

Chapter 2

A Brief History of International Education Policy: From Breton-Woods to the Paris Declaration

James H. Williams

Abstract This chapter overviews a history of international education policy, beginning with the establishment of the UN and Bretton Woods architectures up to recent efforts to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of donor funding with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action. Education is increasingly viewed as a human right and a core responsibility of governments and is understood as a core component of individual and national development, a requirement for economic growth, and a key factor enabling human capabilities. Participation in schooling has increased everywhere, though rates are lower in low-income countries, especially among girls and marginal populations. International organizations mobilized the global education community to target *Education for All* by 2015. Though not all countries will reach the goal, participation has increased dramatically. A distinguishing feature of the last half of the twentieth century up to the present has been the development relationship between industrialized nations and developing countries. Though targeted to economic and social development, development assistance including that in education, became embroiled both in the international relations of the times and in the fits and starts of understanding how development occurs and can best be fostered.

Depending on how one understands things, there may be no such thing as international education policy. It is true that Article 26 of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, discusses education:

1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

J.H. Williams (✉)

Educational Leadership and Policy, Graduate School of Education and Human Development,
The George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA

e-mail: jhw@gwu.edu

2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.
3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children (United Nations 1948).

And the *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, adopted in 1989, mentions education 20 times (United Nations 1989). However, if policy is understood as requiring an organization or entity where policy is to guide decisions, a policy-maker or policy-making entity, a policy decision, and perhaps a written policy document, the international arena qualifies only tangentially or perhaps episodically, as a place where education policy is made. If, however, the conception of policy can be expanded to include tacit or implicit policy, then a history of international education policy may be possible.

Formally, policy is formulated primarily by entities such as governments with a formally constituted decision-making authority. So with exceptions noted above and a few others, formal international education policies exist only to the extent that governments adopt them. This is not to suggest that governments act freely to enact or adopt (or reject) policies in the best interests of their people (or their elites). Many forces—most not duly constituted to operate as makers of policy—constrain government choices. But international education policy must be understood either as some aggregate of national policies—influenced as they are by global, international, transnational forces on the one hand and indigenous, local, and national forces on the other—or as tacit or implicit policy.¹

The diffuse nature of international education policy is complicated by the fact that while no one entity has responsibility for formulating policy internationally, a wide range of organizations play an influential role: national governments; development banks and funds; United Nations (UN) organizations; other multilateral development organizations; bilateral development organizations; research, training, and professional organizations, universities; for-profit firms with government contracts; nonprofit international nongovernmental organizations based in high-income countries; and nonprofit groups based in low-income regions (Chabbott 2003). To these we might add faith-based organizations, philanthropic organizations, and business. Of the work these organizations do, the ideas that are circulated and remain in circulation long enough to affect the decisions of other organizations might be considered policy.

¹ Indeed, neither formulation nor adoption is strictly necessary for tacit policy to be in effect and have effects.

2.1 Overarching (Implicit) Policy: The Universalization of, Right to, and Responsibility for Schooling²

If tacit policy is possible, then by far the overriding international education policy since World War II has been the “decision” made more or less consciously by most if not all nations in the world to universalize formal schooling. This “policy” can be seen: (1) in the adoption by most countries in the world of the *Education for All* and *Millennium Development Goals* of universal primary education by 2015, (2) by the schools-on-the-ground fact of increases in school enrollment in all regions of the world approaching universality at least at the basic level; and (3) by the acceptance of universal schooling as a global norm, a right of all citizens, a responsibility of national governments and of the international community.

To provide some historical perspective, Table 2.1 compares primary enrollment rates by region in 1935–1940 and 2010. It is clear that there has been tremendous growth in primary enrollment over the past 70 years, and that expansion of schooling, particularly in the industrialized “North” was well under way by the beginning of World War II. The post-war “policy” of universalization of

Table 2.1 Estimated primary enrollment rates 1935–1940 and 2010, by region

1935–1940 ^a		2010 ^a	
Sub-Saharan Africa	19.6 (25)	Sub-Saharan Africa	77.0
Middle East/North Africa	22.5 (13)	Arab States	88.0
Asia	30.6 (13)	Central Asia	94.0
		East Asia & Pacific	96.0
		South and West Asia	93.0
North America & Oceania	79.1 (6)	North America & Western Europe	97.0
Northern Europe	72.0 (12)		
Southern Europe	50.8 (6)	Central & Eastern Europe	95.0
Eastern Europe	48.2 (10)		
South America	40.7 (13)	Latin America & Caribbean	95.0
Central America	33.7 (9)		
Caribbean	59.0 (13)		
World	40.8 (120)	World	91.0

