

Sokira T.S.

Ph.D., Associate Professor, Russian Academy
of Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation,
Moscow, Russia, e-mail: t_sokira@mail.ru

EDUCATION AS A FACTOR IN THE FORMATION OF HUMAN CAPITAL AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

At the present stage, education as a factor in the formation of human capital has become an element of the strategy of economic growth, has become part of the practice of state regulation of all developed countries of the world. Being an active participant of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, being on the road to modernization to economic growth, integrates into the international competitive system, is an active participant in the implementation of international programs for sustainable development, and pays much attention to the development of education. In this connection, the topic proposed for consideration in this article is very relevant and meets the task facing Kazakhstan – to make education the centerpiece of a new model of economic growth.

The aim of the study is to actualize the world experience of education as a factor in the formation of the Cheka in the context of its national development. The scientific and practical significance of the work consists in concretizing ways to improve the quality of education in the process of the Third Modernization of Kazakhstan's economy. The methodological basis of the study was the work of political economics classics and modern researchers of education in the context of human capital development. The value of the work is that opportunities have been expanded and directions for improving education have been indicated in the formulation of the state policy of Kazakhstan. This research can be useful for industry and state theorists and practitioners, in planning, analyzing and evaluating the state of education and improving human capital.

Key words: education, human capital, modernization of the economy, state policy, economic growth, sustainable development.

Сокира Т.С.

э.ғ.к., доцент, Ресей Федерациясы Президенті жанындағы
Ресей мемлекеттік басқару академиясы,
Мәскеу қ., Ресей, e-mail: t_sokira@mail.ru

Білім адами капиталды және экономикалық өсуді қалыптастыру факторы ретінде

Білім берудің қазіргі сатысында адам капиталын қалыптастыру факторы экономикалық өсу стратегиясының элементі ретінде әлемнің барлық дамыған елдерінің мемлекеттік реттеу тәжірибесіне енгізіледі. Қазақстан төртінші индустриалдық революциясының белсенді қатысушысы ретінде экономикалық өсуді жаңғырту жолында халықаралық бәсекеге қабілеттілік жүйесіне біріктірілген, тұрақты дамудың халықаралық бағдарламасын жүзеге асырудың белсенді қатысушысы болып табылады, білім беруді дамытуға үлкен көңіл бөледі. Осы мақалада ұсынылған тақырып өте өзекті және Қазақстан алдында тұрған міндетке сай – білім беруді экономикалық өсудің жаңа моделінің орталық элементі етіп орнықтыру.

Зерттеу мақсаты – қарастырылып отырған білім берудің әлемдік тәжірибесін – Адам капиталын ұлттық даму контекстінде қалыптастыру факторы ретінде жүзеге асыру. Жұмыстың ғылыми- тәжірибелік маңыздылығы Қазақстан экономикасының үшінші жаңғырту үдерісінде білім берудің сапасын арттыру жолдарын тұрақтандыруда жатыр.

Зерттеудің әдіснамалық негізі ретінде адами капиталды дамыту контекстіндегі саяси экономика классиктері және білім берудің заманауи зерттеушілері қызмет етті. Жұмыстың мәні

– Қазақстанның мемлекеттік саясатын қалыптастыруда білім берудің мүмкіндіктерінің кеңейтілуі және жүзеге асыру бағыттарының көрсетілуі. Бұл зерттеу адам капиталын жүзеге асыру және білім беру жағдайын бағалау мен талдауға, салалық және мемлекеттік теоретиктер мен практикаға және жоспарлауға пайдалы болуы мүмкін.

Түйін сөздер: білім, адами капитал, экономиканы жаңғырту, мемлекеттік саясат, экономикалық өсу, тұрақты даму.

Сокира Т.С.

к.э.н, доцент, Российская академия государственной службы
при Президенте Российской Федерации, г. Москва, Россия,
e-mail: t_sokira@mail.ru

Образование как фактор формирования человеческого капитала и экономического роста

На современном этапе образование как фактор формирования человеческого капитала стало элементом стратегии экономического роста, вошло в практику государственного регулирования всех развитых стран мира. Казахстан как активный участник Четвертой промышленной революции, находясь на пути модернизации к экономическому росту, интегрируется в международную конкурентную систему, является активным участником реализации международных программ устойчивого развития, огромное внимание уделяет развитию образования. В связи с чем тема, предложенная для рассмотрения в данной статье, весьма актуальна и отвечает задаче, стоящей перед Казахстаном – сделать образование центральным звеном новой модели экономического роста.

Цель исследования заключается в актуализации рассмотренного мирового опыта образования как фактора формирования ЧК в контексте его национального развития. Научная и практическая значимость работы состоит в конкретизации путей улучшения качества образования в процессе Третьей модернизации экономики Казахстана. Методологической базой исследования послужили труды политэкономических классиков и современных исследователей образования в контексте развития человеческого капитала. Ценность работы заключается в том, что расширены возможности и указаны направления совершенствования образования при формировании государственной политики Казахстана. Данное исследование может быть полезным отраслевым и государственным теоретикам и практикам, в планировании, анализе и оценке состояния образования и совершенствования человеческого капитала.

