

The Political Functions of Education in Deeply-Divided Countries: Coming Together Apart: The Case of Switzerland

Gunther M. Hegu
Western Michigan University

Published in Theodor Hanf (Ed.): *The Political Function of Education in Deeply Divided Countries*, Series on Ethnicity, Religion and Democracy, Nomos Verlag: Baden-Baden 2011, p. 233-256.

Introduction

What is the function of education in Switzerland's multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, and multi-religious society? The Swiss political system regulates conflict in Switzerland's divided society by giving citizens the options of exit, voice, or loyalty.¹ This paper argues that the Swiss educational system incorporates those options and is thus an important element of Switzerland's consociational democracy (*Konkordanzdemokratie*). Swiss consociational democracy is based on power-sharing and consensus building between multiple stakeholders and veto-players in the Swiss polity, and latent conflict is regulated by avoiding conflict or agreeing to disagree.

How does the structure of the education system contribute to conflict regulation between the different segments of Swiss society? My answer to this question is structured into two parts: first, I give some general background on Switzerland, and then provide a brief survey of the history and institutional structures of Swiss education, highlighting its path-dependent development over the last 200 years and some of the critical junctures and choices that have shaped the educational landscape.

Today's Switzerland is seen as a beacon of political stability, peace, and prosperity, but in the past the country was embroiled in several civil wars, most recently in 1847, albeit that fratricidal quarrel lasted for barely a month, involved few casualties, and its winners were not out for revenge but made concessions to the losers in the 1848 federal constitution (Im Hof 2007).

¹ The concepts of exit, voice and loyalty are borrowed from Albert Hirschman (1970).

Switzerland's approximately 7.7 million residents, of which 1.6 million or 21 percent are foreigners, make up a multi-lingual, multi-ethnic, and multi-religious society. Linguistically, the Swiss population is divided into about 63.7 percent German-speakers, 20.4 percent French-speakers, 6.5 percent Italian-speakers, and 0.5 percent Romansh-speakers, with the remaining 9 percent of residents speaking other native languages, according to the 2000 census. German, French, Italian and Romansh are the four national languages of Switzerland, and the first three are also designated official languages. Of the 26 cantons and half-cantons that constitute federal Switzerland (see table 1), three are officially bilingual (Bern, Fribourg, and Valais), while one, The Grisons, is trilingual, with the remaining 22 federal states relying on a single official language: Italian in Ticino, French in Geneva, Vaud, Neuchâtel, and Jura, and German in the remaining 17 cantons.

[Table 1: The 26 Cantons and Half-Cantons of Switzerland]

In terms of their religious denomination, the Swiss are about evenly divided into Protestants and Roman-Catholics, plus a small Jewish minority and a growing Muslim community. Roman-Catholics mainly live in the central and southern Swiss cantons, while Protestants dominate in most of the other regions of Switzerland. Most urban-industrial agglomerations in Switzerland are to be found in the Northeast and Western parts of Switzerland, while the Eastern, Central and Southern areas are more rural and agriculturally based.

Significantly, these social cleavages do not overlap or reinforce one another, but rather they cut across each other in the sense that for instance German-speakers are split into Protestants in the urban-industrial north and Catholics in the rural-agricultural center of Switzerland, while the French-speaking *Suisse Romands* live in mainly protestant urban agglomerations like Geneva and Lausanne, but also in more rural areas and Catholic strongholds like Jura, Fribourg and Valais. Thus, no linguistic, religious, socio-economic, or ethnic group in Switzerland forms a homogenous and dominant majority, but rather finds itself in the majority on some issues, and in the minority on others.

Switzerland's system of education is among the most decentralized education systems in the world, and Swiss educational policy is often described as the most decentralized among all policy areas in Switzerland's already highly decentralized federal system (Heidenheimer 1997).

In fact, the differences among the school systems of the Swiss cantons are so profound that experts speak of 26 different systems of education in Switzerland (Egger 1984). How did these 26 fundamentally different education systems emerge, and what is their function in Switzerland's deeply divided society?

The answer, I argue, lies not only in the well-known cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity of Swiss society but, equally important, results from the fact that policymaking in modern Switzerland is based on three fundamental principles: direct democracy, federalism, and subsidiarity. In general, as practiced by the Swiss, these political concepts complement each other and have led to the image of Switzerland as a haven of democracy, stability and prosperity. But sometimes the three are in conflict, and it is particularly in the area of education policy where different interpretations and applications of subsidiarity, direct democracy, and federalism have led to extensive variations in educational structures and policies across the communities, cantons and regions of Switzerland.

Subsidiarity: The principle of subsidiarity is implied by Article 3 of the Swiss constitution. It states that public functions should be carried out by the lowest or smallest, most decentralized level of government that is capable of doing so; only if the local government fails to address an issue or asks for assistance, should higher levels of government intervene. By keeping decision-making local and close to the individual citizen, the subsidiarity principle ensures the continued loyalty of the Swiss people.

Direct democracy: Swiss voters participate directly in policymaking by way of popular referenda and citizens' initiatives, particularly at the local and cantonal level. Although participatory rights vary by canton, at the federal level all Swiss voters have recourse to the obligatory referendum (Art. 140 BVfg) concerning constitutional changes and membership in international organizations; they can trigger a facultative or conditional referendum if 50,000 voters or the eight cantonal governments demand it (Art. 141 BVfg.); or they can initiate a popular initiative to ask for a revision of the federal constitution if 100,000 voters' signatures are collected during

an 18 month period.² A popular referendum or initiative is adopted if both a majority of voters and cantons support a measure. Direct democracy in Switzerland provides additional veto points not found in other democracies and makes the expression of “voice” especially powerful.

Federalism: Switzerland consists of 26 cantons or federal states, 20 of which are considered full cantons with two votes each in the upper chamber of the Swiss legislature, the Ständerat, and six are labeled half-cantons, with one vote only since they resulted from the division of previously full cantons into separate units as a result of religious or political strife: the split of Unterwalden into the half cantons of Obwalden and Nidwalden, or Basel into Basel-City and Basel-Landschaft, and Appenzell into Ausserrhoden and Innerrhoden. Switzerland also experienced the secession and creation of the new canton of Jura in 1978, formerly the French-speaking and catholic part of the mainly German-speaking and protestant canton of Bern. Thus examples abound in which Swiss voters have exercised their “exit” option, either historically through secession from a canton or more recently through increased mobility across cantons. Historians have described the Swiss federal system as a highly decentralized form of federalism, compared to other federations like the ones found in neighboring Austria and Germany. The Swiss Federation is said to be based on a *Staatsnation*, or nation of political will, founded with the intent to preserve cultural and political variety, in contrast for instance to German unitary federalism, which is based on the idea of a *Kulturnation*, with the objective to create cultural unity and relative political-economic equality between diverse regions (Braun, 2003). In comparison with its other federal neighbor, Austria, where we find a centralized state, substantial executive power, and strong labor and social-democratic influence, Switzerland could be characterized as a fragmented state with constrained executive power and bourgeois party dominance.