^aFigures for 1935–1940 are estimated primary gross enrollment rates (see Benavot and Riddle 1988). Figures for 2010 are primary adjusted net enrollment rates based on UNESCO statistics (see UNESCO 2012). Gross enrollment rates include children outside the primary school age range, of which there are many in developing education systems, and so are considerably higher than net enrollment rates, which are calculated on the basis of children of school age. As a result, the differences between initial and current figures are greater, in some cases substantially so

²Throughout the chapter, I attempt to use “schooling” to refer to formal graded education offered by the state, to distinguish schooling from other forms of education.

schooling was more of a playing out and affirmation of earlier trends and an extension of those trends to all regions of the world.

Though it is doubtful that all children in the world will be enrolled in school by 2015 as targeted, the expansion of schooling has been remarkable across political regimes and systems, levels of economic production and consumption, languages and cultural systems. The enrollment figures shown are net of quite high rates of population growth in a number of countries during this period. The rate of growth in absolute numbers of children enrolled in school is much higher.

2.2 Explaining the Universalization of Schooling

Empirical investigations of the expansion of schooling have found this expansion statistically unrelated to factors that might be expected to predict it, rates of economic expansion for example (Meyer et al. 1977). Though it is undeniably true that countries with greater national incomes have higher levels of educational participation, the causal relationships are murky and ambiguous, the direction of causality unclear (Hannum and Buchmann 2006). A number of countries with comparatively low levels of national income have also expanded schooling. Some research suggests that high levels of participation in basic education are not dependent on high national income (Caldwell 1986). This and other areas of policy convergence have been explained explicitly by at least two bodies of theory/research, another implicit one, and one that extends and complicates the other two.

First, implicitly, increases in educational participation as well as convergence on other policies can be understood as a result of the “natural” evolutionary process of “modernization” and “development” of human societies. Modernization, while discredited by many scholars in its stronger forms, is remarkably resilient in the discourses of use. Chabbot (2003) quotes James Grant, founder of UNICEF, (1979): “From 1945 to 1990, the development discourse did not so much evolve as accrete. Old ideas did not go away entirely as new ideas were added on top, creating a great amalgam of good and not so good ideas, none of them fully implemented” (p. 36).

Modernization theories have been critiqued by “world culture” theorists (see for example, Meyer and Ramirez 2000; Ramirez 2003) as well as critical theorists (see for example, Ball 2008; Rizvi and Lingard 2006). World culture theorists see universal schooling as part of a dominant “world culture” characterized by the “institutionalization of rationalized myths of Western modernity in the structure of nation-states and the world polity that houses them” (Takayama et al. 2013). These theorists see school as a national and global imperative:

The hope that education will foster peaceful, rational, compassionate human beings, who will, in turn create peaceful, rational, compassionate societies, is a tenacious one in the modern world. The power of education to incorporate self-actualized citizens into nation-states and into world society remains central to Western notions of development. The notion that some international development activity, such as a few schools, might change the course of a nation-state’s history is a cherished one... (Chabbot 2003, p. 162)

Modernization theorists tend to see the nation-state as the primary unit. Modernization, a universal direction, is accepted and not interrogated. The relevant questions relate to why (and how) some countries develop rapidly, while others do not.

By way of contrast, critical theorists see the universalization of schooling less as a world cultural phenomenon than as a manifestation of the increasing incorporation of nation-states into the global capitalist system, with schooling's ultimate purpose being service to the interests of capital (Rizvi and Lingard 2006; Tarabini 2010).

...the hegemonic global education agenda of our times is located in the interaction between finance-driven reforms, competitiveness driven reforms and equity-driven reforms. This agenda aims to solve the main problems of the capitalist system by ensuring the compatibility of two major objectives: economic growth and poverty reduction. The new global mandate for education policy since the 1990s has been based on the quest for growth, productivity and competitiveness but in a way that reduces poverty and guarantees social stability (Tarabini 2010, p. 6).

