HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

SCIENTIFIC AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF FINANCING GENERAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Ummatov Avaz Muydinovich
Lecturer at the Department of Management
International School of Finance, Technology and Science

Abstract: The financing of general education institutions constitutes a fundamental pillar of public fiscal policy and a decisive determinant in the formation of human capital and long-term socio-economic development. This article examines the scientific and theoretical foundations underpinning the financing of general education institutions, drawing upon contemporary developments in educational economics, public expenditure management theory, and international financing models. The study employs a multi-method analytical approach encompassing comparative analysis, systematic theoretical investigation, and critical review of empirical evidence derived from international scholarly literature, World Bank reports, OECD assessments, and UNESCO policy documents. The research analyses centralized and decentralized financing mechanisms, evaluates the efficiency and transparency of educational expenditures, and interrogates the persistent structural challenges confronting education finance systems in both developed and developing countries. Findings indicate that result-oriented financing frameworks, strengthened institutional accountability, and evidence-based resource allocation models offer the most sustainable pathways toward equitable and high-quality general education. The article concludes with theoretically grounded practical recommendations for reforming the financing mechanisms of general education institutions in the contemporary economic context.

Keywords: general education financing, human capital theory, public expenditure management, educational economics, decentralization, result-oriented financing, fiscal policy, education reform.

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary global economy, education occupies a dual role as both a fundamental human right and a strategic public investment that determines the trajectory of national development. The financing of general education institutions - encompassing primary and secondary schooling that constitute the foundational stratum of any national education system - has emerged as one of the most critically examined dimensions of public finance scholarship. As governments worldwide grapple with the challenge of reconciling constrained fiscal resources with the imperative to deliver inclusive, high-quality education, the theoretical and practical dimensions of education finance have assumed unprecedented scholarly and policy significance.

The relationship between education expenditure and socio-economic outcomes has been extensively documented in the literature on human capital theory, originating with the seminal contributions of Schultz [1] and Becker [2], who demonstrated that investment in education yields substantial returns not only to individuals but to economies as a whole. Subsequently, growth economists such as Lucas [3] and Mankiw, Romer, and Weil [4] incorporated education as an endogenous variable in growth models, providing theoretical grounding for the argument that public

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

financing of education constitutes productive capital formation rather than mere consumption expenditure. These theoretical insights have profoundly shaped the way international organizations and national governments conceptualize and justify education budgets.

Yet, despite a broad normative consensus on the importance of education financing, significant heterogeneity persists in how countries design, implement, and evaluate their education financing systems. The allocation of fiscal resources to general education institutions is shaped by a complex matrix of factors, including constitutional arrangements, the degree of fiscal decentralization, demographic pressures, the distributional objectives of social policy, and the institutional capacity of education governance systems. In many transition and developing economies, inadequate and inefficiently managed education finance remains a binding constraint on educational quality and equity.

This article addresses the research problem of identifying, systematizing, and critically evaluating the scientific and theoretical foundations upon which contemporary education financing models are constructed. The principal research objectives are: (i) to review and synthesize the theoretical frameworks most relevant to education finance; (ii) to analyse the structural characteristics of centralized and decentralized financing models; (iii) to assess international experience in education expenditure management; and (iv) to propose theoretically grounded recommendations for enhancing the efficiency and transparency of general education financing. The scientific significance of this inquiry lies in its contribution to the consolidation of a coherent theoretical framework capable of guiding evidence-based reforms in education finance policy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The scholarly discourse on the financing of general education institutions is situated at the intersection of several intellectual traditions, including human capital theory, public finance, institutional economics, and educational policy research. A rigorous review of this literature reveals both the breadth of theoretical perspectives that inform education finance and the persistent conceptual tensions that animate ongoing scholarly debate.