Ключевые слова: образование, человеческий капитал, модернизация экономики, государственная политика, экономический рост, устойчивое развитие.

Introduction

It is well known that education at the present stage of the development of society is the most important function of the society providing, as the reproduction and development of the society itself, as well as the systems of its activity. How important is its significance for the present and future of mankind is described in the World Education Monitoring Report (WDMO) for 2016, which presents an authoritative report confirming the extremely important contribution of education to all aspects of sustainable development. At the same time, the report clearly indicates how far humanity is from achieving the goals of sustainable development. For example, «... the current level of aid, about \$ 5 billion a year for primary education – which is only \$ 5 per year per inhabitant of a rich country – is a very small investment in sustainable development and peace in the future» [Jeffrey D. Sax, 2016: 6]. In this connection, WDMO defines the goals of

sustainable development 4 (LRC4) in the field of education until 2030 – providing comprehensive and fair quality education and encouraging the possibility of lifelong learning for all.

Modern Kazakhstan, for which the problem of the need for the further formation of sustainable development of Kazakhstan society in the conditions of global competition remains relevant, can not remain indifferent and is in the trend of solving modern problems, including in education. The proclaimed third modernization of the economy and society is not accidental, one of the development priorities on the way to the knowledge economy is human capital (Cheka), in the improvement of which the main role is given to education. Thanks to education, a significant increase in the Cheka and human potential is ensured, and their decisive role in the social and economic development of society.

The future of Kazakhstan depends on accelerated technological modernization of the economy, cardinal improvement and expansion of the business

environment, macroeconomic stability, as noted in the President's Address of 2017 [Nazarbayev NA, 2017: P.3], but it is not achievable without educated, highly intelligent staff. It is not by chance that they say that humanity has one way to progress – knowledge, and the only way to overcome all obstacles on this path is intellect. Knowledge and intelligence are the products of education that Kazakhstan's economy needs.

Above stated circumstances determine the relevance of the topic and are determined by the general interest and the need to study this category, despite the fact that it has a rich tradition of study. In its development, it went through several stages of development, but it requires clarification and adaptation to the modern realities of the development of the economy of Kazakhstan.

As an object of research, we have determined the historically established world experience and achievements in the field of education. The subject of the study is approaches, technologies, forms and methods in education.

The aim of the study is to actualize the world experience of education as a factor in the formation of the Cheka in the context of its national development.

Research hypothesis: education has a rich tradition of study, but the requirements of modern development of the economy of Kazakhstan require clarification and concretization of historically established approaches to education as a factor in the formation of the Cheka and economic development.

Methods of research

In the solution of the private task, aimed at achieving the goal, updating the international experience of education in relation to the modern stage of modernization of the economy of Kazakhstan, the historically developed technologies, forms and methods in education are analyzed. In the process of solving this problem, a retrospective analysis of the different views of scientists on education and its technologies and forms was carried out.

The methodological basis for the study was both general scientific and special methods of scientific knowledge. Priority was given to the use of content analysis.

Results of discussion

In Western economic science, the development of the factor of education can be traced as part of the formation of the modern concept of the Cheka. Indeed, the Cheka is a synthetic and rather

complex development factor, the quality of which is determined mainly by the level of education in the economic system. It is not accidental that the development of the concept of the Cheka in economic science is a process of accumulating knowledge, or rather it is the process of the evolution of the accumulation of ideas and views on human education and the determination of the significance and role of accumulated knowledge in the economy.

Being the basic factor of human capital, education for several centuries has gone its own way of development and has left its mark on science at every stage. At each stage of its advancement, an approach was developed reflecting the system of views on human capital and the place in it of education, characteristic for the existence at that time of various economic schools.

Our contemporaries, scientists make attempts to synthesize these three-century views, singled out of them the conceptual foundations that are successfully applied in modern practice of development of education. With the help of retrospective analysis, we identified, in our opinion, the most significant of them.

In the pre-industrial period, which lasted until the beginning of the XIX century, a man and his knowledge underestimated and perceived economic community as a specific production asset [Petty 1899 (1691)], however, they did not deny its monetary value. Knowledge and human capacity is not regarded as an asset, as well as personal qualities of the individual, therefore, not by chance the person prosecuted for the pursuit of knowledge, which was equated with dissent and often considered dangerous to society. Therefore, the population, in its main mass, remained illiterate. The State and the Church have created a monopoly on knowledge and supervised university education, which is limited to a narrow range of the accumulation of knowledge of the population, the so-called clergy, within the walls of universities in Europe as Bologna, Oxford, and others. Higher education was primarily in theological. As for the working class, its qualifications were supported by the transfer of professional skills and competences throughout life from father to son [Castel 1995]. Within the existing workshop system of production, on-the-job training was part of the work process.