Other scholars see a more complex process of global forces interacting with local politics—national, sub-national and local processes that mediate global trends (Takayama 2007; Steiner-Khamsi 2000, 2004; Carney et al. 2012); the meanings local actors make of national and global imperatives (see, for example, Anderson-Levitt 2003; Vavrus and Bartlett 2012; Gardinier 2012; Worden 2011 as well as Mundy 1998 and others).

Other scholars see convergence as less interesting than the persistence of differences at national and local levels. Cummings (2003), for example, identified six broad historical-structural-cultural patterns that shape policy in different countries, largely within a multiple-routes-to-modernity perspective, but one that rejects convergence on a single model of education or national development.

Still, the notions of progress, improvement, earlier and more advanced stages, in fact the word development itself, even when critiqued, suggest an underlying paradigm of modernization, or something much like it.

2.3 International Education Policy, International Development, and the (Many New) Nation-States

Of course, the development of global international education policy in the post World War II period cannot be considered apart from changes in the political geography of the world and from the emergence and development of international development more broadly.

The independence of nation-states mostly in Africa and Asia resulting from the breakup of European colonial empires after World War II led to the birth of more than 100 new nation-states.³ In most colonies, colonial powers had established school systems, some more extensive than others, mostly to train a small cadre of

³ Much of Central and South America had attained political independence earlier.

local elites to manage the day-to-day operations of the colony. Often these systems were of lower quality than schools in the homeland. British colonizers, for example, tended to offer a two-tier system of a small number of elite academic schools with instruction in English and a larger number of local-medium language schools of less academic rigor to serve the larger population. These were supplemented in many cases by schools established by missionaries and faith-based organizations and by locally run community schools. Malawi, for example, is estimated to have had upwards of 5,000 “community schools” prior to Independence in 1964. Almost never was the colonial system intended to serve the entire population, and only a very small proportion of students expected or equipped for higher levels of education. Still, the colonial school systems firmly established the institution of schooling among certain segments of society at least along with the notion of schooling as a path to formal sector work, prosperity, and modernity. The administrative, curricular, linguistic, and selectivity functions colonial school systems established proved enormously influential in setting the direction of post-Independence policy at the national level (Cummings 2003).

At the same time, this imported formal school system lay on top of existing indigenous systems of socialization, training, and often religious instruction. In some cases, indigenous forms of education have largely been subsumed into formal schools. In other cases, traditional and “modern” operate within their own spheres.

At Bretton Woods, the (winning) nations, having just emerged from the most destructive war in human history, and wanting to put an end to war, established the Bretton Woods global architecture for international cooperation. At the time, most of what would come to be called the “developing world⁴” was soon to emerge from colonial rule. The path to improvement seemed to be that of modernization and economic development along the lines of the North and West, and education played a key role. The linkages between education and development were manifested in several assumptions:

1. That modernization would improve the well-being of poor people;
2. That schooling would help countries and individuals modernize or “grow up modern” (Fuller 1991);
3. That provision of schooling would (singly, necessarily) lead to national development;
4. That the central state was capable of providing sufficient schooling (to all);
5. That carefully-designed external assistance could help countries improve their school systems and foster national development in general;
6. That internationally organized and externally-funded education projects would, or at least could, lead to significant improvements in poor countries’ school systems; and
7. That the primary policy challenge of schooling was getting children into school.

⁴We use the terms “developing world” and “developing countries” along with “Third World” as a kind of lazy shorthand, aware of the superiority they assign to industrialized nations.

Each of these assumptions or beliefs was challenged over the interim period, though some remain hardy and alive in the current discourse. However, interestingly, even as the core assumptions linking education and development came under scrutiny in some, more academic circles, faith in schooling grew more generally.

With independence, most new governments moved quickly to create national school systems, signaling their modernity, their concern for the needs of the population, and their aspirations for national development. In Malawi's case, similar to that of many nations, the 5,000 existing community schools were nationalized under the administrative authority of the national education ministry, which developed ambitious plans for growing education systems to meet the demands of a newly-independent people and economy.