The theoretical architecture of education finance is most durably associated with human capital theory. Schultz [1], in his foundational address to the American Economic Association, argued that the underinvestment in human beings - particularly through neglect of education - represented a systematic failure of economic analysis. Becker's subsequent formalization of this theory [2] provided a microeconomic foundation for understanding individual and public investment in schooling as rational decisions yielding measurable returns. This framework remains influential in justifying state expenditure on general education, particularly in contexts where market failures - such as incomplete information, externalities, and capital market imperfections - preclude optimal private provision.

Building on this foundation, the endogenous growth literature assigned education a central role in the dynamics of long-run economic growth. Romer [5] demonstrated that human capital accumulation generates knowledge spillovers that prevent diminishing returns to capital, while Lucas [3] constructed a model in which economy-wide human capital externalities drive sustained growth. These theoretical developments provided macroeconomic justification for treating education expenditure as an investment in productive capacity, and they have been adopted by international development organizations as rationale for prioritizing education in public budgets [6].

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

The economics of education literature has further elaborated the relationship between educational inputs - including teacher quality, classroom resources, and instructional time - and learning outcomes. Hanushek [7] challenged the prevailing assumption that increased educational spending automatically translates into improved student achievement, arguing that the efficiency of resource utilization is equally or more important than aggregate expenditure levels. This critique stimulated a rich empirical and theoretical debate about the conditions under which education spending is productive, with subsequent research by Krueger [8] and Card and Krueger [9] offering evidence that well-targeted investments in school resources do improve educational outcomes, particularly for disadvantaged populations.

The institutional dimensions of education finance have been extensively analysed within the framework of public expenditure management theory. Schick [10] identified the core functions of a sound public expenditure system - aggregate fiscal discipline, allocative efficiency, and operational efficiency - as directly applicable to education budgets. The World Bank's influential work on public expenditure management has consistently emphasized that the institutional quality of budget processes, including the credibility of budget formulation, the comprehensiveness of budget coverage, and the robustness of expenditure controls, fundamentally determines whether fiscal resources reach education institutions in a timely and adequate manner [11].

Decentralization represents another major theoretical and empirical strand in education finance scholarship. Tiebout's [12] classic model of local public finance posited that fiscal decentralization enables a closer alignment between the provision of public services and the preferences of local communities. Applied to education, decentralization theorists such as Oates [13] have argued that local governments, being closer to schools and communities, possess superior information about local educational needs and are therefore better positioned to allocate resources efficiently. However, critics of decentralization - including Shah [14] and Bardhan [15] - have highlighted the risks of interregional inequity, elite capture, and administrative incapacity that can accompany poorly designed fiscal decentralization in education systems.

UNESCO and OECD research has enriched this theoretical landscape with substantial comparative empirical evidence. UNESCO's global monitoring reports [6] have documented persistent disparities in education financing between high-income and low-income countries, demonstrating that many developing nations fall significantly short of the financing benchmarks - such as allocating at least 4-6% of GDP or 15-20% of public expenditure to education - recommended by international frameworks. The OECD's Education at a Glance series [16] provides systematic cross-national data on education expenditure patterns, revealing that while OECD member states invest substantially in education, significant variation exists in the efficiency and equity with which these resources are deployed across education levels and population groups.

Recent scholarship has increasingly focused on result-oriented and performance-based financing models as mechanisms for improving the efficiency of educational expenditure. Barber, Moffit, and Kihn [17] introduced the concept of 'deliverology' - a systematic approach to translating education policy priorities into measurable delivery outcomes - which has influenced the design of financing mechanisms in several countries. Similarly, the literature on school-based management, examined by Caldwell [18], suggests that granting schools greater autonomy over resource allocation decisions can improve educational outcomes, provided that accountability mechanisms are sufficiently robust. These theoretical insights collectively inform the analysis presented in subsequent sections of this article.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a multi-method analytical framework combining comparative analysis, systematic theoretical review, statistical analysis, and scientific observation. The choice of methodology is determined by the dual theoretical and applied orientation of the research, which requires both a rigorous synthesis of existing scholarly knowledge and an empirically grounded assessment of international experience.

