of educational services are different from the Hirschman's model: only the public sector should collapse according to the theoretical model, but real-world commercialization in post-Soviet countries leads to a loss of quality in the state-public sphere of education, and its satellite, the scientific sector, is in the same situation.

In education, public finances will flow into commercialized schools, institutions of higher education, designed to «pluralize» the offer of educational services. Therefore, the

declared «pluralization» means only an increase in ideological control over certain groups of young people. More specifically, according to the model of commercialization of education, the state will give public money to educational organizations that will be state-loyal, i.e. will «grow» the younger generation more rigorously and consistently (based on the lack of public control), ideologically – although not necessarily more efficiently. Thus, public finances invested in them by the state, designed to bring education out of a miserable state, will begin to impose neoliberal commercialized principles in public consciousness. This, of course, will lead to greater deintellectualization of education, diminishing its accessibility, and will lead to social tension and social struggle.

Unfortunately, the consequences were not limited to robbery of public wealth. We do not have to guess to what consequences the commercialization of education could lead to in the future – it's quite enough just to look at the present results of these trends obtained in education. Commercial education in the «higher» school, besides the name, has nothing common with high-quality university education. And it is at least because of its devastating effect: commercial educational institutions have a narrow specialization, they depend on other centers of intellectual production, they transfer skills, not knowledge, but at the same time – thanks to the «invisible hand» of the market – they have the opportunity to pretend, as if they meet the criteria required for true universities. Universities do not oppose them, but it happens just the opposite: the very presence of commercial «higher» educational institutions and the neoliberal rhetoric of governments are sufficient conditions for the spread of the effect of commercialization on state universities. Now universities do not need fundamental researches, but pursue short-term and applied ones; training courses become increasingly the highly specialized and market-oriented; researches become more limited (use of trained skills, rather than creative approach) and routine.

Conclusion

Commercialization and infinite privatization of education, on the one hand, creates a commercial cartoon for universities, and on the other hand, it accelerates the collapse of genuine universities, which does not exclude future conflicts related to their intellectual decline. The commercialization of education and, in particular, higher education will lead to a reduction in the intellectual potential of the entire society, the spread of medieval obscurantism on the one hand and the hyper-exploitation of cognitive capitalism on the other. But a number of recent studies have shown that a market mechanism is not suitable for the productive or efficient provision of public services, but serves in fact mainly for profit at the expense of society [28; 29; 37].

The penetration of market principles into higher education can now be felt at different levels. One of the major steps taken by neoliberal governments to introduce new, more flexible market requirements for the production and dissemination of knowledge is the restructuring and abolition of state-public funds. The funding was transferred to a shorter-term, targeted and competitive basis. Educational institutions reacted in two ways.

Firstly, the competition for funds has grown: it means that even ***in budget financing a market approach has started to emerge***. As a result, we can see an increase in the number of short-term contracts and contracts with rigorous terms for the scientific and pedagogical community, the exploitation of «casual» workers, such as graduate students – assistant teachers, hiring other employees on a subcontract basis – ranging from janitors and cleaners

up to the IT-group and other intellectual services of university. The growing development of administrative structures and the practice of undermining professional autonomy – so-called «*proletarianization*» of the professorial community – worsen such situation. Thus, the spheres of development are transferred to a market basis, and individual contracts could be continued or do not continued on the results of the work performed.

Secondly, a reduction in funding means that higher education institutions are forced to turn to the private sector, either directly through partnerships, through grants for specific courses or research projects, or by way of a trip through the commercialization of the university itself, in search of funds for research and education. In the latter case, the university is forced to offer commercially procured services, for example, to provide premises for a conference to subsidize its core activities – **to provide higher education and engage in scientific activities**.

Neoliberal ideologists say that institutions of higher education should develop new systems of functioning that would increase specialization and in which one of the main features would be the flow of finance from the outside. It follows that universities should decide on their main activities, the opportunities to take their niche and choose the profile of the specialists they are preparing – that is, to develop a consumer-oriented approach to education and training of specialists.

The analysis of modern educational practice in industrialized countries (primarily transitive) does not refute the thesis about the conditionality of the whole system of education by the normative and managerial-power tasks of the social system, by the class interests of the dominant social group, and, conversely, confirms it.