However, as a consequence of colonialism and underdevelopment, most new nation-states lacked the financial, human, and technical resources to develop educationally and economically as they hoped. Development assistance from industrialized to poor countries, modeled more or less on the U.S. Marshall Plan which aimed to rebuild Europe after the destruction of World War II, became established as a major element of international relations between the "First" and "Second Worlds" on the one hand and the "Third World" on the other, beginning in the late 1940s. Industrialized nations developed bilateral aid relationships with particular countries. International organizations and multilateral development agencies developed technical assistance and funding relationships across a range of countries. Because of the substantial and strategic financial and technical resources made available to low-income countries in education and most other aspects of government, global international education policy cannot be discussed without reference to development assistance. For even as there is no real authority structure to formulate global policy, nation-states, which receive substantial amounts of external funding, however sovereign they may be politically, are not quite independent in their policy-making.

Even so, schooling appeals to individuals who want progress, i.e., to improve themselves, as well as national leaders seeking to develop the nation economically and otherwise, improve the collective well-being, gain international recognition, or be known for these aspirations. Schooling is the institutional form and the residual of the aspirations of modern man, modern woman, and their states.

2.4 Coercion, Borrowing, Cultural Enactment

In discussing the rise of mass schooling, Ramirez (1997) usefully speaks of educational isomorphism as a consequence of coercion, mimetic processes, and cultural enactment.⁵ This seems an apt typology of the means by which international education

⁵In Ramirez's words, "...nation-states and nation-state candidates adopt increasingly similar educational activities because they subscribe to a cultural model within which such activities and organizations are keys to national and individual progress." (Ramirez 1997: 49)

policy has been created among the nations of the world. Increased economic linkages and communications have brought peoples into greater contact and inter-dependency in a world of uneven power relationships. Educational ideas from the West and the North carry greater policy weight than ideas from the South, because the model of schooling is Western, and because the West and North have greater coercive, projective, and cultural power.

But it is not necessarily the case that all policies are imposed by outsiders. Many are adopted, because they seem “the right thing to do”. Consider for example the case of gender. Virtually every government in the world has agreed to principles of gender equality in schooling. It is true that international organizations, multilateral and bilateral development agencies, and NGOs have promoted gender equity. Still, it does not seem to be the case that so many countries would have adopted gender equity as a policy goal if it were a matter of direct coercion. Of course, indirect means of influence are common, such as donors making funding available for gender-related activities. Nonetheless, many countries adopted gender policies modeled on those of other countries or because the idea was modeled by other countries. Others developed gender policies because they had “subscribed” to a cultural model in which all people, regardless of gender, have the right to school. Researchers have examined the complex interactions of global practices in national and local contexts (see, for example, Anderson-Levitt 2003; Vavrus and Bartlett 2012). Policy ideas and ideals may be Western or global in origin, but they are adopted locally, by individuals and nations for their own reasons. Of course school systems are famously “loosely-coupled”, perhaps even more so in poor countries. Official national policy, however global in formulation, is understood and implemented locally, by actors who have particular and often limited resources, whose exposure to global influence is often less direct and less intense, and in any event whose primary reference groups are nearby.

Of course, there are great variations in the formulation of education policy and its content across time and countries. Policies have variously emphasized basic education, vocational and technical education, higher education, non-formal education. Central objectives have shifted from access to equity to quality to learning. Government-led and supply-oriented strategies have largely given way to market-based strategies with a much greater role for “demand-side” policies and interventions. In all of this, however, what is rarely questioned is the underlying policy—based on a fundamental belief that Meyer et al. (1977) would assert is inherent to modern political society—that schooling is a means of improvement for nations and for individuals. The more of it one or one’s country gets, the better.

The next section of this chapter provides an overview of developments in international education policy and development since the late 1940s. Subsequent sections discuss trends in: (1) the formulation of international education policy by nation-states in this complex environment of sovereignty, interdependence, and asymmetrical power; and (2) the content of education policy.

2.5 Decade by Decade

From the end of World War II until the 1970s and beyond, more than 90 new nation-states came into being, mostly as a result of decolonization. In many cases, governments moved quickly to nationalize schools, as a matter of national pride; so schools would more actively promote citizenship, identification, and loyalty to the new nation and its leaders; and to maximize use of limited resources. Educational planners, modeling their work on economic planning carried out in the socialist states, developed elaborate plans for expansion of schooling and its linkages with economic development and national development plans. Western universities and international organizations such as UNESCO promoted education and state-led planning as a development activity. It was the heyday of U.S. and Soviet development assistance, which, though relatively modest in education, linked national development, technical and financial assistance, diplomacy, and national interest in an effort to win allies in the larger Cold War. Nonetheless, the belief in modernization, whether capitalist or socialist, the efficacy of the state and the central role of schooling remained unquestioned.

