

学校编码: 10384

分类号____ 密级 ____

学号: 25720120153568

UDC ____

廈門大學

博 士 学 位 论 文

大学公私界限模糊现象探究

A Study for Phenomena of the Blurred Boundary

Between Public and Private Universities/Colleges

陈 涛

指导教师姓名: 邬大光教授

专业名称: 高等教育学

论文提交日期: 2015 年 10 月

论文答辩时间: 2015 年 12 月

学位授予日期: 2015 年 月

答辩委员会主席:

评 阅 人:

2015 年 12 月

厦门大学博硕士学位论文摘要库

厦门大学学位论文原创性声明

本人呈交的学位论文是本人在导师指导下，独立完成的研究成果。本人在论文写作中参考其他个人或集体已经发表的研究成果，均在文中以适当方式明确标明，并符合法律规范和《厦门大学研究生学术活动规范（试行）》。

另外，该学位论文为（福建省社会科学规划项目青年博士论文项目《公共角色与民营化：大学公私属性问题研究》项目批准号：2014C103）课题（组）的研究成果，获得（福建省社会科学规划项目青年博士论文项目和国家留学基金委“联合培养博士研究生”公派项目）课题（组）经费或实验室的资助，在（厦门大学教育研究院、比利时荷语鲁汶天主教大学教育与社会实验室）实验室完成。（请在以上括号内填写课题或课题组负责人或实验室名称，未有此项声明内容的，可以不作特别声明。）

声明人（签名）：

年 月 日

厦门大学学位论文著作权使用声明

本人同意厦门大学根据《中华人民共和国学位条例暂行实施办法》等规定保留和使用此学位论文，并向主管部门或其指定机构送交学位论文（包括纸质版和电子版），允许学位论文进入厦门大学图书馆及其数据库被查阅、借阅。本人同意厦门大学将学位论文加入全国博士、硕士学位论文共建单位数据库进行检索，将学位论文的标题和摘要汇编出版，采用影印、缩印或者其它方式合理复制学位论文。

本学位论文属于：

1. 经厦门大学保密委员会审查核定的保密学位论文，于 年 月 日解密，解密后适用上述授权。

2. 不保密，适用上述授权。

（请在以上相应括号内打“√”或填上相应内容。保密学位论文应是已经厦门大学保密委员会审定过的学位论文，未经厦门大学保密委员会审定的学位论文均为公开学位论文。此声明栏不填写的，默认为公开学位论文，均适用上述授权。）

声明人（签名）：

年 月 日

摘要

大学公私界限模糊现象已经成为一种全球趋势，只不过在每个国家的表现形式和程度有所不同。公私界限的模糊性造成了政策制定的困惑性，甚至在这些困惑下，人们逐渐“迷失”了对大学和高等教育本质的认识。回顾大学发展史，欧洲中世纪大学并无公私之说，但从大学存在意义的公共功能、治理范式的公共参与和利益结构的公共理性中体现更多地是其公共角色。换言之，“公/私”并不是大学源头的固有特征，公共角色才是大学的本质属性。随着民族国家的形成，以德国柏林大学为标志的现代大学开始兴起，浓厚的“国家主义”色彩使其成为“公立”大学的典范。有了“公”，也就有了“私”。欧陆国家大学并不在意的公私问题，在美国却对簿公堂，达特茅斯诉讼案使公私联合开始分化，历史上现代大学的公私界限日渐分明。在 20 世纪 80 年代新自由主义的冲击下，现代大学面临前所未有的生存危机，其功能和属性表现出许多“后现代”特征，创业型大学的崛起便是有力的证明。大学公私界限模糊主要表现在：高等教育供给模式的“公私合作”、高等教育财政模式的“资源依赖”和现代大学治理模式的“私法人化”。

在当前大学公私界限日益模糊的现实背景下，种种迹象都将矛头指向高等教育民营化。特别是民营化与全球化的捆绑反应和内在关联，使高等教育民营化的形式和程度更加复杂多变。在全球的视野下，《服务贸易总协定》对高等教育提供者的形式和身份产生了颠覆性影响。跨境高等教育实体机构的流动，使其大学公私界限模糊现象不仅发生在一国之内，而且还出现在跨国之间，这使得那些实体机构的公私属性更加复杂、界限更加模糊。传统的所有权、监管权和资金来源等标准也难以辨别其复杂的公私属性，甚至还引发了像国内有关中外合作大学公私属性的争论，高等教育机构分类再次成为学界关注的焦点。从英国诺丁汉大学两所国际分校的案例中，可以发现公私合作伙伴已成为实体机构的基本特征，超越“公私二元”的“第三类型”和“认证院校”的新型分类将更加具有可操作性。