The situation gradually began to change in the XIX century. It was in the XIX century and the first half of the twentieth century that the prerequisites for the birth of the Cheka concept were formed, mainly due to the development of education. It is no accident that the researchers defined this stage as a stage in the

beginning of mass training. In the nineteenth century, in the United States and in the first half of the 20th century, a movement for mass education developed in Russia, as well as in Kazakhstan [Baidusenova MB, 2016]. However, investments in education did not immediately become part of the investment strategy. In general, practically throughout the post-Soviet space, by the 1920s and 1930s, literacy and education began to be recognized as an important factor in the country's economic development. One could observe an increase in interest in the economic evaluation of the effectiveness of investments in people. Economists differentiated the capital and current costs of the employee. However, there was no proper development of the Cheka theory. The reasons for this situation lie in the planned economy and in the fact that education was free, there were no labor markets and the Cheka [Didenko 2015].

In Western Europe and the United States, the situation developed in a different way. The development of industry and technology, the emergence and use of on-line production, the transition to innovative entrepreneurship, required employers to use new combinations of factors of production, including knowledge, as well as social and innovation activity [Schumpeter 2008 (1934)]. Thus, from the end of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century, the formation of vocational training institutions has begun, which are gradually becoming objects of state regulation, providing for the needs of the economy in skilled workers.

By the mid-1950s, among the economists among the economists, the opinion was firmly established that education of the population of the country is a special resource, without which further development of the economy is impossible. At the same time, for example, the post-war economic growth of the United States was provided not so much by the mass education and use of the results of this education, as by the monopoly participation of the state and the favorable external political and economic situation. This growth soon came to an end, revealing the vulnerability of the extensive way of development of the country's economy, as well as the growth model based on the state's monopoly.

In the fifties there was a differentiation of the productive forces according to the educational and qualification level. The emergence of new social groups engaged in non-physical work, in the administrations of state and corporate structures. Pursuing their interests, it was these groups that became the spokesmen for the transition to a new development model that would reflect their needs

and interests. The solution of this task is at the late industrial stage.

In the 1960s and 1970s, an essential notion of the core of the Cheka theory of education was created, and the Convention Against Discrimination in Education (1960) was adopted. In these years, in the conditions of growing international competition and high energy prices, the US and other industrial countries faced the task of finding new internal factors for sustainable growth of social and economic development. The traditional investment of capital in natural wealth, physical means of production, technology, finance in themselves were no longer able to guarantee sustainable economic and social growth in the long term. As a result, the conceptual value of the worker and the various aspects of his knowledge and skills were finally put into conceptual tangible forms. A huge role in this was played by the theory of methodological individualism of the economists of the Chicago School [Blaug 1992: 209].

According to the Nobel laureate G. Becker [Becker 1962], T. Schultz [Schultz 1960] and J. Mincer [Mincer 1958; 1962] individuals accumulate knowledge in the field of education and enlightenment. They also proposed a research program that scientifically justifies investing in people [Schultz 1961] in the form of spending on: (1) medicine, health and nutrition; (2) in-service training at the employer's expense; (3) education at different levels of study; (4) additional educational programs not funded by the employer. Thus, three of the four points of the Chicago school program were associated with education. The narrowing of the theory of the Cheka before education was dictated by the current socio-economic situation in the developed countries, and especially in the United States.

The developed paradigm of the Cheka by the economists of the Chicago School still remains one of the most productive in modern economic science and public administration. It is worth mentioning that later Schultz [Schultz 1981] and other researchers [Behrman, Deolalikar 1988] showed that investments in health, medicine and livelihoods are crucial for developing countries and less important for developed countries. Therefore, for these latter, investment in education was of paramount importance for this period (in the 1960s-1970s). Indeed, the theory of human capital, although it understands investing in a person widely enough [Becker 1993], was initially oriented at all to investment in education.

In 1962 Fritz Mahlup introduced the concept of «knowledge economy». Approximately at this time,

the economy of the developed countries of the world started on the transition from the industrial stage of development, where industry determined economic growth and made the main contribution to the creation of GDP (30-40%), into a new stage called post-industrial development [Aganbegyan 2017]. Today it is generally recognized that the «knowledge economy» is the highest stage of development of the post-industrial economy, a real driver of social and economic development, the transition to which is a strategic task in the economic development of states. From this time it has been observed that the Cheka is gradually replacing not only natural resources, but also fixed capital, which means that the contribution of investments in education is growing.

At the considered historical stage, the question of measuring the CHC and the effectiveness of investments invested in the Cheka by a particular individual was also raised. So, relying on the general judgment that time is required for any process [Becker 1965], G. Becker, following his colleagues [Mincer 1958], suggested measuring the CR by the number of years spent on training. In a work that became classical [Mincer 1974], the boundaries of the empirical measurement of the Cheka were broadened (see: [Becker, Chiswick 1966]). As a result, its indicators include, in addition to the number of years of training, also the potential experience in the labor market, in the form of the number of years of work that have elapsed since graduation, as «a rough but very useful measure of work experience and an indicator of continuing education in the workplace» [Becker 1993: 393]. The Mintzler proposed to model the income logarithm as a sum of the linear function of the number of years of training and the quadratic function of the number of years of potential work experience, which corresponds to the traditional specification of the equation:

$$\log Y = \log Y_0 + r S + b_1 T + b_2 T^2,$$

where Y is labor income (Y₀ is the level of a person's earnings without education and experience); S – number of years of study and T – duration of potential work experience.