The 1950s were a period of optimism in international development. Comprehensive economic planning was promoted by development specialists in the market and socialist economies alike, at least planning for economic development in low-income countries. The primary focus was on economic development at the national level. With loans for capital investments, technology transfer, appropriate technical assistance, and increased trade, most though not all development agencies and specialists felt that countries would be able to develop. The primary path to development followed a path similar to that taken by the industrial economies of the West and North, from agricultural and natural resource production to industrialization. Despite the general consensus, some economists, sociologists, and others questioned whether conditions were the same for the late arrivals as for the wealthy nations, whether the playing field had tilted or not, and in whose favor.

Educationally, pent-up demand for schooling on the part of new citizens of new nations led to a remarkable expansion of schooling. Ambitious education plans, corresponding to equally ambitious economic development plans, were developed. Attempts were made to use school systems to develop skilled labor according to manpower plans developed in conjunction with economic and national development plans. Managerial resources in the newly independent nations were often scarce. While national staff “capacity” was developed, expatriates occupied many technical positions in the education and other ministries. Often school systems expanded more rapidly than available resources in human terms of students, teachers, administrative officials, and policymakers and in material terms of school buildings and instructional materials. Regardless, the heady days of fresh independence fostered an atmosphere of possibility and promise. UNESCO assumed a major role during this period as the lead UN agency for education.

The 1960s saw an intensification of the Cold War rivalry between the United States, the Soviet Union and their various allies. In part, this rivalry played out in a competition for favor among developing countries, and corresponding allocations of development assistance to the needy, who were also allies. The 1960s represented the high point of modernization theory. With appropriate technology and good economic development policy, national economies should, it was felt, reach the stage of take-off and sustained economic growth through a series of clear steps (Rostow 1960). Failure to take off was hypothesized by some scholars to result from individuals' non-modern attitudes, for example, the extent or lack of achievement motivation (McClellan 1961). At the same time, critical thinkers especially in the Third World began to write about the need for changes not just in the attitudes of people in less-industrialized countries or in the technologies made available to them by industrialized nations, but in the structure of resources and trade in the world economic order.

In education, the 1960s saw emergence of human capital theory, advanced by Theodore Schultz (1963, 1971) and others. Human capital theory argued that economic development in the West could not be explained simply by the accumulation and application of natural inputs and financial capital. A substantial portion of the difference in growth could (best) be explained by differences in human capital, the knowledge and skills acquired through education and training. Schooling thus became an economic investment, not just a cost to the national treasury.

In both development and education arenas, there was the beginning of awareness that the early promises were not being realized. National economies were not growing as fast as projected by development plans. School systems were overwhelmed by persistent shortages of necessary inputs, and expansion of schooling did not necessarily lead to jobs at the individual level or economic growth at the national. Neither development nor schooling was working out as hoped.

The 1970s and the Second Development Decade saw a shift from economic development as a goal in itself to economic development for improved well-being of the population, especially the poor. Participatory, bottom-up, community-based, and grass-roots approaches to development became prominent, along with the language of basic needs and income (in)equality. Women and children began to draw policy attention along with other groups previously marginal to the development experience. "Structural" inequalities both within and across countries were highlighted. Education saw a number of critiques of schooling. Freire saw most schooling as an instrument of "domestication" (1972) while Illich (1970) urged the "disestablishment" of schooling as credential-granting (and thus socially reproductive) institution. Carnoy (1974) portrayed education "as cultural imperialism" (1974). Nonformal education drew attention as an alternative to the regimentation of formal schooling and a solution to the world educational crisis (Coombs 1968). Some countries worked hard to catch up to population growth and the challenges of underdevelopment. Others especially in East and Southeast Asia were beginning to link schooling with skills development and an export-oriented economic development strategy (World Bank 1993). Others such as Cuba, Tanzania, China, etc.

used education to promote a larger social and political transformation of society (Carnoy et al. 1990).

The 1980s saw the debt crisis. Neoliberal economic analysis found that the governments of developing countries were financially over-extended. Implementation of structural adjustment programs by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund were required as the condition for funding. Structural adjustment programs required substantial reductions in the size of government budgets, mostly by reducing government workforces and cutting back on government programs and bureaucracies, and removal of protections to national currencies and national markets. High levels of inflation and unemployment resulted. Education and other social sectors suffered serious cutbacks in funding. Efficiency became a high goal. With the rise of neoliberal thought, market strategies drew considerable attention in the social sectors as well.