Swiss federalism is most pronounced in the education sector, where the concept of educational federalism, or *Bildungsföderalismus*, refers to the fact that in educational matters the Swiss federal government’s authority is limited to those few sectors explicitly assigned to the federation by the constitution, for instance in areas like vocational education and higher education funding, and by default the 26 Swiss states, or cantons, have retained *Bildungshoheit*

² To be sure, since the introduction of the measure in 1891, only about 10 percent of popular initiatives have been successful.

or sovereignty over almost all educational matters. Educational federalism is based on the subsidiarity principle, embodied in Article 3 of the Swiss constitution, according to which public tasks ought to be carried out by the smallest, lowest, and most decentralized possible political entity. It can be argued that while a minimalist interpretation of subsidiarity has prevailed, for instance, in neighboring Germany and the European Union, the Swiss have practiced a maximalist version, which essentially requires that issues are addressed by the local level of government first, and regional or national authorities are only permitted to intervene if and only if lower levels of government lack the capabilities to address the issue at hand. For the education policy sector that means the federal government and national policy coordinating bodies remain weak, while the cantons retain their educational authority. Direct democracy also plays an important role in Swiss policy making, mainly in the form of popular referendums of cantonal voters (Koback 1993). Swiss citizens participate in policy-making through the popular election of state and local boards of education. In the *Suisse romande*, the French-speaking cantons and mainly Italian-speaking Ticino, these education councils are organized primarily at the cantonal level and have mostly advisory functions. Its members are often professional educators and academics appointed for their expertise by cantonal parliaments or executives. In the German-speaking areas, elected education boards exist at the community, district, and regional level. Although they consist mostly of laypersons, they often have extensive supervisory or policy-making functions (Hega 1992).

Since the early 1990s, Swiss education policy, arguably among the most decentralized policies in Switzerland's "decentralized federalism" (Braun 2003, p. 58 ff.), has been marked by calls for fundamental change, continuous reform efforts, and, at times, political upheaval (Criblez et al. 2008). At least three recent events point to the need to analyze these developments from a particular perspective, namely the relationship between the federal government and the cantons. First, in a constitutional referendum in May 2006, a large majority of Swiss voters, albeit amidst very low overall participation, adopted several constitutional articles, referred to collectively as "educational constitution" (*Bildungsverfassung*). These voters indicated their desire for more national harmonization and less regional particularism in an education system hitherto dominated by the 26 cantons. Secondly, in June 2007, the Swiss Conference of

Cantonal Education Ministers (*EDK*) finally passed an intercantonal agreement on the harmonization of compulsory schooling (the so-called *Harmos-Konkordat*) that had been in the making since 1997. Thirdly, even though 11 cantons have now ratified the intercantonal harmonization agreement, opposition in the form of popular initiatives against ratification of the *Harmos-Konkordat* has emerged in some cantons, and the agreement has been rejected by voters in six cantons to date (June 2010). These events seem to point to a “quantum leap” in the vertical (federal-cantonal) and horizontal (intercantonal) cooperation in Swiss education policy, but they also raise questions about the political function of education in Switzerland. This chapter analyzes these competing and often countervailing trends in Swiss education from a historical-institutional perspective. It argues that education in Switzerland is changing in a gradual, but not continuous or linear fashion, toward more homogeneity of institutional structures and policies. The trend toward greater homogeneity has been evolving in concentric cycles, at different speeds and at different times in different sectors of education. It started in the 19th century with cantonal centralization of compulsory schooling, shifted to regional intercantonal coordination in primary schooling and other sectors in the 1970s, and has since the early 1990s led to national (and international) harmonization efforts, culminating in the creation of what is called a *Bildungsraum Schweiz*, a “Swiss educational area” today. Analytically, we will thus distinguish between the three processes of cantonal centralization, intercantonal coordination, and national harmonization. Chronologically, we can discern six phases since the early 19th century. And in terms of policy analysis, we will differentiate based on the policy instruments used and the actors involved in pushing toward greater homogeneity in the educational system(s) of Switzerland. One conclusion of the paper is that the education policies of the Swiss cantons and regions have become more homogenized, but with starts and spurts, and occasional reversals. At times, cantonal policies diverged so much so as to create an educational crisis, which often was first addressed at the regional level. But regional cooperation created even greater interregional disparities, threatening a popular backlash and federal intervention. Thus in growing apart, education policies created the very conditions for eventually coming together, first regionally, and more recently, at the national level as well.

Coming Together Apart: The Evolution of Swiss Education Policy

Looking at education policy in Switzerland over the last 200 years, we can identify six phases in the evolution of Swiss education policy:³

- 1798-1803: The failed attempt to establish a centralized or unitary educational system during the Helvetic Republic. This phase, however, had a lasting impact in that many cantons revived ideas and approaches from the Helvetic period when they established their cantonal education systems after 1830, for instance the institutionalization of education councils.

- up to 1870: The beginnings of a national education policy, starting with the so-called Regeneration phase after 1830. But initial steps toward supra-cantonal institutions failed repeatedly, such as the attempts to establish a national university in the 1830s and then again after the introduction of the federal system in 1848, despite the fact that the federal government had been granted the right in the first federal constitution (Art. 22) to found a university and a polytechnic school. The eventual creation of the polytechnic school in Zürich (today the Federal Institute of Technology) was a first successful step toward a national education policy, which was justified primarily as a necessity for the economic development of the country.

- 1870-1910: The foundation of a national education area. A new stage was reached with the discussions concerning the revision of the federal constitution in 1872/74, when for the first time constitutional provisions regarding primary schools were spelled out, making them compulsory and in the case of public primary schools, also free of charge. Instruction must be government supervised and the cantons were required to offer sufficient primary schooling open to all students regardless of their religious denomination. Although the implementation of these articles was defeated in the so-called “school bailiff” vote in 1882, for the first time norms, albeit “soft” ones, had been set to govern primary schools not just in a single canton but nation-wide.

- 1910-1960: During this “wait-and-see period” from World War I to the early 1960s the relationship between the cantons and the federal government with respect to education

³ For periodization, see Criblez 2008.

changed very little, with the exception of the Vocational Education Law of 1930, which created the foundation for increasing federal regulation in this sector.

- 1960-1990: The idea of a shared responsibility of federal and cantonal governments for education arose with sustained economic growth and the rapid expansion of educational opportunities and heralded a new phase in Swiss education policy from the 1960s to 1990s. Higher education was most affected by this trend: the academic high schools (*Gymnasien*) expanded significantly, the regulations for the mutual recognition of high school graduation certificates (*Maturitäts-Anerkennungsverordnung*) was revised twice (1968 and 1972) within a few years, and university enrolments grew rapidly so that the cantons reached the limits of their capacity to finance universities. Thus the federal government started to subsidize cantonal universities in 1965, created several new institutions in the area of science and higher education, and was granted a constitutional basis for supporting research. Educational expansion was to grow in a coordinated fashion, and in addition to several planning, coordination and reform initiatives, the Swiss Conference of Cantonal Education Directors (*EDK*) in 1970 passed the so-called *Schulkonkordat*, an agreement to coordinate the cantonal education systems. Correspondingly, the federal constitution was to be amended as to assign joint responsibility for the educational system to the federation and the cantons. The constitutional revision, however, was rejected in a popular referendum in 1973 (Criblez 2008, p. 24).

- The growth of a national education area since 1990: The latest phase in the evolution of Swiss education policy started in the late 1980s and was marked, firstly, by an increasing orientation of cantonal and national education policies toward international pressures, secondly an intensification of inter-cantonal coordination through the enactment of several coordination agreements among cantons, and thirdly, a continued trend toward national harmonization, especially in vocational education, but in other sectors as well. This culminated in the ratification of the new "education constitution" by voters and cantons on May 26, 2006, and the adoption of the *Harmos-Konkordat* on June 14, 2007, which laid a new legal basis for the coordination and harmonization of Swiss education policy.

The process of gradually adapting the various educational structures of Switzerland to each other over the last two-hundred years evolved in three concentric circles, which could be labeled the cantonal centralization (*Kantonalisierung*), intercantonal coordination (*Interkantonalisierung*), and national harmonization (*Nationalisierung*) of education policy. It started in the cantons during the 19th century with their centralization of compulsory schooling at the cantonal level, shifted to intercantonal coordination of primary schooling and other sectors at the regional level in the 1970s, and has continued and intersected with national (and international) harmonization efforts since the 1990s, culminating in the creation of what is called a *Bildungsraum Schweiz*, a “Swiss educational area”, today.