It was also found that in less educated workers, income growth is less pronounced than among the more educated, but with age, this effect is gradually reducing and dying out. Therefore, researchers later found different rates of return on education for different age cohorts. Over time, the Mincer equation became the most popular empirical equation in microeconomics [Becker 1993], and the basis for empirical research on labor income indicators

[Lemieux 2006]. Realizing the social significance of the Cheka, modern research also studies the social returns from investment in education, which is no longer measured by income difference, but through differences in productivity levels.

1980-2000-ies. fall at the first post-industrial period. These years are characterized by: (1) the expansion of secondary specialized and higher education [Castells 2010]; (2) a change in the role of educational diplomas and degrees, as well as certificates of qualification improvement as new forms of ownership [Wright 1997], which became the basis for assessing the quality of Cheka, expertise and certification of knowledge, the standard of their measurement and reduction to a unified standard.

In the seventies of the twentieth century, with the expansion of secondary specialized and higher education, scientific works began to appear that deal with the problem of excessive education of the population [Berg 1970; Freeman 1976; Collins 1979], trying to prove that not all the returns are received by the Cheka [Verhaest, Omey 2006]. However, international statistics and the United States have shown that since the early 1990s, the average return on average and higher education, continued to grow despite the overall increase in the educational level of the working population [Becker, Hubbard, Murphy 2010].

In the 1990's. began to study non-economic factors of economic growth, based on the measurement of which are new indicators of the HC of the socio-demographic and cultural context in determining economic growth [Lee, Lee 1995; Mulligan, Sala-i-Martin 1997]. Based on the experience of psychologists, it was found, for example, that school performance indicators contribute more to GDP growth than traditional Cheka indicators, not to mention the role of performance in the growth of personal incomes and productivity of a wide range of professions [Lee, Lee 1995]. It was concluded that it is not the number of years of study that is important, but how the school program is filled, what are the methods of teaching and predisposition of the students themselves, their basic skills. A special place and role was assigned to the formation of competences. Basic hard skills, including skills of abstract thinking, working with texts, mathematical accounts and computer work, as well as flexible skills such as teamwork skills, communications, decision making [Handel 2013] and t.p.

The second post-industrial stage (2000-2010) gave us new modern interpretations of the Cheka and expanded the role of education in its content.

So, since the early 2000's. the studies that showed the special role of preschool education, family and other institutions of preschool development of children were actualized.

As the labor market became saturated with graduates of colleges and universities, research became increasingly critical to assess the formal approach to the task of forming competitive skills and competencies that will be in demand in the form of the Cheka by the economy of the future. These studies are associated with the name of Nobel laureate J. Heckmann, who noted the importance of the formation of non-cognitive skills in the general part of the Cheka as a factor affecting the human position in the labor market, as well as on his earnings [Heckman 2000; Heckman, Rubinstein 2001]. Analysis of J. Heckman and his colleagues showed that investments in the child's non-cognitive skills in the early stages of his development are very important. At later stages, they can compensate for the lack of investment in the cognitive aspects of Cheka in the child at earlier stages. But, it is necessary to understand that this will require much higher costs [Cunha, Heckman, Schennach 2010].

Relying on the data of American statistics, J. Heckman drew attention to the underestimation of the role of non-institutional channels for the formation of the Cheka, such as the family and business organizations. He also found that American society invests too much in school and post-secondary education programs and does not invest enough in pre-school programs of a less prosperous part of the country's population. And, most importantly, he concluded that the formation of the Cheka is a complex and dynamic process and investments in it at the earliest stage have a colossal synergistic effect, which manifests itself in the late stages of its formation, i.e. practically throughout life. Also, a group of J. Hackman proved that the formation of a critical set of competencies occurs before ten years of age [Heckman, Carneiro 2003].

Attention at this stage deserves the development of distance or remote education, which has become an important aspect of competition in the education system. Exceptional significance of this form of education was noted already by G. Becker, since it allows saving both the employers and listeners their main resource – time [Becker 2002].

A new trend at the present stage in the last decade is the study of education by the researchers as the essential content of the Cheka in the context of national development. All over the world and in Kazakhstan, today it has become realized that in

order to reach a new stage of development, that is, to ensure that the Cheka of the nation «has earned» with maximum efficiency, a broader vision of the objectives of the education system is needed, a reduction in the inequality of life chances in this sphere for children from different strata of the population, as well as the development of inclusive education.