There was a general disillusionment with the efficacy of the central state. Manpower planning and economic planning in general fell into disrepute. The World Bank, USAID and other agencies promoted decentralization in education and other sectors—in an effort to improve bureaucratic responsiveness to clients or beneficiaries; to share the burden of finance with local communities and beneficiaries; to downsize the central bureaucracy. At the same time, local authorities often lacked the capacity, training, and resources to manage decentralized units effectively. Decentralized governance generally requires more capacity, in more places, than more centralized governance.

Research found rather remarkable effects of education, especially secondary education of women, on child mortality, child and maternal health, and fertility decline (see for example, Caldwell 1979, 1980). Parallel developments saw a greater emphasis on inclusion of women and other previously excluded groups and a willingness to broaden the groups involved in schooling. A series of rate of return analyses suggested that the social returns to primary education were greater than to secondary and higher education. As a result, many of the major funding organizations shifted their funding to basic education. Still, there was also a general recognition that past attempts to improve access had failed to reach all children. The decade ended with the World Conference on Education for All (WCEFA), organized by many of the major international organizations and actors in international and development education. Modeled in part on UNICEF's successful immunization campaigns of the 1980s, WCEFA's goal was to mobilize and support governments so as to ensure a basic education for all of the world's children by the year 2000.

The 1990s saw an intensification of several earlier trends. Tightening budgets led to increased calls for accountability including results and impacts, for funding agencies, the agencies implementing projects, and countries receiving aid. At the same time, there was growing awareness of unintended dysfunctions of different approaches to development assistance and the limitations of projectized development assistance. There was increasing recognition of the need for ownership and capacity of the development enterprise on the part of recipient countries, and for coordination among funding agencies and across development initiatives.

Increasingly, the effectiveness of aid came to be understood as dependent on good governance on the part of the recipient country. Alternative modalities of technical assistance were developed, including budgetary support and sector-wide approaches (SWAp). Support was also growing for a comprehensive approach to basic development goals, leading to the *Millennium Development Goals* in 2000.⁶

In education at the global level, much of the 1990s was occupied with mobilization around the *Education for All* (EFA) goals. Later in the decade as it became clear that the initial EFA goals were not going to be met by 2000, a subsequent meeting was organized in Dakar in 2000, where the various nations—donors and recipients alike—recommitted themselves to achieving universal basic education by 2015.⁷

In parallel, there was growing participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), both international and national, in development activities. Though not without controversy, the idea was that NGOs were able to reach farther and deliver services more flexibly than government.

The fall of socialist regimes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe ended the Cold War. Surprisingly, conflict increased, though mostly in the form of intra-state conflicts. The notion of “complex humanitarian emergency” was developed—an emergency that is multidimensional, man-made, and politicized. To a greater extent than before, conflict involved non-state actors, to which the established international architecture, composed as it was of nation-states, had difficulty responding. Some political spaces became impossible to govern becoming “failed states”. As other countries moved toward greater risk of failure, the notion the “fragile state” was developed, defined as a government lacking the capacity or will to provide basic services to its people and the ability to govern its spaces after dark (Williams *n.d.*). As the number of such cases arose, it became clear that standard approaches to development assistance, once the humanitarian crisis ended, were not effective, often not possible, sometimes even making bad situations worse. Areas affected by conflict were in greater need of assistance, yet because of instability, weak institutions—the elements of state fragility—received significantly less funding and support.

Other issues have come to the fore: As a result of the moves to implement EFA policies, including abolishment of school fees, enrollments have increased, outstripping in many cases the capacity of school systems to provide. When successful, increasing numbers of basic education completers put pressure on the secondary level to respond. Often, secondary systems lack the capacity to educate all students who wish to enroll. Many secondary school systems lack the curricula to respond to

⁶Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education; Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women; Goal 4: Reduce child mortality rates; Goal 5: Improve maternal health; Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases; Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability; Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development.