Comparative analysis constitutes the primary methodological instrument of this study. By systematically comparing education financing models across countries with differing institutional arrangements, income levels, and governance structures, the research identifies patterns, best practices, and recurring challenges that transcend national specificities. Comparative methodology is particularly appropriate for education finance research, given the substantial variation in how different countries structure their financing systems and the corresponding variation in educational outcomes [16]. The comparative analysis draws upon published data from the World Bank World Development Indicators, OECD Education at a Glance, and UNESCO Institute for Statistics databases.

Systematic theoretical analysis is employed to organize and critically evaluate the principal theoretical frameworks - including human capital theory, endogenous growth theory, public expenditure management theory, and fiscal decentralization theory - that provide the conceptual foundations for education finance. This approach enables the identification of areas of theoretical convergence, as well as the unresolved tensions and empirical questions that remain central to scholarly debate.

Statistical analysis is utilized to examine quantitative evidence on education expenditure levels, trends, and outcomes across national and international contexts. Statistical data drawn from authoritative multilateral sources provide empirical grounding for the theoretical arguments advanced in the article, and they enable the identification of statistically meaningful relationships between financing parameters and educational quality indicators.

Scientific observation and analytical synthesis are employed throughout the research to derive conclusions that are both internally consistent and grounded in real-world educational governance experience. The interpretive dimension of this methodology draws upon the scholarly tradition of policy analysis, as outlined by Weimer and Vining [19], which emphasizes the rigorous application of social science frameworks to the evaluation of public policy instruments. The methodological triangulation achieved by combining these approaches enhances both the validity and the generalizability of the research findings.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

1. Theoretical Foundations of Education Finance

The scientific and theoretical foundations of financing general education institutions are grounded in three interrelated theoretical traditions: human capital theory, public goods theory, and public finance theory. Together, these frameworks provide a coherent rationale for state intervention in education financing and establish the normative criteria against which financing policies may be evaluated.

Human capital theory, as developed by Schultz [1] and Becker [2], establishes education as a productive investment that increases the cognitive skills, adaptability, and productive capacity of

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

individuals. From the perspective of this theory, public financing of general education is justified on grounds of market failure: because the social returns to education exceed private returns due to positive externalities - including technological spillovers, civic participation, and reduced crime - private actors will systematically underinvest in education in the absence of public subsidy [3]. This argument has been empirically validated in a comprehensive meta-analysis by Montenegro and Patrinos [20], who found that the average private return to an additional year of schooling is approximately 9%, while social returns, when externalities are accounted for, are substantially higher.

Public goods theory offers a complementary justification for state financing of general education. While education possesses characteristics of a private good - in that the benefits of schooling are largely appropriable by the individual - it also generates substantial non-excludable and non-rival public benefits, including a literate and informed citizenry, democratic participation, social cohesion, and the intergenerational transmission of cultural norms [5]. The mixed public-private character of education implies that market provision would yield socially suboptimal levels of educational investment, and that collective provision through public finance is necessary to internalize the social benefits of general education.

Public finance theory, particularly in its fiscal federalism dimension, addresses the question of how financing responsibilities should be distributed across levels of government. Oates' decentralization theorem [13] posits that decentralized provision of locally differentiated public services maximizes welfare, provided there are no significant interjurisdictional externalities or scale economies. In the context of education, this theoretical prediction has informed widespread reforms toward fiscal decentralization, under which sub-national governments are assigned significant financing responsibilities for general education. However, as the empirical record demonstrates, the welfare-enhancing potential of decentralization is contingent on adequate fiscal equalization mechanisms to prevent the translation of interregional wealth disparities into educational inequality [14].