The exceptional importance of education in the context of the Cheka for the development of modern economies, as well as its new understanding, are reflected in many policy measures. So, since the 1960s. in many countries that are members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and in the last 30 years – and in developing countries, the state has begun to play an active role in providing a wide range of educational services from basic education to advanced training courses.

The maintenance and development of a quality Cheka has become a key task, the implementation of which has been reflected in the policy documents and political guidelines of international organizations. For example, the Third UNESCO International Conference on Continuing Adult Education (Tokyo, 1972). Or the Incheon Declaration on Education for the period up to 2030 (Incheon, South Korea, 2015), which played an important role in the formulation of the LRC in education – «to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and to create opportunities for lifelong learning for all». According to it, UNESCO is entrusted with the management, coordination and monitoring of the education agenda for the period up to 2030.

And, finally, the achievements of some national governments, for example, the large-scale program «Smart Nation», launched in 2014 by Singapore's Prime Minister Li Xianglong.

The Cheka played one of the leading roles in China's 38 percent economic growth (1978-2008), which was to a large extent determined by the expansion of secondary specialized education.

Another important area of research has been international comparisons, the material for which were education indicators and other components of the Cheka, included in the database of international comparative statistics and composite indices [Stiglitz, Sen, Fitoussi 2010].

So, for example, the level and dynamics of the development of the «knowledge economy» in various countries, incl. and in Kazakhstan determine the international ratings that have been held since 1994. Since that time, Kazakhstan has risen by 5 points from 79th to 73rd place (Table 1).

Table 1 – Dynamics of Kazakhstan in the Knowledge Economy Index (1995-2012)

Year	Indexline	KEI	KI	Economic and Institutional Regime	Innovations	Education	ICTs
2012	73	5,04	5,4	3,96	3,97	6,91	5,32
2000	78	4,58	5,1	3,03	3,92	7,2	4,17
1995	79	4,93	5,93	1,95	4,03	7,26	6,48

If we analyze the dynamics for each indicator of the index in Table 1, then we can conclude that over time the country's potential for building a «knowledge economy» was mainly weakened by a decline in indicators in the spheres of education and innovation. At the same time, in terms of indicators of the economic and institutional regime, as well as ICT, Kazakhstan is clearly improving, which positively affects the overall level of the «knowledge economy» index.

The Education Index in the countries of the world according to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) is calculated as the adult literacy index and the index of the cumulative share of students receiving education. The rating of Kazakhstan among the countries of the world according to the education level index in 2016 is determined by 39 places (from 188 countries) and is given in table 2. It is generally accepted that developed countries should have a minimum score of 0.8.

Table 2 – World Ranking for the Education Level Index 2016g

Rating	A country	Index
1	Australia	0,939
8	USA	0,900
26	Belarus	0,834
34	Russia	0,816
39	Kazakhstan	0,805

Other rating indicators are of interest, among which there are no data on Kazakhstan due to non-participation in the studies. This is the Global Index of Cognitive Skills and Educational Attainment, which measures the achievements of the world in education according to the British company Pearson (Table 3).

Table 3 – The rating of the effectiveness of national education systems 2017g

Rating	A country	Index
1	USA	100
2	Switzerland	87,2
34	Russia	49,1
50	Indonesia	33,3
Note:	In 2017, the study covers 50 countries.	

And finally, the rating of the national higher education systems (U21 Ranking of National Higher Education Systems), measuring the achievements of the countries of the world in the field of higher education according to the Universitas 21 international university network (Table 4).

Table 4 – Ranking of national systems of higher education 2017g

Rating	A country	Index
1	USA	100
2	Switzerland	86,9
33	Russia	49,9
50	Indonesia	33,3
Note:	In 2017, the study covers 50 countries.	

Meanwhile, today there are other proposals for improving the rating system of education. For example, the Incheon Declaration calls on the group on the World Education Monitoring Report to ensure independent monitoring and reporting on the goal of sustainable development in education (LRC 4) and on education in the remaining LRCs for the next fifteen years. The main objective of

this agenda is to provide an all-encompassing education. This approach requires reliable data and large-scale monitoring. The publication of the World Monitoring Report on Education of 2016 for government agencies and policy makers provides valuable information to improve the quality of monitoring and speed up the implementation of LRC 4. Equality and inclusiveness should be the criteria for the final success.

However, the inequality in the formation and growth of the Cheka still plays a significant role even in developed countries. Studies have shown that families with higher incomes are more actively investing in the Cheka (for example, in self-education [Becker 1960]). And the return from school education is much higher among students from a more prosperous socio-economic environment [Neuman 1991]. From recent studies based on the material of developing countries, the presence of developed human capital in the country increases the positive effects of financial reforms [Li, Yu 2014].

Conclusion

The growing importance of the Cheka today is associated with the strengthening of the role of education in the development of modern economies. And indeed, the economy in which workers have a high level of education and qualifications consistent with the technologies used in it, has clear advantages over the economy, using more backward technologies serviced by low-skilled workers.