本研究借助“资源依赖理论”和福柯的“治理术研究”，分别从大学的外部环境和内部治理两个维度，以一种相对微观且富有批判性的视角考察大学组织公私属性历史变迁。总体来说，外部资源环境是大学组织得以生存的物质保障，利

益相关者提供资源的稀缺或丰盈决定了大学的公私偏向，甚至影响到大学内部的治理模式和知识体系。基于两大理论的考察和解读，大学公私属性变迁实质指向的是大学与政府（国家）、市场（社会）的三角权力关系，而大学公私界限变化只不过反映了这一关系中大学的偏向。在关注大学外在公私属性变迁的同时，大学内在“主体性”一直与其外部利益相关者进行博弈，这就是大学公共角色的本质要求。作为应对大学财政、管理和质量等体制性危机的民营化策略，却与大学的公共角色形成了悖论关系，并引发了诸如霸权危机、合法性危机等深层危机。

高等教育常识的一再颠覆，促使人们不得不反思高等教育的性质，甚至重新定义高等教育。高等教育产品属性经历了从“公共产品”到“准公共产品”再到“全球公共产品”的转变，大学的营利性与公益性也不是非此即彼，而是可以兼容。显然，高等教育中的“公”与“私”影响着高等教育政策的制定。以法德中三国高等教育公私并举为例，通过考察三国人口状况、收入水平、经费来源、院校变化和规模等特征，不难发现三国高等教育在资金、监管、质量和公平等政策问题上具有共同趋向，即资金问题表现在生均成本逐渐增高，特别是私立院校学生的经济压力增大；监管问题表现在三国政府的放权行为，使市场成为院校幕后的施力者；质量问题集中于私立院校的教学质量；公平问题则体现在弱势群体阶层对优质教育的选择。基于对大学公共角色的认识，法德两国高等教育公私并举政策对中国的启示有：资金分配的公共性、监管模式的参与性、质量评鉴的自治性以及公平发展的持续性。其实，这些政策背后反映的是大学与政府、市场的关系应保持当前的“应然位序”，即政府应在放权的基础上加强责任，市场应在规则下展开竞争，大学应坚守其公共角色。这也是现代大学制度的要求。

本研究根据以上研究理路，以大学公私界限模糊现象为研究突破口，以大学与政府（国家）、市场（社会）的三角权力关系为主线，将研究主体分为四个部分：从历史的图景描绘大学公私属性变迁；从全球的视野呈现跨境实体机构属性；从国家的维度考察高等教育公私并举；从未来的发展预测大学公私属性走势。基于上述分析，本研究得出以下三点结论：一是大学公私属性变迁具有规律性；二是大学公私界限模糊现象具有动态性；三是大学公共角色理论发展具有开拓性。

关键词：公私界限；模糊现象；公共角色；高等教育民营化；公立与私立大学

Abstract

It has been a global phenomenon that the boundary is increasingly blurred between public and private universities/colleges by way of different forms and degrees in each country. Such fuzzy boundary between public and private universities/colleges leads to the bewilderments of policy-making. It even makes people increasingly feel 'lost' when understanding the essence of higher education and universities/colleges. There were no public and private distinctions for the European Medieval Universities from the history of university development. However, the universities reflected their public character that was embodied in the public function of self-existence, public participation of governance paradigm, and public reason of stakeholders' relationships. In other words, the 'public' and 'private' are not inherent features of universities since their origin, instead the public character is the essence of universities. With the formation of nation-state, the modern universities which were the landmark of the Berlin University in Germany started to rise and they set good examples for the 'public' universities with 'nationalism'. Ever since then, 'public' universities appeared, so did the 'private' universities. The 'public/private' problem that was out of concern in the Continental European countries was sent to the Court in America. It facilitated the differentiation of public-private joint model from the Dartmouth Case. Thereafter, the boundary of public and private was gradually clear in historical modern universities. Under the influence of the neo-liberalism in the 1980s, the modern universities were faced with the unprecedented survival crisis. The rising of the entrepreneurial universities provided some convincing evidences for their post-modern characteristics in their functions and nature. The blurred boundary between public and private universities/colleges can mainly be summed up as follows: the 'public-private partnership' in the supply pattern of higher education; the 'resource dependence' on the financial pattern of higher education; and the 'private juridical person' in the governance pattern of modern universities.