2. State Financing Mechanisms in Education Systems

State financing mechanisms for general education vary substantially across countries and reflect differing philosophical commitments to equity, efficiency, and local autonomy. The dominant financing instrument in most countries is the school grant or per-pupil allocation formula, through which central or sub-national governments transfer resources to schools based on student enrollment, with adjustments for need-based or cost-based factors. Formula-based financing has been widely advocated as a means of promoting transparency and equity in resource distribution, as it replaces discretionary budget allocations with rule-based transfers that are more resistant to political manipulation [11].

Performance-based financing represents a more recent and increasingly prominent approach, in which a portion of school funding is contingent upon the achievement of predetermined educational outcomes or quality benchmarks. Drawing on principal-agent theory [2], performance-based models seek to align the incentives of school administrators and teachers with the goal of maximizing learning outcomes. Evidence from Chile, the Netherlands, and England suggests that well-designed performance incentives can promote instructional improvement and resource efficiency [17]. However, performance-based systems also carry risks, including perverse incentives for teaching to the test, cream-skimming of advantaged students, and the potential for gaming of outcome metrics, which must be carefully managed through robust accountability systems.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Categorical grants and earmarked funding represent a third major mechanism, through which higher levels of government direct resources to specific educational programs, populations, or expenditure categories. The theoretical justification for categorical grants rests on the presence of positive externalities from specific educational investments - such as early childhood education or special needs support - that would be undersupplied in the absence of targeted financial incentives [19]. While categorical grants can be effective in directing resources toward priority areas, excessive earmarking can reduce the flexibility of school administrators to allocate resources according to local circumstances and may create perverse incentive structures that distort school-level decision-making.

3. International Experience and Financing Models

A comparative examination of international education financing models reveals the diversity of institutional arrangements through which countries organize the public financing of general education, and it yields important insights into the conditions associated with financing efficiency and educational quality.

The Nordic countries - Finland, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway - represent a model of highly centralized and equity-oriented education financing, characterized by strong fiscal equalization mechanisms, high per-pupil expenditure, and minimal private co-financing. Finland's celebrated educational performance, consistently among the highest in international assessments such as PISA, has been attributed in part to an equitable financing system that ensures high-quality education regardless of students' socio-economic backgrounds [16]. The Nordic experience suggests that high levels of public investment, combined with strong teacher professionalism and limited competition between schools, can yield outstanding educational outcomes.

The United States, by contrast, operates a highly decentralized education financing system in which primary responsibility for school funding rests with local school districts, financed predominantly through local property taxes. This system has been extensively criticized for its regressive distributional consequences: because property values - and therefore local tax revenues - are highly correlated with household income and wealth, the system tends to channel greater resources to schools in affluent communities than to those in disadvantaged areas [9]. Although federal and state compensatory grants have partially mitigated these disparities, significant interdistrict funding inequalities persist and are associated with persistent achievement gaps between high- and low-income students.

The experience of Central and Eastern European countries that underwent post-socialist transition provides insights relevant to education finance reform in emerging economies. Following the dissolution of centralized state budgets, many transition countries adopted per-capita financing formulas that improved transparency and reduced discretionary allocations. Poland and Estonia, in particular, implemented reforms that combined per-pupil financing, fiscal decentralization with equalization transfers, and significant autonomy for school principals in resource management [18]. These reforms were associated with notable improvements in educational quality, as measured by international assessments, and are frequently cited as models for education finance reform in developing and transition contexts.

In developing country contexts, the World Bank and other multilateral organizations have advocated for result-oriented financing mechanisms, including conditional grants and output-based financing, as means of improving the efficiency of constrained education budgets [11]. Pilot programs in several sub-Saharan African and South Asian countries have demonstrated that school grants tied to

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

enrollment and attendance targets can improve access to education; however, evidence on the impact of such mechanisms on educational quality remains more mixed [6].