Investments invested in education have a long-term payback, they are not limited to meeting the current needs of people and have a profound impact on the economic, social, cultural and moral image of the country during future periods of time. However, in our dynamically developing world, we cannot fail to note the existing tendency to reduce the time lag of education. That is, the gap in the number of years needed to change technology and train personnel for them is reduced. Previously, radical technical changes in social production occurred in about 35-40 years and for training it was quite an average of 6-8 years. But, in modern conditions, the average period of renewal of technology and technology has

decreased to 4-5 years, and in the most developed sectors – up to 2-3 years, the terms of training of qualified workers have increased to 12-14 years or more [Shchetinin V.P. 2001]. These circumstances need to be considered when determining state strategic programs in the field of education development, raising the level of skills and forming long-term prospects for using the Cheka.

At the present stage, education becomes an element of the strategy of economic growth, and its promotion and forecasting has become part of the practice of state regulation of all developed countries of the world. One of the most important stimuli for the development of education was his treatment as a producer of the Cheka and a factor of socio-economic growth. Therefore, in all developed countries, since the 1960s, the role and importance of education in training has increased in the system of national priorities. This goal was achieved because of a jump in the share of education spending in relation to the national income of these countries.

The development of education and training in Kazakhstan over the past 25 years has contributed to the solution of such important tasks of social and economic development as the acceleration of economic growth, the alleviation of inequality in the distribution of personal incomes, the improvement of the quality of the national labor force, and therefore the competitiveness of the economy.

The globalization of the economy of the 21st century requires thousands of well-educated workers who can adapt quickly to changes in production and information processes. The population's coverage of higher and professional education is an important indicator for determining the level and prospects for business development. In assessing the effectiveness of vocational education, the functioning of a continuous system in the receiving and upgrading of skills directly in the workplace is also considered in the country. Education is not able to fully reveal its potential for the development of the country and the world if it does not significantly improve the level of participation, do not make education an ongoing process and not fully implement the principles of sustainable development in the state education systems, and thus achieve sustainable economic growth in the country.

Литература

- 1 Аганбегян А.Г. 2017. Человеческий капитал и его главная составляющая – сфера «экономики знаний» как основной источник социально-экономического роста. *Экономические стратегии*. 3:66-79.
- 2 Байдюсенова М.Б. 2016. История развития образования и образования Казахстанского ханства до наших дней. 2 // G-Global: [Электронный ресурс] <http://group-global.org/ru/publication/29493-istoriya-razvitiya-obrazovaniya-i-prosveshcheniya-ot-kazahskogo-hanstva-do-nashih>
- 3 Джеффри Д. Сакс. 2016. Введение к Всемирному докладу по мониторингу образования.– ОО по вопросам образования, науки и культуры 7, Placede Fontenoу, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France. 1: 6 -7.
- 4 Диденко Д. В. 2015. Интеллектуалоемкая экономика: человеческий капитал в российском и мировом социально-экономическом развитии. СПб.: Алетейя.
- 5 Назарбаев Н.А. 2017. Третья модернизация Казахстана: глобальная конкурентоспособность. Послание народу Казахстана Президента Республики Казахстан. – *Казахстанская правда*. 20: 1 – 3.
- 6 Щетинин В., 2001 Человеческий капитал и неоднозначность его трактовки. *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*. 12: 42-49.
- 7 Becker G. S. 1960. An Economic Analysis of Fertility In: Roberts G. (ed.) *Demographic and Economic Change in Developed Countries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 209–240.
- 8 Becker G. S. 1962. Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 70 (5): 9–49.
- 9 Becker G. S. 1965. A Theory of the Allocation of Time. *The Economic Journal*. 75 (299): 493–517.
- 10 Becker G. S. 1993. Nobel Lecture: The Economic Way of Looking at Behavior. *Journal of Political Economy*. 101 (3): 385-409.
- 11 Becker G. S. 2002. The Age of Human Capital. URL: http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/0817928928_3.pdf
- 12 Becker G. S., Chiswick B. R. 1966. Education and the Distribution of Earnings. *The American Economic Review*. 56 (1/2): 358–369.
- 13 Becker G. S., Hubbard W. H., Murphy K. M. 2010. Explaining the Worldwide Boom in Higher Education of Women. *Journal of Human Capital*. 4 (3): 203–241.
- 14 Behrman J. R., Deolalikar A. B. 1988. Health and Nutrition. In: Chenery H., Srinivasan T. N. (eds). *Handbook of Development Economics*. Vol. 1. Ch. 14. Oxford: Elsevier; 631–711.
- 15 Berg I. 1970. *Education for Jobs: The Great Training Robbery*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- 16 Blaug M. 1992. *The Methodology of Economics: Or, How Economists Explain*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 17 Blau P. M., Duncan O. D. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley.
- 18 Collins R. 1979. *The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.
- 19 Cunha F., Heckman J. J., Schennach S. M. 2010. Estimating the Technology of Cognitive and Noncognitive Skill Formation. *Econometrica*. 78 (3): 883–931.
- 20 Freeman R. 1976. *The Overeducated American*. New York: Academic Press.
- 21 Castel R. 1995. *Les Métamorphoses De La Question Sociale: Une Chronique Du Salarial*. Paris: Fayard.
- 22 Castells M. 2010. *The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed. Singapore: Wiley; Blackwell.
- 23 Handel M. J. 2013. Putting Tasks to the Test: Human Capital, Job Tasks, and Wages. *Journal of Labor Economics*. 31 (2. Part 2): S59–S96.
- 24 Heckman J. J. 2000. Policies to Foster Human Capital. *Research in Economics*. 54 (1): 3–56.
- 25 Heckman J. J., Carneiro P. 2003. Human Capital Policy. In: Heckman J. J., Krueger A. B. (eds) *Inequality in America: What Role for Human Capital Policies?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 77–239.
- 26 Heckman J. J., Rubinstein Y. 2001. The Importance of Noncognitive Skills: Lessons from the Ged Testing Program. *The American Economic Review*. 91 (2): 145–149.
- 27 Lee D. W., Lee T. H. 1995. Human Capital and Economic Growth Tests Based on the International Evaluation of Educational Achievement. *Economics Letters*. 47 (2): 219–225.
- 28 Lemieux T. 2006. The «Mincer Equation» Thirty Years after Schooling, Experience, and Earnings. In: Grossbard S. (ed.) *Jacob Mincer a Pioneer of Modern Labor Economics*. New York: Springer; 127–145.
- 29 Li J., Yu H. 2014. Income Inequality and Financial Reform in Asia: The Role of Human Capital. *Applied Economics*. 46 (24): 2920–2935.
- 30 Mincer J. 1958. Investment in Human Capital and Personal Income Distribution. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 66 (4): 281–302.
- 31 Mincer J. 1962. On-the-Job Training: Costs, Returns, and Some Implications. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 70 (5): 50–79.
- 32 Mincer J. 1974. *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research; Columbia University Press.
- 33 Mulligan C. B., Sala-i-Martin X. 1997. A Labor Income-Based Measure of the Value of Human Capital: An Application to the States of the United States. *Japan and the World Economy*. 9 (2): 159–191.