Cantonal centralization: Beginning in the 19th century, it was originally the cantons which started to offer more comprehensive and standardized educational opportunities, motivated by demands for legal equality of citizens and the recurrent discussion about the lack of social mobility due to educational disparities. Cantonal educational sovereignty remained intact until the 1960s with the exception of vocational education, where the federation acquired significant authority. Despite monitoring each other and institutionalizing the Conference of Cantonal Education Ministers (*Schweizerische Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren, EDK*) as a forum for discussion in 1897, the cantons developed their own educational systems without having to confirm with any national stipulations. Only in the 1960s, due to the increasing mobility of the population as well as the financial bottlenecks created by educational expansion, did this strict educational federalism evolve into a kind of “cooperative federalism”: the cantons started to co-operate much more intensively, resulting in the intercantonal school coordination treaty, the *Schulkonkordat*, of 1970. Following further coordination problems like the conflict over the uniform beginning of the school year, the cooperation between cantons was strengthened even further in the 1990s, resulting in a huge increase in interlocking policies.

Intercantonal coordination: The developments described above denote the second circle in the concentric homogenization process. In order to preserve educational federalism and prevent central government interference with cantonal educational authority, the cantons started to cooperate more closely in educational matters. But cooperation takes on a compulsory form only in the 1970s. In addition, since 1970 and ever more since the 1990s, the EDK develops into

an intermediary educational actor between the federal government and the cantons, pushing harmonization with a variety of measures. Co-operative federalism proved capable in promoting coordination between the cantons, however, not quite as far-reaching as had been expected and hoped for in the 1970s.

The new education constitutional articles of 2006, which are a real step toward national harmonization of education policy, also strengthened the EDK because it gave the federal government subsidiary regulatory powers in areas previously reserved for the cantons: the federation can now intervene in primary and secondary schooling if and only if coordination between the cantons has failed. This creates a high degree of legitimacy for the EDK to effectively improve coordination between cantons. On the whole, this process can be labeled “intercantonal coordination”, because it does not involve the delegation of cantonal powers to the federation but rather the cantons *de jure* retain their freedom of action in all areas of coordination. However, *de facto* they are no longer able to decide independently but must comply with the clauses of intercantonal agreements to which they acceded. And they are at least morally compelled to follow the recommendations of the EDK (Criblez et al 2008).

National harmonization: The idea of a national education area in Switzerland had been an early goal of nationalist, unitarian, and radical-liberal oriented politicians, who supported their proposals for uniform national policies in education by arguments for improved quality: a high quality education in all Swiss regions could only be achieved and guaranteed through federal control. The first and most far-reaching attempt at a uniform Swiss education system came during the Helvetic Republic (1798-1803). The Helvetic unitary state was to be created, following the example of revolutionary France, not only by law but also in the minds of the people, and to achieve it, cultural and educational policy were crucial. The educational systems of the cantons not only should be structured uniformly, but they were to serve as multipliers in creating a single national identity. But the Helvetic Republic lacked the means, opportunities, and resources to realize these goals, and its existence was too short and the resistance from the cantons too strong. Thus the project of a uniform national education system, crowned by a national university, remained a just that, a project.

The founding of a federal state in 1848 revived the idea of a national university. The 1848 constitution gave the federation the right to set up a national higher education institution and a polytechnic school, but more extensive objectives like empowering the federal government to supervise the whole educational system failed. At the same time, the first federal constitution created Switzerland's educational federalism by relegating all educational competences to the cantons unless they had been explicitly assigned to the federation.

Although the constitutional reform of 1872/74 transferred additional competences in education to the federal government, for instance quality control in primary education, the principle of educational federalism was reaffirmed ten years later when the creation of the office of a Swiss Education minister, called the *Schulvogt* or "education bailiff" by its detractors, and laws to implement the new constitutional competences were soundly defeated in a popular referendum. From then on the cantonal education systems developed rather autonomously and insulated from each other. Even though a constitutional amendment in 1902 allowed the federal government to subsidize cantonal school systems, these federal subsidies did not lead to a harmonization of policies because it was pretty much left to the cantons how they were to use the federal monies. Thus federal-cantonal relations in the educational sector, except in the area of vocational education, remained virtually unchanged until the 1960s, when a popular initiative to change the educational provisions in the constitution revived the debate by proposing shared authority between the federation and the cantons in all educational matters. But once again the initiative was rejected by popular vote in 1973. At last, the constitutional revision of 2006 has reorganized regulatory competences in the education sector by allocating to the federal government subsidiary powers in areas where the cantons traditionally held sway. The consequences of this change remain to be seen in the coming years. But for the first time the combination of new federal constitutional powers and a new intercantonal treaty sponsored by the conference of cantonal education ministers to harmonize compulsory schooling seems to aim at creating a true national education area in Switzerland.

The Subsidiarity Principle in Switzerland

The legal and political foundation for the cantonal differences in educational systems and policies is provided by the Swiss federal constitution, which enumerates in its article three the so-called “subsidiarity principle.” The principle of subsidiarity, which is often translated in common parlance as “nearness” or “decentralization,” stresses the notion that decisions should be taken at the lowest level of authority possible and policy functions should be exercised by the lowest level of government capable of fulfilling the specific task.⁴ In the Swiss context this means that the powers of the federal government are limited to those functions that individuals, families, companies and local or regional authorities cannot exercise by themselves. Subsidiarity is not merely a procedural criterion to delineate the authority of different levels of government, but rather a substantive principle that implies that decisions should be taken at the level closest to the ordinary Swiss citizen and that action taken by the higher level of government should be limited to the absolutely necessary. The drafters of the Swiss constitution introduced the subsidiarity principle in 1848 as a signal that the newly created federation would not amount to an arbitrary extension of federal competence at the detriment of the member cantons. In practice, however, the criteria for deciding how subsidiarity actually is to be implemented have remained very vague ever since.⁵

Subsidiarity has always meant different things to different cantonal governments. For some, it serves to guarantee that the Swiss cantons and communities preserve or even expand their powers at the expense of the federal government. Other cantonal governments clearly see it as a means of safeguarding their power against the federal government in the capital, Bern, while steadfastly refusing to apply the principle to the devolution of power within their own cantonal jurisdiction. Invoking the principle of subsidiarity, the French- and Italian-speaking cantons of

⁴ The word subsidiarity comes from the Latin *subsidium*, a military term for auxiliary forces later generalized to mean help or support. The term was imported into Swiss constitutional law through the detour of Roman Catholic social philosophy to mean that the center, i.e. Bern, should act only to the extent necessary to achieve national objectives in order to support rather than supplant the actions performed by individual cantons.

⁵ It is interesting to note that the interpretations of the meaning of subsidiarity as adopted in the Maastricht Treaty for European Union similarly have varied greatly across the EU member countries like France, Germany, and the United Kingdom (Kersbergen and Verbeek, 1994).

Switzerland decided the appropriate locus for educational policy making to be the cantonal executive. The six cantons of the *Suisse romande* have centralized most policy-making and administrative functions at the cantonal level. Following their educational reforms of the early 1960s, they moved toward regional integration by creating intercantonal policy networks that coordinate cantonal education policies and attempt to harmonize the cantonal education systems of the *Suisse romande*.

By contrast, cantonal executives and parliaments in the German-speaking regions have interpreted the subsidiarity principle in a very different way. Most functions in education policy remain highly decentralized and remain the prerogative of local governments and citizens. Communities finance and run their own primary and secondary schools. These are supervised by elected education boards consisting mainly of representatives of the local citizenry. Their small cantonal education ministries are often staffed by part-time administrators “borrowed” from local communities. Direct-democratic participation by citizens is extensive in many German-speaking cantons. For instance, teachers at the primary and lower secondary schools are elected by the local citizenry and have to stand re-election at periodic intervals.