Currently, under the realistic background of the blurred boundary between public and private universities/colleges, privatization in higher education is to blame for all the bad situations. In particular, the forms and degrees of privatization are more complicated and varied in the joint reaction and internal relevance of privatization and globalization. From the global perspective, *General Agreement on Trade and Service (GATS for short hereafter)* has a disruptive effect on the forms and identities of the providers in higher education. Due to the flow of transnational higher education entities, the phenomena of the blurred boundaries between public and private universities/colleges did not only exist within one country but also spreaded across nations. This has resulted in more complex and vaguer properties of these public-private entities. It became very difficult to use the traditional criterion, such as ownership, regulation and funding source, to divide the complex public-private properties of entities. It even triggered the debate on the public or private property of Sino-foreign Cooperation Universities in China. Therefore, the classification of higher education institutions has become the hot topic among the academy again. We can find that the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) has become the basic features of entities from the cases of two international branch campuses of University of Nottingham in the United Kingdom. The new classification of ‘the third type’ and ‘accredited institutions’ are more operatable than the ‘public-private’ dualism.

Under the guidance of ‘*Resource Dependence Theory*’ and Foucault’s ‘*Studies of Governmentality*’, this study will investigate the historical transitions of public and private universities in the two dimensions of the external environment and internal governance from a relatively micro and critical perspective. In general, the environment of external resources provides the material insurance for university survival. Furthermore, the amount of resource from stakeholders decides the public and private property of universities, and even influences the internal governance pattern and knowledge system of universities. Based on the investigation and explanation of the two theories, we found that the essence of public/private transition actually indicates the triangle power relationship among university, government (or

state) and market (or society), whereas the changes of boundary between public and private universities/colleges just reflect the university's bias in the relationship. While the external changes of the public and private universities/colleges are concerned, the internal 'subjectivity' of universitie/colleges has always been gaming with their external stakeholders, which is the essential requirement of university's public character. However, the privatization strategies, which are to cope with the institutional crises such as university funding, management and quality, have developed a paradoxical relationship with the public character of university, and have also triggered some deep crises such as hegemony and legitimacy.

The common sense of higher education has been subverted time and again, which urges people to rethink its nature, andeven to redefine it. The property of higher education outputs has changed from 'public goods' to 'quasi-public goods' to 'global public goods'. And it is not analternative between for-profit and public interest of university. Instead, they are compatible with each other. Obviously, whether it is public or private has an influence on policy-making of higher education. Taking the public and private higher education in France, Germany and China for instances, it is easy to find that policy-making in higher education in terms of the issues of funding, regulation, quality and equity, has some common tendencies in the three countries by making a survey on the features of polulation condition, income level, funding source, institution change, student size and etc. First, the students' average cost are gradually increasing, especially the students in private colleges are faced with increasing financial pressure. Second, the regulation has been improved, as decentralization has been adopted by governments in the three counties, and markets has been put into effect behind universities/colleges. Third, teaching quality of private colleges has become the focus in terms of quality. Fourth, the choice of high quality education has been provided to the disadvantaged social groups in terms of equity. Based on the cognition of university's public character, the co-existence of public and private policies of higher education in France and Germany could have some implications for China in the following aspects: the publicity in allocation of funding, the participation

of regulation pattern, the autonomy of quality assessment and the sustainability of equity development. In fact, the policies reflected that the relationship between university, government and market should keep the ‘sollen orders’ . That is, the government should strengthen its responsibilities on the basis of decentralization, the market should compete under the rules, and university should hold its public character. Those are the requirements of the Modern University Institutions.