- 34 Neuman S. 1991. Parental Background, Educational Attainments and Returns to Schooling and to Marriage: The Case of Israel. *Applied Economics*. 23 (8): 1325–1334.
- 35 Petty S. W. 1899 (1691). *Verbum Sapienti*. Reprinted in the *Economic Writings of Sir William Petty*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 36 Schultz T. W. 1960. Capital Formation by Education. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 68 (6): 571–583.
- 37 Schultz T. W. 1961. Investment in Human Capital. *The American Economic Review*. 51 (1): 1–17.
- 38 Schultz T. W. 1981. *Investing in People: The Economics of Population Quality*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- 38 Schumpeter J. A. 2008 (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest and the Business Cycle*. Trans. R. Opie. New Brunswick; London: Transaction Publishers.
- 40 Stiglitz J. E., Sen A., Fitoussi J.-P. 2010. *Mismeasuring Our Lives: Why Gdp Doesn't Add Up*. New York: The New Press.
- 41 Wright E. O. 1997. *Class Counts: Comparative Studies in Class Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

References

- 1 Aganbegyan A.G. 2017. Chelovecheskiy capital i ego glavnyy sostavlyayushy – sfera «ekonomiki znaniy» kak osnovnoy istochnik social'no-ekonomicheskogo rosta. [Human capital and its main component is the sphere of the «knowledge economy» as the main source of socio-economic growth.]. *Ekonomicheskie strategii*, vol. 3, pp.66-96 (in Russian).
- 2 Baydusenova M.B. 2016. Istoriya razvitiya obrazovaniya i obrazovaniya Kazachstanskogo hanstva do nashih dney.2//G-Global: [Electronnyy resurs] <http://group-global.org/ru/publication/29493-istoriya-razvitiya-obrazovaniya-i-prosveshcheniya-ot-kazahskogo-hanstva-do-nashih>
- 3 Dzheffri D. Saks. 2016. Vvedenie k Vsemirnomu dokladu po monitoringu jbrazovaniia. – OON po voprosam obrazovaniya, nauki i kul'tury 7, Place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France. 1: 6 -7.
- 4 Didenco D.V. 2015. *Intellectualoemkaya ekonomika: chelovecheskiy capital v possiyskom i mirovom sozialino-ekonomichescom razvitii*. SPB.: Alteia.
- 5 Nazarbaev N.A. 2017. Tret'ya modernizatsiya Kazachstana: globalnaya konkurentosposobnosty. *Poslanienarodu Kazachstana Prezidenta Respubliki Kazachstan*. – *Kazachstanskaya Pravda*. 20: 1 – 3.
- 6 Schetin V. 2001. Chelovecheskiy capital i neodnoznachnosty ego tractovki. *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya*. 12: 42-49.
- 7 Becker G. S. 1960. An Economic Analysis of Fertility In: Roberts G. (ed.) *Demographic and Economic Change in Developed Countries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 209–240.
- 8 Becker G. S. 1962. Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 70 (5): 9–49.
- 9 Becker G. S. 1965. A Theory of the Allocation of Time. *The Economic Journal*. 75 (299): 493–517.
- 10 Becker G. S. 1993. Nobel Lecture: The Economic Way of Looking at Behavior. *Journal of Political Economy*. 101 (3): 385-409.
- 11 Becker G. S. 2002. The Age of Human Capital. URL: http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/0817928928_3.pdf
- 12 Becker G. S., Chiswick B. R. 1966. Education and the Distribution of Earnings. *The American Economic Review*. 56 (1/2): 358–369.
- 13 Becker G. S., Hubbard W. H., Murphy K. M. 2010. Explaining the Worldwide Boom in Higher Education of Women. *Journal of Human Capital*. 4 (3): 203–241.
- 14 Behrman J. R., Deolalikar A. B. 1988. Health and Nutrition. In: Chenery H., Srinivasan T. N. (eds). *Handbook of Development Economics*. Vol. 1. Ch. 14. Oxford: Elsevier; 631–711.