Local Autonomy and Cantonal Authority

Federalism and localism are different means of decentralization and implementing subsidiarity. Federal states differ with respect to how much educational authority is exercised by local governments. There are federal states with substantial local community power in education, like the United States and Switzerland, but there are others with little local community power, such as Germany and Austria. In most Western countries, local communities are only responsible for school-building maintenance, which does not entail real power in education. In contrast, in Switzerland elected local community boards often decide on the appointment and dismissal of teachers, have tax power, and can influence the school curriculum, and can thus be said to share in the control of education. The predominance of local and cantonal governments in Swiss education is expressed in table 2. Only in the university sector and in vocational education does the federal share of expenditures amount to a significant contribution. Both

primary and secondary schools are to more than 98 percent financed by cantonal and local governments.

[Table 2: Public Expenditures for Education by Educational Sector, Level of Government and Type, about here]

The key factors in implementing the subsidiarity principle either by way of federalism or localism are the division of political authority in education between state and communal governments and the control of school governance by the local citizenry. Authority over compulsory education is generally the responsibility of local Swiss governments.⁶ Most cantons and municipalities have a popularly elected education board or council which is responsible for the governance and administration of the so-called "popular schools" (*Volksschulen*).⁷ In other cantons, local schools are supervised by school inspectors and education boards that are appointed by the cantonal government.

Primary and lower secondary education is also subject to direct citizen control through the popular elections of local schoolteachers in some cantons. The influence of local governments on cantonal education policy and the participation of citizens in school governance vary across cantons. Local influence takes place through numerous formal and informal channels, and provides one basis for the significant variations between cantonal education systems.

According to the subsidiarity principle (*Subsidiaritätsprinzip*) embodied in article 3 of the Swiss constitution, the larger community shall only perform those functions that the small community cannot accomplish or can fulfill only ineffectively (Rechsteiner 1978, p. 18). The subsidiarity principle forms the constitutional basis for the parallel development of different cantonal education systems in Switzerland. In many cantons, primary schools and even most of the secondary schools are governed by the largely autonomous communities. As a result of strong

⁶ The only exceptions are the city cantons of Geneva and Basel-City, where all schools, including popular schools, are run by the canton (Plotke 1979, p. 217).

⁷ The "popular school" (*Volksschule*) is the most common type of school in Switzerland. It includes the primary level and the lower secondary level with the most basic academic requirements, compared to other types of lower secondary schools. Therefore, popular schools are often mere extensions of the primary school and thus in some cantons called "extended primary schools" (*Primaroberschule*) or "terminal schools."

local autonomy, the organization and structure of compulsory schooling varies not only between cantons but sometimes even across the communities of the same canton.⁸

Table 3 and 4 indicate that the total and per-capita spending on education varies widely across the Swiss cantons and regions. In general, in all the German-speaking cantons, with the sole exception of the city canton of Basel-Stadt, local communities provide between half and four fifths of total educational expenditures. In contrast, local governments are clearly less important and the cantons control most educational expenditures in Ticino and all the French-speaking cantons, except for Jura, where canton and communities share educational expenditures about equally. Per capita (and per student) educational expenditures also vary widely, but they are generally higher in those cantons where the cantonal authorities provide a larger share of total educational expenditures and where local governments are of less importance in the financing of schools.

[Table 3 and Table 4: Total and Per-Capita Educational Spending of Cantons, about here]

Depending on the canton or community, compulsory school traditionally began at age six or seven and continued for seven, eight or nine years in the popular school (*Volksschule*). In the mid-1960s, the popular school lasted seven years in six cantons, eight years in 13 cantons, and nine years in six cantons. In many cantons, individual communes were free to extend compulsory schooling by one year.⁹ In Fribourg, the school system in the cantonal capital differed from that of the countryside. Other cantons had different regulations for male and female students,¹⁰ and for full-time and part-time compulsory schools (Hega 1999).

By the late 1960s, most cantons had extended compulsory education to nine years, but some still required only eight years of school attendance.¹¹ Depending on the canton, primary school

⁸ In bilingual cantons like Berne, Fribourg, and Valais, for instance, school systems differ according to whether the area belongs to the German- or French-speaking region of the canton.

⁹ For instance, in Lucerne, Uri, Nidwalden, Zug, Basel-Land, Appenzell-Ausserrhoden, and St. Gallen (Tschäni 1967, p. 395).

¹⁰ Prior to 1974, compulsory schools in the cities of Geneva and Carouge in the canton Geneva had separate classes for male and female students, starting in the 4th grade (Rechsteiner 1978, p. 317).

¹¹ For instance, Aargau had a uniform, eight year popular school until the 1970s, allowing students to transfer to higher secondary schools as late as at the age of fourteen. In Basel and Bern, in contrast,

lasted four, five, or six years, followed by two, three, or four years of lower secondary school. The academic year started in the spring in 17 cantons, most of them German-speaking, and in the fall in the other cantons, including all the French-speaking ones. The age of school entry was six years in 13 cantons, but seven years in the other 12 cantons, particularly in the German-speaking region. The number of school weeks per year varied by a full month, between 38 and 42 weeks, and the time of selection for the transfer to academic secondary schools differed by as much as four years, taking place between grades five to nine. The variations in curricula, teaching materials, and teacher training and qualifications across cantons and regions were equally striking.

By 1970, educational policy makers faced a dilemma. The growing mobility of citizens and new pedagogical findings increased public demand for harmonization or at least coordination of the varying cantonal school systems. In order to resolve problems created by such intercantonal differences, the cantons concluded the so-called school concordance treaty (*Schulkonkordat*), a treaty between cantonal governments to coordinate their education policies.¹² This non-binding agreement took years to come into existence and decades to actually take force and alter the landscape of the Swiss educational map.

Following some early successes in harmonizing cantonal policies through the *Konkordat*, policy coordination again came to a halt in the early 1980s. Although all cantons, except one, eventually had signed the concordance treaty, several signatory cantons were not willing or able to fulfill its obligations and recommendations because of strong popular or partisan

transfer to academic secondary schools took place after four years of primary schooling; in Vaud and Jura the first selection for academic tracks was already made after the fourth primary grade.

¹² In contrast to other federal countries like Germany and Austria, the Swiss constitution includes an article (article 7, paragraph 2) on the (horizontal) cooperation between the states, which allows the cantons to sign mutual contracts, called *Konkordat* (concord), on issues of legislation, jurisprudence, and administration. The contracts have to be submitted to the federal authorities (Federal Council or, ultimately, the Federal Assembly), which can block the implementation of the concord in case it contains anything that impedes the federation or the rights of other cantons. The cantons differ in their definitions of these concords, and all cantons require a popular referendum or at least a parliamentary vote to become a party in a *Konkordat*. Besides the *Konkordat*, there exist other intercantonal agreements that are ratified directly by the cantonal executives. These are called administrative agreements (Rechsteiner 1978, p. 179).

opposition and the resistance of teachers to changes in primary school policy. Opposition was fueled in part by a strong sense of localism of the citizenry, and turf battles between bureaucrats, teacher unions, and local school boards created additional obstacles. Particularly contested issues were the coordination of the start of the school year and the initiation of foreign language teaching in the primary schools. In some cantons, like Zürich and Basel-Stadt, it took several cantonal referendums and school reforms before the issue of the beginning of the school year was finally resolved through a federal popular referendum in 1985. But the issue of foreign language teaching was still not resolved, with a few, but important cantons like Aargau holding out in their refusal to follow the other cantons' efforts to coordinate primary school policy.