According to the above research designs, this study can be divided into four parts with the phenomena of blurred boundary between public and private universities/colleges as breakthrough and with the power relationship of university, government (or state) and market (or society) as the main clue. Part1 describes the transition of public and private universities/colleges from the historical graph. Part2 presents the attributes of cross entities from global perspective. Part 3 investigates the public and private higher education at the national context. Part 4 predicts the tendencies of public and private universities/colleges from future development. Based on the above analyses, three points can be summarized as follows. Firstly, the transition of public and private universities/colleges has regularity. Secondly, the blurred boundary between public and private universities/colleges has dynamic features. Thirdly, the theoretical development of university’s public character is characterized by expansion.

Key Words: the boundary of public and private; blurred phenomena; public character; privatization of higher education; public and private universities/colleges

目录

第一章 绪论	1
第一节 研究缘起	1
一、选题背景	1
二、问题提出	5
三、研究意义	7
第二节 研究述评	10
一、理想模式：关于大学公私属性相关概念的研究	10
二、现实境遇：关于大学公私界限模糊现象的研究	14
三、困惑归因：关于大学公私属性及其标准的研究	17
第三节 研究思路	21
一、研究的思路图	21
二、研究的切入点	23
三、研究的重难点	23
第四节 研究设计	25
一、理论基础	25
二、研究方法	31
三、研究界定	32
第二章 历史的图景：公私立大学的兴起、发展及其特征	35
第一节 “无公无私”：中世纪大学	35
一、大学的起源（公元 12~15 世纪）	35
二、大学的类型——三所著名大学的案例	39
三、大学的本真——基于公共角色的认识	48
第二节 “公私分明”：历史的大学	53
一、民族国家形成与古典大学的现代转型	53
二、德国柏林大学的创建及其国家化进程	57
三、美国达特茅斯法案及公私分化的出现	62

第三节 “公私模糊”：创业型大学	70
一、撒切尔—里根主义与后现代大学来临	70
二、大学公私界限日益模糊的现象与境遇	74
三、组织与治理：欧美创业型大学之案例	81
第三章 全球视野：无疆界教育语境中的大学公私属性	88
第一节 “独立王国”的再现：时空压缩效应	88
一、全球化与高等教育国际化和区域化	88
二、服务贸易总协定对高等教育的影响	91
三、多样化的高等教育提供者及其特征	98
第二节 “公私合作”的兴起：跨境实体办学	103
一、跨境高等教育实体机构流动及组织属性	103
二、以英国诺丁汉大学马来西亚分校为案例	112
三、跨境高等教育公私合作伙伴关系的建立	118
第三节 “公私属性”的论争：中外合作大学	121
一、中外合作办学的发展现状、类型及性质	121
二、以英国诺丁汉大学中国宁波分校为案例	125
三、中外合作大学的属性争议及其解决策略	130
第四章 国家的背景：公私立大学的制度变革与现代转型	133
第一节 中欧高等教育公私并举的现代特征	133
一、中欧三国高等教育公私体制共性特征	133
二、中欧三国高等教育类型及其公私格局	137
第二节 高等教育环境可变因素的中欧比较	143
一、人口状况	143
二、收入水平	146
三、经费来源	148
四、院校变化	154
五、学生规模	158
第三节 中欧公私院校并举现状中的政策问题	162
一、资金问题	162

二、监管问题	166
三、质量问题	168
四、公平问题	170
第五章 未来的大学：公私立大学的本质属性与发展走势	173
第一节 大学公私属性变迁的逻辑及理论诠释	173
一、大学公私属性变迁：两个支撑理论的解读	173
二、现代大学制度建构：利益相关者间的张力	178
第二节 大学公私界限模糊现象及其问题本质	181
一、现象的特征与其根源	181
二、现象背后的问题本质	186
第三节 大学公私界限模糊现象下的政策思考	190
一、反思高等教育的性质	190
二、欧洲经验与中国现实	193
第六章 结语	199
一、研究结论	199
二、研究创新	202
三、研究不足	203
四、研究展望	204
参考文献	206
在学期间取得的科研成果	229
后记	230