- 15 Berg I. 1970. *Education for Jobs: The Great Training Robbery*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- 16 Blaug M. 1992. *The Methodology of Economics: Or, How Economists Explain*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 17 Blau P. M., Duncan O. D. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley.
- 18 Collins R. 1979. *The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.
- 19 Cunha F., Heckman J. J., Schennach S. M. 2010. Estimating the Technology of Cognitive and Noncognitive Skill Formation. *Econometrica*. 78 (3): 883–931.
- 20 Freeman R. 1976. *The Overeducated American*. New York: Academic Press.
- 21 Castel R. 1995. *Les Métamorphoses De La Question Sociale: Une Chronique Du Salarat*. Paris: Fayard.
- 22 Castells M. 2010. *The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed. Singapore: Wiley; Blackwell.
- 23 Handel M. J. 2013. Putting Tasks to the Test: Human Capital, Job Tasks, and Wages. *Journal of Labor Economics*. 31 (2. Part 2): S59–S96.
- 24 Heckman J. J. 2000. Policies to Foster Human Capital. *Research in Economics*. 54 (1): 3–56.
- 25 Heckman J. J., Carneiro P. 2003. Human Capital Policy. In: Heckman J. J., Krueger A. B. (eds) *Inequality in America: What Role for Human Capital Policies?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 77–239.
- 26 Heckman J. J., Rubinstein Y. 2001. The Importance of Noncognitive Skills: Lessons from the Ged Testing Program. *The American Economic Review*. 91 (2): 145–149.

- 27 Lee D. W., Lee T. H. 1995. Human Capital and Economic Growth Tests Based on the International Evaluation of Educational Achievement. *Economics Letters*. 47 (2): 219–225.
- 28 Lemieux T. 2006. The «Mincer Equation» Thirty Years after Schooling, Experience, and Earnings. In: Grossbard S. (ed.) *Jacob Mincer a Pioneer of Modern Labor Economics*. New York: Springer; 127–145.
- 29 Li J., Yu H. 2014. Income Inequality and Financial Reform in Asia: The Role of Human Capital. *Applied Economics*. 46 (24): 2920–2935.
- 30 Mincer J. 1958. Investment in Human Capital and Personal Income Distribution. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 66 (4): 281–302.
- 31 Mincer J. 1962. On-the-Job Training: Costs, Returns, and Some Implications. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 70 (5): 50–79.
- 32 Mincer J. 1974. *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research; Columbia University Press.
- 33 Mulligan C. B., Sala-i-Martin X. 1997. A Labor Income-Based Measure of the Value of Human Capital: An Application to the States of the United States. *Japan and the World Economy*. 9 (2): 159–191.
- 34 Neuman S. 1991. Parental Background, Educational Attainments and Returns to Schooling and to Marriage: The Case of Israel. *Applied Economics*. 23 (8): 1325–1334.
- 35 Petty S. W. 1899 (1691). *Verbum Sapienti*. Reprinted in the *Economic Writings of Sir William Petty*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 36 Schultz T. W. 1960. Capital Formation by Education. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 68 (6): 571–583.
- 37 Schultz T. W. 1961. Investment in Human Capital. *The American Economic Review*. 51 (1): 1–17.
- 38 Schultz T. W. 1981. *Investing in People: The Economics of Population Quality*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- 39 Schumpeter J. A. 2008 (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest and the Business Cycle*. Trans. R. Opie. New Brunswick; London: Transaction Publishers.
- 40 Stiglitz J. E., Sen A., Fitoussi J.-P. 2010. *Mismeasuring Our Lives: Why Gdp Doesn't Add Up*. New York: The New Press.
- 41 Wright E. O. 1997. *Class Counts: Comparative Studies in Class Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.