Federalism and Direct Democracy

Direct democracy, in addition to federalism and proportional power-sharing, is the third distinctive characteristic of the Swiss political system (Linder 1994). The importance of direct-democratic popular participation manifests itself in constitutional referendums and popular initiatives at the national level (Kobach 1993); it is even more firmly anchored in the cantons and communes (Hega 1999). Citizens are frequently called on to vote, electing not only the members of parliaments and councils on all three levels of government, but also local and cantonal executives and officials. Moreover, Swiss citizens decide directly a large number of specific issues, either in obligatory referendums or through referendums or initiatives demanded by a certain number of voters. Ballot issues include new laws, taxes, and public expenditures.

Indeed, “[a]t cantonal and local levels referenda occasionally go further. Some cantons hold an obligatory referendum for most laws and important acts, and referenda may be held for some financial decisions about investments for large-scale government projects. Semi-direct democracy is, on the whole, more widely used in the Swiss-German cantons and communes. In the French- and Italian-speaking parts of Switzerland the opportunities for popular referenda are more restricted, especially at the local level.” (Linder 1994, p. 85)

The mechanisms of direct democratic participation grant voters in the Swiss cantons a special position in regard to education policy. At the state level, any change of cantonal school laws

requires approval by a popular referendum. Through the means of the popular initiative or personal petition to the parliament, each citizen-voter has the opportunity to instigate a popular vote on the change of school laws.¹³ At the community level, the citizen-voter participates in school affairs in three ways: he or she votes on substantial expenses for schools, elects the local school authorities, and in many places even elects the teachers for local schools (Rechsteiner 1978, p. 736).

The particular Swiss combination of direct democracy and federalism affords voters in the small cantons significant overrepresentation, since most referendums and initiatives require not only a nation-wide popular majority, but also a majority of voters in a majority of the 26 cantons. In the area of education, overrepresentation has given voters in the small, rural cantons of central and eastern Switzerland almost special veto powers over educational reforms, as in the case of the 1973 referendum over the so-called “Education article”. This constitutional amendment, which would have given the federal government more powers in educational policy, was supported by a slight popular majority (52.8 percent) at the national level, but ultimately failed because it was rejected by the voters in a slim majority of the 26 cantons (12.5 out of 23 total votes).¹⁴

Recent Reforms and the Future of Education Policy Coordination

The political-cultural differences between the different Swiss regions became apparent during several key national referendums in the early 1990s, particularly those that dealt with European and national integration. The 1991 referendum on Switzerland’s membership in the European Economic Area, for instance, underscored the differences between German- and French-

¹³ In Zürich, five popular initiatives concerning the popular schools were successfully launched in just three years, from 1972 to 1975: the initiative for the reinstatement of the spring start of the school year (1972), the initiative for a general reform of the school system (1972), the initiative for the introduction of an orientation stage in popular schools (1973), the initiative for the creation of full-time pre-primary schools (1973), and the initiative for smaller classes (1975). (Rechsteiner 1978, p. 736).

¹⁴ Of the 26 cantons of Switzerland, twenty are so-called “full cantons” and six are so-called “half cantons” (Basel-City and Basel-Land, Appenzell-Ausserrhoden and Appenzell-Innerrhoden, Obwalden and Nidwalden) which are the historical results of the split of formerly full cantons. Half cantons have the same constitutional status as full cantons, except that they have only one instead of two seats in the Swiss upper house of parliament, the State Council or *Ständerat*, and they count only half as much as full cantons in constitutional referendums. Thus the required cantonal majority, the so-called *Ständemehr*, consists of 12 of the possible 23 cantonal votes.

speaking Swiss: whereas membership was supported overwhelmingly by the *Suisse Romands*, it was rejected by popular majorities in nearly all of the German-Swiss cantons. Similarly, the divide between the *Suisse romande* and the *Deutschschweiz* was highlighted by recent educational reform initiatives, both at the federal and cantonal level.

Probably the most divisive issue between the two main linguistic groups of Switzerland came to the fore over the issue of early second language teaching in Swiss primary schools, and particularly the proposal by some German-speaking cantons, most notably Zürich, that this should be English rather than French. In violation of the 1975 recommendation by the *EDK* that the first non-native language to be taught starting in fourth or fifth grade should be one of the three national languages, the education director of Zürich in January 1998 as part of his "School Project 21" proposed to introduce "early English" (*Frühenglisch*) already in the first grade of primary school. This idea was rejected not just by many observers in the French-speaking cantons as an attack against French as the *langue deux* that constituted "a revolution," "a breach in the dyke," "a serious threat to the linguistic peace" and even "to national unity" between the *Suisse romande* and the *Deutschschweiz* (Tagesanzeiger, Jan. 17, 1998, p. 19). At least partially in response to the pressure created by Zürich's push forward, the *EDK* convened an advisory group of five experts to draft a "comprehensive linguistic concept" (*Gesamtsprachenkonzept*) for Switzerland. As one of the leading Swiss newspapers noted, "in comparison to the usual 'run-through time' in Swiss education policy, the report was commissioned in record time and drafted with breath-taking speed" (Tagesanzeiger, Aug. 20, 1998, p. 2). The report recommended that a first foreign language be introduced, at the latest, in the second grade of primary school as a compulsory subject, and a second foreign language to be taught starting in fifth grade. A third foreign language would be added in seventh grade. The experts, however, did not want to explicitly stipulate which language should be taught first, but rather leave that decision to the individual cantons. They recommended that in addition to

teaching English, language instruction should include a second national language and preferably a third.¹⁵

These conflicts highlight the tension between the principles of local autonomy and cantonal sovereignty versus the need for policy coordination and integration in a federal polity. The Swiss case shows that subsidiarity and federalism, far from being essentially the same concept, can often come in conflict when the particularistic interests of the constituent units of a polity, bolstered by a maximum interpretation of subsidiarity principle, compete with federal policy objectives.

Conclusion

Switzerland's federalism has been described as a system of interlocking, but distinct and autonomous "policy networks" (Lehmbruch, 1993). The conceptualization of a federal system as a set of intersecting "policy networks" links the main organizational actors of the "public" and "private" sectors: governments and administrations, political parties, interest groups, and business associations. According to Gerhard Lehmbruch: "As these organizations operate within the institutional framework of a federal state with horizontally differentiated administrations and with a pluri-centric society, they establish links that cluster into a variety of 'issue networks.' These are partially autonomous but interlocked through overarching networks." (Lehmbruch, 1993, p. 55)

In the Swiss case, the overarching links between these issue networks are established by the federal and cantonal governments, intergovernmental conferences and committees, bureaucratic channels, and, very important in the Swiss case, personal interactions on an informal level. The party system plays a part in the establishment of policy linkages, especially in the Christian-democratically governed cantons of central Switzerland. While some of the Swiss issue networks are strongly integrated at the national level, for instance in labor relations

¹⁵ Another attempt to protect the "linguistic peace" was the call by the expert commission that French language learning might be less extensive (in terms of years of instruction) but more intensive (in terms of quality) than English instruction.

and banking policy, the education policy networks have retained a highly "pluri-centric" character.

In primary education, decentralized decision-making processes eventually necessitated a minimum of harmonization of outputs through bargained coordination. The 1970 *Schulkonkordat*, which introduced a minimum framework for operating primary schools, is a case in point. But pluri-centrism and disjointed strategies often prevent the emergence of unified policy outputs, as was the case of lower secondary school reforms or the introduction of foreign language teaching in the 1990s.

Leonard Parri described Switzerland as a "centreless polity" in which subnational governments "possess large financial resources, a monopoly of the intermediate and field administration, important judicial prerogatives a strong political potential based on a separate historical identity and on a canton (rather than federal) based party system." (p. 206f.) The Swiss federal government simply lacks sufficient political legitimacy and administrative resources to exert significant influence or act as a partner of the cantons in the education policy arena. Since political authority and financial resources rest primarily with the cantons, they created their own policy networks without federal participation, and preempted or undermined federal efforts to regulate or coordinate policy through "goal displacement" and even "goal-sterilization."