REFERENCES

1. Zinchenko V. V. Ekzistencijno-dialogichna model' filosofii osviti: osvith'o-vihovna ta social'no-duhovna komunikacija u konteksti suspil'nogo rozvitku. *Filosofija osviti – Philosophy of Education*, 2018, no. 1(22), pp. 115-133.
2. Zinchenko V. V. Mizhnarodna ta zovnishn'oekonomichna dijal'nist' / Zinchenko V.V., Al'kema V.G., Burova O.B., Sotnichenko O.A., Petuhova O.M., Shtan'ko L.O. Kerivnik avt. kolektivu ta nauk. redaktor Zinchenko V.V. L'viv, Magnolija 2006 Publ., 2018. 466 p.
3. Zinchenko V. V. Strategii i perspektivy ustojchivogo rozvitija: evropejskij opyt i global'nye dilemmy sovremennosti: monogr. Penza, PGUAS, 2017. 152 p.
4. Béduwé C., Berthaud J., Giret J.-F., Solaux G. Les relations entre l'emploi salarié et les interruptions d'études à l'université. *Education et sociétés*, 2018, no. 1 (41), pp.7-25.
5. Behr W. Jugendkrise und Jugendprotest. Stuttgart etc.: Kohihammer, 2012. 193 p.
6. Bello W. Economic Crisis Shakes Old Paradigms. As our global economic and ecological crises converge, neither neoliberalism nor Keynesianism can cure what ails us. *Foreign Policy In Focus*. Available at: http://fpif.org/economic_crisis_shakes_old_paradigms/ (accessed 12 January 2019).
7. Bildung auf einen Blick 2017: Attraktivität der Hochschulausbildung weiter ungebrochen: Der neue OECD-Bericht «Bildung auf einen Blick 2017: OECD-Indikatoren»//Weiterbildung/Bildungspolitik.Veröffentlicht: Dienstag, 12. September 2017. Available at: <https://www.bildungsspiegel.de/news/weiterbildung-bildungspolitik/1767-bildung-auf-einen-blick-2017-attraktivitaet-der-hochschulausbildung-weiter-ungebrochen>. (accessed 12 January 2019).
8. Byram M. and Dervin F. (eds.) Students, staff and academic mobility in higher education. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008. 320 p. pp. 237-259.
9. Bollnow O.F. Neue Geborgenheit. Das Problem einer Überwindung des Existenzialismus. Stuttgart, Köln: Kohlhammer, 2012. 247 p.
10. Depaepe M., Smeyers P. Beyond empiricism: on criteria for educational research. Leuven [Belgium]: Leuven University Press, 2003. 269 p.
11. Dewey J. *Democratie et l'education*. Paris: Marabout, 2005. 212 p.
12. Gill S. The Constitution of Global Capitalism, paper presented to the British International Studies Association, University of Manchester, UK. Available at: <http://www.theglobalsite.ac.uk/press/> (accessed 12 January 2019).
13. Goodpaster K. E., Sayre K. M. (eds.) *Ethics and the Problems of the 21-ht Century*. Chicago, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 2016. 217 p.
14. Hahn K. *Die Internationalisierung der deutschen Hochschulen: Kontext, Kernprozesse, Fallstudien und Strategien*. Wiesbaden: Springer-Verlag, 2004. 404 p.