⁷The Dakar goals are: Goal 1: Expand early childhood care and education; Goal 2: Provide free and compulsory primary education for all; Goal 3: Promote learning and life skills for young people and adults; Goal 4: Increase adult literacy by 50 %; Goal 5: Achieve gender parity by 2005, gender equality by 2015; Goal 6: Improve the quality of education.

the needs of diverse students, some of whom will continue on to higher levels of education, but many of whom will not, and who need to leave school with a respected credential and skills to earn a living. Provision of education does not necessarily lead to employment if the schooling provided does not meet the needs of employers (UNESCO 2012), or if the economy does not produce enough jobs.

The 2000s opened with the recognition of failures to reach universal goals of development and education outlined above coupled with renewed commitments to achievement of those goals. Soon after the turn of the century, the events on 9/11 focused U.S. attention on terrorism. Development assistance, at least in the United States, became even more closely linked with diplomacy and defense. Funding was shifted to areas felt to be at greatest potential risk for terrorism.

In parallel, there was a trend among development agencies toward the creation of general funds devoted to particular problems, for example the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. The educational equivalent, the *Fast Track Initiative*, was established in 2002 and headquartered at the World Bank. Its goal was to bypass the normal aid processes, which were lengthy and bureaucratic, and get funding quickly to countries able to demonstrate the capacity to use the funds well. Initial criteria for effective capacity were challenged as the Initiative developed. A critical external mid-term evaluation led to establishment of a new management structure more independent of the World Bank, and a new name, The Global Partnership for Education. A number of countries have received funding to achieve EFA goals, through preparation of a comprehensive sector plan and other means. But the neediest and most conflict-affected areas have, until recently, been left out.

Concern with accountability, evidence, results and impact led to a focus on evidence-based policy formulation, development planning organized in terms of results frameworks, and impact as explicit evaluation criteria. Ongoing concerns about aid effectiveness led the OECD to promulgate the *Paris Declaration of Aid Effectiveness* (OECD 2008), which detailed five principles for aid effectiveness and established procedures for monitoring implementation of the principles.⁸ This was followed up in 2008 by the *Third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness* in Accra, and the *Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness* in Busan, South Korea, in 2011. The Accra meeting found progress in some areas, but indicated the need for greater efforts in terms of country ownership, building more effective and inclusive partnerships, and achieving development results and openly accounting for them.

Successful at the level of aspirations, international education policy has failed to reach its potential in several important ways. While more children are enrolled in school than ever before, the extent of learning is not clear. Schools still operate with fewer resources than they need, a situation that will only worsen as demand for schooling is likely to increase more rapidly than the resources to fund it. Current models of schooling may be unaffordable and inappropriate for all. Current curricula fail to prepare many for livelihood after school. New demands continue to be

⁸The principles are: ownership; alignment; harmonization; managing for results; and mutual accountability.

placed on schools and on the education policy process, with few demands taken away. The more critiques that emerge, the greater the burden on schools, school systems and governments, some of which will not reach the “minimum” targets of the *Millennium Development Goals*. Then too, funding agencies are working hard to fix problems in development assistance process. But many of the rigidities are inherent. It is difficult to form an equal partnership when inequalities among nations are structural, and one party is funding the other. Economic, social, and political development are poorly understood, difficult to organize and to support, even without the interests of competing states and the challenges of different languages, cultures, traditions, different histories and differences in power. Still, the aspirational success of education as a modern idea and as an individual goal and national project is remarkable, challenged only perhaps, arguably so, by advances in technology. Schooling has become part of the landscape of modern life, a right of individuals and a rite of passage, defining, in part, the life chances of those who get it and those who do not.

References

- Anderson-Levitt, K. M. (2003). *Local meanings, global schooling: Anthropology and world culture theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ball, S. (2008). *The education debate*. Oxford: Policy Press.
- Benavot, A., & Riddle, P. (1988). The expansion of primary education, 1870–1940: Trends and issues. *Sociology of Education*, 61(3), 191–210.
- Caldwell, J. C. (1979). Education as a factor in mortality decline: An examination of Nigerian data. *Population Studies*, 33(3), 395–413.
- Caldwell, J. C. (1980). Mass education as a determinant of the timing of fertility decline. *Population and Development Review*, 6(2), 225–255.
- Caldwell, J. C. (1986). Routes to low mortality in low-income countries. *Population and Development Review*, 12(2), 171–220.
- Carney, S., Rappleye, J., & Silova, I. (2012). Between faith and science: World culture theory and comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, 56(3), 366–393.
- Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as cultural imperialism*. New York: David McKay.
- Carnoy, M., Samoff, J., Burris, M. A., Johnston, A., & Torres, C. A. (1990). *Education and social transformation in the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chabbot, C. (2003). *Constructing educational development: International organizations and Education for All*. New York: Routledge.
- Coombs, P. H. (1968). *The world educational crisis: A systems analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cummings, W. K. (2003). *The InstitutionS of education: A comparative study of educational development in the six core nations*. Oxford: Symposium.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Fuller, B. (1991). *Growing-up modern: The western state builds third-world schools*. New York: Routledge.
- Gardinier, M. P. (2012). Teachers in Albanian educational reform and democratization. *Comparative Education Review*, 56(4), 659–683.
- Hannum, E., & Buchmann, C. (2006). Global educational expansion and socio-economic development: An assessment of findings from the social sciences. In J. E. Cohen, D. E. Bloom, & M. B. Malin (Eds.), *Educating all children: A global agenda* (pp. 495–534). Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