For Switzerland as a whole, coordination of education policy has developed farthest in the compulsory school sector, beginning with the *Schulkonkordat* of 1970 and culminating in the *Harmos-Konkordat* of 2007. But regional and cantonal particularism remain the predominant modes in most other education sectors.

(Table 5: Harmos Konkordat adoption about here)

Education is one of the most important areas of Swiss cantonal sovereignty and local autonomy. But increasingly, educational issues require action at the national level. Although the education system will likely remain firmly anchored in its local context, and local features will continue to shape the cantonal school systems, a new national approach must encompass the communal institutions, even individual schools. Such an attempt for an integrated national education policy cannot succeed without conjuring the present local character of Swiss

education policy, the principle of deciding and solving problems where they are most immediate. This decision making process is marked by a multitude of actors on all levels of the polity, and by personal connections that allow for a smoother functioning of the system. Decision-making in the education arena is slow, incremental, and aimed at inclusiveness, due to constraints like local autonomy and direct democratic participation by a population that often exhibits a stout conservatism in matters of institutional change and educational reform. These factors have contributed to the impression of immobility and stagnation of the Swiss education system. Based on such parameters, three possible futures of Swiss education policy are conceivable: a first scenario, where the federal government, in its effort to coordinate, lead and create national uniformity in the context of a emerging dynamic Europe, overpowers the cantons, which do not have the capacity to address education issues of a larger scale; a second hypothesis of a dominant cantonal dynamic, where the cantons, based on their cultural traditions, their socioeconomic structures and demographic composition, remain the dominant political actors whose conflicts define Swiss reality; and a third model, where the cantons receive strong and dynamic impulses from the national government and adapt them to their local environment. This third model could ensure that the cantons maintain their local identity, but master the national challenges that Switzerland is facing presently and in the future.

To sum up, education makes a distinctive contribution to Swiss consociational democracy:

- educational federalism with its highly decentralized structure based on cantonal cultural autonomy manifests itself in educational financing, where only 10 percent of expenditures are federal, about 60 percent are cantonal, and the remaining 30 percent local, but also in cantonal control over teacher training and curriculum development.
- direct democracy is found in education in the form of local elections of teachers and school boards, but also in reliance on the militia system and bureaucracies based on lay or part-time personnel. Direct democracy provides local and regional interests with additional veto points in the form of obligatory referendums or frequently invoked citizen initiatives.
- subsidiarity has led to a relative harmonization rather than standardization in education policy, and it has also allowed for the continued importance of private and parochial schools, especially at the secondary and tertiary level, and the local character of public primary schools,

as evidenced by the emphasis on local and regional studies (*Heimatkunde*). Even in higher education, cantonal control remains dominant, with only two Federal Institutes of Technology as compared to ten cantonal universities.

The educational system of Switzerland provides the options of exit, voice and loyalty and thus helps to strengthen consociational democracy in Switzerland's linguistically, religiously and culturally divided society. Loyalty is reinforced by teaching the Swiss founding myths in schools and by relying on educational federalism and subsidiarity, with the focus on the local community most Swiss citizens identify with strongly. People are loyal, even if they disagree with the policies of the national and cantonal governments. Direct democracy allows people to voice their dissatisfaction in referendums and citizen initiatives, through elections of school boards or even individual teachers, and by participating as lay persons in the militia system and educational bureaucracy. Finally, the education system provides exit options, in the form of a sizable private school sector, especially as one moves up the educational ladder from primary to secondary to tertiary education, which makes it relatively easy to opt out of the public school system.

But if education policy has helped to hold the Swiss polity together by providing the options of exit, voice, or loyalty, it has not prevented and perhaps contributed to the emergence of "two Switzerlands", a "*Lagerbildung*" or growing gap between the more internationally oriented and integration minded French- and Italian-speaking *Suisse Romands* against the German-speaking *Deutschschweizer*, who mostly but not uniformly seem to prefer the status quo of cantonal and regional particularism.

Thus it remains to be seen if the recent adoption of the constitutional education article and the *Harmos* intercantonal cooperation agreement were indeed a "quantum leap" in bringing the 26 cantonal education systems closer together, or whether they will allow for the continued drifting apart of the two regional camps.

References

Badertscher, Hans (Ed.) (1997), *Die Schweizerische Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren 1897 bis 1997*. Bern: Verlag Paul Haupt.

- Bickel, Hans and Schläpfer, Robert (Eds.) (1994), *Mehrsprachigkeit - eine Herausforderung*. Aarau, Frankfurt a.M., Salzburg: Verlag Sauerländer.
- Bildungspolitik im Schweizerischen Föderalismus. Festschrift für Prof.Dr. Eugen Egger* (1985), Schriftenreihe der Schweizerischen Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren [EDK]. Bd. 10. Bern and Stuttgart: Verlag Paul Haupt.
- Bogdanor, Vernon (1988), 'Federalism in Switzerland', *Government and Opposition*, Vol.23, No.1, pp. 69-90.
- Braun, Dietmar (2003), *Fiscal Policies in Federal States*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Bundesamt für Statistik (Ed.) (several years), *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Schweiz*, several volumes. Zürich: Verlag Neue Zürcher Zeitung.
- Centre suisse de documentation en matière d'enseignement et d'éducation (CESDOC). (1985), *Demain... Combien d'élèves? Morgen... Wieviele Schüler?.* Geneve: CESDOC.
- Criblez, Lucien (Ed.) (2008), *Bildungsraum Schweiz. Historische Entwicklung und Aktuelle Herausforderungen*. Bern: Verlag Paul Haupt.
- Deppeler, Rolf (1971), 'Die Entwicklung des Bildungswesens', In Gruner, Erich (Ed.). *Die Schweiz seit 1945*. Bern: Francke Verlag, pp. 252-79.
- Egger, Eugen (1984), *Education in Switzerland*. Bern: Swiss Conference of Cantonal Directors of Education.
- Eschet-Schwarz, Andre (1989), 'The Role of Semi-Direct Democracy in Shaping Swiss Federalism: The Behavior of Cantons Regarding Revision of the Constitution, 1866-1981', *Publius*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 79-106.
- Furter, Pierre (1979), 'Educational and Regional Disparities: A Swiss Research Programme', *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 14, No.3, pp. 251-61.
- 'Can the Confederatio Helvetica be imitated?' (1988), *Government and Opposition*, Vol.23, No.1, Special Issue Switzerland: (Winter).
- Gretler, Armin (1990), *Das schweizerische Bildungswesen auf dem Prüfstand. Der OECD-Bericht 'Bildungspolitik in der Schweiz' und die EDK-Berichte Bildung in der Schweiz von morgen*. Aarau: SKBF.
- Gruner, Erich (1977), *Die Parteien in der Schweiz*. (2nd ed.). Bern: Francke Verlag.
- Hadley, Charles D., Morass, Michael, and Nick, Rainer (1989), 'Federalism and Party Interaction in West Germany, Switzerland, and Austria', *Publius*, Vol.19, No.4, pp.81-97.
- Hega, Gunther M. (2001), "Regional Identity, Language and Education Policy in Switzerland." *Compare--A Journal of Comparative Education*, vol. 31, no. 2, June 2001, p. 205-227.
- Hega, Gunther M. (1999), *Consensus Democracy? Swiss Education Policy between Federalism and Subsidiarity*. New York and Bern: Peter Lang Publishing.