15. Human Development Report 2016. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. 290 p.
16. Kwiek M. The University and the State. A Study into Global Transformations. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2006. 424 p.
17. LeVasseur L., Robichaud A. L'envers de la résistance en éducation: émancipation, conservatisme et paradoxes. *Education et sociétés*, 2017, no 1 (39), pp. 85-99.
18. Les indicateurs de l'enseignement 2018 (La Direction générale du Pilotage du Système éducatif présente la treizième édition des «Indicateurs de l'enseignement»). Available at: <http://www.enseignement.be/index.php?page=0&navi=2264>. (accessed 12 January 2019).
19. Liessmann K. P. Theorie der Unbildung: Die Irrtümer der Wissensgesellschaft. Wien, Paul Zsolnay, 2010. 176 p.
20. Lodge P., Brackston T. Educational policy and educational inequality. Oxford: Robertson, 1992. 256 p.
21. Marcuse H. Kritik der reinen Toleranz. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1993. 127 p.
22. Moignard B., Rubi S. Les figures de la déviance à l'école: les "élèves perturbateurs" comme analyseur de la transformation des milieux éducatifs et scolaires. *Education et sociétés*, 2018, no. 1 (41): Vingt ans après: la sociologie de l'éducation et de la formation francophone dans un univers globalisé. pp. 43-61.
23. Metzger J.-L. Entre utopie et résignation: la réforme permanente d'un service public. P.: L'Harmattan, 2017. 238 p.
24. Mutschmann K. Herrschaft der Minderheit. Die verratene Basis. München: Wirtschaftsverlag Langen/Müller/Herbig, 2016. 229 p.
25. Newby H. Some Possible Futures for Higher Education. London: CVCP. Available at: www.cvcp.ac.uk/WhatWeDo/Speeches (accessed 12 January 2019).
26. Panait O.M., Teodoro A. Vers l'analyse des résistances aux normes éducatives issues de la globalisation. *Education et sociétés*, 2017. no. 1 (39). pp. 5-18.
27. Potvin M. Diversité ethnique et éducation inclusive: fondements et perspectives. *Education et sociétés*, 2014, no. 1 (33). pp. 185-202.
28. Regan B. Not For Sale: The case against the privatisation of education. London: Socialist Teachers Alliance, 2011. 60 p.
29. Rikowski G. The Battle in Seattle: Its significance for education. London: Tufnell Press, 2011. 370 p.
30. The Future of Education and Skills Education 2030 – OECD. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/figure/The-Future-of-Education-and-Skills-OECD-Education-2030-Framework-Knowledge-skills_fig7_326032010. (accessed 12 January 2019).
31. Sintschenko V.V. Globale Weltbild der Moderne auf dem Weg zu einem neuen Bewußtsein. Der homo oecologicus universalis («des globalen ökologischen Menschen») als gesellschaftlichen und wirtschaftsmodell. *Creative Economics and Social Innovations*, 2017, no. 1, pp. 126-140.
32. Sklair L. The Transnational Capitalist Class, Oxford: Blackwell, 2010. 304 p.
33. Teachers As Cultural Workers: Letters To Those Who Dare Teach (Edge, Critical Studies in Educational Theory). New York: Westview Press, 2007. 128 p.
34. Ziele der Agenda 2030 für nachhaltige Entwicklung. Available at: <https://www.bundestkanzleramt.gv.at/entwicklungsziele-agenda-2030>. (accessed 12 January 2019).
35. Ziel 4. Hochwertige Bildung. Available at: https://www.bundestkanzleramt.gv.at/entwicklungsziele-agenda-2030#Ziel_4_Inklusive_gleichberechtigte_und_hochwertige_Bildung_gewahrleisten_und_Moeglichkeiten_lebenslangen_Lernens_fuer_alle_foerdern_. (accessed 12 January 2019).
36. Zinchenko V. V. Deliberative models of processes management under conditions of social and economic transformations. *Actual Problems of Economics*, 2011, no. 5 (119), pp. 4-12.
37. Zinchenko V. Institutional trends globalization and transformation of socio-economic development//Mokslas ir praktika: aktualijos ir perspektyvos. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys. Kaunas: LSU, 2017. 279 p. (pp.257-265.)
38. Zinchenko V. Humanistic Values and Enlightenment Strategies of Global Society in the Potential of the Sustainable Development of Democracy. *American Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2018, vol 4, no. 1, pp. 1-13.
39. Warwick D. The Future Business of Universities, Speech to the Association of Business Schools. Available at: www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/services (accessed 12 January 2019).

Информация об авторе

Зинченко Виктор Викторович

(Украина, Киев)

Доктор философских наук, профессор, старший исследователь, главный научный сотрудник, заведующий отделом интернационализации высшего образования

Институт высшего образования Национальной академии педагогических наук Украины

E-mail: vvzinchenko@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9729-6861

Scopus Author ID: 56244928700

Researcher ID: K-6835-2012

Information about the author

Viktor V. Zinchenko

(Ukraine, Kyiv)

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Senior researcher, Principal research scientist, Head of the Department of Internationalization of Higher Education

Institute of Higher Education of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine

E-mail: vvzinchenko@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9729-6861

Scopus Author ID: 56244928700

Researcher ID: K-6835-2012