Contents

Chapter One Introduction	1
1. Research Origin	1
1.1 Research Background	1
1.2 Research Questions	5
1.3 Research Significances	7
2. Literature Review	10
2.1 ‘Ideal Modes’: the Studies of Concepts of Public and Private Universities/Colleges	10
2.2 ‘Relistic Situations’: the Studies of Phenomena of Blurred Boundary Between Public and Private Universities/Colleges	14
2.3 ‘Bewildered Causes’: the Studies of the Criteria of Distinction Between Public and Private Universities/Colleges	17
3. Research Ideas	21
3.1 Research Paths	21
3.2 Research Points	23
3.3 Key and Difficult Points	23
4. Research Designs	25
4.1 Theretical Foundation	25
4.2 Research Methodology	31
4.3 Research Limitations	32
Chapter Two Historical Pictures: The Rise, Development and Their Characteristics of Public and Private Universities/Colleges	35
1. ‘Neither Public Nor Private’: the Medieval University	35
1.1 The Origin of University (12-15 Century A.D.)	35
1.2 The Types of University: the Cases of Three Renowned Universities	39
1.3 The Nature of University: Based on the Cognition of Public Character	48
2. ‘Explicit Boundary Between Public and Private’: the Historical University	53
2.1 The Formation of Nation-State and the Modern Transition of Classic	

University	53
2.2 The Creation of the Berlin University in Germany and Its Nationalized Process	57
2.3 The Dartmouth Case in America and the Appearance of Public and Private Differentiation	62
3. ‘The Blurred Boundary Between Public and Private’: the Entrepreneurial University	70
3.1 Thatcher-Reaganism and the Approaching of Post-Modern University	70
3.2 The Phenomena and Situations of the Blurred Boundary Between Public and Private Universities/ Colleges	74
3.3 Organization and Governace: the Cases of the Entrepreneurial Universities in Europe and America	81
Chapter Three Global Perspectives: Public and Private Universities/Colleges in the Discourse of Borderless Education	88
1. Reappearance of ‘the Independent Kindom’: the Effects of Time-Space Compression	88
1.1 Globalization and Internationalization and Regionalization in Higher Education	88
1.2 <i>General Agreement on Trade and Service</i> Impacts on Higher Education	91
1.3 Diversitified Providers in Higher Education and Their Characteristics	98
2. The Rise of ‘Public and Private Partnership’: Operation of Cross-Entities	103
2.1 The Mobility of Cross-Entities in Higher Education and Their Organizational Characteristics	103
2.2 A Case Analysis of the University of Nottingham in Malaysian Branch Campus	112
2.3 The Establishment of the Relationship of Public-Private Partnership in Cross-Border Higher Education	118
3. The Debate of ‘Public or Private’: Sino-Foreign Cooperation University	121
3.1 The Statue quo, Type and Property of Sino-Foreign Cooperation University	121

3.2 A Case Analysis of the University of Nottingham in Ningbo, China Branch Campus	125
3.3 The Debate on Property of Sino-Foreign Cooperation University and Its Solutions to Strategies	130
Chapter Four National Context: The Modern Transition and Institutional Reform of Public and Private Universities/Colleges	133
1. The Modern Characteristics of Public and Private Co-existence in Sino-European Higher Education	133
1.1 The Common Characteristics of Public and Private Higher Education in Three Sino-European Countries	133
1.2 The Types of Higher Education and their Public and Private Frameworks in Three Sino-European Countries	137
2. The Sino-European Comparison of Variable Factors of Environment in Higher Education	143
2.1 Population Condition	143
2.2 Income Level	146
2.3 Funding Source	148
2.4 Institution Change	154
2.5 Student Size	158
3. The Issues of Policies of Co-existed Statue quo in Sino-European Universities/Colleges	162
3.1 The Issues of Funding	162
3.2 The Issues of Regulation	166
3.3 The Issues of Quality	168
3.4 The Issues ofEquity	170
Chapter Five Prospective University: the Essential Character and Developmental Tendency of Public and Private Universities/Colleges	173
1. The Transitional Logic of Public and Private Universities/Colleges and Its Theoretical Explanantion	173
1.1 The Interpretation of Two Theories	173
1.2 The Stakeholders' Game	178
2. The Phenomena of Blurred Boundary Between Public and Private Universities/Colleges and Their Problematic Essence	181
2.1 The Characteristics of Phenomena and Their Origin	181

Degree papers are in the “[Xiamen University Electronic Theses and Dissertations Database](#)”.

Fulltexts are available in the following ways:

1. If your library is a CALIS member libraries, please log on <http://etd.calis.edu.cn/> and submit requests online, or consult the interlibrary loan department in your library.
2. For users of non-CALIS member libraries, please mail to etd@xmu.edu.cn for delivery details.