- Heidenheimer, Arnold J. (1997), *Disparate Ladders: Why School and University Policies Differ in Germany, Japan, and Switzerland*. New Brunswick, USA and London, UK: Transaction Publishers.
- Hirschman, Albert (1970), *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty. Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Im Hof, Ulrich (2007), *Geschichte der Schweiz*. 8th Ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Kersbergen, Kees van and Verbeek, Bertjan (1994), 'The Politics of Subsidiarity in the European Union', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.32, No.2 (June), pp. 215-36.
- Kerr, Henry H. (1987), 'The Swiss Party System: Steadfast and Changing', in: Hans Daalder. (Ed.). *Party Systems in Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, The Netherlands, and Belgium*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Klöti, Ulrich (1988), 'Political Ideas, Financial Interests and Intergovernmental Relations: New Aspects of Swiss Federalism', in: *Government and Opposition*, Vol.23, No.1, pp.91-102.
- Kobach, Kris W. (1993), *The Referendum. Direct Democracy in Switzerland*. Aldershot, UK and Brookfield, USA: Dartmouth.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter (1986), *Entscheidungsstrukturen und Entscheidungsprozesse in der Schweizer Politik*. Frankfurt and New York: Campus Verlag.
- Lehmbruch, Gerhard (1993), 'Consociational Democracy and Corporatism in Switzerland', *Publius*, Vol.23, No.2, pp.43-60.
- Linder, Wolf (1994), *Swiss Democracy: Possible Solutions to Conflict in Multicultural Societies*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- McRae, Kenneth D. (1983), *Conflict and Compromise in Multilingual Societies*. Vol. 1, Switzerland. Waterloo: WLU Press.
- Neidhart, Leonhard (1970), *Plebiszit und Pluralitäre Demokratie. Eine Analyse der Funktion des Schweizerischen Gesetzesreferendums*. Bern: Francke Verlag.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (several years), *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators*. Center for Educational Research and Innovation. Paris: OECD.
- Parri, Leonardo (1989), 'Territorial Political Exchange in Federal and Unitary Countries', *West European Politics*, Vol.12, No.3 (July), pp.197-219.
- Plotke, Herbert (1979), *Schweizerisches Schulrecht* (Schriftenreihe der Schweizerischen Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren, EDK; Bd. 3). Bern, Stuttgart: Haupt.
- Poglia, Edo (1983), *Disparités régionales en education. Le cas des régions de montagne*. (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Serie XXII, Soziologie, Bd. 77). Bern, Frankfurt/M, New York: Peter Lang.
- Rechsteiner, Werner A. (1978), *Die Volksschule im Bundesstaat. Verfassungsgrundlagen und Verwaltungsorganisation der allgemeinen Pflichtschulen in Österreich, in der*

- Bundesrepublik Deutschland und in der Schweiz* (Zürcher Beiträge zur Rechtswissenschaft, Bd. 521). Zürich: Schultheiss Polygraphischer Verlag.
- Schmitter, Philippe C. and Lehmbruch, Gerhard (Eds.) (1979), *Trends Towards Corporatist Intermediation*. Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications.
- Schneider, Reinhardt (1982), 'Die Bildungsentwicklung in den westeuropäischen Staaten 1870-1975', in: *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, Vol.11, No.3, pp.207-26.
- Schweizerische Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren (EDK) (1990), *Bildungspolitik in der Schweiz. Bericht der OECD* (Studien und Berichte 5). Bern: EDK.
- Schweizerische Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren (EDK) (1987), *Herausforderung Schweiz. Materialien zur Förderung des Unterrichts in den Landessprachen* (Studien und Berichte 2). Bern: EDK
- Steinberg, Jonathan (1996), *Why Switzerland?* 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The Swiss Educational Mosaic: A Study in Diversity* (1991), Swiss Federal Statistical Office, Federal Administration of Finance, and CESDOC (Eds.). Bern: CESDOC.
- Tschäni, Hans (1967), *Profil der Schweiz. Ein lebendiges Staatsbild*. Zürich: Rascher Verlag.
- von Blumenthal, Viktor (1991), *Bildungspolitik in der Schweiz. Vergleichende Daten und Analysen zur Entwicklung in den 80er Jahren*. München: Saur Verlag.

Table 1: The 26 Swiss Cantons and Half-Cantons (2010)

Canton		Entry into Confederation	Adoption of Cantonal Constitution	Area (square km)	Population)	Density (Population per square km)	Capital	Population of Capital (2000)	Number and Type of Districts ¹	Number of Municipalities	Official Languages ²
Zurich	ZH	1351	1869	1,729	1,332,730	701	Zürich	365,043	11 A/J, 18 E	171	G
Bern	BE	1353	1993	6,049	969,299	158	Bern	136,338	26 A/J, 27 E	392	G, F
Luzern	LU	1332	1875	1,492	368,742	233	Luzern	61,034	5 A, 6 J/E	88	G
Uri	UR	1291	1984	1,076	35,162	33	Altdorf	8,282	2 J	20	G
Schwyz	SZ	1291	1898	908	143,719	143	Schwyz	12,872	6 A/J	30	G
Obwalden	OW	1291	1968	491	34,429	66	Sarnen	8,398	--	7	G
Nidwalden	NW	1291	1965	276	40,737	138	Stans	6,217	--	11	G
Glarus	GL	1352	1988	685	38,370	51	Glarus	5,728	14 E	25	G
Zug	ZG	1352	1894	239	110,384	416	Zug	21,705	--	11	G
Fribourg	FR	1481	1857	1,670	268,537	141	Fribourg	36,355	7 A/J, 8 E	168	F, G
Solothurn	SO	1481	1986	791	251,830	308	Solothurn	75,237	5 A/J, 10 E	125	G
Basel-City	BS	1501	1889	37	186,672	5,072	Basel	178,428	5 E	3	G
Basel-Land	BL	1501	1984	428	271,214	502	Liestal	12,853	5 A, 6 J, 8 E	86	G
Schaffhausen	SH	1501	1876	298	75,303	246	Schaffhausen	34,225	6 A/J/E	27	G
Appenzell-Ausserrhoden	AR	1513	1908	243	53,054	220	Herisau	15,624	3 A/J	20	G
Appenzell-Innerrhoden	AI	1513	1872	172	15,549	87	Appenzell	5,194	2 J	6	G
St. Gallen	SG	1803	1890	2,014	471,152	222	St. Gallen	75,237	14 A/J/E	86	G
Graubünden	GR	1803	1892	7,106	190,459	26	Chur	32,868	14 A, 39 J/E	190	G, R, I
Aargau	AG	1803	1980	1,405	591,632	388	Aarau	16,481	11 A/J/E	229	G
Thurgau	TG	1803	1987	1,013	241,811	229	Frauenfeld	20,204	8 A/J/E	80	G
Ticino	TI	1803	1830	2,811	332,736	110	Bellinzona	16,849	8 A/J, 10 E	176	I
Vaud	VD	1803	1885	3,219	688,245	188	Lausanne	128,112	19 A/J, 30 E	375	F
Valais	VS	1815	1907	5,226	303,241	53	Sion	25,336	14 A/E, 3 J	143	F, G
Neuchâtel	NE	1815	1858	797	170,924	206	Neuchâtel	33,579	6 A/J	53	F
Geneva	GE	1815	1847	282	446,106	1,442	Geneva	171,042	--	45	F
Jura	JU	1979	1977	837	69,822	82	Delemont	11,548	3 A/J/E	64	F
Switzerland	CH		1874	41,293	7,778,900	174	Bern			2,631	G, F, I, R

1 Abbreviations for districts: A = Administrative districts, J = Judicial districts, E = Electoral districts.

2 Abbreviations for official languages: G = German, F = French, I = Italian, R = Romansh

Sources: Huber, Alfred (1994). *Staatskunde-Lexikon*. 4th ed. Luzern: Verlag Schweizer Lexikon, p. 165-166. Bundesamt für Statistik (2010). *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Schweiz* (<http://www.bfs.admin.ch>).