4. Centralized vs. Decentralized Financing Approaches

The debate between centralized and decentralized approaches to education financing reflects a fundamental tension in public finance theory between the efficiency advantages of local preference revelation and the equity imperatives of ensuring equal educational opportunity regardless of place of residence. Centralized financing systems, in which the national government bears primary responsibility for resource mobilization and allocation, offer the advantages of fiscal risk pooling, economies of scale in administration, and strong capacity for redistributive transfers from wealthier to poorer regions. Countries such as France, Japan, and South Korea operate predominantly centralized financing systems and have achieved high levels of interregional educational equity [16].

Decentralized financing systems, conversely, offer the potential advantages of closer alignment between school funding and local needs, greater community ownership and accountability, and enhanced incentives for local innovation in service delivery. However, the realization of these potential benefits is critically dependent on the institutional preconditions for effective decentralization, including adequate fiscal capacity at the sub-national level, well-functioning accountability mechanisms, and robust fiscal equalization systems [13]. Where these preconditions are absent - as is often the case in developing countries - decentralization may exacerbate interregional educational disparities and undermine the quality of education in resource-poor jurisdictions.

The emerging international consensus, as reflected in World Bank and OECD policy guidance, favors a balanced model of 'managed decentralization', in which sub-national governments and schools are granted meaningful autonomy over resource allocation decisions, but within a framework of national standards, equalization financing, and strong accountability for outcomes [11]. This approach seeks to capture the efficiency benefits of decentralization while preserving the equity-protecting functions of central government financing.

5. Challenges and Efficiency in Educational Expenditure

Despite substantial growth in global education spending over recent decades, persistent challenges undermine the efficiency and equity of educational expenditure in many countries. One of the most pervasive challenges is the misalignment between resource allocation decisions and evidence on cost-effectiveness. In many education systems, resources continue to be allocated according to historical precedent, political considerations, or input-based criteria rather than on the basis of rigorous evidence about which educational interventions yield the greatest learning gains per unit of expenditure [7]. This misalignment results in significant productive inefficiency, with considerable fiscal resources directed toward inputs - such as non-instructional administrative expenditure - that have limited demonstrable impact on educational outcomes.

Transparency and accountability deficits represent a closely related challenge. In many low- and middle-income countries, public expenditure tracking surveys have documented significant leakages of education funds between the point of central budget allocation and the point of delivery at the school level [11]. Strengthening public financial management systems, including through the adoption of modern information technology platforms, real-time expenditure reporting, and participatory budget monitoring by communities and civil society organizations, is a critical precondition for improving the efficiency of education finance.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Demographic pressures and urbanization trends are creating new challenges for education financing planning. Rapid urban growth is generating significant demand for new school infrastructure in metropolitan areas, while demographic decline in rural regions is creating fiscal sustainability challenges for schools with falling enrollment. Addressing these structural demographic dynamics requires more flexible and responsive financing mechanisms, including mechanisms for the reallocation of resources from declining to growing school populations, and innovative approaches to the provision of quality education in low-density rural contexts [6].

CONCLUSION

This article has examined the scientific and theoretical foundations of financing general education institutions, drawing upon a multi-disciplinary synthesis of human capital theory, public finance theory, institutional economics, and comparative education policy research. The analysis has yielded several substantive findings with significant implications for both theory and practice.

The theoretical review confirms that state financing of general education is robustly justified by market failure arguments rooted in human capital theory and public goods theory, as well as by the macroeconomic evidence linking educational investment to long-run growth. At the same time, the analysis highlights that the mere quantum of educational spending is an insufficient predictor of educational quality; the efficiency, equity, and institutional quality of financing mechanisms are equally decisive determinants of educational outcomes.

The comparative analysis of international financing models underscores that no single financing model is universally superior; rather, optimal financing arrangements are contextually dependent and must be calibrated to the institutional capabilities, fiscal resources, and distributional objectives of each country. The most successful financing systems - as exemplified by Nordic countries and high-performing East Asian education systems - combine adequate public investment, equitable resource distribution, strong institutional accountability, and a clear focus on learning outcomes.