- Illich, I. (1970). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McClellan, D. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand.
- Meyer, J. W., & Ramirez, F. O. (2000). The world institutionalization of education. In J. Schriewer (Ed.), *Discourse formation in comparative education*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Meyer, J., Ramirez, F. O., Robinson, R., & Boli-Bennet, J. (1977). The world educational revolution, 1950–1970. *Sociology of Education*, 50, 242–258.
- Mundy, K. (1998). Educational multilateralism and world (dis)order. *Comparative Education Review*, 42(4), 448–478.
- OECD. (2008). *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action*. Paris: Author. <http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/34428351.pdf>. Accessed 13 Jan 2013.
- Ramirez, F. O. (1997). The nation-state, citizenship, and educational change: Institutionalization and globalization. In W. K. Cummings & N. F. McGinn (Eds.), *International handbook of education and development: Preparing schools, students and nations for the twenty-first century* (pp. 47–62). Oxford: Elsevier, Pergamon.
- Ramirez, F. O. (2003). Toward a cultural anthropology of the world? In K. Anderson-Levitt (Ed.), *Local meanings, global schooling*. New York: Palgrave.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2006). Globalisation and the changing nature of the OECD's educational work. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Education, globalisation and social change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rostow, W. (1960). *The stages of economic growth: A non-Communist manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schultz, T. (1963). *The economic value of education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schultz, T. (1971). *Investment in education: The role of education and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Steiner-Khamisi, G. (2000). Transferring education, displacing reforms. In J. Schriewer (Ed.), *Discourse formation in comparative education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Steiner-Khamisi, G. (2004). Blazing a trail for policy theory and practice. In G. Steiner-Khamisi (Ed.), *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Takayama, K. (2007). A Nation at Risk crosses the Pacific: Transnational borrowing of the U.S. crisis discourse in the debate on education reform in Japan. *Comparative Education Review*, 51(4), 423–446.
- Takayama, K., Waldow, F., & Sung, Y. K. (2013). Finland has it all?: Examining the media accentuation of “Finnish education” in Australia, Germany, and South Korea. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 8(3), 307–325.
- Tarabini, A. (2010). Education and poverty in the global development agenda: Emergence, evolution and consolidation. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30(2), 204–212.
- UNESCO. (2012). *EFA global monitoring report, 2012: Youth and skills: Putting education to work*. Paris: Author.
- United Nations. (1948). *The universal declaration of human rights*. New York: Author. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml>. Accessed 31 Jan 2013.
- United Nations. (1989). *The convention on the rights of the child*. New York: Author. <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/crc.htm>. Accessed 13 Jan 2013.
- Vavrus, F., & Bartlett, L. (2012). Comparative pedagogies and epistemological diversity: Social and material contexts of teaching in Tanzania. *Comparative Education Review*, 56(4), 634–658.
- Williams, P. (n.d.) State failure in Africa: Causes, consequences and responses. <http://www.europaworld.com/entry/ass.essay.8>. Accessed 31 Jan 2013.
- Worden, E. A. (2011). The “mock reform” of history education in Moldova: Actors versus the Script. *Comparative Education Review*, 55(2), 231–251.
- World Bank. (1993). *The East Asian miracle: Economic growth and public policy*. Washington, DC: Author.

Globalization, International Education Policy and Local
Policy Formation

Voices from the Developing World

Brown, C.A. (Ed.)

2015, XVIII, 254 p. 2 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-94-007-4164-5