**Table 2: Public Expenditures for Education by Educational Sector, Level of Government and Type
(in Millions of Swiss Francs, 2007)**

	Total		Level					
			Federal		Cantonal		Local	
	absolut	in %	absolut	in %	absolut	in %	absolut	in %
Total	27,003.4	100.0	3,140.4	11.6	15,419.3	57.1	8,443.7	31.3
Educational Sector								
Kindergarden/Preschool	1,022.3	3.8	-	-	458.2	44.8	564.1	55.2
Compulsory Schools	11,467.2	42.5	17.1	0.1	4,687.8	40.9	6,762.3	59.0
Schools for special-need students	1,419.2	5.3	-	-	710.5	50.1	708.8	49.9
Vocational Schools	3,317.9	12.3	462.0	13.9	2,615.6	78.8	240.3	7.2
General/Academic Secondary Schools	2,196.8	8.1	23.6	1.1	2,058.5	93.7	114.7	5.2
Advanced Vocational Education	179.6	0.7	57.8	32.2	120.9	67.3	1.0	0.5
Universities and Polytechnics	6,694.9	24.8	2,346.9	35.1	4,335.6	64.8	12.4	0.2
Other 1)	705.5	2.6	233.1	33.0	432.3	61.3	40.1	5.7
Type of Expense								
Current Spending	25,109.5	93.0
Teacher Salaries	14,908.1	55.2
Salaries for other Personnel	3,611.6	13.4
Materials	3,764.3	13.9
Other Expenditures	2,825.5	10.5
Investment Spending	1,893.9	7.0

1) Without spending for basic research

Source: Bundesamt für Statistik, Öffentliche Bildungsausgaben, 2010

Table 3: Total Expenditures of Cantons by Educational Sector (2007)

Cantons	Education Sector				Total
	Popular Schools	Vocational Schools	General and Academic Secondary Schools	Universities	
	in 1000 francs				
Zürich	1,100,313	442,726	349,219	1,094,991	3,081,244
Bern	1,098,588	519,849	192,335	663,231	2,543,823
Luzern	203,575	135,122	128,415	220,667	712,497
Uri	30,674	7,047	11,696	9,944	65,523
Schwyz	64,559	37,788	32,308	36,294	175,369
Obwalden	6,093	12,476	10,362	9,144	40,299
Nidwalden	8,772	12,593	19,202	8,842	54,244
Glarus	34,915	13,492	9,624	9,405	68,412
Zug	105,369	50,405	51,207	35,695	248,830
Freiburg	363,269	107,936	87,842	221,972	797,057
Solothurn	131,506	78,021	77,092	112,578	402,337
Basel-Stadt	326,750	121,322	52,134	272,382	802,215
Basel-Landschaft	272,464	71,236	94,883	262,346	729,823
Schaffhausen	52,165	31,896	20,032	19,150	130,086
Appenzell A.Rh.	34,535	12,943	10,402	14,631	76,755
Appenzell I.Rh.	3,953	3,536	9,735	4,401	23,198
St. Gallen	235,567	190,869	98,106	301,993	840,553
Graubünden	76,399	87,058	76,568	112,363	355,574
Aargau	938,266	127,350	161,608	238,951	1,494,446
Thurgau	98,468	117,732	81,270	72,431	390,719
Tessin	267,182	150,590	82,256	188,354	710,697
Waadt	880,439	191,354	180,761	449,320	1,743,919
Wallis	226,532	100,540	101,478	137,285	587,111
Neuenburg	110,269	102,654	53,765	152,369	438,395
Genf	683,232	305,981	169,267	612,686	1,873,550
Jura	96,150	44,100	21,306	11,747	190,928
Total	7,450,004	3,076,614	2,182,872	5,273,173	18,577,602

Source: Bundesamt für Statistik (<http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index.html>).

Table 4: Cantonal Per-Capita Spending, by Education Sector, in Swiss Francs (2007)

Cantons	Popular Schools	Vocational Schools	General and Academic Secondary Schools	Universities	Total
Zürich	831.8	334.7	264.0	827.8	2,329.3
Bern	1,132.7	536.0	198.3	683.8	2,622.7
Luzern	562.5	373.3	354.8	609.7	1,968.6
Uri	890.5	204.6	339.5	288.7	1,902.1
Schwyz	461.6	270.2	231.0	259.5	1,253.8
Obwalden	180.4	369.3	306.7	270.7	1,192.8
Nidwalden	221.7	318.3	485.3	223.5	1,371.0
Glarus	918.0	354.7	253.0	247.3	1,798.7
Zug	968.2	463.2	470.5	328.0	2,286.5
Freiburg	1,375.2	408.6	332.5	840.3	3,017.4
Solothurn	528.1	313.3	309.6	452.1	1,615.8
Basel-Stadt	1,721.8	639.3	274.7	1,435.3	4,227.1
Basel-Landschaft	1,019.5	266.6	355.0	981.7	2,730.9
Schaffhausen	699.3	427.6	268.5	256.7	1,743.8
Appenzell A.Rh.	659.8	247.3	198.7	279.5	1,466.3
Appenzell I.Rh.	263.1	235.3	647.8	292.9	1,543.6
St. Gallen	505.7	409.7	210.6	648.3	1,804.3
Graubünden	398.2	453.7	399.0	585.6	1,853.1
Aargau	1,621.1	220.0	279.2	412.8	2,582.0
Thurgau	413.5	494.4	341.3	304.2	1,640.7
Tessin	815.5	459.6	251.1	574.9	2,169.2
Waadt	1,298.3	282.2	266.6	662.6	2,571.6
Wallis	762.9	338.6	341.8	462.4	1,977.3
Neuenburg	649.0	604.2	316.5	896.8	2,580.4
Genf	1,546.6	692.6	383.2	1,386.9	4,241.1
Jura	1,409.1	646.3	312.3	172.2	2,798.2
Total	977.9	403.8	286.5	692.1	2,438.5

Source: Bundesamt für Statistik (<http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index.html>).

**Table 5: Intercantonal Agreement on the Harmonization of Compulsory Schooling
(HarmoS–Konkordat) in 2010**

Canton	Status^[1]	Date of Adoption or Rejection	Remarks
Schaffhausen	Adopted	29. Oktober 2007	adopted by cantonal parliament (<i>Kantonsrat</i>)
Vaud	Adopted	22. April 2008	adopted by cantonal parliament(<i>Grand Conseil</i>)
Jura	Adopted	23. April 2008	adopted by cantonal parliament (<i>Parlement</i>)
Glarus	Adopted	4. Mai 2008	adopted by cantonal citizens' convention (<i>Landsgemeinde</i>)
Wallis	Adopted	7. Mai 2008	adopted by cantonal parliament (<i>Grosser Rat</i>)
Neuenburg	Adopted	25. Juni 2008	adopted by cantonal parliament (<i>Grand Conseil</i>)
Luzern	Rejected	28. September 2008	rejected by cantonal referendum
Graubünden	Rejected	30. November 2008	rejected by cantonal referendum
Thurgau	Rejected	30. November 2008	rejected by cantonal referendum
St. Gallen	Adopted	30. November 2008	adopted by cantonal referendum
Zürich	Adopted	30. November 2008	adopted by cantonal referendum
Genf	Adopted	18. Dezember 2008	adopted by cantonal parliament (<i>Grand Conseil</i>)
Nidwalden	Rejected	8. Februar 2009	rejected by cantonal referendum
Tessin	Adopted	17. Februar 2009	adopted by cantonal parliament
Bern	Adopted	27. September 2009	adopted by cantonal referendum
Uri	Rejected	27. September 2009	rejected by cantonal referendum
Zug	Rejected	27. September 2009	rejected by cantonal referendum
Freiburg	Adopted	7. März 2010	adopted by cantonal referendum

Source: Schweizerische Konferenz der Kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren (<http://www.edk.ch>).