On the basis of this analysis, the following practical recommendations are advanced for improving the financing mechanisms of general education institutions. First, education authorities should transition from input-based to result-oriented financing models, in which resource allocation decisions are guided by evidence on the cost-effectiveness of educational interventions and tied to the achievement of measurable learning outcomes. Second, the transparency and accountability of education budgets should be substantially strengthened through the adoption of modern public financial management systems, mandatory public disclosure of school-level expenditure data, and robust mechanisms for civil society monitoring. Third, fiscal decentralization in education should be accompanied by strong equalization mechanisms to prevent the translation of regional fiscal disparities into educational inequalities. Fourth, investment in the institutional capacity of school-level financial management is essential to ensure that resources allocated to schools are deployed effectively and efficiently. Fifth, international cooperation and knowledge exchange on effective education financing models should be intensified, with particular attention to the adaptation of international best practices to the specific institutional and fiscal contexts of developing and transition economies. These recommendations, grounded in both theoretical analysis and international empirical evidence, provide a basis for the evidence-based reform of education financing systems in the contemporary economic context.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

REFERENCES

1. Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. The American Economic Review, 51(1), 1–17.
2. Becker, G. S. (1964). Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education. National Bureau of Economic Research; Columbia University Press. New York.
3. Lucas, R. E. (1988). On the mechanics of economic development. Journal of Monetary Economics, 22(1), 3–42.
4. Mankiw, N. G., Romer, D., & Weil, D. N. (1992). A contribution to the empirics of economic growth. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 107(2), 407–437.
5. Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change. Journal of Political Economy, 98(5), S71–S102.
6. UNESCO. (2023). Global Education Monitoring Report 2023: Technology in Education — A Tool on Whose Terms? United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Paris.
7. Hanushek, E. A. (2003). The failure of input-based schooling policies. The Economic Journal, 113(485), F64–F98.
8. Krueger, A. B. (1999). Experimental estimates of education production functions. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114(2), 497–532.
9. Card, D., & Krueger, A. B. (1996). Labor market effects of school quality: Theory and evidence. NBER Working Paper No. 5450. National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, MA.
10. Schick, A. (1998). A Contemporary Approach to Public Expenditure Management. World Bank Institute. Washington, D.C.
11. World Bank. (2018). World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise. World Bank Group. Washington, D.C.
12. Tiebout, C. M. (1956). A pure theory of local expenditures. Journal of Political Economy, 64(5), 416–424.
13. Oates, W. E. (1999). An essay on fiscal federalism. Journal of Economic Literature, 37(3), 1120–1149.
14. Shah, A. (2006). A Practitioner's Guide to Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfers. Policy Research Working Paper No. 4039. World Bank. Washington, D.C.
15. Bardhan, P. (2002). Decentralization of governance and development. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 16(4), 185–205.
16. OECD. (2023). Education at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators. OECD Publishing. Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en
17. Barber, M., Moffit, A., & Kihn, P. (2011). Deliverology 101: A Field Guide for Educational Leaders. Corwin Press. Thousand Oaks, CA.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

18. Caldwell, B. J. (2008). Reconceptualizing the self-managing school. Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 36(2), 235–252.

19. Weimer, D. L., & Vining, A. R. (2017). Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice (6th ed.). Routledge. New York.

20. Montenegro, C. E., & Patrinos, H. A. (2014). Comparable Estimates of Returns to Schooling Around the World. Policy Research Working Paper No. 7020. World Bank. Washington, D.C.

21. Psacharopoulos, G., & Patrinos, H. A. (2018). Returns to investment in education: A decennial review of the global literature. Education Economics, 26(5), 445–458.

22. Mingat, A., & Tan, J. P. (1992). Education in Asia: A Comparative Study of Cost and Financing. World Bank Regional and Sectoral Studies. Washington, D.C.